



YADA YAHOWAH

TWISTIANITY



VOLUME TWO

TOWRAHLESS

*WITHOUT GUIDANCE*

CRAIG WINN

YADA YAHOWAH  
TWISTIANITY

VOLUME TWO

TOWRAHLESS

*WITHOUT GUIDANCE*

CRAIG WINN

Craig Winn. *Twistianity: Towrahless*.

Craig Winn. *Questioning Paul: Towrahless*.

1<sup>st</sup> edition. [www.yadayah.com](http://www.yadayah.com), 2007.

2<sup>nd</sup> (revised) edition. [www.yadayah.com](http://www.yadayah.com), 2008.

3<sup>rd</sup> edition. [www.yadayah.com](http://www.yadayah.com) and Claitor's Publishing Division, 2012.

4<sup>th</sup> edition. [www.yadayah.com](http://www.yadayah.com) and Claitor's Publishing Division, 2013.

5<sup>th</sup> edition. [www.yadayah.com](http://www.yadayah.com) and Amazon, 2017.

6<sup>th</sup> (revised) edition. [www.yadayah.com](http://www.yadayah.com) and Amazon, 2020.

7<sup>th</sup> (revised) edition. [www.yadayah.com](http://www.yadayah.com) and Amazon, 2023.

Revised and renamed 1<sup>st</sup> edition. [www.yadayah.com](http://www.yadayah.com) and Amazon, 2024.

Copyright © Craig Winn 2024

Copyright Statement - [About Us - \(www.yadayah.com\)](http://www.yadayah.com)

*About the Author...*

Twenty-two years ago, Craig Winn was an entrepreneur. The turbulent story of his last adventure is shared in his first book, *In The Company*. 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 9.11.01, 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* has now been updated and substantially expanded, becoming *God Damn Religion*, after witnessing the sadistic savagery of Muslim terrorists on 10.07.23 in Israel. It reorders the *Quran* 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 | Way of Allah’s Messenger*. If you want to know why fundamentalist Muslims commit 90% of the world’s most heinous terrorist acts, and if you care about the wellbeing of God’s people, *Snake, Satanic, Submission, Slaughter*, and *Sunnah* are instrumental.

In his quest to resolve a puzzling prophetic anomaly, Craig began translating the text of the Dead Sea Scrolls. That endeavor led to the 23 volumes of *Introduction to God, Yada Yahowah, Observations, Coming Home, Babel*, and 5 books on *Twistianity*, formerly, *Questioning Paul*. They were renamed and rewritten to present the Passover Lamb’s true identity and to condemn the abomination known as Replacement Theology.

Throughout, Craig, or Yada as he is known to Yahowah, has been committed to providing amplified translations. They are not only more accurate and complete, they are readily verified. As a result, he has been afforded hundreds of insights into the words Yahowah

inspired, many of which are unheralded and profound.

Beyond these 35 books, Craig Winn has been interviewed as an expert on religion, politics, economics, and terrorism 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 his *Yada Yah Towrah Study*. He currently produces a live podcast every Friday evening, where he discusses insights gleaned from his translations. Links to the podcast and archives, as well as to the social media sites expounding upon *Yada Yahowah* are provided at [YadaYah.com](http://YadaYah.com).

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. All 30 of his published books are offered without royalty.

Over the past twenty years, Craig Winn has devoted his life to exploring Yahowah's testimony. 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.

Craig encourages readers to share his translations and resulting insights with others, albeit with two 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 copyrighted material.

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 many helpful resources, as well as to friends and forums.





# TWISTIANITY

## TOWRAHLESS

### Table of Contents:

1	<i>Alla</i>   To the Contrary <i>Discordant...</i>	1
2	<i>Dauchaomai</i>   To Brag <i>Previously Functional...</i>	42
3	<i>Anomos</i>   Without an Inheritance <i>I was Torahless...</i>	103
4	<i>Kauchaomai</i>   Bragging <i>I do not recall...</i>	166
5	<i>Shama'</i>   Listen <i>Learning Something...</i>	259
6	<i>Kataginosko</i>   Condemned <i>Peter Judges Paul...</i>	310
7	<i>Thanatos</i>   Deadly Plague <i>Feed My Sheep...</i>	355
8	<i>Kakos</i>   Pernicious <i>Do not Accept...</i>	380
9	<i>Pistis</i>   Faith <i>Without Evidence or Reason...</i>	486
10	<i>Christo</i>   Drugged <i>Intoxicating...</i>	536
11	<i>Baskaino</i>   Bewitched <i>Ignorant and Irrational...</i>	583



*Discordant...*

Never in the sordid history of bizarre notions has something so obviously wrong been so widely accepted as right. Nonetheless, somehow, somehow, the twisted tales of the Christian New Testament have managed to fool billions of people for nearly two thousand years.

What was the appeal of the religion of contradictions and substitutions? Was it the syncretism with other popular belief systems, such as those involving Dionysus, or was it the boldness of the counterfeit? Surely, it was neither evidence nor reason because they were in short supply. It could not have been the writing quality either since it was abysmal. Even the symbolism, that of a dead god on a stick, was torturously unappealing.

But it was overtly anti-Semitic, demonizing Jews for killing a revolutionary god, so it resonated with Romans and Greeks, even Persians and Egyptians – drawing them in by incorporating their religious myths, holidays, symbols, and rituals.

Thus far, the wannabe apostle's poorly conceived and written letter to the Galatians has been an abomination, a decidedly unacceptable and egotistical rant. So as we approach Paul's next statement, would there be a sparkle of light. After all, from the narrowest possible interpretation, had what follows been set into a different context, and then properly explained, there might have been a glimmer of hope that the self-proclaimed Apostle

was encouraging the faithful to “*shamar* – observe” the Torah and then actually do what it says. After all, Yahowah’s instructions are more valuable to us when we study His teaching and understand His guidance as opposed to robotically doing something.

This is one of the many things Orthodox Jews get wrong. They habitually impose restrictive behavior irrespective of God’s intent. In this regard, the symbolism of circumcision is even more important than the act – although both are essential to our ability to respond to and engage in the Covenant relationship with God.

That is not to say we should disregard our Heavenly Father’s advice. If you want to be included in the Covenant, if you want to be adopted into His family, and if you want to be invited into heaven, if you are not currently circumcised and are a man, get circumcised. As we shall see, with Yahowah, male circumcision is a life-and-death decision, one in which He is unwilling to compromise. Therefore, my point is that we should seek to understand why this is so, and then embrace Yahowah’s instructions regarding life in the Covenant.

These things known, without the proper perspective, Paul’s next statement is misleading and counter to God’s intent. While it is true that we should never be compelled but, instead, should act on our own accord, that is not what Paul was implying.

**“To the contrary** (*alla* – but by way of contrast and making a distinction), **not even** (*oude* – but not) **Titus** (Titos – a Latin name meaning nurse), [*the one with (o syn) me (ego)*] **a Greek (Hellen) being** (*eimi* – existing (present tense, active, participle)), **was compelled** (*anagkazo* – was forced or pressured, necessitated or obligated (aorist, passive, indicative indicating he was acted upon in the past)) **to be circumcised** (*peritemno* – to be cut off and completely separated; from *peri*, concerning the account

of, near, and all around, and *tomoteros*, to cut something to create separation (aorist, passive, infinitive conveying that at that time he was influenced in this way by the verb which has properties of a noun)).” (Galatians 2:3) (The reason for bracketing the clause “the one with me” is that it is not found in Papyrus 46, the oldest witness of this statement.)

For those who may place greater confidence in the McReynolds English Interlinear associated with the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition, here is that rendering for your convenience and consideration. “But but not Titus the with me Greek being was compelled to be circumcised.” So much for the myth that the NA27 has been updated to reflect the oldest extant manuscripts. There is nothing older than P46 and they ignored it and included portions of the phrase “the one with me.”

Had Sha’uwl been trying to actually share Yahowah’s message, he would have provided some context along with an explanation as to why it would never have been appropriate to “compel or force” anyone to do anything. God does not issue mandates and there are no obligations. We are all free to accept or reject the Covenant. The choice is ours, and it is offered under the auspices of freewill.

Titus, by being uncircumcised, may well have been a Pauline convert, but that was a ticket to nowhere. He had excluded himself from the Covenant and was precluded from Heaven as a result of his condition. It mattered not that he was Greek, only that he remained without identifying himself with the sign of the Covenant.

Therefore, while there is nothing God asks which is obligatory, and no choice should ever be compelled, an explanation would have gone a long way toward helping people understand the symbolism involved in their decision regarding whether or not to be circumcised. It does, after all, open a person up to the possibility of an extension of life when done and, if not, its absence assures

either the elimination or incarceration of one's soul. This is because, while circumcision does not guarantee admission into the Covenant Family, and the benefits pursuant to it which include eternal life, a man who dies uncircumcised has no chance of either. If Titus remained uncircumcised, his soul no longer exists or it was imprisoned in She'owl. Further, Sha'uwl was fully aware of the black-and-white nature of this choice and the implications.

Few things are more obvious to the observant than Yahowah does not "*anagkazo* – compel." He is a proponent of freewill. Therefore, the decision to circumcise our sons, or to become circumcised ourselves should our parents fail to prepare us for the Covenant in this way, is ours to make as parents and as individuals. Those who choose wisely to position their children and themselves to enjoy the Covenant's benefits. Those who do not are automatically and summarily disqualified and excluded. It is our choice, but so is the resulting consequence.

Circumcision is the sign demonstrating a family's acceptance of the conditions and benefits of the Covenant. It denotes their desire to be included in it or excluded from God's Family. The symbolism is hard to miss, as this sign deals with the part of the male anatomy responsible for conceiving children.

By consistently filling in words which aren't actually in the Greek text to improve readability, without designating them as being added by way of brackets or italics, translators have artificially elevated the status of this epistle, far beyond what the words deserve. But other than that, the KJV rendering is permissible: "But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised:" LV: "But even Titus, who was with me, though he was a *Gentilis* / Gentile, was not *compulsus* / compelled to be *circumcidi* / circumcised," Jerome, a Roman, couldn't write "Greek," even though the text required it. That's funny in a way.

Arbitrarily putting words into Paul's mouth has lost its charm. There is no basis for the NLT's opening clause, one which is not only in conflict with the testimony found in Acts but is also a sentiment with damning consequences: "And they supported me and did not even demand that my companion Titus be circumcised, though he was a Gentile." Do you suppose that the team of scholars and religious leaders who compiled this supposed "translation" really thought that "*Hellen*" meant "Gentile?"

The reason I suggested that this statement, at least without a proper explanation, was counterproductive is that it could be construed to suggest that Paul and others were in a position to annul one of Yahowah's most essential instructions. Rabbis would claim this authority for themselves on other issues, but never regarding something as clear and compelling as circumcision. Even they had their limits when it came to contradicting and opposing God, but not Paul.

By way of example, Akiba was particularly clever. Misconstruing Yahowah's penchant for volition, the rabbi promoted the myth that a majority vote by Rabbis could override the Torah on any subject that was of interest to men. This arrogant assertion eventually became the basis of Judaism, with rabbinical arguments in the Talmud superseding the Towrah. And in a roundabout way, it is also the basis of Roman Catholicism, whereby a Pope, elected by Cardinals, is seen as having the authority to establish new rules, even those which contradict God's guidance. Therefore, this is one of many places where Sha' uwl's lack of specificity has become problematic. And frankly, there is no way to see any of this as productive.

But that's not the only issue at play here. By transitioning from: "**Later, through fourteen years, also, I went up to Yaruwshalaim along with Barnabas, having taken along also Titus. (2:1) I went up, but then downward from uncovering an unveiling revelation**

which lays bare, laying down to them the beneficial 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: “To the contrary, not even Titus, a Greek being, was compelled, forced or pressured, necessitated or obligated, to be circumcised,” (Galatians 2:3) without any intervening explanation is a sure sign that: 1) The purpose of the Yaruwshalaim Summit was designed to deal with Paul’s contrarian position regarding circumcising Greeks. 2) Paul wanted it to appear as if his rivals agreed with his position against circumcision even though this would place everyone in opposition to God. 3) That this decision not to encourage a man to be circumcised to participate in the Covenant was so fresh in everyone’s mind that no transition or introduction was required to remind the audience that the purpose of the meeting had been the disconnect between Paul’s message and God’s position relative to circumcision. For this reason and many more, it is apparent that Galatians was written soon after the Yaruwshalaim Summit in 50 CE, which was before Sha’uwl’s first visit to Thessalonica, Corinth, or Rome – the other candidates for his initial epistle.

Further, as we will discover in Acts, to the contrary, Titus was actually encouraged to become circumcised at this meeting. Therefore, Paul’s testimony regarding his recent past is once again suspect – or, at the very least, intentionally misleading. And that means that he has violated the *hayah* clause of Yahowah’s prophetic test a second time. He has failed to accurately report what has recently occurred.

Third, as we shall soon discover, Yahowah’s position on circumcision is clearly stated, as is Sha’uwl’s opposition to it. Their views are the antithesis of one

another. Therefore, this begs the question: how is it possible for an informed and rational person to believe that Paul was authorized to speak for God under these circumstances? To think that Yahowah changed His position on an issue, in which He has always been unequivocal, is to believe that God is capricious and unreliable. And if that is the case, we cannot trust anything He says, nor anyone who claims to speak for Him. Therefore, there is no possible way for Paul to be credible in this conflict. This is the rational conundrum which renders Christianity false – and it cannot be overcome.

Speaking of credibility, what follows should give us pause. Regardless of whether you or I concur with God's position on the sign of His Covenant, the only way to justify the reference to Titus' lack of circumcision set awkwardly between Galatians 2:2 and 2:4 is to realize that, while this letter may have been addressed to the Galatians, it was not about them. Sha'awl went to Jerusalem to undermine the competition – the rival apostles. This letter was designed to discredit them so that Paulos could rise above them unchallenged. And in this way, Sha'awl is impersonating Satan, who would rise above all by discrediting the Prophets.

Grammatically, the following clause is not the start of a new sentence. And it has nothing whatsoever to do with Titus being a Greek or being uncircumcised (or so it would appear). And the problem with it, apart from the fact that the required transition is nonexistent, is that there is no reason to criticize someone or demean them without demonstrating that what they have said or done was inconsistent with Yahowah's instructions. Paul did not. And it will not be the last time. Worse still, it is Paul who should actually be exposed and condemned for advocating these contrarian positions against God's instructions.

With this in mind, Paul's subsequent statement transitions from being inappropriate to being devastating

when seen flowing out of his opening salvo against the Towrah. If you recall, Paulos claimed that “the old system which had been in place” was “disadvantageous, harmful, wicked, and worthless.” And since the sign of that system was circumcision, it is hard to miss the association between this statement and Paul’s underlying contention that the Torah is of the flesh and enslaves. So without further introduction, here is Galatians 2:4:

“...but (*de* – moreover then) **on account of** (*dia* – through, by, or because of) **the** (*tous*) **fake brothers** (*pseudadelphos* – impersonators who falsified their kinship, relationship, and affinity) **brought in surreptitiously under false pretenses** (*pareisaktos* – joining secretly, smuggled in), **who** (*hostis* – literally: whoever and whatever) **sneaked into the group** (*pareiserchomai* – crept in by stealth, slipping in) **to secretly spy upon** (*kataskopeo* – to closely investigate, evaluate, and consider but more typically: to lie in wait, to spy out, and to clandestinely plot against) **the freedom and liberation** (*ten eleutheria* – the liberty and release from conscience, from binding morality, from slavery and bondage, the emancipation from all constraints) **that** (*en* – which) **we** (*emon*) **possess** (*echo* – hold on to and experience) **in** (*en* – with or among) **Christo** (XPΩ – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to usurp the Septuagint’s credibility and infer Divinity) **Iesou** (IHΥ – 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”) **in order that** (*hina*) **us** (*emas*) **they will actually make subservient as slaves** (*katadouloo* – they will control for their own ends, making servants brought into bondage (future tense, active voice, indicative mood)),...” (Galatians 2:4)

Before we analyze this statement, let’s reconstitute our bearings by reviewing it in context: “**Later, through**



fourteen years, also, I went up to Yaruwshalaim along with Barnabas, having taken along also Titus. (2:1) I went up, but then downward from uncovering an unveiling revelation which lays bare, laying down to them the beneficial 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 obligated 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,...” (Galatians 2:4)

As a result of Paul’s “separate and distinct” “message or messenger,” it “became apparent” that he “had to go up to Yaruwshalaim” to confront the “presumptions, suppositions, and opinions” of others that he “might be running foolishly and in vain.” We know that “not obligating” “Greeks” to be “circumcised” was the overriding issue, a topic so vital to Paul’s new religion and rhetoric, he felt compelled to deliberately demean the character and motives of the participants. Paul claimed that either the men chosen by Gospel Jesus to be his disciples, or those they had invited into their company, or both, were “impersonators who faked their relationship.” He claimed that they had “secretly snuck into” this meeting “under false pretenses” “to spy upon and plot against” the “liberation from conscience and constraints” Paul and his followers claimed to “possess.” And as such, Paul was paranoid, suggesting that he was a psychotic narcissist,

perhaps even schizophrenic. Paul was actually implying that the intent of the clandestine interference of the supposed interlopers was “to make [Paul and associates] subservient, controlling them for their own means.” Yes, it was all about Paul – and in this regard, nothing would ever change.

One would expect such divisive delirium from the Caesars, rival Greek emperors, or political rivals, but it is crude, even rude, when written about those who were alleged to have known Gospel Jesus and when promoted by someone claiming to speak for the very same Christou Iesou. But at least we can celebrate one achievement – the lines of the debate have been drawn and everyone is compelled to take sides. It is Paul and pals against everyone else in a quest for supremacy.

If we are to believe Sha’uwl’s words, they suggest that someone who claimed some affinity with the disciples, in the city of reconciliation where the Miqra’ey were fulfilled, were fakers, spies, and enslavers who wanted to deprive Paul and his companions of freewill, making them subservient to them. And since there isn’t a scenario in which this would have been possible, the claim serves as further indication that Sha’uwl was either delusional or dishonest. But since he couldn’t tell a lie, it must have been the former.

Venturing back into reality, the Covenant is Yahowah’s means to liberate His children from oppression. Therefore, Paul’s claim upends reality and suspends credulity. It simply reinforces the conclusion that Sha’uwl / Paul was mentally ill and morally compromised. And that is particularly bad when it is coupled with his bouts of narcissism and occasional schizophrenia, even his propensity to respond as a psychopath when challenged.

While no person, spirit, government, or religious institution has the power or authority to revoke our liberties

as part of Yahowah's Beryth family as a result of Dowd's fulfillment of the Miqra'ey, in the culture of that day, at the time the letter to the Galatians was written, there were only two human agencies which sought temporal submission, and which had the power to enslave individuals during their mortal existence: the Jewish Sanhedrin and the Roman government. But representatives of either institution would have had no interest in such a meeting. And should they have sought such entertainment; they would have overwhelmed the others with their status and not slithered in and acted as spies.

But why even speak of "surreptitiousness, false pretenses, slipping in, and secrecy" in relation to the "*ekklesia* – called out" associated with Shim'own Kephas? To disparage them is to discredit the entire Gospel story. This is a devastating lose-lose paradigm for Peter, Paul, and Christianity.

The terms and conditions to participate in Yahowah's Covenant and the benefits associated with His Invitations to Meet were not secrets. We are never concerned that someone hears the Word of God because we want the unreligious and open-minded to hear it, even if they reject it and us. The liberation we experience in our relationship with Yahowah should be so joyously expressed, that it becomes contagious.

This diatribe sounds a bit like Paulos was part of a secret society such as the mystery cult of Dionysus, or Gnosticism, or perhaps involved in Mithraism, the Babylonian faith which became the dominant mystery religion practiced in the Roman Empire in the 1<sup>st</sup> through 4<sup>th</sup> centuries. It is as if he was concerned that those mysteries, the seven grades of initiation, the clandestine symbols, the secret handshake, and insider slogans known only to the initiated, were somehow on the verge of being compromised by a spy.

The reason Mithraism was cited as an example is because as a religious Roman citizen, it is quite possible that Sha'awl was an initiate, especially since the religion he conceived and Constantine embraced have so much in common. Mithras was the Savior god, not unlike Paul's depiction of his Christ. He was born of a rock, something embraced by Roman Catholicism through their misguided association with "Saint Peter," the "Rock." Mithras loved to ride and then slaughter sacred bulls, symbolic of the son of the sun god usurping the old god's authority, thereby demonstrating his superiority. And in Christianity, we find vestiges of sun worship woven into the fabric of the faith with solar allusions presented as accoutrements. They are shown as a sign that the new cast is superior to the father and his outdated modes. Having done away with the old god, and thus that god's old testament, the son of the sun could reign supreme, again in keeping with Paul's letters.

Mithras was emblazoned with scorpions and serpents, which is incriminating because the thorn Paul referenced controlling him was likened to a scorpion stinger by Gospel Jesus, and the serpent is Satan, through whom Paul admitted being possessed. Rather than observing Yahowah's seven feasts, all of which Paul negated, Mithras ate supper with Sol (the Sun), who is shown bowing to him. He is always depicted with a halo or sunburst above his head, as is the Christian Jesus. Mithras is commonly shown with two torchbearers, Cautes and Cautopates, assisting him, creating a Roman trinity. Their lanterns and staffs are held in opposite directions, representing sunrise and sunset, life and death, salvation and condemnation. The image is evocative of Calvary's crosses, with the largest one set between the others. Especially interesting considering Paul's inverted and twisted testimony, depictions of Mithras are almost always double-faced.

This Roman god with a Babylonian pedigree is presented amidst flashing rays of light, even lightning

bolts, just as Paul claimed to have seen him on the road to Damascus. He is depicted with the moon's blessing and approval after having defeated the sun god, Sol. Mithras then ascends through the seven heavens, something Paul and Muhammad claimed to have done as well.

The caduceus, the symbol of Mercury, the “messenger of god,” is associated with Mithras throughout these myths, which is telling because Paul's principal claim was to have been God's exclusive messenger to the world. Mithras is typically shown carrying keys, not unlike Peter in the Roman Catholic Church. He has a scepter in his hand, denoting his authority. He either holds a globe in his hand, or has one at his feet, conveying the notion that the world was his, again just as was the case with Sha'awl. These globes are even festooned with crosses – another Pauline fixation with a pagan past.

Especially telling considering Paul's fixation on the death and bloodletting of his savior; in Mithraism souls are immersed and saved in their graves by the blood of their god so as to be bodily resurrected in harmony with Mercury's message – most of which undergirds Paul's testimony. Especially intriguing, Mithras always wore a conical Phrygian cap, which denoted freedom from the law in the pursuit of liberty – which is hauntingly familiar to those aware of Paul's penchant to preach freedom from the Towrah. Also interesting, the Roman Savior who defeated the old god was costumed in Anatolian robes, the official dress of the land of Paul's birth. He is even shown as a fountain, baptizing his initiates.

The birthday of Mithras was December 25<sup>th</sup>, which was celebrated as the Festival of “*Natalis Invicti* – the Birth of the Unconquerable.” That means that he was conceived and thus resurrected each year on Easter Sunday – nine months earlier. To be saved by him, the initiate simply swore an oath of devotion making salvation faith-based. The rituals included recitals of a catechism, where

believers in the mythical god were asked to provide the prescribed answers to rehearsed questions to receive the gift of salvation.

The highest-ranking clerics were called “*Pater* – Father;” they carried a shepherd’s staff and wore elaborate robes emblazoned with sunbursts. They were distinguished by a Phrygian cap covered in thunderbolts and by a ruby ring. Each of these survives today in Roman Catholicism – Paul’s legacy. What’s more, believers were united in a universal faith, which is what “catholic” means. They identified themselves through their special handshake – something Paul also introduced. Women were excluded, just as they were from Paul’s personal life. Only men could participate and become clerics – also in keeping with Paul’s theology. So all of this provides us with something to think about.

Beyond the covert religious nature of the mythology, and the fact that it plays no part in our relationship with Yahowah, we must also deal with the rather peculiar sequencing of statements and events. Paul has connected mutually exclusive concepts and inconsistent conclusions. On one hand, he implied that the disciples were supportive of his message, at least to the extent that no one suggested that a Greek be circumcised, strongly inferring that everyone agreed with his position. But then in the next breath, we find Paul facing such severe opposition that he is compelled to exclude his adversaries and demean his foes. It is a sure sign that he was both crippled by paranoia and an ineffective debater who could not effectively refute those opposing him.

Further, we cannot blame these incompatible associations on scribal error. Papyrus 46 dates to within thirty-five to seventy-five years of the time Sha’uwl connected these conflicting statements. Further, there is no discrepancy between the Nestle-Aland and the oldest surviving manuscript. We cannot even blame these

conflicting notions on the difficulty of translating words from one language into another. In this case, they are perfectly clear. There is no dispute regarding their meanings – only the justification for them.

There is also the problem of the absurd transition from not compelling circumcision to surreptitious spies' intent on making Sha'uwl subservient to them. On the surface, it is insane. It does little more than provide a window into this man's soul and affirm that Paul was insecure and malevolent. Demonstrating the resulting paranoia, he saw everyone as a potential adversary. And so he would abandon all moral constraints to undermine those he sought to rise above.

The best that can be said of Paul is that what he wrote was mean-spirited and contrarian nonsense. Yahowah's willingness to free us from human oppression is not a secret and it cannot be invalidated by anyone – it's the foundational message of the Torah, the Covenant, the Exodus, the Invitations, and even the Ten Statements – all of which embody an everlasting promise of liberation.

Also at issue is the fact that the men who attended this meeting were identified in the book of Acts. They were neither Romans nor members of the Sanhedrin. Some had been, but were no longer, Pharisees. To the extent Luke cobbled the well-attested story together correctly, they were all elders in the Yaruwshalaim Assembly, which means that they could not have been "false brothers." They did not sneak into the meeting; they were invited. And they were active participants, not secret observers.

Unless something changes, we are on the cusp of having to acknowledge the unavoidable. The evidence is all too quickly becoming undeniable. It is obvious that God did not inspire these words. They are Paul's. And they are wrong on all accounts. But I suppose that is only a problem for those who prefer that those speaking for God tell the

truth. For all others, there is faith – and it overcomes all, including reason.

Those who would excuse Galatians 2:4, thereby forfeit the high ground – demonstrating their willingness to wallow in the lies of the delirious. And yet, theologians are driven to protect the man responsible for inspiring their faith, their prestige, and their incomes. They do so to keep from ostracizing themselves from their fellow Christians – those who believe that the so-called “New Testament” is not only “Scripture,” but also inerrant. And yet such an assumption is a religious myth akin to the Greek Charities and the Roman Graces being divine.

The Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear of Galatians 2:4 reads: “Through but the brought in secretly false brothers who came in along to look carefully the freedom of us that we have in Christ Jesus that us they will enslave thoroughly,…”

While the KJV’s publication of “Christ Jesus” is not appropriate, their translation is otherwise accurate. In this case, the problem is with Paul’s Greek, not Bacon’s English or Jerome’s Latin: “And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:”

The Vulgate acknowledges that this verse is in fact a continuation of the previous sentence: “...but only because of false brothers, who were brought in *subintroductos* / unknowingly. They entered *subintroierunt* / secretly to spy on our liberty, which we have in Christo Iesu, so that they might reduce us to servitude.” Jerome’s rendering also associates the reason for not compelling circumcision with the arrival of the false brothers. So other than the transliteration of an errant name and title, the Latin translation was quite literal.

Being literal, however, simply illuminates the



senselessness of Sha'awl's words. Therefore, Jerome explained: “~ The sub prefix of both ‘*subintroductos*’ and ‘*subintroierunt*’ indicate secrecy or a lack of knowledge about the action of the verb. In other words, the true brothers did not realize at first that these others who were brought into the Faith were false brothers. They entered while their intentions and falseness were unknown.” But this does not help. No man has the power or authority to alter what Yahowah has said and what Dowd has done.

When reading a novel, I prefer style over substance. But the Christian New Testament is not marketed by Bible publishers as a work of fiction. And yet, based on the liberties they have taken, the NLT is fictional. “Even that question came up only because of some so-called Christians there—false ones, really—who were secretly brought in. They sneaked in to spy on us and take away the freedom we have in Christ Jesus. They wanted to enslave us and force us to follow their Jewish regulations.” In that Yahowah told us that: “being presumptuous, overstepping one’s bounds, and taking liberties” serves as proof that someone is a false prophet, it seems Tyndale Publishing House, Inc. just revealed their true identity.

Nothing in the statement Sha'awl wrote said anything about being “forced to follow their Jewish regulations.” There was no subject or race mentioned. And while the NLT was wrong, it was not without cause. Based upon what we learn in the Acts 15 accounting of this meeting, a disagreement arose over whether God’s children should follow God’s example, and thus observe the Towrah. This known, however, there is no correlation between the Towrah and “Jewish regulations.” They are all derived from rabbinic traditions and the Oral Law – especially the Talmud. And yet this is a common Christian misconception, bred out of ignorance, disdain for the Towrah, affinity for Paul, religious rivalry, and anti-Semitism. Therefore, the NLT’s foray into interpretation

and away from translation was indicative of the religion's demonization of Jews.

As you contemplate Sha' uwl's response to the alleged "false brothers," recognize that "submission," from *hypotage*, is not found in Papyrus 46, the late 1<sup>st</sup>-century witness of this letter, even though it is included in more recently compiled texts (following *eiko*, meaning "yield"). Additionally, *euangelion*, rendered as "Gospel" in most English translations, but more accurately translated as "good message or beneficial messenger," is not extant in the earliest manuscripts either. Further, in P46, we find a placeholder for Yahowah's title between "*e aletheias* – the truth" and "*diameno* – may continue to be associated" in the oldest Greek text, but not in the Textus Receptus, the Novum Testamentum Graece, nor the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, even though the first claimed to be the "text received directly from God," and the other two have claimed to have corrected every error of the former by referencing older manuscripts.

Therefore, the two things we know for sure are: we are not the first to be troubled by what Paulos said, and, others have already tried to fix these problems. At the very least, the resulting response is the product of considerable meddling and copyediting – some of which may have been required just to make what follows appear lucid.

**"...to whom** (*ois*) **neither** (*oude* – not even and but no) **to** (*pros* – against, among, with regard to, or advantageously) **a moment** (*hora* – an occasion in time or an hour) **we yielded** (*eiko* – we surrendered, gave in, or submitted) [**to the submission** (*te hypotage* – to the obedience and subjection)] **in order that** (*hina*– as a result) **the truth** (*e aletheia* – that which is an eternal reality and in complete accord with history and the evidence) **of the Theos | God** (*tou ΘΥ* – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God) [**good message and beneficial messenger** (*euangelion*)] **may continue to be**

**associated** (*diameno* – might remain and continue) **among** (*pros* – to against, or advantageously with regard to) **you** (*umas*)." (Galatians 2:5)

With regard to this statement, the Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear, in direct denial of their claim to have corrected their text to reflect the oldest extant manuscripts, published: "...to whom but not to hour we yielded in the subjection that the truth of the good message might stay through to you."

The earliest witness of this statement reads: "to whom neither to a moment or hour we submitted in order that the truth of the *Theos* | God might continue to be associated among you." (2:5)

Excuse me while I vent for a moment, but this is pathetic. If the imposters had to be sneaky just to get into the room, and if their mission was simply to spy on Sha'awl, why is not surrendering to them being presented as a heroic and selfless stand which was required to bring us the truth? Couldn't we just read the Towrah for ourselves? Couldn't we just ignore them – especially since nothing they said, if anything, is known? Why is everything being presented as if it is not only Paul against the world, but that without Paul's lone stand against the influence of God, we would all die? And how is it that we are to believe that Paul is the arbitrator of "the truth of the God" when he began this letter telling us that His "old system was immoral and corrupt?" This is truly insane.

The issues are pervasive and serious because circumcision is a condition to participate in the Covenant, and the inference here is that some must submit to and obey the Torah to benefit from the old system. But how could that be possible when there is no Hebrew word for "obey." When it is found in English "translations," it is because they have misrepresented the meaning of the Hebrew verb, *shama*, which means "to listen." Likewise, there is no

Hebrew word for “submit.” The few times it is found in English Bibles either “*kachash* – to deceive,” “*raphas* – to stamp down,” or “*‘anah* – to respond” were twisted to provide this errant connotation. And as a condition, we are free to accept it or reject it. The choice is ours.

Towrah is comprised of “teaching” that we are well advised to “listen and respond to.” It is not comprised of a set of “laws” to which we must “submit and obey.” It is filled with God’s guidance and teaching, not His orders.

No one can diminish the Father and Son’s gift, so I am at a loss to see how Sha’uwl’s failure to yield to these men who, are neither identified nor quoted, would have had any material effect on anyone. But I do see an ego of gargantuan proportions masking a debilitating bout with insecurity.

Considering the audience, Paul is claiming that he is preventing the application of the same instructions our Heavenly Father provided to the Children of Yisra’el in His Towrah. By taking this stand, Sha’uwl is freeing believers from listening to God. Or not, should you prefer the truth.

While it is irrelevant in this discussion, for the sake of providing the missing context, the only people with the authority to enslave Paulos, and thus silence him, would have been representatives of the Roman government. Not even the Sanhedrin could have done so because Paulos was a Roman citizen. Moreover, as a rabbinical student in Yaruwshalaim, Sha’uwl would have known the latter personally. And as we will discover, Rome’s alleged imprisonment of Paulos did not silence him. If anything, it caused the wannabe superstar to wax poetically of his captors.

From personal experience, and as a result of the public notice in the 91<sup>st</sup> Psalm, Yahowah protects and enables those who work with him. We are impervious to censure and threats. So, Sha’uwl’s response was as flawed as was

his proposition.

Christian theologians, knowing what the founder of their religion will say next, would have us believe that the purpose of this troubling exchange was to free believers from the Torah. And that is because they, like Paul, despise God's Teaching. They neither understand it nor respect it.

Christian clerics also insist that the "false brothers" who were advocating on behalf of the Torah were "Judaizers." But this is ridiculous. Judaism is predicated upon Rabbinic Law, upon the Talmud, as opposed to Yahowah's Towrah. And Jews do not evangelize. The notion of a "Judaizer" is yet another of Paul's anti-Semitic myths – one that Christians have continued to lap as if nectar from the blood-soaked fingertips of their dying god.

This, of course, means Christian theologians are wrong on every account. It saddens me to say that it is obvious: Sha'uwl despised the Torah as much as they do. As a rabbinical student, he hated every word of it, just as do the rabbis of this day, arguing against it in their Talmud.

Yahowah's position, since it still matters, is the antithesis of Paul's, Christianity's, and Judaism's. The fulcrum upon which the Towrah pivots is the Exodus: the story of Yahowah freeing His people from religious and political oppression in Egypt as a result of His Covenant through the Miqra'ey.

This is why the First Statement Yahowah etched on the First of Two Tablets begins: **"I am Yahowah, your God, who delivered you from the crucible of oppression, out of the house of bondage and slavery."** The Exodus serves as a historical portrait of Yahowah's plan of liberation, one which is prophetically portrayed in the seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet which Dowd fulfilled to enable the Towrah's benefits.

The Miqra'ey, which were explained during the

Exodus and then fulfilled in year 4000 Yah, free us from being subject to mankind's political and religious schemes, from mortality, corruption, and separation from God. Therefore, it is blasphemous for Sha'uwl to suggest that he considered the Torah to be a source of bondage, or for Christians to promote such a notion, especially since the path to freedom delineated, commemorated, predicted, and explained by the *Miqra'ey* | Invitations to be Called Out and Meet were fulfilled by Dowd whom Paul was robbing.

*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis chronicles Abraham's journey away from the religious and political climate of Babylon and into a liberating personal relationship with God. For only the second time in human history, the Creator and His creation walked side by side as friends. This relationship developed into the Covenant and serves as the backbone of the Towrah, just as it is the expedient of the Exodus.

The first three Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God were fulfilled by Dowd to deliver on the promises on Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children. In this way, Yahowah has freed us from death and from religious and political guilt, indeed, from all forms of human oppression and control. And with the relationship reconciled, we are adopted into Yahowah's family. It is one cohesive story from beginning to end. There are no turns in this path, no dead ends. There are no changes or modifications along the way.

In this light, and as I have shared, the definition of the Hebrew title Towrah is not "Law," but is instead "Teaching and Guidance." The Towrah is our "Owner's Manual" written by life's Architect. It is the soil from which the Tree of Lives grows. Its fruit is a loving relationship leading to reconciliation, to knowing God and to living forever with Him. The Towrah exists to highlight this path and result.

As highlighted a moment ago, while essential,

circumcision alone does not save anyone. It is what it represents that matters. So long as we understand and accept that circumcision is symbolic of being separated and set apart from man's desires and from oppressive religious schemes, and that it acknowledges and announces our acceptance of the "*Beryth* – Familial Covenant Relationship" with God, we are spiritually circumcised. That said, physical circumcision remains a condition of the Covenant, so every man who wants to participate in it is encouraged to tangibly demonstrate his commitment to the relationship in this manner.

We observe the Towrah by closely examining and carefully considering Yahowah's teaching and guidance. We benefit from the Towrah when we respond to what we have come to learn and understand. Slavishly devoting oneself to a rigorous regime of doing everything the Torah says, however, at exactly the right time and in precisely the right way, and never doing anything contrary to its instructions, has never saved anyone – and is actually impossible. But coming to understand the *towrah*, and then capitalizing upon the means to reconciliation articulated therein, has ransomed and redeemed every child of the Covenant.

Returning to the passage, here is what the King James Version says relative to Galatians 2:5, not that I understand it: "To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." If it is possible to make Paul sound worse than he already does, credit the English for revealing it.

Since the Latin Vulgate reads: "We did not yield to them in subjection, even for an hour, in order that the truth of the *evangelii* would remain with you," we know why "subjection" and "gospel" were included in more recently compiled Greek texts, and in every subsequent translation. And yet, no one was trying to hold anyone in "subjection," and Yahowah doesn't have a "gospel."

But you wouldn't know it by reading the New Living Translation. In another break from their "Essentially Literal and Dynamic Equivalent" philosophy, one which has consistently rendered *euangelion* as "Good News," this time they wrote "Gospel" (even though *euangelion* wasn't actually written in the Greek text). "But we refused to give in to them for a single moment. We wanted to preserve the truth of the gospel message for you." It is too bad the Tyndale brain trust was not as committed to "preserving the truth." (Not that it is found in Paul's epistles.)

Moving on to the next plank in the Ark of the Deception, we find our handrail in this disorienting realm of Pauline verbosity with the Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear suggesting that the troubadour of faith provided the following rebuttal to his critics: "From but the ones thinking to be somewhat kind then they were nothing to me it differs face the God of man not receives to me for the ones thinking nothing conferred."

More literally and completely rendered from the words Sha'uwl actually selected, his retort was materially more demeaning and considerably less convincing:

"But (*de* – and then now) from (*apo*) those (*ton* – the ones) currently reputed and supposed (*dokei* – presently presumed based upon opinions and appearances) to be (*eimi*) someone important (*tis* – something) based upon some sort of (*hopoios* – some kind of) unspecified past (*pote* – both former or present time), they were actually (*eimi* – they were in the past and continue to genuinely exist as (imperfect active indicative)) nothing (*oudeis* – of no account and completely meaningless and worthless) to me (*moi*).

It carries through (*diaphero* – it currently actively and actually (present active indicative) spreads, really performs drifting different ways, it presently bears in alternate directions; from *dia* – through and *diaphero* – to



carry a burden) **the face** (*prosopon* – head, person, individual, and appearance) **of the God** (*o* ΘΣ – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God) **of man** (*anthropou* – of a human) **not** (*ou*) **take hold of** (*lambano* – presently obtain, actually acquire, or actively receive (present active indicative)).

**Because** (*gar* – making a connection) **to me** (*emoi*), **the ones** (*oi*) **currently presuming and supposing** (*oi dokei* – presently dispensing opinions based upon reputed appearances), **of no account** (*oudeis* – nothing and nobody, meaningless and worthless) **was their advice and counsel** (*prosanatithemai* – was their one-time cause, additional comments, and limited contribution (in the aorist indicative this was a merely a moment in time having occurred in the past)).” (Galatians 2:6)

All of this is conceited and belligerent, and much of it is awkward and disjointed. The condescending selection of verbs, missing prepositions, inappropriate grammatical forms, and the overall lack of sufficient information, renders the result something between an enigma and an abomination.

But in the context of a meeting with those who were chosen by Gospel Jesus, and specifically including Shim’own, Yahowchanan, and Ya’aqob, who else could have been in attendance who might have been “reputed and supposed to be someone important based upon something that occurred in the past?” The very notion is absurd. But then to impugn the lofty station the unnamed were falsely afforded, Paul cuts them to the knees and claims that these very same acclaimed individuals “were actually worthless.” It’s akin to whiplash on a carousel.

Also, since the disciples are the only potential candidates for Paul’s demeaning dismissal, why didn’t this weasel have the courage to name them here while he was rebuking them? Fact is, he will name them three sentences

hence, but only because he claims that Shim'own, Yahowchanan, and Ya'aqob granted him the right place of honor and authority. And of course, it makes perfect sense for those Paul has summarily dismissed and demeaned to respond by thanking him for the rebuke.

But I must ask: why is Sha'uwl bragging about attending a meeting where the counsel of others was worthless? Why undermine the credibility of those who are not even identified? It is like me telling you that I really disapprove of so-and-so because his opinions were irritating. By doing so, all I would have revealed is that I'm a lousy writer. It may be true, but why prove the case by indulging in meaningless drivel?

Typically, those who counter challenges in this manner do so because they realize that they cannot prevail on the merits of their argument. But it's laughable to demean the very same people whose endorsement is claimed. It is like saying, "They were all complete idiots, and they accepted me as one of them."

And it is what's not said that renders the result somewhere between senseless and slanderous. As this conversation develops, we must question whether Paul was even lucid. For example, *diaphero* speaks of "carrying different things, typically a burden, in various ways." So how does one apply this activity to "the face of the God" or to the context of the discussion? Why wasn't a preposition added before "the face" and why was "*anthropou* – man" scribed in the genitive, making it "of man?" Further, how does any of this relate to "*lambano* – taking, obtaining, acquiring, or receiving?" It is as if Greek was a foreign language and truth was an elusive concept.

If Paul was intending to say that "there are no distinctions in the presence of God which a man can receive," then that is what he should have written even though it is neither true nor consistent with Paul's rhetoric.

But he did not, and I suspect that is because he, himself, claimed to be different and distinct, to hold a status no one else had ever acquired – the lone chosen apostle to the Gentiles (and thus 99.98% of the world). Therefore, if the words are accurately translated, the statement is senseless. But if we try to make sense of them through copious copyedits, Paul’s entire mantra becomes convoluted and contradictory.

As a result, all we know for sure is that Paul wrote poorly and thought irrationally. So why is anyone buying what the village idiot is hawking? He held everyone but himself, even including God, in low esteem. In this case, the self-proclaimed good messenger felt that it was easier to demean than it would have been to discuss.

Overall, this is an interesting comment for Sha’uwl to make considering his penchant for offering unsubstantiated opinions as if they were snowflakes in the Arctic. For Paul, the three years these disciples spent listening to and observing Gospel Jesus didn’t mean squat. His arrogance was no doubt a function of him having been to rabbi school while they, as manual laborers, were flinging nets at fish. I suppose that this is not unlike the disdain clerics have for laity today.

This is the second time over the course of five statements that we have confronted “*dokei* – were of the opinion.” And in this context, it is *dokei*’s subjective side which prevails. According to Paul, these men “purported” to be important, and they “considered” themselves authorities. They were wannabes in the opinion of the wannabe apostle to the world. But compare their experience to that of Sha’uwl, who cannot name a single witness to corroborate his momentary misadventure on the road out of town.

Besides the obvious, this passage should have been a warning to the Roman Catholic Church. Their patron saint

has just said that his god, which is the Christian fellow still hanging around on the stick, does not recognize human hierarchies. Those who claim rank in relationship to the Pauline god, such as popes, not only have no such authority, but they are operating in direct opposition to the founder of their faith.

In truth, however, it is possible to have an elevated and special standing with God. It is the purpose and result of the Covenant. His children are His heirs, inheriting everything He has to offer, from eternal life to perfection, from adoption to empowerment. And one heir is above all others, His Firstborn, our Messiah and King.

While it is akin to putting a pig in a pretty pink dress, I suppose it might have been good had Sha'awl affirmed that religious and political hierarchies have no standing with God. Had these men not been the handpicked disciples of Gospel Jesus, it would have been appropriate to identify the nature of the organization to which other men may have once belonged and also to have listed the invalid positions others may have articulated.

Three sentences from now the self-aggrandizing one will reveal the names of those he is impugning. We will compare his protestation to Luke's testimony in Acts, which claims that beyond the disciples, themselves, the only others who were outspoken were formerly associated with the Pharisees – but so was Paul. And even then, we are left wondering what issues they may have raised other than supporting the Towrah.

Based upon what follows in Galatians, the worthless wannabes were disciples, specifically Shim'own, Yahowchanan, and Ya'aqob. And their testimony was discounted because they were encouraging everyone at the time to observe the same Towrah Dowd wrote about and embodied, that the Messiah observed, taught, and fulfilled. And that revelation is devastating to Paul's credibility,

because speaking of those who had promoted Yahowah's Torah, he just said that they "added nothing to the conversation." With Paul, it continues to be one step sideways and all others backward.

Since this allegation was utterly devastating to King James' claim to having divine authority to rule, which was the entire purpose behind the publication of the King James Bible, the passage was edited to say that "God accepteth no man's person." I kid you not. KJV: "But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me:" Last time I checked, the purpose of salvation was so that God could "accept man's person."

Jerome had the same problem with his pope, so he authored: "and away from those who were pretending to be something. (Whatever they might have been once, it means nothing to me. God does not accept the reputation of a man.) And those who were claiming to be something had nothing to offer me." Sha'awl's convoluted refutation of divine sanction was something they were unwilling to convey. So they copyedited the letter to suit their leader's agenda. But to his credit, Jerome accurately captured Paul's attitude and ego, if not also his underlying insecurity.

The NLT must have considered the words: "**but then** (de) **from** (apo) **those** (ton)" unimportant, so they omitted them from their rendering. And they evidently wanted Paul to be seen referencing "the leaders of the church," so they arbitrarily added this clause. Likewise, the NLT "translators" must have thought it would have been nice for Paul to have written "to what I was preaching," so they included this thought in the text of the epistle as well. And "by the way" must have seemed like the way Paul would have conveyed his thoughts had he been as articulate as the Tyndale team. Similarly, the NLT's inclusion of "great

leaders” and “favorites” was without textual support. So much for being Essentially Literal: “**And the leaders of the church had nothing to add to what I was preaching. (By the way, their reputation as great leaders made no difference to me, for God has no favorites.)**”

On the contrary, God has favorites. ‘Adam, Noach and his family, ‘Abraham and Sarah, Yitschaq and Ya’aqob, Moseh (through whom the Towrah was revealed), Shamuw’el, Dowd, and Yasha’yah immediately come to mind. And, of course, Paul has gone out of his way to tell us that he was preferred over all others.

The transition from the derogatory, “**but now from the ones currently reputed, 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,**” to “Petros” in this next sentence is concerning. Since Shim’own had been a disciple, and was now the most respected member of Yaruwshalaim’s Assembly, it infers that Paul thought that Peter’s “opinions added nothing to the conversation.” That being so, there is no relevance to the Gospels.

In support of this unflattering conclusion, Galatians 2:7 begins with a somewhat contrarian position. The Greek actually reads:

“**Contrariwise** (*tounantion* – on the contrary), **nevertheless** (*alla* – however notwithstanding the objection, exception, or restriction), **having seen and perceived** (*horao* – having looked at, having been aware of, and having looked at) **that because** (*oti* – namely for the reason) **I have been believed** (*pisteuo* – I have been convinced to faithfully give credence to, thereby I have been entrusted (in the perfect tense this occurred in the past producing the state which exists in the present, in the passive voice, Sha’uwl had this done to him, and in the

indicative mood, it actually occurred)) **with the (to) healing message and beneficial messenger (euangelion) of the uncircumcised (tes akrobystia) inasmuch as (kathos – to the degree that and just as) Petros (Petros – rock or stone; typically transliterated “Peter;” the Greek equivalent of the Aramaic kephas) of the circumcised (tes peritome).**” (Galatians 2:7)

As has been the case previously, we cannot blame the scribes for the apparent deficiencies. The Greek text reads exactly this way in every ancient manuscript, including Papyrus 46 – which was originally dated to as early as 85 CE (although this has been adjusted under further scrutiny to between 175 to 225 CE).

The Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear, the most acclaimed scholarly representation of the text, presents these same words as follows: **“But on the contrary having seen that I have been trusted the good message of the uncircumcision just as Peter of the circumcision.”**

Therefore, should we believe Sha’uwl, Shim’own Kephass, and Paulos were assigned the same mission, but to different people? But if this were the case, why was Paul so condemning of the disciple’s message? And why did Paul tell us previously that he was his god’s agent to kings, nations, and Yisra’el? Had he forgotten what his Lord allegedly told him, or did he feel at liberty to change his god’s ordination because he knew it was not true anyway?

While this statement is less grammatically deficient than the preceding six, it is barely literate, and its message is contrarian and convoluted. For example, *tounantion* literally means “opposite or contrariwise,” although it can be rendered as “rather” or “to the contrary.” And that begs the question, how and why was Paul’s message so contrary to the presumed leaders of the Yaruwshalaim *ekklesia*?

Likewise, *alla* also conveys “to the contrary,” in

addition to “nevertheless and notwithstanding,” indicating that there is a “significant contrast, objection, exception, distinction, or exemption” being made. But the problem with both of these terms, and most especially the use of *tounantion* in conjunction with *alla*, is that this clause isn’t related to God’s disdain for hierarchies, or to self-promoting types not adding anything to this conversation. So as back-to-back comparative terms denoting a very significant contrast, they were deployed to demonstrate that Paul sharply disagreed with what was being said at the meeting.

This, in turn, indicates that Galatians 2:7 is not only about divvying up the world, with Paul taking a 99.8% share for himself, his use of *tounantion alla* screams that neither his power grab nor his disdain for the Torah was well-received or agreed upon. Therefore, this was akin to a threat, whereby the admitted serial killer was demanding capitulation. The disciples would either accept his terms or Paul would resort to his specialty – assault and battery.

Exceedingly relevant, Paul divided the world between the circumcised and the uncircumcised. So since male circumcision is an absolute requirement to participate in the Covenant, all of Paul’s followers would remain estranged from God and they would all die. He was, as Yahowah foretold: the Plague of Death.

He has staked out his turf. By doing so, he has announced his animosity toward everything God holds dear – including truth, His people, and the Covenant. From henceforth, *Sha’uwl* | Paul would be Yahowah’s, Yahuwdym’s, the Towrah’s, and the Beryth’s most annoying antagonist. In pursuit of his new religion, he would do everything in his sphere of influence to keep those who disagreed with him from convincing his target audience – the world apart from Jews – that he was wrong. His tactics would include the delirium of replacement theology, vicious character assassination, and rampant



anti-Semitism.

Paranoid and delusional, Sha'awl would position Jews as competitors and opponents – his rivals and thus enemies. So while Yahowah's Chosen People had faced the wrath of the Egyptians, Philistines, Hittites, Moabites, Amalekites, Babylonians, Assyrians, Greeks, and Romans, Paul's religious assault would become their most debilitating foe. The pathogen he conceived with this letter and those which would follow, unleashed a two-thousand-year curse. And in that regard, had it been a prediction rather than a threat, it would have been the lone prophecy he got right.

Prior to this parting of the ways, many of the followers of The Way had been Ebionites who were Torah-observant Yahuwdym. They had invited and welcomed Gowym into the Covenant family with open arms – and under the same terms. However, now, as a result of Sha'awl's lust for power and as a consequence of this meeting, Paul's new covenant would be contrarian, upending an auspicious beginning.

A wedge was being driven between Jews and Gentiles such that Paul's "church" would henceforth view Yahowah's Chosen People as a conniving and ruthless enemy, as Christians would come to discount their God, His Land, Word, and people.

Even the Shim'own bar Kokhba revolt against Rome (climaxing in the Yowbel Year of 133 CE) which led to the Diaspora was rooted in Sha'awl's animosity toward his kin. The false messiah's sponsor, Rabbi Akiba, was able to wage his revolt by completing the job Sha'awl had begun, isolating and marginalizing the Yisra'elite members of The Way, the Ebionites, so that they had no safe harbor. Hated by everyone except God, they were decimated before Akiba's loyalists were routed by Rome, severing the connection between Yahuwdym and the Land as well as The Way.

Rather than Yahowah's Spirit inspiring and guiding him, Sha'uwl's ego blinded him. His anti-Torah message would be in direct opposition to Yahowah's instructions.

So now that we know that Sha'uwl was opposed to Yahowah, who do you suppose he aligned with and promoted? Who inspired him?

Especially proud of it, *Sha'uwl* | Paul answered this question at the conclusion of his second letter to Corinth: Satan. But even if he had not felt the urge to brag, it is already obvious to the Towrah-observant. So what does that say about Christians?

Since we do not have much to work with when trying to translate Galatians 2:7, before I share my thoughts on why these deficiencies exist, let's consider how Bacon and Jerome dealt with Paul's concluding statement. KJV: "But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter;" As we shall see, the King James Version is setting the stage for Paul's "Two-Covenant Theory."

The KJV added "when they" without textual support. They errantly replaced *euangelion* with "Gospel." The King James also added the clause "was committed to me" without justification in the Greek text. They repeated "gospel" a second time, even though there was no basis for doing so. Then they added, again without support in the Greek, "was and unto" before Petros. In other words, there is almost no correlation between the Greek manuscripts and the English found in the King James. To believe that Paul's original letter was the inspired word of God is akin to claiming that the King James Version was authorized by God.

As a result of all of their contributions to Paul's epistle, it was now: "the gospel of the uncircumcision" which "was committed unto [Paul]." So while this wasn't

an accurate translation, as an occultist, Sir Francis Bacon had no difficulty conveying the intended message. By discouraging circumcision, most of the world's population was automatically and irrevocably excluded from the Covenant and thus could not be saved. For someone who was opposed to God, and in league with Satan, it was a clever move.

Jerome's take on the verse was astute. While he had to add the words "it was," "since," "they," "me," and "to," at least his definition of *pisteuo* as "was entrusted to" was reasonable. However, by doing so, he undermined his translation of *pisteuo* as "faith" elsewhere. Jerome also had to significantly alter the word order. Yet, these things aside, considering what he was working with, it was a respectable effort. At least he did not create a "new gospel for the uncircumcised." "But it was to the contrary, since they had seen that the *evangelium* to the uncircumcised was entrusted to me, just as the circumcised to Petro."

However, from: "contrariwise, notwithstanding the objection or restriction, having perceived that because namely I have been believed entrusted with the healing message of the uncircumcised inasmuch as Petros of the circumcised," the NLT produced: "Instead, they saw that God had given me the responsibility of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles, just as he had given Peter the responsibility of preaching to the Jews." And yet there is no indication, apart from Sha'uwl's power grab, that this was true.

The reality that we must confront is that this sentence does not even approximate Godly perfection. In fact, even if it had been appropriately worded, it was not true. According to Acts 15, neither Shim'own nor Ya'aqob supported Sha'uwl's position. And since we are compelled to think, I want to deal openly and thoughtfully with what Sha'uwl has written. After all, we are encouraged to test messages, searching to know if they are from God, man, or

the Adversary.

The first step with regard to these deficiencies is to admit the obvious: the writing quality is akin to the illiteracy found throughout the Quran. It is beneath God's talent to have inspired this. And while we cannot blame Paul for "Gospel," we cannot excuse his replacement of Yahowah's fortuitous gift with the Greek goddesses, "Charis," or their Roman counterparts, the "Gratia." Further, there is too much ambiguity in this letter for it to be considered Divine.

Without exception, the basis of *Sha'uwl's* | Paul's arguments and feuds was inadequately developed or deliberately hidden. Although, there is no mistaking that Paul was assailing Yahowah's Towrah. There is no evidence that he had any issue with the Talmud (the Jerusalem Talmud existed at this time, but not the Babylonian extension).

So, for what it is worth, and that may be nothing, here is the most favorable spin we can put on these words, a perspective that is unsupported by what we are reading. A possible justification for the defects in wording may have been because Sha'uwl was dictating this as a letter to a community of people he distrusted in response to an attack on his qualifications and on his message. The penman may have been one of Paul's associates as opposed to a professional scribe. But the bigger issue was that Paul was angry, hurt, and overly emotional, and he let his ego get in the way.

But to infer, especially without any textual support, that Sha'uwl's letters were inspired, word for word as the Set-Apart Spirit moved his lips, is to demean Yahowah's ability to communicate. And if that were the case, it would be Yahowah who was schizophrenic, not Paul.

Further incriminating the Devil's Advocate, unlike what we find in the Torah, there is no instruction to write

Yahowah's words down, to pass God's personal, first-person testimony on to future generations. There is no admonition to leave God's witness exactly as it was delivered, without any additions or subtractions. There is no comparison between the profound, mind-expanding, and soul-stirring presentation we consistently experience in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms and what we are reading here. Moreover, much of Sha'awl's message has been untrue – and all of it has been unsupported.

One of my favorite litmus tests, at least apart from *Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 13 and 18, for determining that which is from man and that which was created by God, is the comparison between the pin and the lily. Both serve a purpose, but one is beautiful, no matter how closely we look. Examine a pin under a microscope, as we are doing here with Paul's letters, and the flaws are readily recognizable. Not so with the lily where, like the Towrah, the more it is magnified, the more obvious it becomes that it was conceived by a superior being.

Based upon what we have seen, it is pitifully obvious that Paul's letters are from Sha'awl of Tarsus, not God. Paulos had his issues, being both psychotic and demon-possessed. These problems bubble to the surface in Galatians, a letter which chronicles one of the darkest episodes in this controversial man's life. As such, this epistle remains his most haunting legacy. And that is the most positive and conciliatory explanation of the evidence at our disposal – at least at this point in our investigation. We still have a great deal to learn as Paul's pen becomes ever more drenched in Jewish blood.

Even if you don't yet concur with this assessment, it would be preposterous to view the manuscript copies of this letter, both ancient and modern, replete as they all are with numerous grammatical deficiencies and inaccurate statements, as representing the God being demeaned by them. Yahowah does not make mistakes; He is literate,

articulate, and consistent.

Moreover, even with the change of name from Sha'awl to Paul, the Devil's Advocate will never escape the dark shadow of death Yahowah ascribed to him in Habakkuk. For the observant and thoughtful, Paul was done before he began.

By contrast, Yahowah demonstrated that His Torah, Prophets, and Psalms are perfect, complete, trustworthy, and reliable – easy to understand and totally sufficient regarding the restoration and renewal of our souls. Therefore, our relationship with Him is predicated upon His credibility and Word – not Paul's contradictions and denials of it.

Since this is all very personal, especially between Yahowah, Moseh, Dowd, Yasha'yah, and myself, I would like to share our perspective on all of this. In contrast to Sha'awl / Paul, who wrote about his quest for control and acclaim while promoting his contrarian views by misappropriating and misrepresenting the Towrah and Prophets, directing attention away from Father and Son in the process, we have done the opposite. While Sha'awl changed his Hebrew name to a Latin moniker to more closely identify himself with his audiences throughout Greece and Rome, I have retained my given name while embracing a Hebrew *nom de plume*. While Paulos' letters and verbal pronouncements sought to demean and disavow the Towrah in order to promote a religion, we have sought to celebrate the Towrah and engage in the Covenant while renouncing religion and politics. Paul sought faith; we pursue knowledge.

As a product of our desire to understand and share, over the past twenty-two years I have written twice as many books as Paul wrote letters and I have recorded a hundredfold the number of speeches on Yahowah's testimony and that of the imposters. I have sought to more

accurately and completely convey the texture of God's Hebrew nomenclature while Sha'awl did the opposite.

We have prioritized Yahuwdaym while Paul courted Gowym. We begin by detailing what can be known and appreciated about Creation, life in the Garden, the pursuit of the Covenant, the revelation of Yahowah's name, the nature of the Exodus from religious and political oppression, and the gift of the Towrah, all while explaining the purpose of the Invitations to Meet, even denoting what can be known about their fulfillments. Therefore, we foretell where, when, and why Father and Son will return.

By contrast, Sha'awl / Paul knew nothing of these things, so he chose to speak of his own pursuits. In this light, my greatest discovery is the realization that Dowd is the Messiah and Son of God who fulfilled the first three Miqra'ey and that it is our King who will return to fulfill Yowm Kipurym in short order, doing so to reaffirm the Covenant relationship. Doing the opposite, Sha'awl renounced and robbed Dowd of his acclaim and accolades to promote a replacement in pursuit of religion.

While Sha'awl sought the limelight, I'm content to reflect it, much like the moon does for the sun. While Paul falsely claimed God's authorization, I have reluctantly acknowledged Yahowah's prevalent endorsements. And while those who believe the Plague of Death will die, those who read Yahowah's testimony in *Yada Yahowah* will live.

Before we move on, let's summarize where we have just been. Paul's relentless onslaught has taken a negative turn, replete with many accusations which are conflicting and errant:

**“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 good message 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 and forced 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 for a moment we yielded or surrendered, 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 were 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 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 perceived that because namely I have been believed entrusted with the healing message and beneficial messenger of the uncircumcised inasmuch as Petros / Rock of the circumcised.”



(Galatians 2:7)

This was not the product of a sane or rational mind. It is rambling and psychotic, delusional and paranoid. It only serves to prove that Yahowah was right when He warned us about Sha'awl. He has become the Plague of Death.

✠✠✠

Dauchaomai | To Brag

*Previously Functional...*

The realization that Galatians is not “Scripture” in the Christian sense, does not infer that a spirit was not engaged in Sha’uwl’s mission. By using *energeo* in the next statement, Paul acknowledged that something was “functioning” in him, “facilitating” the resulting toxin the Christian world has come to ingest.

Sha’uwl / Paul will infer that the spirit who inspired him, working within him, was the same “*o* – one” who inspired Shim’own Kephass, now called “*Petro* | Peter.” That being so, it explains why Gospel Jesus bluntly equated Peter to Satan after the misrepresented declaration where Iesous told him to tell no one that he was the Christos.

“**For indeed** (*gar* – because then namely), **the one** (*o* – article nominative singular masculine) **having previously functioned** (*energeo* – (scribed *energesas*) having operated and produced previously at work (in the aorist participle, this refers to a snapshot in antecedent time)) **in Petro** (*Petro* – in rock or stone; typically transliterated “Peter” from the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew/Aramaic *kephas*) **to** (*eis* – into and inside) **an apostle** (*apostolen* – one who is prepared to be sent out with a message) **for the** (*tes*) **circumcision** (*peritome*), **it actually is functioning** (*energeo* – (scribed *energesen*) it truly operating and is really working (aorist active indicative)) **also** (*kai*) **in me** (*emoi*) **to** (*eis*) **the nations and ethnicities** (*ta ethnos* – the people from different places and races).” (Galatians 2:8)

It was either yet another desperate lie, deliberate and inexcusable, or it was true and, therefore, self-incriminating and damning. Sha'owl wants his readers to believe that the spirit working within him was not only the same one guiding the disciples, but that it came from God. But since Peter's and Paul's messages were discordant, necessitating this summit, and both contrary to Yahowah, the spirit would have to have been duplicitous. And in this regard, Satan would not have cared how much they differed between them, so long as they were contrary to God in ways that made his ascension possible.

According to the testimony provided by Shim'own Kephas or one of his colleagues to Luke and then passed on to us in the opening chapters of Acts, Paul's claim to similar inspiration was wildly inaccurate. At this time, they were in disagreement on almost every issue. And even though Peter was less dismissive of the Towrah, his defense of it was remedial at best and often inaccurate.

Having studied the Towrah, I realize that the only way to receive the Set-Apart Spirit is to embrace the conditions of the Beryth while accepting the invitations offered through the Miqra'ey. And even then, She comes upon those Yahowah is seeking to enlighten, protect, and deploy. There is nothing to suggest that either Peter or Paul were ever Covenant, and there is a mountain of words demonstrating otherwise. Therefore, if they were inspired by a spirit, then they were demon-possessed – something Paul, himself, admits.

Several years ago, during my previous edit of this material, I tried to paint Peter as Paul's foil, as the voice of Gospel Jesus and of the Towrah against the Towrahless One and Devil's Advocate. I had once thought that his retort against Paul's position in opposition to the Towrah, while feeble, was heartfelt. I have even considered Peter's take on Shabuw'ah / Pentecost to have been somewhat plausible. But the more I considered the disciples'

testimony and compared it to God's clearly articulated positions on these things, the more I realized that Peter was no closer to the truth and no better than Paul. His every word was untrue.

For example, Shabuw'ah was not fulfilled at the time or manner claimed by Peter and Luke in the Book of Acts. This harvest of standing grain is in our immediate future, and during it, only those who have capitalized upon what Dowd has accomplished through the Miqra'ey on behalf of the Beryth will benefit – all of which Peter and Paul deny.

Informed and rational, we now know for certain that Peter's and Paul's claims were unfounded, both regarding the Towrah and Ruwach. And since they were in conflict with each other and in opposition to God, all of the air has gone out of the room.

One of the reasons that I prefer the insights we glean through amplification is because of words like *energeo*. By examining them, we not only plumb the depths of what's being conveyed, we also come to understand that terms like *ethnos* convey a much broader and more all-encompassing idea than either "nations" or "Gentiles."

*Energeo*, when applied to Shim'own Kephas, was scribed in the aorist active participle, thereby, exhibiting the characteristics of a verb and an adjective as a moment in antecedent time. This grammatical form is used to say that this took place earlier in his life and that one thing preceded another. But when Sha'uwl applied *energeo* to himself, he used the aorist active indicative, whereby the mood of assertion proclaims that the state being presented by the writer was real. In this context, and by incorporating these telling nuances, we can read Paul's statement to say: "There was a time, long before I took charge, that this other fellow may have once done in a limited way what I have already accomplished and am doing in a massive way." I did say he was a narcissist, after all.

According to the Devil’s Advocate, Paul was pertinent and Peter was passé. Sha’uwl was usurping his authority. So why did Gospel Jesus bother with the disciples in the first place? There is no room for them in Paul’s power grab.

Translated as “having previously functioned” and “actually functioning,” the two times it appears in Galatians 2:8, *energeo* speaks of “causing something to function or work, thereby producing an effect.” But it is an amoral term, without any inference as to whether the power is good or bad, whether the effect being produced is right or wrong, or whether the result is beneficial or harmful. And I suppose this is the reason that Gospel Jesus is never shown using this verb. Therefore, all we know for sure is that Paul wanted his audience to believe that there was no difference between the source and the result of his “power and ability,” and that which had once been demonstrated through Shim’own and now through him.

But even the most favorable interpretations evaporate when we examine the Greek text more closely. *Energeo* was written as *energesas*, which is masculine singular in reference to the subject, “o – the one,” also written in the masculine singular. But the *ruwach qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit of Yahowah is feminine in Hebrew and neuter in Greek. Therefore, the source of power Paul was claiming was masculine, and thus could not have been Yahowah’s Set-Apart Spirit – which was most assuredly the source of Dowd’s inspiration and ability. Fortunately (or unfortunately depending upon your perspective), as we have already seen, Sha’uwl was not mum on the identity of the spirit who possessed him. The masculine and singular source of his inspiration was *ha Satan* | the Adversary.

This known, there is a difference between proving that Sha’uwl / Paul was a fraud, the Wolf in Sheep’s Clothing, and alleging that he was the Devil’s Advocate. And while the initial conclusion has become irrefutable, its derivative would be foolish to ignore.

We already know that Sha'awl / Paul would eventually admit in his second letter to the Corinthians that he was demon-possessed. And we are now aware that he has opened Pandora's Box with his ode to the masculine power influencing his assault on the Towrah, its Covenant and its people. But Sha'awl was a liar, so we ought not trust his testimony. However, God is not, and Yahowah called Sha'awl "*ben 'awlah* – the Son of Evil," initially in *Shamuw'el* / He Listens / 2 Samuel 7:10 and then again in *Mizmowr* / Lyrics to be Sung / Psalm 89:22. As the Son of Evil, he was Satan's child. In due time, we will consider both prophecies in association with Sha'awl. They are presently presented in the *Above and Beyond* and *To Dowd or Not to Dowd* chapters of Volume 1, *A Voice, of Coming Home*.

So now regarding *Sha'awl's* | Paul's misleading statement, the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear (NAMI) asserts that Paul wrote: "The one for having operated in Peter to delegateship the circumcision operated also in me to the nations." Therefore, these things known, save one glaring issue, the translations which follow are accurate, albeit inadequate renderings of the poison he has presented. KJV: "(For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:)" The adjective-verb, *energesas*, which we have been addressing, was accurately translated as "wrought effectually" in its first occurrence, but even though it is singular and masculine in the Greek text, it was not rendered in the third person, making "For 'he' that" inappropriate, albeit telling. However, kudos to Francis Bacon who realized that Paul was bragging by using *energesas* to say "the same was mighty in me."

And while there was no basis for "he" in the Greek text because "*o* – the one" is an article and not a pronoun, it is once again apparent that Jerome's Latin Vulgate served as

the basis of the King James: “For he who was working the *Apostolatium* / Apostleship to the circumcised in Petro, was also working in me among the *Gentes* / Gentiles.”

As usual, the NLT has been presumptuous. Paul did not identify the source of his power: “For the same God who worked through Peter as the apostle to the Jews also worked through me as the apostle to the Gentiles.”

The New Living Translation inappropriately associated the entity working with Paul as “God,” so I am compelled to once again provide the following for your consideration. While I have presented this before and will do so again in other chapters, at this juncture it is especially prudent to consider the implications of Paul’s stunning confession...

**“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 preeminent and awe-inspiring** (*hyperbole ton* – exceedingly great, transcendent, magnificent, and admittedly exaggerated aspects of the 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 be lifted up** (*me hyperairomai* – I not become conceited, 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, or a poisonous scorpion’s 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, lifting myself up** (*me hyperairomai* – I may not be overly proud, 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 12:6-7)

Sha’uwl revealed the identity of his power. He explained why “the one” providing it was masculine, not feminine. He also admitted why he was so critical of God and so averse to His Son, Family, and Towrah.

In an upcoming chapter in this volume of *Twistianity*, “*Kataginosko* | Convicted,” we will consider what Paul just



said in the context of the Dionysus quote attributed to the flashing light he encountered on the road to Damascus. But suffice it to say, for now, Paul admitted that he was driven by his ego and controlled by a demon. And that does not bode well for Christianity.

Without the clutter of the Greek text, the Adversary's Apostle testified:

**“Because indeed if I might want to brag and boast, glorifying myself, honestly, I would not be unjustified. But then I will say I am presently abstaining. But someone not approaching me might ponder beyond what he sees in me, or something he hears from me, (2 Corinthians 12:6) or of the extraordinary superiority of the preeminent and awe-inspiring, exceedingly great revelations.**

[Excuse me for interrupting this diatribe, but what revelations? Paul has not and will not reveal anything accurate or worth knowing. His only fulfilled prophecy was that he would impose a curse.]

**Therefore, it should be self-evident, in order that I not become overly proud, exalting myself beyond what would be justified, there was given to me a sharp goad and troubling thorn in the body, a messenger and spiritual envoy of Satan, in order to strike and 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)**

After you catch your breath, we will move on.

As we have come to expect with Paul, after stepping sideways, he stumbles backward. He is once again associating his message with his favorite pagan goddesses.

**“And (*kai*) having known and having recognized (*ginosko* – having become familiar with and having**

acknowledged) **the Charis | Grace** (*ten Charis* – the name of the lovely and lascivious Greek goddesses of merriment, known to the Romans as the *Gratia*, from which “Grace” is derived) **of the one** (*ten* – article accusative singular feminine) **having been given** (*didomi* – having been offered and bestowed, having been assigned, experienced, and furnished) **to me** (*moi*), **Ya’aqob** (*Iakobos* – an inaccurate transliteration of *Ya’aqob*, meaning One who Digs in his Heels, Standing Steadfast, Jacob, renamed “James” in honor of the British King), **and** (*kai*) **Kephas** (*Kephas* – a transliteration of the Hebrew word for stone in the palm of one’s hand, the nickname of *Shim’own* | He Listens), **and also** (*kai*) **Yahowchanan** (*Ioannas* – a tragically inaccurate Greek transliteration of *Yahowchanan*, a compound of *Yahowah* and *chanan* meaning Yahowah is Merciful, commonly known as John), **the ones** (*oi*) **presently presumed and regarded** (*dokei* – currently considered and supposed, of the opinion and assumed) **to be** (*eimi*) **pillars** (*stulos* – metaphorically used to symbolize an important, authorized, or authoritative leader, especially someone who establishes, upholds, and supports), **the right** (*dexias* – to take the right hand and place of honor and authority) **they gave** (*didomi* – they offered, granted, and extended) **to me** (*emoi*), **and** (*kai*) **to Barnabas** (*Barnabas* – meaning Son of a Prophet) **fellowship** (*koinonia* – association and participation) **as a result** (*hina*). **We** (*emeis*) **to** (*eis*) **the** (*ta*) **nations and ethnicities** (*ethnos* – people from different races and places), **but** (*de*) **they** (*autos*) **to** (*eis*) **the circumcision** (*ten peritome*).” (Galatians 2:9)

Liars lie, that is what liars do. As proof, lingering hostilities will cause Paul to condemn Peter later in this same letter. Further, there was no mention of John being at this meeting in Acts, and that is because he had moved on to Ephesus. And even then, Sha’uwl will tell Timothy to undermine and refute John and his preaching. Moreover, Shim’own explicitly challenged Paul’s claim to the Gentile

world, largely because Gospel Jesus had allegedly authorized him to preach to them. Then there is the issue with *Ya'aqob* | Jacob and his epistle. It was written to say that the kind of faith Paul was promoting was ineffective and deadly.

Beyond all evidence to the contrary, what is the purpose of a supposed endorsement from “presumed and supposed” pillars? It is like claiming that the village idiots applauded at the end of a speech. And as for Barnabas, he would part ways with Sha'awl as a result of this meeting. They were hardly of one accord.

Conveying the meaning of the same words somewhat differently, the Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear reads: “And having known the favor the one having been given to me Jacob and Cephas and John the ones thinking pillars to be right they gave to me and Barnabas of partnership that we to the nations themselves but to the circumcision.”

While the Greek does not flow exceptionally well into English, the message is that Sha'awl claimed that the three men closest to Gospel Jesus, his brother, Ya'aqob, Shim'own Kephas, and Yahowchanan, all “granted the right place of honor and authority to” Paul. And then as an afterthought, they said that his pal, Barny, could tag along. But it is all as egotistical as it is delusional because the same source claimed that they were and remained bitter enemies.

While it may be a smaller issue among much bigger ones, the distinction between how Paul says he was treated versus Barnabas is revealing. Based upon the way Paul worded this, associating “the right” with him and “fellowship” with Barnabas, it would be inappropriate to suggest that the “right hand of fellowship was extended to Paul and Barnabas.” And with this deliberate distinction, rendering *dexias* as “the right hand,” when removed from “*koinonia* – fellowship,” would be misleading. Therefore,

we are left with what the context thus far has consistently conveyed: Paul wants us to believe that the disciples Yahowchanan, Shim'own, and Ya'aqob stepped aside to position Sha'uwl in "*dexias* – the place of honor and authority." And if you believe that, you will believe anything.

But at least now we know with absolute certainty that the men who Sha'uwl was demeaning with "*dokei* – presumed and supposed" have been named: Yahowchanan, Shim'own, and Ya'aqob. And while that is what we suspected, in this context, it is ironic because in Galatians 2:6 Paulos claimed that their "advice and counsel was utterly worthless" and that they "meant absolutely nothing to him." But now that Paulos craves their approval, all of a sudden the "presumed pillars" are credible – at least when seen stepping aside and bowing to the ascendancy of Paul. With spiritual advisers like this, the Devil becomes superfluous.

While it is another small thing, you may have noticed that "the one" has changed genders from one sentence to the next. He was masculine in 2:8, but in the shadow of the naked goddesses of licentiousness, the alluring Charis, she is now feminine in 2:9. This suggests, at least grammatically, that the Charities inspired Paulos. But even that is farfetched because he was not into girls, just boys.

Everyone in this audience, sneaky spies, presumptive leaders, or otherwise, would have recognized the Greek and Roman goddesses. They would have seen that Paul was associating his faith with the Charities, which is only a good thing for those who prefer paganism.

Beyond his asinine enslaving remarks, associating with false gods, rejecting the Towrah, replacing Dowd, and promoting a religion while rejecting the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Statements Yahowah engraved on the Tablets of Stone, the evidence suggests that Paul's declaration skirted the truth.

Even if “*dexias* – the right” is extrapolated to be “the right hand” as in a “handshake” or “greeting” rather than “the right to take the place of honor and authority,” in Acts we learn that the greeting preceded the discussion. And that would make Paul’s recasting of events, with an inverted chronology, invalid. In Acts, “*ginosko* – recognition” of his arrival was not an antecedent to acceptance.

In Galatians, the inference is that the supposed disciples had listened to Paul’s presentation of his preaching and dogma, and then approved it, offering him the position of power and authority. Thereby, the use of “*ginosko* – knowing and recognizing” at this juncture portends that Ya’aqob’s, Shim’own’s, and Yahowchanan’s acknowledgment should be equated to an acceptance of Sha’uwl’s Towrahless message. But in Acts we learn that this welcoming greeting occurred before, not after, Paul presented his case, and therefore it did not serve as support of his ministry. And this deliberate sleight of hand was designed to mislead readers regarding something absolutely essential to Christianity’s credibility demonstrates that Sha’uwl was as deceitful as the Devil. Saint Paul, indeed.

On the positive side, the Greek word *stulos* is related to *stauros*, the “upright pillar” upon which Dowd hung, opening the door to life on Passover. The Messiah’s sacrifice as the Upright Pillar (the ‘*edon*) on the upright pole (*stauros*) was “symbolic of the authorized and authoritative leader who establishes and upholds (*stulos*).”

*Stulos*, which means “a pillar or column which stands and supports something,” is used several times in the Greek texts. The next two occurrences are found in Revelation 3:12 and 10:1. The ‘*edon* concept of the “Upright One who is the Foundation of the Tabernacle” is advanced by: **“All who are victorious will become pillars (*stulos*) in the Tabernacle of My God and will never have to leave it. And I will write on them the name of My God.”**

(Revelation 3:12).

In Revelation 10:1, the *stulos* symbolism is reminiscent of Yahowah going before the Children of Yisra'el by day as a pillar-shaped cloud and by night as a pillar of light. "Then I saw another mighty messenger coming down from heaven, surrounded by a cloud, with a rainbow over His head. His face shone like the sun, and His feet were like pillars (*stulos*) of fire."

Okay, so I'm grasping for straws to find something positive to write about in the midst of the Christian swamp. Obviously, the Christian writers knew nothing of any of this. So, I promise not to do it again.

On the less-than-admirable side of the ledger, there is a disturbing tone to some of this which needs to be considered. While *dokei* can convey the idea of "choosing to think, and of thought," its primary meaning is more along the lines of "supposition and presumption," and thus of "imagination and opinion." That is not to say that *dokei* cannot be translated as "recognized and regarded," as evidenced by the verb *dokimazo*, which means to "examine, to regard as worthwhile, and to judge as good, genuine, worthy." But recognizing and acknowledging that Sha'uwl's intent was to label Ya'aqob, Shim'own, and Yahowchanan "the supposed, presumed, and opinionated" pillars would be more accurate – especially since he has already equated this word to these men to say that they were meaningless and worthless.

We must ask: "Why would Sha'uwl choose to refer to the three most acclaimed disciples as the "*dokei* – assumed" pillars when he could have used "*epiginosko* – acknowledged" pillars? *Epiginosko* speaks of "a thoughtful conclusion which is formed after becoming thoroughly acquainted with the evidence." *Epiginosko* is the "synthesis of knowledge and understanding, of having sufficient information and the ability to process it rationally." *Epiginosko* is "objective" while *dokei* is "subjective."

*Epiginosko* speaks of “an informed conclusion” while *dokei* is “an unfounded opinion.” Therefore, in our search for truth, in our desire to know that which is trustworthy and reliable, *epiginosko* is the epitome of that quest, while *dokei* leads us backward into the murky and mystical religious realm of faith. Further, *dokei* continues to pit the Christian messengers as a house of cards in conflict pursuing disparate missions.

Twice now Paulos has divided the room, each time inaccurately and unfairly, claiming that the outreach of Shim’own, Ya’aqob, and Yahowchanan was limited to the Jews, while his mission encompassed the remainder of the world – the nations and races. This simply was not true on either side while unacceptable to Yahowah and discordant with the mythos associated with Gospel Jesus.

According to Iesou Christou, John’s mission was not limited. If anything, it was focused on the “uncircumcised,” especially the Greco-Roman world. He lived in Ephesus – the largest, most influential Greco-Roman city in the world. And for better or worse, Yahowchanan was the leader of the *ekkllesia* there, not Sha’uwl. It is even likely that the Gospel attributed to John was written in Ephesus, a city which lies well beyond the province of Galatia from the perspective of *Yahuwdah* | Judea. Also telling, according to his second letter to Timothy, everyone, who knew Paul intimately, ultimately rejected him.

Further, Revelation, which is also attributed to an aging John at the conclusion of the 1<sup>st</sup> century, and thus fifty years removed from this debacle, was cobbled together on the Greek Island of Patmos. And it provides a set of clues which associates the early church with Satan. And so if Sha’uwl’s sentiments were accurate and Yahowchanan had been retired since he was no longer relevant outside Judea, why was this “Revelation” given to him and not to Paul?

Therefore, considering the way things played out, Sha’uwl was wrong in limiting Yahowchanan’s influence while claiming it for himself. And he should not have been so dismissive or disparaging regarding Yahowchanan’s status. And as a result, this letter has taken on an undeserved and undeniable egotistical tint, bordering on delusional.

And as we have just discovered, Paul’s ego was so enormous, by his own admission, the Devil had to prod him to control him – to keep him in line. And even after demonic modification, Sha’uwl was still so full of himself that his words elicit a gag reflex. He would have us believe he was an expert on all things pertaining to Rabbinic Judaism, and that as a Roman citizen from Tarsus, he was the purveyor of enlightenment to the Greco-Roman world. And this nonsense is overshadowed by his claim of being God’s anointed and exclusive choice of Apostles committed to demeaning and contradicting Him.

Burnishing his hellish résumé, Sha’uwl claims to have studied in *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem under Gamaliel, whom he paints as the foremost religious scholar of his day. So astute was he, Sha’uwl brags that he was known as the most extraordinary student due to his superior intellect. He considered himself a soaring orator and an accomplished writer. By comparison, Ya’aqob was a lowly stonemason, and Shim’own and Yahowchanan were fishermen from backwater towns in Galilee. While Sha’uwl protests (when it serves his interest) that men hold no rank with God, among men, Paulos routinely ranked himself far above all others. So at least he was a hypocrite extraordinaire.

Continuing to deal with this controversial passage, we find the KJV affirming the “supposed” connotation of *dokei*: “And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they



unto the circumcision.” But that is not what Paul wrote. The “right” was only associated with Paul and “fellowship” was all that was attributed to Barnabas.

Remember... “And having known 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 to be pillars, and thus 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. (Galatians 2:9)

Jerome’s Vulgate blend of Old Latin texts revealed: “And so, when they had acknowledged the *gratiam* / grace that was given to me, Iacobus, Cephas and Ioannes, who seemed like pillars, gave to me and to Barnabæ the right hand of fellowship, so that we would go to the *Gentes* / Gentiles, while they went to the *circumcisionem* / circumcised,” Jerome also picked up the less than flattering nature of *dokei* with “seemed to be” and “seemed like.” And while we may also see glimpses here into the secret handshake of fellowship associated with the Mithraism mysteries, Jerome is to blame for creating the myth of “the right hand of fellowship” being offered to both men.

Writing their own Bible, the New Living Translation authored the following verse, repeating every mistake while creating some of their own: “In fact, James, Peter, and John, who were known as pillars of the church, recognized the gift God had given me, and they accepted Barnabas and me as their co-workers. They encouraged us to keep preaching to the Gentiles, while they continued their work with the Jews.” Their chutzpah is stunning. In this case, they were not even consistent with their beloved *charis*, translating it as “gift” rather than transliterating the Roman goddesses’ name. This malfeasance highlights the most serious problem with Galatians 2:9. This is the second of 107 times that Paul blurred the line between his religion

and paganism. He said: “**having known the *Charis* of the one given to me.**” *Charis* is the name given to the Greek “Charities,” just as *Gratiam* identifies the Roman “Graces.”

Should you be curious, had Paul wanted to say “favor,” he would have used *eunoia*. If he had wanted to say “gift,” *didomi* would have been the perfect choice. If his intent was to say “fortuitous,” *tucheros* would have worked. “Love” is *agape*. “Joy” is *chara*.

More appropriate still, the Greek word for “mercy” is *eleeo*, and “merciful” is *eleemon*. *Eleeo* speaks of “demonstrating mercy through helping the poor and afflicted by providing aid in the form of an unearned gift.” As such, *eleeo* would have been a vastly superior term. But there is more. *Eleos* also conveys “mercy, loving kindness, and goodwill toward those who are troubled.” Ideally, *eleos* “demonstrates a willingness to help the unpretentious by offering them clemency.” The related *eleemosune* even speaks of a “merciful gift which is charitably donated to the otherwise impoverished.” So why did the Hebrew Sha’uwl, now the Latin Paulos, choose the name of the Greek goddesses known as the *Charis* with so many much better options?

Even if there is no acceptable answer, it must be asked why, with a plethora of inoffensive words at his disposal, and especially *chrestos* and *eleos*, did Paul choose to promote the name of pagan goddesses and select *Charis*? And since his motivation is as important as his execution, we know the result. He discredited himself and led billions of souls the wrong way, down a dead-end street. Christians would culture a faith-based relationship with the pagan deities *Charis* and a mythological person, Iesou, predicated upon the lore of Dionysus. It would be the Devil’s version of potpourri.

Since Paul’s path has led so many souls away from the Towrah, it is important to recognize that the concepts of

“favoritism, mercy, compassion, loyalty, and love,” wrongly incorporated into “grace” as a result of Paul’s poison pen, are advanced more assuredly and pervasively throughout Yahowah’s Testimony than they are in Paul’s letters. While shocking to Christians, the fact remains that God inspired His prophets to write *chen* and its verbal form, *chanan*, the Hebrew words for “the unearned gift of mercy and loving kindness, unmerited favor and acceptance,” twice as often as Sha’uwl scribed *charis*. So, the problem is not with the concept of “favoritism and mercy” as we know them today, but instead with Paul’s choice of words – and his proposed means to them.

The alleged stonemason and fishermen evidently added a caveat to the self-proclaimed scholar’s euangelion...

**“Only (*monon* – just, alone by itself) *the (ton)* lowly and poor (*ptochos* – worthless, of little value, beggars, destitute, and impoverished) *that (hina* –the purpose of) *we might remember (mnemoneuo* – we could call to mind, be mindful of, and possibly think about) *which (hos* – who) *also (kai)* **I was eager and quick (*spoudazo* – I was giving the best effort, always ready) *same (autos)* **this (*houtos*) to do (*poieomai* – to accomplish).”** (Galatians 2:10)****

This is funny in a way since Paulos means “lowly” in Latin. With tongue planted smugly in his cheek, I am sure he was all too eager to profess that he was ever ready to serve his interests. He was doing so at this very moment. But alas, even if I am being a little too cynical, what are the chances that, after allegedly spending three years walking in the footsteps of Iesou, witnessing everything that their god-man said and did, these three men would distill his words and deeds down to: “alone, by itself, the lowly that we might remember?”

Should this have been the sum total of the life’s work of Gospel Jesus, there would have been just one unidentified and unspecific statement etched on a singular

tablet. There would have been no reason to die under such circumstances – especially if working for the poor there would have been no point in putting oneself out of commission. But I digress since the only reason that God-Man died was that the dastardly Jews killed him. They must have been uncharitable back in the day.

Should “only the lowly we might remember” have been the gist of the message, then the purpose of creation would have been to observe and memorialize human poverty and suffering. After all, in Paul’s summation and acceptance of Peter’s proclamation, there was no mention of helping the destitute, or even a reason to elevate their status – nor any correlation of this to Iesou the Christou. Moreover, should they have conquered poverty through the implementation of a new economic system, they would have eliminated the principal object of their new faith.

Should Peter and Paul have been right, God could have dispensed with the rest of the Torah, including the Covenant. The Prophets would have been a waste of time. And why bother with all the pain associated with fulfilling Passover and UnYeasted Bread? All one needs to do is avoid circumcision, renounce the Torah, believe Paul instead of God, and remember the poor. That being the case, why did Paul trouble himself by writing fourteen letters? And how does doing this fit into a faith-based religion where works are strictly forbidden?

The NAMI reads: “Alone the poor that we might remember that also I was diligent same this to do.” One can only hope that Shim’own, Ya’aqob, and Yahowchanan were slightly more articulate than this portends. But I’m not sure which was more impoverished, Sha’uwl’s Greek or Bacon’s English. KJV: “Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do.” (So much for the notion that Francis Bacon wrote the Shakespearian plays.)

Jerome wrote fluidly and fluently. LV: “Asking only

that we should be mindful of the poor, which was the very thing that I also was solicitous to do.” But for readability, the NLT is always smooth as silk: “Their only suggestion was that we keep on helping the poor, which I have always been eager to do.”

Recapping Sha’uwl’s eighth paragraph, we find:

“Because then namely, the one having previously functioned in Petro to an apostle for the circumcision, it actually functioned also in me to the nations and ethnicities. (Galatians 2:8)

And having known and recognized, becoming familiar with the *Charis* | Grace of the one having been given to me, Ya’aqob, and Kephaz, and also Yahowchanan, the ones presently presumed and supposed to be pillars, and thus 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. (Galatians 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 same this to do.” (Galatians 2:10)



There is considerable reason to believe that Paul was self-serving and disingenuous regarding the purpose and outcome of this meeting. I say this because the Jerusalem Summit, also called the “Council of Jerusalem” and the “Apostolic Conference,” between Paul and the disciples, is also presented in the book of Acts, dominating the 15<sup>th</sup> chapter. And Luke’s account stands in stark contrast to what Paul has written here in Galatians.

Keeping in mind that Luke was Paul’s leading

publicist, propagandist, promoter, and healer (having failed to serve as his exorcist), beginning with the 15<sup>th</sup> chapter of Acts, we read:

**“And some (*kai tis*) having come down from (*katerchomai apo*) **Yahuwdah** (*tes Ioudaia* – transliteration of Yahuwdah, meaning Related to Yah, known today as Judaea) **were teaching** (*didasko* – were instructing) **the brethren** (*tous adelphos*– the brothers) **that if** (*oti ean*) **you might not be circumcised** (*me peritemno*) **as prescribed by Moseh** (*to ethos to Mouses* – per the manner or practice customary of Moseh), **you are not able** (*ou dynamai* – you are incapable, lacking the capacity) **to be saved** (*sozo* – to be healed, rescued, or delivered).” (Acts 15:1)**

Luke just conveyed something Paul had been unable or, at least unwilling, to write. He not only identified Moseh as the author of the book Paul was assailing, thereby identifying it as Yahowah’s Towrah, but he unambiguously told us what they were arguing about. Specifically, and recognizing that this was directed at “the brothers,” the question before them was: can a man who is not circumcised in accordance with the Towrah’s prescriptions be saved?

Before we consider the impact of the New Testament revisionism in relation to Sha’uwl’s preaching, let’s check to see if there was any possibility that circumcision might be considered optional, or even unnecessary, for those seeking to benefit from the Beryth or Miqra’ey and form a relationship with Yahowah. Quite frankly, no matter how the supposed disciples responded to the question of circumcision pursuant to salvation is irrelevant. Neither they nor their words were capable of saving anyone. They couldn’t even save themselves. The only answer which matters is Yahowah’s. So to answer this question, we must turn to the *Towrah* | Guidance that Sha’uwl is trying to disavow and consider Yahowah’s instructions regarding

circumcision. They initially presented in *Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 17...*

**“So then (wa) God said** (*'amar 'elohym* – the Almighty affirmed and declared, making a request (qal imperfect – literally with unfolding consequences)) **to** (*'el*) **‘Abraham** (*'Abraham* – father who raises and lifts up those who stand up and reach up, father of the abundantly enriched, merciful father, or father of the multitudes who are confused and troublesome), **‘As for you** (*wa 'atah 'eth* – in addition and with regard to you), **you should continually examine and genuinely consider** (*shamar 'atah* – you should consistently observe, always focusing upon, look at and pay attention to, learn from and care about, diligently and literally contemplating the details which comprise (qal imperfect – literal interpretation of the relationship with ongoing and unfolding consequences throughout time)) **My Family Covenant Relationship** (*beryth 'any* – My Household Accord and Agreement).

**In addition, so should the offspring you conceive and the seeds you sow** (*wa zera' 'atah* – as well as your seed, descendants, and prodigy) **following you** (*'achar 'atah* – after you) **so that they might approach throughout their generations** (*la dowrym hem* – for them to draw near and reach the goal no matter when or where they live, for every age, period, lineage, race, or class of individual).” (*Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:9*)

In this statement, we find the fourth of five conditions of Covenant participation. It may be the most important because it explains the other four. If you were looking for the meaning of life, for the grand unification theory, for the answer to everything, you have found it: “*shamar beryth* – focus upon Yahowah’s family relationship” and everything you could ever imagine will be yours: eternal life, absolute perfection, adoption into the first family, becoming enlightened, enriched, and empowered.

It should be noted that “*zera'* – seed” and “*dowr* –

generations, dwelling places, lives, and epochs of time” were both scribed in the construct form, not only linking the *zera*’ and *dowr* together but also connecting them with *beryth*. Therefore, the “Covenant” is the “seed” from which “generations come to dwell throughout time” with Yah.

According to God, our responsibility regarding His Covenant is to “*shamar* – observe” it – literally and continually examining every nuance of it. It is the same instruction He gives us regarding His Towrah – which not so coincidentally represents the one and only place where we can go to “observe” Yah’s Covenant, as it is the only place where its conditions and benefits are recorded.

The means to become a “*zera*’ – offspring” of the “*beryth* – family-oriented covenant relationship,” and thereby “*dowr* – live throughout time in God’s dwelling place” is simple: “*shamar* – closely examine and carefully consider every detail” associated with Yahowah’s Covenant as it is presented in His Towrah. And in this regard, *zera*’ speaks of “seeds which are sown in cultivated and receptive ground such that they take root and grow, producing the fruit of a productive harvest.” Shabuw’ah and Taruw’ah are a product of the Covenant.

Although “*shamar* – observe” serves as the operative verb with respect to our participation in the Covenant, *shamar* is among the least understood words in the Towrah. It is almost always translated as “keep” in English Bibles even though etymologically *shamar* is based entirely upon the ability to “use our sense of sight to be watchful, carefully examining and scrutinizing that which can be seen,” of “being focused and visually alert by keeping one’s eyes open,” and of “viewing things from the proper perspective so as to be aware of what is occurring.”

You may have noticed that this proclamation from Yahowah regarding what He expects from those who want to participate in His Covenant was direct and unequivocal. Simply stated: *shamar beryth* is a requirement. If you want



to have a relationship with God, you do so by carefully and continually observing His written Towrah testimony regarding His Covenant. At least, that is what God, Himself, had to say regarding our participation, and He ought to know. And by inference, there would be no reason to consider any other source of information other than that which Yahowah has conveyed regarding His Beryth.

What many miss, especially those who are religious, is that this statement from God is utterly devastating to Pauline Doctrine. Paul's thesis, more commonly known as "Faith in the Gospel of Grace," is based upon the notion that Abraham was saved, not because He closely examined and carefully considered what Yahowah had personally revealed to him regarding His Towrah Teaching and Covenant Relationship, but instead because he "believed God." According to Paul, Abraham's salvation was a product of his faith and not his willingness to engage as Yahowah had instructed. But "being observant," especially during personal experiences like this one, leads to knowing, to understanding, to trusting, and to relying, while "belief" is the product of not knowing and of not understanding. In fact, belief all too often leads to faith in things which are neither reliable nor true.

And this is no small point because the fulcrum upon which Paul's Christian mantra pivots away from God is upon his invalid claim that Abraham wasn't observant, didn't actually know God, wasn't responsive, but dispensed with all of that and replaced twelve chapters of *Bare'syth* / Genesis with belief.

The fact is that those who know, trust. Those who do not know often resort to believing. Moreover, the means to "knowing" is "*shamar* – careful observation." Faith is substituted when observation is lacking or fails.

Clearly, God did not ask Abraham to believe Him, nor did He suggest that we should believe Him. He asked Abraham and those who would benefit from the Covenant

to observe what He had to say. And to accomplish this, we must read the Towrah, closely examining and carefully considering its every word.

Let's continue to do what Yahowah requested and see where His words lead...

**“This specific** (*zo 'th* – this one and only, singular entity being discussed as the (demonstrative singular feminine pronoun from *zeh* – lamb and sheep)) **Familial Covenant of Mine** (*beryth 'any* – My Family Agreement, My Household Accord, and My Home (singular feminine construct)), **which beneficially marks the way to the relationship** (*'asher* – which to show the way to this fortunate and joyful place that is found by walking the correct way, thereby revealing the steps which lead to life), **you should continuously observe, closely and literally examining, while carefully considering** (*shamar* – focus upon, look at and pay attention to, be aware of, learn about and remember, care about and cling to, retain for protection, diligently contemplate in great detail (qal stem imperfect conjugation – literally and genuinely, consistently and continually, with actual and ongoing implications regarding the relationship)).

**You should strive to be discerning and make an intelligent connection to understand Me** (*bayn 'any* – to pay attention while being observant and diligently join things together in a rational and prudent way which lead to perceiving, properly regarding, and comprehending Me). **This is for you to be perceptive and prudent regarding the association** (*wa bayn 'atah* – for you to make the appropriate connection after exercising good judgment).

**To form a thoughtful relationship and to make a comprehensible connection between** (*wa byn* – to consider the instruction provided and make an intelligent association with) **your offspring** (*zera' 'atah* – your descendants and children, your seed and posterity, those you conceive who are harvested) **following you** (*'achar*

*'atah* – after you), **you should circumcise** (*muwl* – you should cut off and remove the foreskin, warding off a deadly and debilitating curse by way of this oath, changing priorities while making a binding promise to undergo the benefits of circumcision (scribed with the niphath stem denoting the genuineness of this relationship while stressing the advantages accrued to the parent, while the infinitive absolute intensifies the importance of the act, and in the imperfect conjugation, revealing that this instruction on circumcision will endure uninterrupted throughout time with ongoing benefits)), **accordingly** (*la* – to facilitate their approach), **your every male to help them remember their status** (*'atem kol zakar* – every son of yours, every man and every boy to remember, memorialize, and honor the status and renown associated and implied with this celebration of the relationship).” (*Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:10*)

Not only was this request clear and unequivocal, not only does this affirm Yah's previous appeal, not only does it reinforce the uniqueness of the one and only Covenant, it encourages us to think so that we come to understand precisely what God is asking of us.

But also, this condition is additive, providing us with the fifth and final Covenant requirement: circumcise our sons so that we and they remember the Covenant. So, I ask you, when Paul screamed out against circumcision in his letter to the Galatians, claiming it was unnecessary and counterproductive, demeaning the Towrah in the process while promoting a second and different covenant, why did anyone believe him? Why have billions of souls been beguiled into believing a man who wrote poorly, admitted to being demon-possessed, and blatantly lied to them?

This reminds me of a letter I received this past week from a self-proclaimed agnostic who, as part of a Christian community, thought it was appropriate to accuse me of being demon-possessed and in league with Satan, hiding

from religious accusers so that I could deceive them – all without finding fault in anything I had written. She concluded her letter by telling me that I must answer her accusations so that she can decide whether to circumcise her young son against his father’s adamant protestations. My response was to say that it was foolish for her to make a decision based upon my credentials rather than Yahowah’s instructions, particularly after her insistence on relying upon the ad hominem fallacy to slander me and denigrate *Yada Yahowah* without cause. That is the same thing that is happening here. Since Yahowah has clearly stated His position, why not read it and rely upon His answer? What does discrediting or venerating me or anyone else have to do with salvation?

Sometimes, if we pause long enough, if we dig deep enough, if we are especially observant and thoughtful, we learn something we would otherwise miss. Such is the case here. You see, “*muwl* – circumcise” was scribed using the niphil stem. The niphil, as the passive form of the qal, conveys three ideas. First, it is a relational stem, affirming the fact that circumcision is germane to our relationship with God. Second, it requires a literal interpretation of the testimony, meaning that the circumcision is actual and not merely symbolic. And third, the niphil, as the reflexive counterpart of the qal, indicates that the subjects, the parents in this case, receive the benefit of the verb’s action, which is circumcision.

Collectively then, when the niphil stem is used in conjunction with *muwl* in this context, we discover that by circumcising our sons, we as parents benefit from the act. It is as if we, ourselves, are being circumcised, or cut into the Beryth. And that is a very good thing because circumcision is the sign of the Covenant. It affirms our acceptance, demonstrating our willingness to be cut into this relationship with God. We are in essence saying: we will raise our children to become sons and daughters within

## God's Family.

Along these lines, it is intriguing to note that, while the primary definition of *muwl* is “to circumcise,” the secondary connotation speaks to its purpose: “to ward off and incapacitate a potentially negative influence through an oath.” Similarly, while the primary connotation of *zakar* is “male,” it is equally appropriate to consider it as a “memory aid – making something known and helping us remember it.”

Through the repeated use of ‘*achar ‘atah*, we are being encouraged to follow Abraham’s example. And the only way to do so is to listen to Yahowah’s instructions, come to understand them, accept them, and then act upon them – just as Abraham has done.

God has systematically presented the guidance and instructions necessary for us to know Him, for us to relate to Him, and for us to live with Him. After asking us to walk away from all forms of “*babel* – confusion,” including family traditions, national allegiances, and religious corruption, Yahowah encouraged us to trust and rely upon Him instead. He then asked us to walk to Him and become perfect in the process, with His Towrah providing the directions.

God’s fourth and fifth requests of us, indeed His requirements with respect to our participation in His Family, were presented in the previous two statements. He wants us to continuously and genuinely observe His Covenant, focusing upon and diligently considering the conditions and benefits of this relationship. He knows that when we come to appreciate what He is offering we will respond appropriately. And so now, to demonstrate our understanding, to help us remember everything He has shared with us, God is asking us to circumcise our sons. Consider it a signature, a vow to accept and embrace this extraordinary gift – the opportunity to engage in a personal relationship with our Heavenly Father.

Written in the infinitive absolute, and followed by “*kol* – all,” there is no room for negotiation or interpretation regarding circumcision. We can either accept Yahowah’s terms or reject them – but we cannot alter them to suit some other agenda as Paul has done.

Sha’uwl’s position and God’s are irreconcilable. This then begs the question: why would anyone in their right mind want to claim the “uncircumcised” as Sha’uwl / Paul has done? Without exception, they are all estranged from God – and will remain that way.

Since Yahowah has established only one prerequisite and four requirements for participation in His Covenant, that we walk away from Babylon (away from mankind’s confounding and intermingled political, religious, economic, military, patriotic, cultural, and conspiratorial schemes), that we come to trust and rely on Him (which necessitates us coming to know Him and understand what He is offering), that we walk to Him (along the specific path which He prepared in the Torah) so as to become perfected (by way of UnYeasted Bread), that we carefully and continually observe His Covenant, and that men and their sons be circumcised, let’s consider why He has asked this specific thing of us...

**“And (*wa*) you all shall make a declaration by cutting off and separating (*malal* – you shall truthfully proclaim and speak about being circumcised, announcing the truth regarding the principle of circumcision as a sign, as a subtle means of communicating what it means to be set apart (the niphil stem is used to convey the voice of genuine relationships where the subject, which is “you” as a parent, receives the benefit of the verb, which is circumcision, in the perfect conjugation designating that this instruction and resulting action should be accomplished and considered whole and complete, and in the consecutive associating it with our *basar* – flesh)) **your foreskin’s** (*‘arlah* – the fold of skin covering the conical**

tip of the masculine genitalia; akin to *'aram* and *'arak* – the tendency of people to gather together before the cunning and crafty, to be drawn in by the clever counsel and calculating tendencies which are conceived, arranged, set forth, ordained, and esteemed to appear comparable) **association with ('eth) one's mortal human nature and propensity to preach** (*basar* – the physical body and animal nature but also separating from mankind's propensity to proclaim and publish what the people yearn to hear).

**And** (*wa*) **this will exist** (*hayah* – this is and will be (scribed in the qal perfect, signifying the relationship is genuine and that the act is only performed once and is considered complete)) **as** (*la*) **the sign to remember** (*'owth* – the example to visually illustrate and explain, the symbol and standard, the pledge and attestation of the miraculous nature (singular, as in the one and only sign, construct form, linking the sign to)) **the Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth* – mutually binding familial agreement, household promise, relational accord, marriage vow based upon home and family (feminine singular, scribed in the construct form, eternally associating the *beryth* – covenant with *'owth* – the sign of *muwl* – circumcision)) **between Me, for the purpose of making a connection** (*byn* – in concert with coming to know and understand Me as a result of being perceptive, prudently considering the insights which are discernible regarding Me) **and between you, promoting understanding** (*wa byn* – to cause you to be aware and to more readily comprehend the association).” (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:11)

It is interesting to be sure. Yahowah did not explain the reason that He wanted us 1) to disassociate from our country and its customs and culture, 2) to trust and rely upon Him, 3) to walk to Him and become perfected, or 4) to closely examine and carefully consider these conditions.

He must have considered, as I do, that the reasons were either self-evident or that we were smart enough to figure them out for ourselves, especially considering the context in which they were presented. However, with circumcision, God wanted us to appreciate the merits associated with this sign. So let's explore them.

Yahowah wants us to “*muwl* – be cut off and separated from” our “*’eth* – association with” our “*basar* – physical bodies, animalistic, and mortal human nature, as well as our tendency to get preachy.” To be associated with God, we are to disassociate ourselves from man and man's message.

But more than this, by disassociating from our physical bodies, Yahowah is denouncing the absurd and counterproductive Christian notion of bodily resurrection. The intent of the Miqra'ey is to do the opposite and remove the limitations of being a physical being. To enter Heaven and be with God, to be perfected, to become immortal, and to travel through time and space, we must be upgraded from matter to energy, from bodies to light.

Therefore, the “*’owth* – sign” of the “*beryth* – covenant” is a reminder that we must walk away from Babylon and our physical limitations before we can walk to God. It signifies that to be adopted into our Heavenly Father's family, symbolically, we are evolving from physical beings, with mortal, imperfect, substantially limited, and decaying bodies to spiritual beings who are cut into this relationship through separation, and thereby elevated, empowered, and enriched.

It is interesting to note that, while circumcision is a symbolic sign, the act itself is literal and physical. Further, *hayah*, which was scribed in the third-person masculine singular and rendered as “this will exist” in the passage, was more literally scribed as “he shall exist” as the sign. Therefore, when we accept the terms of Yahowah's Covenant, we, ourselves, become symbolic of the



relationship.

Hebrew verbs do not designate the past, present, or future, as is the case with English tenses, but instead they reflect truths which remain unchanged throughout all time. Such is the case with *hayah*, meaning “was, is, and will be” all at the same time. Therefore, we were, we are, and we will always be signs of the Covenant.

“*Owth* – sign to remember” and “*uwth* – to consent and agree” are written identically in Hebrew. So not only is circumcision, this separation from our physical and animal nature, a “visual means to illustrate and explain the miraculous nature” of the Covenant, it is our way of showing our “consent and agreement” to raise our children in harmony with the conditions Yahowah has outlined. Circumcision is a parent’s pledge to honor God’s family-oriented agreement. It is our signature on their adoption papers – telling our Heavenly Father that we want our children to become His children; that we will dedicate ourselves to encouraging this desirable result. And not so coincidentally, the best way to accomplish this is to recite the Towrah to our children and thereby expose them to its Covenant, sharing its lone prerequisite, requirements, and benefits.

Also interesting, while Iesou the Christou was an amalgamated myth concocted by blending one part Dowd and two parts Dionysus, had it been true and not a fable, he would have been circumcised by his parents on the eighth day. So, if Christians are to follow “Jesus” example rather than Paul’s rhetoric, why are there so many uncircumcised Christians?

**“Therefore, with** (*wa* – it follows that with) **a son** (*ben* – a male child) **of eight** (*shamonah* – from *shamen*, meaning olive oil, which is symbolic of the Spirit, of light, of being anointed, and of being rooted in the land) **days** (*yowmym*), **you shall circumcise** (*muwl* – you shall cut off and separate his foreskin (scribed using the niphah stem

denoting a relationship which is genuine whereby the parents benefit from doing as God has requested, and in the imperfect conjugation which tells us that this must continue to occur over time because it is designed to produce ongoing results)) **with regard to your** (*la*) **every** (*kol*) **male to remember** (*zakar* – masculine individual; from *zakar*: to commit to memory, to remind, and to remember) **throughout** (*la*) **your dwelling places and generations** (*dowr* – your protected households and extended families, elevating and extending your lives), **those naturally born** (*yalyd* – those naturalized as a member of the extended family through natural childbirth) **in the home** (*beyth* – into the household and family (singular absolute)), **and also** (*wa*) **those wanting to be** (*kasap* – those desiring, yearning, and passionately longing to be) **acquired and included** (*miqnah* – purchased and obtained; from *qanah* – to be redeemed (speaking of adoption)), **of** (*min*) **every** (*kol*) **son** (*ben* – male child) **of foreign lands** (*nekar* – of places where they were not properly valued and appreciated, and yet who are nonetheless observant) **who relationally** (*‘asher* – by way of making a connection) **are not** (*lo*’) **from** (*min*) **your seed** (*zera*’).” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:12)

Eight denotes eternity, which is why the symbol for infinity (as a line which never ends –  $\infty$ ) and the numeral (8) are so similar. In the Towrah, this association is celebrated on the eighth day of the *Miqra*’ of *Sukah* | Shelters, which is symbolic of us camping out with God throughout eternity. Additionally, the Hebrew word for “eight,” *shamonah*, is based upon *sheman*, meaning “olive oil.” This oil is used as a metaphor for the Set-Apart Spirit because She enlightens us, nurtures us, anoints us, heals us, and cleanses us. The olive tree is not only native to Yisra’el, it is one of the world’s longest-lived organisms.

We ought to be reassured by the realization that we were designed by the Author of this instruction to receive

the benefits of circumcision. The eighth day is the perfect time to perform this minor procedure, because bleeding is minimized, as is infection, because human blood coagulates most effectively on the eighth day of our lives.

You may have noticed that this is the second time Yahowah has used “*zakar* – male” in association with circumcision. Since the instruction is directed toward, albeit not exclusive to, young boys, literally “*ben* – sons,” the reason for using *zakar* becomes obvious when we consider the word’s etymology. *Zakar* means: “to establish in one’s memory, to remind, to remember, to reflect, to recall, and to memorialize something important, making it known.” It also conveys the idea that “truth can cleanse and purify, causing us to shine brightly and brilliantly.” When we are enveloped in the Set-Apart Spirit’s Garment of Light, we are cleansed and purified by Her so that we can radiate Yahowah’s pure and brilliant light. Moreover, each time a parent bathes their son, they will be reminded of their commitment to raise him such that he is prepared to follow us into the Covenant.

Relevant in light of Paul’s argument with the disciples, and his claim to the uncircumcised world, is that there are two different classes of individuals described in this statement. And both are to be circumcised, which signifies that two distinct groups of people can become part of Yahowah’s Covenant Family. ‘Abraham’s direct descendants through Yitschaq and Ya’aqob (who became Yisra’el) are “*yalyd* – naturally born” into Yahowah’s “*beyth* – family.” But since Yahowah has routinely promised that the benefits of the Covenant would also be available to “*gowym* – people from different races and places,” He has provided a provision for adoption. That is what “*kasap miqnah* – those deeply desiring to be acquired and included” from “*nekar* – foreign lands” represents. These are adopted children – *gowym*. And in this regard, as we progress, we will discover that the root of *nekar*, *nakar*,

speaks of “an observant individual.”

Hiding this reality, most English Bibles base their translations of this verse on the Masoretic Text, where the *ksp* root of “*kasap* – longing” is pointed “*kesep* – money.” As *kasap miqnah*, the clause speaks of those who “really want to be acquired and included.” But as *kesep*, the order of things has to be reversed, and *miqnah kesep* becomes a string of nouns: “acquisition money,” which is then corrupted to read “purchased with money.”

And yet while the “*kasap miqnah* – wanting to be acquired and included” translation is more consistent with the Covenant and more informative, the *miqnah kesep* vocalization does address adoption, and thus provides us with two distinct ways to be included in the Covenant: natural childbirth as a literal descendant of Abraham, and by choice through adoption. And thus, both renderings are acceptable when viewed from this perspective.

By chance, should you have an aversion to adoptive parents “purchasing” a child when they value that child more than his or her natural parents, be aware that this is how Yahowah adopts us. He and His Son paid the price for us to live with Him as His children. This is what Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children represent.

There was a subtle pronouncement in Yahowah’s invitation into His Covenant Family that I may have been the only one to see but don’t want you to miss. And to highlight it, I will translate *nekar* as *nakar*, which is equally justifiable, albeit more familiar and pertinent, than ‘*asher* and *zera*’ as I have come to know and love them.

**“Therefore, a son (*wa ben*) of eight (*shamonah*) days (*yowmym*), you should circumcise (*muwl*) for yourselves to draw near (*la ‘atem*), every (*kol*) male to remember (*zakar*) throughout (*la*) your dwelling places and generations (*dowr ‘atem*), those naturally born (*yalyd*) in the home (*beyth*), and also (*wa*) those wanting to be**

**(kasap) acquired and included by longing to be adopted (miqnah) of (min) every (kol) child (ben) of the observant foreigner, recognized by the discerning individual from a different ethnicity and place, speaking another language, who having paid attention will comprehend and acknowledge that which deserves the attention of the astute (nakar) who, to show the way to benefit from the relationship ('asher – who, to reveal the way to make the proper connections to get the most out of life), is not (lo') derived from, part of, or on account of (min) what you individually have scattered, sown, and produced of it and regarding him (zera' 'atah huw' ).” (Bare'syth 17:12)**

From this perspective, as we return to God's instructions, it is important that we consistently approach Yahowah's Word from the proper vantage point and with an open mind. In this light, when a word is repeated in Hebrew, it serves to substantially increase its importance. Such is the case with “*muwl muwl*” in this next statement.

Also, while its primary definition is “to circumcise, to cut off, to separate, and to remove the foreskin,” you may be surprised by *muwl*'s secondary and tertiary definitions – both of which are listed below. Additionally, because of what we learned about *kasap* versus *kesep*, the following translation includes both renderings...

**“He should absolutely circumcise, definitely cutting off the foreskin because he can ward off a deadly and debilitating result by way of his oath promising to cease what is currently being done by changing priorities while making a binding promise relative to circumcision (*muwl muwl* – he (masculine singular) can affect the relationship beneficially by acting as a parent for the advantage of his children by emphasizing the importance of being cut into this agreement (scribed with the niph'al stem denoting the genuineness of this relationship while stressing the benefits**

accrued, in the infinitive absolute which intensifies the importance of the act, and in the imperfect conjugation, telling us that this instruction on circumcision will endure uninterrupted throughout time with ongoing results)) **of the naturally born** (*yalyd* – naturalized as a member of an extended family through natural childbirth) **in your home and as part of the family** (*beyth* – into your household) **and also** (*wa*) **those desiring to be** (*kasap* – those wanting, strongly yearning, and passionately longing to be) **included** (*miqnah* – acquired, purchased, redeemed, and obtained) **as well as those who are acquired and adopted** (*miqnah* – purchased through adoption and included) **with the investment of your money** (*kesepe* – your precious metals; born out of a deep longing and love for adoption).

**This shall be** (*hayah* – this was, is, and will be, existing as (qal stem denotes a genuine relationship between the subject and the action of the verb which is existence, in the perfect conjugation revealing an act that is complete, lacking nothing, when accomplished, in the singular conveying that there are no other options or contingencies, and in the consecutive form, associating our existence with the *beryth* – family-oriented covenant relationship and its sign, *muwl* – circumcision)) **My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth-y* – My mutually binding familial agreement and relational accord), **in the flesh and with the Herald** (*ba basar* – in the physical realm with humanity and through the one conveying this message), **serving as a means to approach toward** (*la* – to the goal of) **an everlasting and eternal** (*‘owlam* – forever existing and never-ending) **Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth* – mutually binding agreement and promise, relational accord and marriage vow based upon home and family (feminine singular)).” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:13)

Based upon this unequivocal declaration from Yahowah, a “New Covenant” of any kind, much less one

where circumcision is not required, is impermissible and impossible. Do not believe anyone who tells you otherwise, and that includes Paul.

Also, if someone condemns “the flesh,” calling it evil, as Paul will do in this epistle, please note that Yahowah’s Covenant was cut with us in the flesh. In addition, in *Bare’syth* / Genesis 1:31, we read: “And God saw all that He had made and perceived that it was good. And there came to be evening and there came to be morning, the sixth day.” It is only in Gnosticism and Pauline literature that the flesh is considered bad.

But just as there is more to *nakar*, ‘*asher*, and *zera*’, *muwl*, *kasap*, and *miqnah* that meet the eye of a superficial reader, such is also the case with *basar*. While as a noun it reads as I have rendered it, the actionable root – *basar* – speaks of the *Nakar* | Observant Foreigner reminding Yisra’el about the conditions and signs of the Beryth as the *Basar* | Herald so that Yahuwdym can return Home. And indeed, he has invested his considerable wealth to encourage the world to approach Yahowah’s eternal *Beryth* | Covenant Family.

God’s instructions have been complete and clear on circumcision. He asked parents to circumcise their sons on the eighth day. The request is easy, safe, and inexpensive when done shortly after birth. It is man who has messed this up. Very few parents read the Towrah, much less consider its implications. Fewer still observe its instructions or share what Yahowah had to say with their children, as God has so often asked. And as a consequence, circumcision is one of many things which separate the preponderance of people from God – largely due to *Sha’uwl*’s | Paul’s toxic diatribe.

As for Paul being authorized by God to contradict Him on a subject as essential as the Covenant and its sign – circumcision – you’d have to be a fool to believe him. Yahowah said one thing, and Paul said the opposite. One

of them was not telling the truth. Guess who? And there ends any chance that Christianity could be credible. It is a horrible hoax foisted by an appalling liar.

Beyond this, if God changed His mind, if He decided to do something new which was counter to His previous promises, He would cease to be trustworthy and reliable. The entire notion of placing one's faith in a god prone to make exceptions to his instructions is indeed a fool's folly. Hell, you might as well read the Quran and deal with abrogation.

God is serious about circumcision. We should be as well. This next statement is as enlightening as it is unequivocal. And especially relevant is *'arel*, a word which, when fully amplified, explains the nature of those who are uncircumcised.

**“Therefore (*wa*), the uncircumcised, the stubborn, unresponsive, and untrusting (*'arel* – the self-reliant, those unwilling to listen who are unobservant, those who are not separated and who are unwilling to be set apart) **male** (*zakar* – man who fails to remember to do this) **who relationally** (*'asher* – by association does not know the proper way or the benefits of the relationship and) **is not circumcised, who is unwilling to change his direction and priorities to embrace this binding promise to ward off the negative repercussions** (*lo' muwl* – who continually remain uncircumcised as a result of their inaction) **with regard to (*'eth*) the flesh of his foreskin and the crafty and cunning counsel** (*basar 'arlah* – the physical, human nature of the one who is separating and estranging by preaching and publishing what mankind wants to hear in association with man's propensity to be drawn together by crafty counsel and cunning tendencies which are conceived, arranged, set forth, ordained, and esteemed to appear comparable), **that soul** (*ha nepesh ha hy'* – speaking of what makes each individual unique, alive, aware, and conscious) **shall be cut off, be excluded,****



**and banished** (*karat* – it shall be severed and cut down, it shall be uprooted and die, perishing and destroyed, ceasing to exist (nifal perfect – they will not only have caused their soul’s banishment, they will suffer the effect of their exclusion as a result of this singular failure during their brief lives)) **from** (*min*) **her / Her** (*hy’* – addressing the *nepesh* which is now severed from the *Ruwach Qodesh’s* Covenant) **family** (*‘am* – people who are kin, related biologically or through a common language or experience).

**By way of association** (*‘eth* – therefore as a result), **they violated and broke by creating two separate variations, thereby dissociating themselves from** (*parar* – they nullified the agreement and injured themselves by revoking the Covenant’s promises, tearing asunder and thwarting the relationship’s benefits, splitting away and harming themselves in the process by severing the agreement through the process of tearing into two parts (hifil perfect – their act of creating a new covenant led to their own demise such that neither they nor their new covenant will endure)) **My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth-y* – My mutually binding agreement and promise, My relational accord and vow based upon home and family (feminine singular, scribed in the construct form, connecting and associating the *beryth* – covenant with God’s *‘am* – family; written with the first-person singular suffix: My – reminding us that this specific and unique Covenant is God’s)).” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:14)

There are many questions which are answered by this passage, so let’s pause here and consider them one at a time. First, *karat*, like so many Hebrew terms, has a dark and light side. Its divergent implications influence us differently depending upon the choices we make. On the bright side, *karat* was used by Yahowah to tell us that He has “*karat* – cut” a “*beryth* – agreeable deal” with us – one which separates those who accept it from those who do not.

But as for those who ignore Yahowah's Covenant, who reject it, or try to change it, they will endure the cutting and divisive side of *karat*. They shall be "cut off" from Yahowah's Family. They will be "excluded" from His Covenant. And they will be "banished" from His Home. Those who choose not to sign their name on Yahowah's Covenant by way of circumcision, those who are unwilling to "*muwl* – change their direction and priorities" will be "*karat* – uprooted" from the land. They will "*karat* – die" and their souls will "perish, ceasing to exist." This is *Sha'uwil's* | Paul's legacy – making him an object of scorn.

Second, while "*muwl* – circumcision" is a physical act in the flesh, our "*nepesh* – souls" are everything but physical. The *nepesh* represents our "consciousness." While it is an essential part of our nature, as all animals have a "*nepesh* – soul, a unique personality, and an awareness of their environment," it has no physical properties. A soul has no mass and it is not matter. And yet, by failing to be circumcised, our soul dies, because it is expressly excluded from Yahowah's Covenant Family. Therefore, the choices we make in our mortal, material bodies influence whether or not we are elevated to a spiritual status.

Third, circumcision is not the sole means to salvation. But it is a barrier to salvation. While few of those who are circumcised will be adopted into God's family, no one uncircumcised will be admitted.

Fourth, we either agree to God's terms or we nullify the opportunity He has given us to survive our mortality and to live with Him. There is no hint of leniency here, no sense of compromise, and no opportunity for a future revision to alter this condition. We either accept it or not. No circumcision, no Covenant. No Covenant, no relationship with God. No relationship with God, no salvation. And therein is why such souls die.

God is not about to compromise. He not only isn't

going to change the terms of His agreement, He cannot change them without becoming unreliable. There is a singular narrow path to life, and we either walk to God along it without wavering, or it is goodbye and good riddance. There is no accommodation for individual approaches to salvation, or for the collective appeal of Christianity, Judaism, or Islam.

The implication here is something no Christian or Muslim seems willing or able to appreciate. Most believe it matters not if their beliefs comply with God's instructions, because "He knows their heart." Contradictions become irrelevant. To them, God is God no matter what you call Him. To them, observing the Sabbath is not relevant, and Friday prayers and Sunday worship are perfectly acceptable. Jihad and Grace are both embraced by the faithful, and many paths are thought to lead to Heaven. Sure, Christmas and Easter are pagan, but since that is not what they mean to the celebrant, they believe that their god will be understanding. For them, mercy invokes a level of capriciousness which they do not see as either unjust or untrustworthy. Their god would not condemn them for getting some of this wrong.

And yet, all of these musings are inconsistent with the God who inspired these words. With Yahowah, you accept the Covenant on His terms or you will be considered to have rejected it. Not only are we in no position to negotiate with God over something integral to His very nature, but we have everything to gain if we agree to His terms, and He loses nothing if we don't.

Fifth, the "*nepesh* – souls" of those who do not accept God's instructions "*karat* – are cut off and perish and cease to exist." Throughout the Towrah and Prophets, this is the prevailing outcome for human souls. At the end of a person's mortal life, they will cease to exist. Their souls will simply perish. But this is not a penalty or a Divine punishment. In fact, Yahowah has little to do with this

eventuality. It is by “*karat* – disassociating from” God that this fate occurs naturally. You see, eternal life with God requires us to associate with Him in the specific manner He has delineated. If we do not accept His terms, if we do not avail ourselves of the path He has provided, then our souls, disconnected from the source of life, will perish, which means that individual consciousnesses will simply cease to exist.

While eternal separation from God is a penalty, having one’s soul perish is not. Each individual is given the gift of life and freewill. Everyone can do with them as they please. If a person chooses to avail themselves of Yahowah’s Covenant, to walk away from Babylon and to walk to Him along the path He has provided, God has promised to give him or her the gift of eternal life, to mercifully forgive their sins, to empower such an individual, to enrich them, and to adopt that soul into His family so that he or she can spend an eternity in His presence.

But if we choose instead to ignore God’s provision, as Paul is encouraging, even dictating, and come to rely on a different scheme, altering the deal He has cut with us, or simply reject it, we will be ignored by God and remain unaltered by His Covenant promises. It is ashes to ashes and dust to dust. Such souls do not know God and God does not know them. As a result, death will be the end of life.

The sixth lesson brings us back to Paul. Circumcision is the fulcrum upon which those who rely on Yahowah’s Word move in a different direction than those who believe the “Thirteenth Apostle.” In Acts, the moment we are introduced to Paul, we learn that he advised against circumcision. As a result, he was called to Yaruwshalaim to explain his departure from Yahowah’s Covenant instructions. When they did not concur with his contrarian approach, Paul wrote Galatians to demean his rivals, especially Shim’own / Peter, Yahowchanan / John, and Ya’aqob / James. Therefore, Christians have a choice.

They can trust Yahowah, or they can believe Paul. Their claims are diametrically opposed and irreconcilable.

Seventh, just as the Covenant and circumcision have a Herald, so do “the uncircumcised, the stubborn, unresponsive, and untrusting, the self-reliant, those unwilling to listen who are unobservant.” And according to the God of the Covenant, the man who is not circumcised, who is unwilling to change his direction and priorities to embrace this binding promise to ward off the negative repercussions of the flesh isn’t welcome. The souls who believe the Apostle of the Uncircumcised will be cut off, excluded, and banished.

And eighth, Yahowah impugned the notion of a New Testament by estranging those who “by their associations violated and broke, indeed, nullified by creating two separate variations, thereby dissociating themselves from My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship.” There is one Covenant, not two. Sorry Twistians, but by wanting two, you have none. By creating a replacement Messiah and God, you have neither.

It is also instructive to know that we cannot blame this conflict between Yahowah and Sha’uwl / Paul on scribal error. While not a word from *Bare’syth* | Genesis 8:21 to 17:11 can be found among the Qumran scrolls, these passages on circumcision are not only extant, they are unchanged. There is not a single discrepancy between the Dead Sea Scrolls, dating to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, and the Masoretic Text from *Bare’syth* 17:12 through the end of the chapter. And on the other side, we have a complete copy of Paul’s letter to the Galatians dating to the late 1<sup>st</sup> century CE.

And that means the conflict between Yahowah and Paul cannot be resolved. If you side with Paul, you have invalidated the benefits of the Covenant. Those who have done so are excluded from God’s family. There are no exceptions. Such souls cease to exist. And that is why the

choices we make in the flesh, and in deciding which *Basar* | Herald is telling the truth, are so important.

Simply stated, as a sign of our desire to participate in Yahowah's Covenant, we are to be circumcised. The foreskin of the male genitalia, responsible for consummating a marriage and producing children, is to be "cut off and separated" – set apart. Our Heavenly Father's Covenant is about bearing children and building a family by way of a *beryth* | family relationship. Yahowah does not want anyone to miss this point.

There should be no doubt and no debate. According to Yahowah, circumcision and the Covenant are related. They go hand in hand. Preclude one and you exclude the other.

Circumcision is a signature, signed in blood, physically symbolizing our desire to be born spiritually into God's family. And in that light, there is an interesting affirmation of the purpose our Spiritual Mother plays in our adoption at the end of this passage. Yahowah told Moseh to write "Her family," not "the family," or "His family." As a result, those willing to "*shamar* – closely examine" His "*beryth* – Familial Covenant Relationship" recognize that God was connecting several aspects of His message together for us.

While the more subtle innuendos were instructive, the primary message here was clear and unmistakable. Yahowah established circumcision as the sign of the Covenant for all of the descendants of Abraham – naturally born or adopted – for all of God's children, for every male member of Yahowah's Covenant, regardless of race, place, or time. According to our Heavenly Father, there will be no uncircumcised males in Her Family or in His Covenant. And that means that circumcision is required to enter into heaven.

For those of you who cringe at the notion that Yahowah might have established a "requirement," which

somehow negated freewill, relax. Circumcision is optional. We are afforded the choice to be circumcised, and to circumcise our sons, or not. The choice is ours to make. All Yahowah is saying is that it is His “*beyth* – home,” His “*beryth* – covenant,” and His “*am* – family.” If we want to participate and desire to be included then we must respect the sign of the Covenant and be circumcised – spiritually and physically. As with all fathers, it is His Home, and therefore His rules. You do not have to do what He says unless you want to live under His roof.

There is one final lesson we can learn from this passage, and that is that we should not trust English Bible translations. Yahowah actually said...

**“Therefore (*wa*), the uncircumcised, the stubborn, unresponsive, untrusting, and self-reliant, those unwilling to listen and those who are unobservant, those who are not separated and who are unwilling to be set apart as a (*arel*) male who fails to remember to do this (*zakar*) who relationally (*asher*) is not circumcised, who is unwilling to change his direction and priorities and make this binding promise to ward off the consequence (*lo’ muwl*) with regard to (*eth*) the flesh, becoming separated by the preaching in association with (*basar*) his foreskin, symbolic of man’s propensity to be drawn together by crafty counsel, by cunning tendencies, and that which is ordained and esteemed to appear comparable (*arlah*), that soul (*ha nepesh ha hy*) shall be cut off, be excluded, and banished (*karat*) from (*min*) Her (*hy*) Family (*am*).**

**By way of association (*eth*), they violated and broke by creating two separate variations, thereby dissociating themselves, they nullified the agreement and injured themselves by revoking (*parar*) My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship (*beryth-y*).” (*Bare’syth* 17:14)**

While not as revealing or complete, the *Roman*

*Catholic Vulgate* was accurate up to the point of identifying from whose family a soul would be excluded. “The male whose flesh of his foreskin shall not be circumcised, that soul shall be destroyed out of his people: because he hath broken my covenant.” Not only is the pronoun “Her” scribed independently in the Hebrew text via *huw*’, “‘*am* – family” was suffixed in the third-person feminine singular, reinforcing the fact that it is “Her Family” – speaking of the Set-Apart Spirit and the Covenant. Also, the reference to “his people” suggests banishment from the villages and land of Yisra’el, rather than from our Spiritual Mother’s family.

The King James Version reads identically, and thus promotes some of the same myths, reinforcing the authority of the church to excommunicate those who they opposed.

Recognizing that both translators had made a mistake, the New Living Translation, not knowing how to deal with “Her,” added a second “covenant” and substituted it for “Her.” “Any male who fails to be circumcised will be cut off from the covenant family for breaking the covenant.” Since it is God’s Word, and since accuracy is therefore important, you should know that there is no basis for “any” in the Hebrew text. They combined “‘*arel* – uncircumcised and unresponsive” with “‘*lo’ muwl* – is not circumcised or changed,” as if only one of these words was spoken by God. Then they completely ignored “‘*eth basar ‘aralah* – with regard to the flesh of their foreskin”—ostensibly to avoid destroying Pauline Doctrine. Then reversing course, they not only repeated “‘*beryth* – covenant,” even though it was written only once, they neglected to convey that *beryth* was scribed with the first-person singular suffix, making it “My Covenant.”

Simply stated, as a sign of our desire to participate in Yahowah’s Covenant, we are to be circumcised. The covering of the male genitalia responsible for



consummating a marriage and producing children is to be “cut off and separated” – set apart. Our Heavenly Father’s Family is focused on bearing and raising children while building a family by way of a mother and father. Yahowah does not want anyone to miss this point because it is the point of Creation and the purpose of the Covenant.

And yet in direct opposition to God, Paul has used “not being circumcised” as the fulcrum of his assault on the Torah, calling it irrelevant and even counterproductive with regard to one’s salvation – even enslaving. Therefore, Yahowah’s message is the antithesis of Paul’s.

There is only one path to God, not two, nor two doorways to heaven, one for Jews and the other for Gentiles. There is but one Covenant, one Towrah, one God, and one Way. And according to Yahowah, men must be circumcised to demonstrate that they have accepted the terms and conditions of the Covenant and are prepared to participate in Passover, leading to UnYeasted Bread and Firstborn Children.

By ignoring the sign of the Covenant – circumcision – the likes of Sha’uwl / Paul have treated Yahowah’s Home with contempt. And considering that the author of the New Testament’s principal argument with the Towrah has been circumcision, his ministry and letters sit at the crosshairs of this prophetic warning. It is hard to imagine Yahowah’s disgust being directed at anyone other than Sha’uwl / Paul in this regard. No one else in all human history even came close to Paul’s influence regarding the specific topic of disassociating circumcision from salvation.

Yahowah is predicting that there will be a devastating consequence, indeed, a curse associated with Paul’s position on this matter in which he flaunted his rejection of the Towrah, the existing Covenant, and especially circumcision. And that is because disassociating circumcision from the Covenant, demeaning the Towrah, and nullifying Yahowah’s instructions for living has

precluded billions of souls from approaching God and entering Heaven.

Yahowah has entered this debate. He has rendered His evaluation of Sha'awl's / Paul's position on circumcising Greeks in particular and Gentiles in general. And it is God's conclusion, His judgment, that Sha'awl's / Paul's claims were dead wrong, so much so that He views his epistle to the Galatians as a "repulsive abomination."

Therefore, it matters not if "Peter" was important or what his opinions may have been. In this regard, the views of "John" and "James" do not matter. Luke's summation of the meeting becomes as immaterial as Paul's revisionist account is irrelevant. When it comes to the consequence of circumcision in concert with God's Home, being part of His Family, and entering Heaven, all that matters is what Yahowah revealed. Period. End of conversation.

Of course, now that you know this, the notion that Paul spoke for God must be discarded. Sha'awl has done nothing but lie from the very beginning.

Sha'awl corrupted and defiled the Word of God. And by so doing, he violated and revoked Yahowah's one and only Covenant on behalf of all those who foolishly believe him. His overt willingness to corrupt and contradict Yahowah's instructions has led to the nullification of the Covenant for every Christian. And this problem has become ubiquitous as a result of Galatians, earning Sha'awl the designation – Plague of Death. It is the sign of Christianity from God's perspective, His preference over the tortured image of a Dead God on a Stick.

Paul's antagonism toward circumcision is mixed with references to the body of the Passover Lamb, represented by "bread," and the Spirit, represented by "oil." The sacrifice the Messiah Dowd made as the Lamb opened the Doorway to Life and to his Father's Home is impugned and negated. By demeaning one, Paul demeaned all. He broke

the connection between them and thereby nullified the Covenant and thwarted the intent of the Invitations to be Called Out and Meet.

For Yahowah to be this explicit and unequivocal, promising to permanently estrange men for rejecting the sign of the Covenant, God is shutting the door on Paul's upstart religion. God is using Sha'uwl's most notorious act of rebellion against His Towrah to alert us to the devastating consequence of this man's message. Pauline Doctrine, by severing the connection between Yahowah, the Covenant, and the Towrah, rendered God's promises moot for billions of Gentile Christians.

While *Sha'uwl* | Paul has invited people of every race and place into his "New Covenant," Yahowah has put us on notice that his invitation was fraudulent, and that the self-acclaimed messenger of god was the greatest abomination in human history. And this is not the first, nor will it be the last time Yahowah lashes out at Sha'uwl prophetically. He has just begun.

Paul's fourteen ill-advised letters, his influence over Mark, Luke, and Matthew, and his litany of speeches were sufficient to separate Christians from God. As a direct result of the canonization of Paul's epistles, far too few Christians observe the Towrah or even know that there are immutable conditions for engaging in the Covenant.

Indeed, whether it is Paul or Akiba, the most notoriously failed or ignominiously influential rabbis, such men have not only failed to consider Yahowah's requirements, replacing His explanations of what is essential with their own, they have done far worse. They have sought to change God and His plans, telling the faithful what they claim their god is going to do for them – such as love and save them.

Yahowah is responsible. He is going to do, and has done, what He has promised. In so doing, He has created

the opportunity to spend eternity with Him, so long as we capitalize on what is required of us. It is our responsibility to observe His Towrah and consider His Covenant so that we come to appreciate what God views as essential, and then act accordingly.

There are requirements to participate in the Covenant and responsibilities for us as parents. And while we are free to ignore them, even reject them, we are not at liberty to enter God's home when we do either. When God makes a promise, such as those delineated in His seven-step plan of reconciliation, He is committed to fulfilling and honoring what He has vowed. And that is what makes Him and His Torah trustworthy.

During the Millennial Shabat there will not be any uncircumcised males because the one-thousand-year commemoration of *Sukah* is a celebration of the Covenant. As a celebration of the Invitation to Camp Out with God, the Millennial Sabbath embodies all that the seventh Festival Feast represents, including restoring the Earth to the conditions enjoyed in the Garden of Eden. It was perfect, devoid of religion and thus of the likes of Paul. Corruptions of Yahowah's word will not be tolerated.

With Yahowah's position on circumcision being so clearly stated, so vital, unequivocal, and nonnegotiable, there are only four reasons that Sha'uwl chose this unwinnable issue to pick a fight with God. First, his target audience – Greeks and Romans – were very proud of their junk and equated circumcision to the mutilation of their crowning jewels. Since those he was playing for fools were foolish in this regard, Sha'uwl appealed to their manhood and sense of superiority. And at the same time, he could capitalize upon the Roman and Greek disgust of Jews who were circumcised.

Second, Paul was a homosexual and thus loved his lover's genitalia as much as his own. And this sexual fascination caused him to prioritize one head over the

other.

Third, Sha'awl was a Gnostic and appealed to Gnostics. These philosophical Greeks perceived the flesh to be a flawed and faulty reflection of the perfect rendition of the spiritual world. Therefore, by equating circumcision with the flesh and with the Towrah and its Covenant, Paul was able to attack and demean each while promoting the superiority of faith since it was not of the flesh.

And fourth, since Sha'awl / Paul served Satan, by negating the benefits of the Covenant, the Devil's Advocate served his lord and master. Without circumcision, Passover's Door is shut, precluding a continuation of life. And if everyone dies, Satan wins because there would be no harvest on Shabu'ah, no gleanings on Taru'ah, no homecoming on Kipurym, and no camping out during Sukah. It is all for naught.

While the debate regarding the efficacy of circumcision is over, we are still obliged to compare Galatians with Acts to ascertain the lengths Paul went to deceive his audience. So, let's return to the book of Acts.



Recognizing that the testimony the Yahuwdym from Yahuwdah (Jews from Judea) had delivered in Antioch, regarding the connection between circumcision and salvation, was accurate, Luke's depiction began, saying...

**“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 (de) a rebellion** (*ginomai stasis* – a heated quarrel and open discord, an insurrection and uprising) **and also (kai) a disputed argument** (*zetesis* – a debated

controversy) **which were neither limited in scope, degree, or time** (*ouk oligos* – not among a few, not to a small degree, and not for a short while), **pertained to the individual (to) Paulos** (*Paulo* – of Latin origin meaning Little and Lowly) **and (kai) to (to) Barnabas** (*Bar-Naby* – meaning Prophet’s Son).

**Regarding them** (*pros autous* – against them), **they gave the order and assigned the task** (*tasso* – they proposed, decided, and instituted the plan) **to come up to** (*anabaino* – to stand up to, to rise up and embark on the mission to reach) **Paulos** (*Paulon* – Little and Lowly) **and (kai) Barnabas** (*Bar-Naby* – Prophet’s Son) **and some others** (*kai tinas allos*) **among** (*ek* – from) **them** (*autos*) **on behalf of** (*pros* – concerning) **the Apostles** (*apostolos* – those who are prepared and sent out) **and elders** (*kai presbyteros* – leaders) **in Yaruwshalaim** (*Ierousalem* – transliteration of *Yaruwshalaim*, meaning the Source of Reconciliation) **with regard to** (*peri*) **this** (*toutou*) **controversy and question** (*zetema* – point of dispute and inquiry, debate and argument).” (Acts 15:2)

So much for the notion of Sha’uwl going to Yaruwshalaim because of a “revelation.” In actuality, there was an all-out rebellion which prompted this investigation. Paul’s message denouncing circumcision and the Torah was under attack by those who knew better.

In that we will be comparing these two presentations, Luke’s Acts and Paul’s Galatians, I would like to proceed by reviewing what Paul had written regarding this meeting when he said:

“Later, through fourteen years, also, I went up to Yaruwshalaim along with Barnabas, having taken along also Titus. (Galatians 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 pertaining

to my own, uniquely and separately, but then to the opinions, presumptions, and suppositions, not somehow perhaps into foolishness and stupidity, without purpose, I might run or I ran (2:2) – to the contrary, not even Titus, a Greek being, was compelled 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 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 God for man not take hold of or receive, because to me, the ones currently presuming and supposing, presently dispensing opinions based upon reputed appearances, are of no account, utterly meaningless and totally worthless was their advice and counsel, their cause and contribution in the past. (Galatians 2:6)

Contrariwise, notwithstanding the objection or exception, having seen that because namely I have been believed entrusted with the healing message and beneficial messenger of the uncircumcised inasmuch as Petros of the circumcised (2:7) because then namely, the one having previously functioned in Petro to an apostle for the circumcision, it actually functions 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, Kephass, and also Yahowchanan, the ones presently presumed to be pillars, 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 for 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 this similarly.” (Galatians 2:10)

That was Sha'awl's version of the events. Now, let's return to the book of Acts and consider his associate's perspective on the Yaruwshalaim Inquiry. This monumental meeting was dated to 50 CE – seventeen years after Dowd's fulfillment of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children in the spring of 33 CE.

Now that we know the pretext for this meeting was misrepresented by Paul, how about the spies? Were they false brothers unknown to the Ekklesia in Yaruwshalaim?

“**But** (*de*) **having arrived in** (*paraginomai eis* – having approached and appeared in) **Yaruwshalaim** (*Ierousalem* – transliteration of *Yaruwshalaim*, meaning the Source of Reconciliation), **they were acknowledged and received** (*paradechomai* – were welcomed hospitably as visitors) **by the** (*apo tes*) **Called Out** (*ekkleisia*), **the** (*kai ton*) **Apostles** (*apostolos*), **and elders** (*kai ton presbyteros*– and the leaders). **And then** (*te* – so then likewise) **they reported** (*anangelo* –they announced and proclaimed) **as much as** (*hosos* – to the degree that) **Theos** | **God** (*o ΘΣ*) **did** (*poieomai* – worked and performed) **with** (*meta*) **them** (*autos*). (15:4)

**But** (*de*) **some important individuals** (*tines* – certain specific people) **steadfastly stood up** (*exanistamai* – resolutely rose up to take a stand), **the ones** (*ton*) **who had been from** (*apo* – as in separated from and disassociated



with) **the religious party** (*tes haireisis* – the faction based upon false teaching and heresy; from *haireomai* – to think and choose for oneself) **of the Pharisees** (*ton Pharisaios* – rabbinical religious fundamentalists; a transliteration of the Hebrew *parash*, meaning to separate, some of whom likely left their ranks in response to what Dowd had done), **who having come to trust and to rely** (*pisteuo* – to think and be persuaded, thus becoming confident), **said** (*lego* – and affirmed) **that** (*hoti*) **it is a necessary requirement** (*dei* – it is a must, it is inevitable, it is proper and established, right and beneficial) **to circumcise** (*peritemno*) **individuals** (*autous*) **not only** (*te*) **to provide instruction as a messenger** (*parangello* – to convey the message or to announce or proclaim the teaching), **but also** (*kai*) **to observe** (*tereo* – to attend to by focusing upon, closely examining and carefully considering) **the Towrah of Moseh** (*Mouseos nomon* – a Greek transliteration of Moseh, meaning: the One who Draws us Out and *nomon* – an allotment which is parceled out, an inheritance which is given, nourishment which is bestowed to be possessed and used, precepts which are apportioned, established, and is received as the means to be proper and approved, prescriptions to become heirs; from *nemo* – that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to one’s children to nourish them).” (Acts 15:4-5)

These individuals were advocating and endorsing the Towrah which Yahowah had dictated to Moseh. And that means that they were not speaking on behalf of Rabbinic Law or the Talmud. And since they were Paul’s antagonists, it would be ridiculous to suggest that Paul’s foe was anything other than this very same Towrah. This is a devastating blow relative to Paul’s credibility – and it was provided by his biographer, Luke, Christianity’s most respected voice.

The lone excuse that could have been deployed to somewhat exonerate Paul, the notion that he was assailing

and demeaning Rabbinic Law rather than the Torah, has just been obliterated by this testimony. If you are an informed and rational person, the debate is over, as is any possibility that Christianity is valid. It is impossible to speak on behalf of God while opposing the Word of God.

The men who “stood up had come to trust and rely,” which means that they were not “false brothers.” They did not “sneak into the meeting under false pretenses,” as they were elders among the Called Out in Yaruwshalaim.

Should there have been any truth in the Gospel attributed to John, one would suspect that Nicodemus, the Pharisee who is shown meeting with Gospel Jesus in John 3, was among them. But either way, they did not come to “secretly observe,” but to the contrary, to stand up and speak. Like Paul, these individuals were former Pharisees. But unlike Paul, they, like Dowd, were Towrah-observant.

While Paul’s first five statements regarding this meeting have all crumbled in the face of evidence to the contrary, Sha’uwl’s sixth, seventh, and eighth assertions are also in jeopardy. Paul had written in Galatians 2:9 that he had presented his case, and then after having done so, he had been accepted by Ya’aqob, Shim’own, and Yahowchanan. But Luke reports that the welcome occurred prior to Paul’s presentation of his message and ministry. He also suggests that the “greeting” was little more than “an acknowledgment that these visitors had shown up.” And that means even the false notion of a “right hand of fellowship” could not have been the ringing endorsement Paul would have his readers believe. Rather, the false Apostle was putting a carefully designed “spin” on the actual events to deliberately mislead his audience.

Also, contrary to Paul’s claim that everyone was accepting of the uncircumcised condition of his Greek associate, Titus (in Galatians 2:3), we find that the elders strongly encouraged circumcision, calling it: **“a necessary requirement, proper, established, right, and beneficial**

to circumcise individuals to provide instruction as a messenger, to announce and proclaim the teaching, and also to be observant by focusing upon the Towrah of Moseh.” Therefore, Paul’s eighth recollection, that he was only told to “remember the poor,” was also untrue. He was told to remember the Torah generally and circumcision specifically.

Now, let’s see if Paul’s claim that an agreement was allegedly reached in the meeting to divide the world, limiting Yahowchanan, Shim’own, and Ya’aqob to the circumcised, while granting Paul authority over every other nation and race, is valid. Luke writes:

“**So then** (*te*) **demonstrating leadership** (*sunago* – drawing people together; from *sun*, with, and *ago*, to lead), **the Apostles** (*apostolos* – those who were prepared and sent out; speaking specifically of the Gospel’s Disciples) **and** (*kai*) **the elders** (*presbuteros* – the leaders) **paid attention** (*horao* – looked at, perceived, recognized, were aware of, and understood) **concerning** (*peri* – because of and with regard to) **this** (*toutou*), **the Word** (*tu logou* – statement, reason, account, declaration, affirmation, treatise, decree, and mandate).” (Acts 15:6)

In other words, the Apostles and elders supported the men who stood up and affirmed the *Towrah* – the Word of God – putting everyone in attendance at odds with Paul. They were, in a word, “observant.” Further, this testimony affirms that “the Word” and the “Towrah of Moseh” were considered one and the same.

As we continue, we are confronted with additional testimony which invalidates Paul’s “all they said was to remember the lowly,” and that they agreed that “the nations and ethnicities belonged to Paul with Shim’own limited to the circumcised.” Turns out they had a lot more to say, and it all was in direct opposition to Paul’s recollection.

“**But then** (*de*) **with considerable and extensive**

(*polys* – very great) **debate** (*zetesis* – questioning and controversy, mediating and reasoning, contentious argument and deliberation, seeking information and dispute) **happening** (*ginomai* – having come to exist), **the Rock** (*petros* – meaning rock, a translation of Shim’own’s nickname, Kephas, of the same meaning in Hebrew and Aramaic) **having stood up** (*anistamai* – having taken a stand, rising, standing upright), **said** (*eipen*) **to and about** (*pros* – regarding) **them** (*autos*),

‘**Men** (*andres*), **brothers** (*adelphoi*), **you all** (*umeis*) **have examined the evidence, thought about it, and have come to understand** (*epistamai* – through intelligent evaluation of what you have come to know, possessing sufficient information to comprehend and take a resolute and confident stand) **that** (*hoti*) **from** (*apo*) **in** (*en*) **the beginning** (*archaios* – existing for a long time in the past) **you all** (*umin*) **chose for yourself** (*eklegomai* – selected) **God** (ΘΣ – a placeholder used in the Septuagint to convey ‘*elohym*, the Almighty, and thus Yahowah) **on account of** (*dia* – through and as a consequence of) **my** (*mou*) **spoken words** (*stoma* – message from my mouth), **listening to and considering** (*akouo* – receiving, hearing, paying attention to, comprehending, and understanding) **the Word** (*legos*) **of the healing messenger and beneficial message** (*tou euangelion*) **to the races and nations** (*ethnos* – to the ethnicities), **and considered it to be trustworthy and reliable** (*pisteuo* – were convinced and became confident).’” (Acts 15:7)

If we are to believe anything attributed to him, Gospel Jesus had trained Shim’own, teaching and guiding him in the way, equipping him to articulate God’s healing and beneficial message to the world. And then he authorized Shim’own, as well as Yahowchanan and Ya’aqob, to convey that message to everyone. There were no limitations, no restrictions, no ethnicities off limits. And as proof of this, every one of those Called Out in

Yaruwshalaim on this day, save Paul, knew the Towrah well enough to cite and support the Word of God.

By acknowledging his history and theirs, Shim'own Kephas confirmed what is recorded of Gospel Jesus' instructions to him, thereby pulverizing Paul's ninth claim. It matters not if a word in any of the Gospels is correct regarding the myth of Iesou Christou because Paul and Christianity fail either way. If "Jesus Christ" existed and told Peter these things, then Paul was lying. If "Jesus Christ" was a fable and all of this was a gross cover-up to replace Dowd, then Paul lied because he claimed otherwise. Simply stated, the ministry of the so-called Disciples and Apostles had never been limited to Jews as Paul had claimed.

These things known, when we place Luke's account of this meeting as it is presented in the Book of Acts next to Paul's description of it in Galatians, we find that the more detailed account, which was told from the perspective of the attendees, is markedly different.

Therefore, while it is obvious that Paul misrepresented these events to demean his presumed rivals, to bolster his dubious credibility, to validate his opposition to the Torah and circumcision, and to claim the world as his own, it does not actually matter if Paul lied, Luke lied, or if they both lied. If Luke's account is untrue in Acts, then it cannot be trusted in the book bearing his name. And since Luke is predicated upon Mark and serves as the basis of Matthew, the credibility of the Gospels crumbles along with his own. And if Luke's representation is accurate, then Paul's is not. If Paul lied, there is nothing left of Christianity.

If Paul cannot be trusted to accurately present what happened during the three most important alleged meetings of his life (the mythical encounter approaching Damascus, the meeting in Arabia, and the trial in Yaruwshalaim), he cannot be trusted with regard to his contrarian message. This is a wake-up call for those who have been led to

believe that Paul was right when he said that the Torah had been replaced by “faith in his Gospel of Grace.”

If you have not already recognized that it is rationally impossible for Paul to be a reliable witness when he contradicts the God he claimed to represent, then the realization that Paul cannot be trusted to accurately relay conversations between men should be sufficient for you to discount his testimony regarding God.

To be clear, I am not saying that everything Paul wrote has been discredited, just the first third of Galatians (everything we have read up to this point), and with it, the foundation of Christendom. The remainder of Paul’s letter to the Galatians, along with other letters, are awaiting our examination. But the realization that the first third of his first epistle has been deficient in every conceivable way should suffice to indicate that his remaining words are not reliable either. It is obvious that they never should have been published or included in the Christian Bible. God’s standard is perfection. Paul had no standards.

Therefore, while it requires study and thought, Paul’s epistle to the Galatians has taught us a valuable lesson: we must be careful. Only Yahowah is trustworthy.



*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 peruse 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," will be our star witness. He, with Luke serving as narrator, reveals that a wide-ranging dispute had arisen between the alleged disciples and Paul. Sha'awl's message was the antithesis of what Gospel Jesus had taught, 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 God 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 that isn’t all he did because he impugned himself in the



process. His confession “**you all chose God for yourself on account of my spoken words,**” is self-serving and hopelessly mistaken. We must either choose or reject Yahowah on the basis of His written testimony. We as individuals can translate it, interpret it and comment on it, direct people’s attention to it, even herald it, but we are never more than conduits through whom His Guidance flows.

And so by his response, we see Peter as pathetic, as a man whose ego was bruised by the claims of another. But Shim’own was not finished pummeling God’s foe while indicting himself. He continued to say...

“**And (kai) God** (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 Holy** (*to agion* – and purifying) **Spirit** (*to ΠΙΝΑ* – a placeholder for *pneuma* used in the Septuagint to represent the *ruwach* – Spirit) **just as** (*kathos* – for the same reason and to the same degree) **also** (*kai*) **to us** (*emin*).” (Acts 15:8)

God has a name. Those who know Him use it. Those who don’t, don’t. And since knowing Yahowah is a prerequisite for speaking intelligently and insightfully about Him, people should stop listening to the Peters and Pauls who speak for nameless gods or gods by different names. This advice, which is clearly confirmed by Yahowah, would also include every rabbi, priest, pastor, pope, nun, or imam.

Yahowah's propensity to peer into someone's heart such that He knows their motives and ambitions is so rare that it should never be used as a means of distinguishing Him from religious deities. Should you be tasked with introducing Him, He is Yahowah, the God of Yisra'el, the God of 'Abraham, Yitschaq, and Ya'aqob. He is the Creator of the universe, the Architect of Life, and the Author of the Towrah. Yahowah is the Father of the Covenant and of His Firstborn, Dowd, our Messiah, Savior, and King. And while all of that is true and pertinent, Kephass said none of these things.

No one speaking for Yahowah would disparage the *Ruwach Qodesh* | Set-Apart Spirit by calling Her the *agion pneuma* | holy spirit, especially since holy is a pejorative in Hebrew. Often transliterated *choly*, it speaks of a grievous and afflicting sickness akin to the Plague of Death.

As for clarity, who were the "to them" to whom the mercurial *choly* spirit was given? Was it addressing Peter's posse or Paul and pals? While both assessments would be wrong if depicting the whereabouts of the *Ruwach Qodesh* | Set-Apart Spirit of Yahowah, either option might be accurate when addressing the interests and work of the *agion pneuma* | holy spirit inspiring this cast of sickening characters.

Since Peter's statement concludes "just as also to us," it appears that he is claiming that the spirit that inspired Paul to speak out against the Towrah and circumcision was the same he experienced. And this means that Gospel Jesus was correct in correlating him with Satan.

As we read further into this pathetic response, and attempt to correctly assess what Peter was trying to say about himself, his rival, his god, and their target audience, our options are severely limited. This is because Peter is saying that, even though he disagrees with Paul's claims and the limitations the verbose upstart has placed on him,

they were similarly inspired and serving the same spirit with conflicting messages. And since neither man knows Yahowah or has a relationship with Him, they are seen constantly stumbling over their tongues. All the while, Peter is reduced to whining, “But what about me? I’m important too!” As a result, with these words, Peter continues to shatter his reputation as a credible witness and competent man...

**“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*), **faith** (*pistis*) **having cleansed** (*katharizo* – having healed and purified) **their** (*auton*) **hearts** (*kardias* – addressing the individual, their desires and attitude).” (Acts 15:9)**

This reminds me of the Quran and Hadith where Allah performs open heart surgery to purify Muhammad’s heart. But alas, had he been literate and moral he would have sued for malpractice since Allah’s messenger was the most disgusting man who ever lived.

By contrast, Yahowah, working through Dowd, perfects souls. He not only doesn’t cleanse hearts, these bad boys retained their full measure of slime.

In addition, they could not have been indistinguishable nor could they both be telling the truth because they disagreed and disparaged one another and God. So this was an inauspicious opening statement by Shim’own Kephas.

After having had the opportunity to listen to Moseh’s brilliant oratory about Yahowah in Dabarym, to Dowd’s soaring and loving lyrics scribed to his Father throughout the Mizmowr, and to the likes of Yasha’yah’s articulate presentation of past and future history under the inspiration of the Ruwach Qodesh, this nonsensical, internally conflicting, emotionally charged, and remedial exchange between immoral and irrational imposters is painful.

Accordingly, Shim'own wallows in self-pity, trying to break free of the shackles the usurper, whom he has just affirmed and praised, placed on him. These clowns were fighting over turf rather than the Towrah. I say this because Peter began by acknowledging that they were inspired by the same *choly* spirit and that their anti-Torah euangelion was indistinguishable. Further, Peter complains that Paul was tempting his *theos* | god, but not over the Towrah, instead over controlling the disciples. Then he steps even further away from Yahowah and His *Towrah* | Guidance and into Judaism with, “which neither our fathers nor we were given the authority.”

May I remind everyone, these malcontents were summoned to Jerusalem because Towrah-observant Jews in Galatia recognized that Sha'uwl / Paul was a self-aggrandizing fraud. This was and remains obvious because he was claiming to speak for the God he was constantly contradicting. In particular, the most divisive issue was that Paul was renouncing the Towrah and denouncing circumcision, things about which Yahowah's position is clear and unwavering. But there has been no mention of these issues thus far which is unconscionable – assuring us that Peter's assessments are no better than his rival's pronouncements. This is Dumb and Dumber, Part One.

**“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 for *theos* used 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)

The lines have been drawn to determine which bull will have the biggest pen – or snake the largest den if you prefer. And somehow this dispute is a test for their *theos* | god who is being tempted to side with one or the other. And the dispute is nasty. A yoke is put on the necks of animals to control and direct a beast of burden.

There is no sanction on yoking Disciples in the Towrah, making Peter’s proposition a religious argument. Authority was afforded to the Lowy who served to explain the Towrah and to the Shaphat to render decisions regarding the Towrah. And, of course, supreme authority was given to Dowd as the Firstborn Son of God, the Anointed Messiah, the Shepherd of the Flock, and the King of Yisra’el. But that’s all She wrote.

If Peter had wanted to say, “Paul, you do not have the authority to renounce the Towrah or denounce circumcision because no one has the right to do either,” he should have said so. And if his issue was the relative size of their audience, then he should have shut up and appeared useless rather than open his yap and prove counterproductive. The problem was Paul’s anti-Yahowah, anti-Towrah, anti-Beryth, anti-Miqra’ey, and anti-Yisra’elite message, not who was going to promote these lies.

Further, the absurdity of being indistinguishable and similarly inspired while haranguing one another is delusional and unseemly. In this regard, there is no dismissing the fact that *peirazo* is an unsavory term. It was used in reference to Satan “tempting” Gospel Jesus in the wilderness prior to the beginning of his mission in Mark 1:13. Matthew plagiarized the earlier imposter using the

same word in relation to Satan, calling him the “tempter” in Matthew 4:3. Then *peirazo* was deployed in Matthew 16:1 to show the Pharisees and Sadducees trying to “tempt” and manipulate Gospel Jesus – and in so doing, equate Jews with the Devil.

Therefore, the disciple is implying that the apostle was acting like Satan and his religious cohorts in his attempt to “test and tempt” God, “searching for ways to exploit” God. While somewhat astute because Paul had made a religion out of misquoting God, it flies in the face of what he claimed previously. And it reveals that Christianity was born out of internal conflict – reflecting the tenor of Paul’s antagonistic letters.

At the very least, and if nothing else, Peter has impugned Paul’s revisionist portrayal of this episode in Galatians where he stated that the disciples had authorized him to be their god’s lone messenger to the world, while limiting them to Jews. Turns out, Peter was apoplectic over imposing such restrictions on him, and then said that he and they could never support them. He is, therefore, renouncing the text of Galatians and that of the New Testament.

But beyond this, 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 no one should accept or support. He was wrong.

In future chapters we will analyze another of Gospel Jesus’ warnings regarding Sha’uwl, this one directed through Shim’own, which is also germane to his recent protestation. As a preview of it now, seventeen years before Sha’uwl would attempt to do this very thing to Shim’own, resurrected Gospel Jesus warned...

**“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.’ (John 21:18)

And then he revealed the future by foretelling the kind of deadly plague he will attribute to God. And this having been shared, he said to him, ‘You should choose to follow me and my way, actively engaging as my disciple.’” (John 21:19) Evidently, with the resurrected voice of Iesou Christou still ringing in his ears, Shim’own told Sha’uwl that he would not wear 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 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** (*lo’ 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 in support of the words which comprise the Towrah’s guidance, doing so by acting upon God’s instructions.

When it comes to analyzing the words we are reading, there is a difference between Paul’s letters and the rhetoric found in Acts. 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 analyzing. However, these conversations in *Yaruwshalaim, Yahuwdah* | Jerusalem, Judah would have been conducted in Hebrew, making the Greek text a translation of what was said years later. This is important because it means that, in his next statement, Shim’own would likely have used the Hebrew “*chen* – mercy” rather than the Greek “*charis* – grace.” Luke, who at the time was traveling with Paul as a groupie and healer, 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 his forefathers. Therefore, Paul's contrarian message which conflicted with everything God has said and done regarding salvation was a nonstarter. Therefore, transitioning away from *Sha'uwl* and back to some semblance of reality...

**“To the contrary** (*alla* – instead, certainly and emphatically), **through** (*dia* – by and on account of) **the charity** (*charis* – the name of the Greek goddesses of charity as opposed to *chen*, the Hebrew word for undeserved kindness and unmerited favor) **of the Lord** (*tou KY* – a placeholder *kurios* used in the Septuagint to convey either ‘*adon*, Lord, ‘*edon*, Upright One, or as a replacement for Yahowah's name), **in Iesou** (*IY* – a placeholder used to the Greek name Iesou to imply a divine saction), **we presently believe** (*pistos* – we express our faith (present active indicative)) **to be saved** (*sozo* – to be healed and delivered) **according to** (*kata* – in accord with) **this manner, means, and 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)

Worse yet. Again, God has a name, and those who do not use it do not speak for Him. The *kurios* | lord is Satan according to Yahowah, although God prefers to use the Hebrew word *Ba'al* | Lord and Master, Owner and Possessor, to identify and describe the Adversary.

As Satan, the Lord is not merciful, although he may well have encouraged the veneration of the *Charis* | Charities. It is Yahowah who is *chen* | merciful, compassionate, and loving, but these sentiments were

conveyed through His Son and our Messiah Dowd, not the mythical misnomer Iesou / Jesus. Beliefs are useless and become counterproductive when they are used to forego knowledge, leading to trust and reliance. Yahowah prefers to convey the benefits of deliverance, reconciliation, redemption, and perfection over the idea of salvation because they explain the results of Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym and highlight the benefits of the Beryth. Therefore, Peter got all of this wrong. And if I know these things, how would it have been possible for him to have walked in the Messiah's shadow and not been aware of some of the most fundamental Towrah Teachings?

By concluding his summation of salvation through faith in the Lord's Charity with "according to this manner, means, and way, the same as them," Peter reveals that he is religious, clueless, and irrational. His way was not even remotely the same as his forefathers and it was also counter to the path Yahowah has articulated.

When it comes to the things of God, being right matters and this was all wrong. And this means that even the proclaimed disciples were beyond clueless as they were deceivers.

The favoritism and mercy 'Abraham, Yitschaq, and Ya'aqob enjoyed, and the way they availed themselves of it, was as Moseh described it when introducing us to these men in the Towrah. It is not only in the Towrah where we come to know them, it was through the Towrah and its *Beryth* | Covenant that they were favored and loved. There was no mention of a Iesou / Jesus nor any reference to Yahowah being a *kurios* | lord. It is through the plan and fulfillment of the Miqra'ey and their enablement of the Beryth's benefits that we are favored by Yahowah and receive His compassion, mercy, and love.

As for Shim'own / Peter, he must have been standing in the religious line and missed the entire purpose of the

relationship. He even missed Dowd's fulfillment of Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym. But worse than this, he became one of the most infamous individuals leading the world in the wrong direction and away from the benefits of the Messiah's sacrifice. Theirs would be the most egregious cover-up and crime ever perpetrated – one boasting billions of casualties along with the demonization of Jews. And that is why we are here, examining the fecal matter in this swamp of contaminated words.

Apart from it and above them, there is only one God, one Torah, one Covenant, and one Way. Shim'own had chosen poorly as had his rival in crime, Sha'uwl. Together they would change the very perception of God while denying His Son. Their replacements would damn the planet.

Forgetting Peter's and Paul's affinity for the *Charis* | Graces for a moment, "believing in 'Jesus Christ'" has never and will never save anyone. Salvation is, at best, a mislabeling of the intent of the Beryth and Miqra'ey – which is to perfect our souls by removing the stench, stain, and stigma of religious and political guilt. The process has nothing to do with "faith." The benefits are accrued by those who capitalize upon what Yahowah is offering and Dowd has done.

Satan, as the Lord in this plot, has long viewed Dowd as his rival – as someone to push aside in his quest to replace God in the hearts of the religious while at the same time, precluding reconciliation. Therefore, as his Apostle, Paul is seen trying to replace the disciples as he positions himself as his Lord's lone Apostle, while at the same time spreading his plague of death. It is the same tactic Allah would use with Muhammad and with similar results because this dark spirit and these deplorable men shared a disdain for God's people that became a pandemic of anti-Semitism.

This explains why the attendees of the *Ekklesia* | 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 influence 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 Son's accomplishment. 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 incriminating themselves.

The only portion of Matthew beyond the Sermon on the Mount, which is potentially reliable, at least to the extent it was witnessed and retained by the *'Ebownym* | Ebionites is known as the Olivet Discourse. The instruction now misattributed in Matthew 24:4-5 and then in 24:23-24, provides a warning to be especially wary of anyone who would make the claims Paul has now professed. In the midst of what was likely Dowd speaking to his countrymen, we find these words now errantly attributed...

**“And Iesous (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), ‘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 or reputation** (*onoma*), **saying** (*lego* – claiming), **‘I** (*ego*) **represent** (*eimi* – am, exist for, and belong to) **the** (*o*) **Christos** (ΧΣ – a placeholder used to represent Christos, which was a replacement for the Hebrew Mashyach), **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 Christos** (*o* ΧΣ – a placeholder used to represent the false title Christos),’ **or** (*e*), **‘In this case, over there** (*hode*).’ **You should not think that this is trustworthy or reliable** (*me pisteuo*). (Matthew 24:23)

**Because** (*gar*) **those pretending to be pseudo-Chrestui** (*pseudochrestui* – a compound of *pseudo* – fraudulent and *chrestui* – wannabe messiahs) **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** (*meegas* – 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 small gathering just prior to the fulfillment of Chag Matsah, while overlooking Mowryah from the Mount

of Olives, Dowd (should this conversation have actually occurred) or Iesou (should it be another layer in the mythology), “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 slated specifically to the disciples, and since only one person committed this offense before them, the lone plausible perpetrator pursuant to this warning would have been Sha’uwl / Paul. And should you not want it to be Paul, then 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, the speaker could not have been talking of anyone past the lifetimes of the audience that day in Jerusalem – seventeen years in advance of this summit. If not Paul, it was a false prophecy.

Dowd’s concern, should this conversation have actually transpired, was that those afforded the opportunity to witness what he would accomplish on Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym would be lured away from the truth, giving rise to the abomination of Replacement Theology and the religion of Christianity. It also means that the individual making the claim to have seen him, of which there was only

one during the lifetimes of the eyewitnesses, would not only be deceptive, he would be very persuasive in misleading even those who should otherwise be aware – which once again points specifically and uniquely to this interplay between Peter and Paul.

Further, the speaker on the Mount of Olives is recorded saying that this deceptive individual pretending to speak for him, amidst a flurry of signs and wonders, will have falsely claimed to have witnessed his appearance, just as Paul claimed on the road to Damascus. Further, based solely on this lone individual's deceptiveness many will follow in his footsteps, misleading countless more. Under these circumstances this is either an accurate assessment accusing Paul pulling the wool over the eyes of those gathered at this meeting, or it is a false prophecy.

The title conveyed on this occasion is unknown to us, hidden behind a translation and a placeholder. The speaker, if Dowd, would have said *Mashyach* | Anointed Messiah. Although, it would have been appropriate, and interesting, for him to have said *Christo*, mocking the title which Paul actually deployed in his letters and speeches.

In this regard, *pseudochrestui* is potentially revealing because the spelling may have been based upon “*chrestus* – useful implement” rather than “*christos* – drugged.” Therefore, it may have been a warning to be on alert to the proposition Paul advanced by feigning that someone known by this Greek title was the Son of God.

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 person during their lifetimes, Dowd was prophetic, and if not Paul, Gospel Jesus 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, which, apart from the prophecies pilfered to form the Book of Revelation, is the New Testament's primary reservoir of prophecy. Everything else stated therein has or is coming true before our eyes, which is not surprising since it was all foretold by Yahowah's Naby'. So what are the odds that the 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 – often sending mixed messages as was the case here. And as a result, Paul's faith has deceived and misled billions. And it is from this perspective that readers should be mindful that my unrelenting criticism of this man is actually less than appropriate since he deserves and will receive 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. However, this isn't God's primary issue with him or mine. False prophets are a dime a dozen. But this man went two steps beyond fraud because he buried Dowd's gift and legacy under his trash talk and he impugned Jews in a conspiracy that has haunted them. And it is for these reasons that I refer to him as the most maliciously infamous and detrimentally 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. And while Islam is clearly more overtly Satanic and genocidal, particularly for Jews, the religion is so asinine it is a wonder that it survived the pedophile’s and rapist’s death.

Muhammad and Allah were also into Replacement Theology. They miscast Dowd and referred to the Christian Jesus caricature as “Issa,” which is an Arabic transliteration of “Esau.” However, since Muhammad never claimed to represent the Messiah, but instead Allah, he would be disqualified from this prophecy. Not to mention the fact that he lived five centuries after the lifetimes of the 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 to have spoken for his Iesou Christou, and yet in all of his sermons and letters, he only quotes Gospel Jesus once! The lone citation is found in 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 11:24-26, and even it is wrong. So how is it that a man who never once quotes the Christou correctly is perceived as his spokesman?

In this light, it is also instructive to compare the inclusion of “new” before “covenant” in the misquoted account in Matthew 26:28. The imposter, pretending to be “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 late 1<sup>st</sup>-century 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 appears. 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 John, where Iesou's words and deeds dominate the text, or actual prophets like 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.

Known to scholars, but not laity, is that "Matthew" is an experiment in plagiarism. The con artist incorporated 90% of Mark and more than 50% of Luke, along with what survived from the 'Ebornym into his "Gospel." Then 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 comprised an eyewitness account in Hebrew. And while there were a score of credible witnesses to this fact, they have not survived. 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 'Ebornym | Ebionites, who were 1<sup>st</sup>-century followers of The Way, specifically excluded Paul's letters from their canon because they considered him to be a false prophet. It was not until Marcion, in the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century, that Paul's epistles were canonized.

Therefore, recognizing that this eyewitness account of what was foretold on the Mount of Olives was spoken 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 proffered 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 evidence of his power, using the same phrase as had been used to warn the disciples, they should have remembered the 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, Paul is proving the case against him.

And while they obviously failed to consider the Towrah, had they done so, they would have found that Yahowah associated “signs and wonders” with false prophets and interpreters of revelations, especially with the likes of Sha’uwl who would eliminate the Towrah 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* 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* 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 (*Yahowah*), 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 (𐤃𐤇𐤅𐤃𐤁), your God (*'elohym 'atah*), with all (*ba kol*) your heart, thinking and judgment (*leb*) and with all (*wa ba kol*) your soul (*nepesh*). (*Dabarym* 13:3)

After (*'achar*) Yahowah (𐤃𐤇𐤅𐤃𐤁), 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* 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** (*Yahowah*), **your God** (*'elohym*), **the One who led you out** (*ha yatsa' 'eth*) **from** (*min*) **the realm** (*'erets*) **of the Crucibles of Religious and Political Oppression** (*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** (*Yahowah*), **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. 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 that matters, while never showing off. Paul had this all wrong.

Before we consider what further was attributed to Gospel Jesus, let's remain cognizant of the fact that the plagiarizer known as "Matthew" composed his gospel by replicating Mark and Luke some three generations and seven decades after these events played out. The evidence reveals that of Mark's 11,025 words, 97% were duplicated in Matthew. Of the material exclusive to Matthew, almost all of it can be shown to have been copied from a Hebrew text attributed to the 'Eboynym. 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)). (Matthew 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) **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 statement, “Matthew” has the speaker saying that, when he is next seen on earth, he will be seen by everyone – which would only be accurate if the prophecy were attributed to Dowd. So, while this statement was not true pursuant to Gospel Jesus, its inclusion into the text serves as yet another nail in Sha’uwl’s now crumbling coffin.

Juxtapose this with Paul’s claim to have encountered

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

As mentioned previously, when it comes to invalidating Paul's appeal, it does not matter if the gospel accounts are all completely fabricated or if some aspect of them correctly reports what Dowd may have said at the time. The religion Paul promoted requires harmony between the texts, and so the moment his letters or statements contradict the accounts found elsewhere, Christianity is proven false, especially when they are in disagreement on fundamental issues such as these.

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

While that explains the association between Satan and these “serpents,” should you wonder why “scorpions” were mentioned in the context of his prophetic portrayal of Sha’uwl’s spiritual encounter, the answer is found in the details. Those who were paying close attention know that Sha’uwl 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.

While I would recommend becoming fully acquainted with the provisions Yahowah is offering Covenant members before countering the Adversary, the overriding implications of this statement are otherwise sound. So, 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 *Damaseq*, 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 the speaker had described Satan’s fall. Although Sha’uwl did say that the lightning bolt was both “unexpected” and “adequate,” whatever that might be worth. Additionally incriminating, of the many who witnessed Yahowah in their presence, no one described him as a lightning bolt.

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 and unidentified “witnesses” (which negates their purpose and nullifies their mention) 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.

Besides 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 a *Yahuwd* | Jew 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 resurrected Jesus is said to have appeared to the women at the tomb, to the disciples in the upper room, and to the men on the road to Emmaus. On each sighting, he appeared as a regular, nondescript man. But that wasn't spectacular enough for the showman, Paul.

It was also different from the way Yahowah appeared to 'Adam, 'Abraham, Ya'aqob, and Moseh. Turns out, God is actually unpretentious. And while the following prophecy was written to reveal the identity and nature of the man who would be the first to identify Dowd as the one who fulfilled Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym rather than describe the man, himself, it is particularly fitting in the midst of so many false statements. In it, Yasha'yah asks a question no one outside of the current Covenant Family has considered...

**“Who** (*my* – an interrogative posing a who, what, where, why, when, or how question about a person) **has affirmed and established, providing a verifiable accounting** (*'aman* – as a singular male individual has presented trustworthy and reliable evidence to confirm, confidently upholding (hifil perfect active third-person masculine singular – for a period of time this individual

enlivens the revelation)) **of our message** (*la shemuwa'ah* 'anachnuw – our report, announcement, and revelation)?

**And (wa) to whom** ('*el my* – through whom and for whom [from 1QIsa as the MT has on whom]) **have the Zarowa' | the Productive Shepherd, Sacrificial Lamb, and One Sowing the Seeds for the Harvest** (*Zarowa'* – the prevailing and effective nature of the ones with the strength to resolve challenges, the overall ability of the remarkably important and impactful individuals of action who, as liberators, leaders, and shepherds among the sheep, akin to rams leading the flock, who are fruitful in their ways, accomplishing the mission by sowing the seeds of new life which grow while advancing the purpose of the Arm of God, of the Shepherd, and Sacrificial Lamb; from *zara'* – to sow seeds which produce and yield fruit) **of Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of YaHoWaH, our '*elowah* – God as directed in His *ToWRaH* – teaching regarding His *HaYaH* – existence and our *ShaLoWM* – restoration) **been revealed and made openly known** (*galah* – been uncovered and exposed, openly displayed and identified (nifal perfect – the individual disclosing their identity is being revealed in the process of this disclosure at this moment in time))?" (*Yasha'yah* / Yahowah Saves / Isaiah 53:1)

Since I was and remain the only person since this was scribed 2,700 years ago to not only correctly relate Yasha'yah's prophetic testimony to his people, but also identify the three Zarowa', making their identities openly known, there is no denying this prophecy. Further, in the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of Yasha'yah, the prophet refers to me as a Sucker, a Shoot growing out of the fallen stump that represents Yisra'el, who will be lifted up by Yahowah in advance of the ultimate Zarowa's arrival...

**“He will rise and be lifted up** (*'alah* – he will ascend and grow, lifting up by writing down and recording what has happened and what will occur (qal imperfect active

third-person masculine singular)), **similar to** (*ka*) **the Sucker** (*ha yowneq* – the Shoot growing out of the rootstock of an old stump or fallen tree, a more recent and smaller branch), **before His appearance to prepare in advance of His arrival** (*la paneh huw'* – in His presence), **much like** (*wa ka* – being comparable to) **the rootstock** (*ha shoresh* – the source of nourishment which anchors the tree to the ground, the root of the family line) **of the Land after a long drought** (*min 'erets tsyah* – of the Earth deprived of rain, from a barren landscape which is solitary and alone, apart from Yah).

**His approach will not be perceived as particularly pleasing because he will not provide a superficial outline or shallow two-dimensional sketch** (*lo' to'ar la huw'* – what he delineates will not be predicated upon some preconceived physical characteristics nor will he be distinguished based upon outward appearances because he will dig well below the surface).

**He will not hold a high office or be a nobleman or king, he will not ascribe any value to the perceived status of others, nor will he be majestically attired** (*wa hayah lo' hadar* – he will not care about adornments, appearances, social status, heads of state, royalty, or being glorified, and he will not seek acclaim [from 1QIsa]) **such that we would look to him** (*wa ra'ah huw'* – so that we would consider him, pay attention to what he is revealing, or perceive him as a witness (qal imperfect)).

**There is nothing readily apparent** (*wa lo' mar'eh* – so there is nothing in plain sight or easily seen, nothing phenomenal in the form of spectacle; from *mah* – to ponder the who, what, why, when, and how of *ra'ah* – what is seen, perceived, and considered, or is it by supernatural revelation or visions) **such that we would desire him, want to be him, or be pleased by him** (*wa chamad huw'* – so that we would covet him, idolize him, or express our gratitude toward him (qal imperfect)).” (*Yasha'yah /*

Yahowah Delivers / Isaiah 53:2)

Since Dowd was an exceedingly handsome man and was afforded the most prestigious titles, those of Messiah, Son of God, and King, the nondescript individual is his Herald. But that said, in his return to fulfill Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym in year 4000 Yah, since no one recognized Dowd, this depiction might also fit his second of three lives.

Although, it's also relevant to know that I am as depicted in these statements...

**He will be scoffed at and ridiculed, dismissed and discredited** (*bazah* – he will be held in contempt and censored, he will be called uninformed, unimportant, viewed as vile, considered worthless, and perceived as despicable (nifal participle – those who demonstrably and actively disrespect and despise him will be perceived as disgusting)), **by a wide variety and a considerable number of individuals who** (*'ysh 'ysh* – by a great many people) **will try to stop him** (*wa chadel* – who will deliberately isolate and rebuff him, attempting to get him to cease and desist, rejecting and besmirching him to debilitate and incapacitate his efforts; from *chadal* – to stop, cease, desist, forego, and leave unfinished in the end [while *chadel* is not suffixed as a verb or with a pronoun, that is the only way to properly convey its primary meaning, which is to stop]).

**Even so, Yada' will come to know, understand, and acknowledge** (*wa yada'* – nonetheless, Yada' will become familiar with, comprehend, and recognize, discover and disclose (qal noun participle active – actually, genuinely, and literally as a verbal adjective descriptive of an individual making the process of evolving from knowing to understanding to acknowledging active and demonstrative) [from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> – the Great Isaiah Scroll unearthed above Qumran – where *yada'* is active versus

passive in the Masoretic Text]) **the implications of sorrow and suffering** (*mak'ob* – the cause and consequence of being harmed and grieved by pondering the impetus behind the anguish of emotional reactions and being traumatized; from *mah* – to consider the reasons behind *ka'ab* – agony and angst) **of being plagued and afflicted by evil** (*choly* – of being sickened and weakened by a malevolent and malignant pandemic, mortally injured by the malady of holiness; from *chalah* – to weaken and sicken by an infectious disease, *chuwl* – to twist and distort, and *chalal* – to profane by making common and thus to corrupt via the invasive nature of religion and government).

**And as such** (*ka* – accordingly and as a result), **from him** (*min huw'*), **the presence** (*paneḥ* – the appearance and facing it is turned away) **will be averted** (*masther* – is avoided (hifil participle active)).

**We** [Yasha'yah is speaking of future generations of Yahuwdym] **will censor him, slandering him as uninformed, unimportant, and disreputable as we scoff at and ridicule him, dismissing and discrediting him** (*wa bazah huw'* – we will view him as vile, consider him worthless as we perceive him to be despicable, holding him in contempt (nifal participle – those who demonstrably and actively show disrespect and despise him will be seen as disgusting) [from 1QIsa where the verb was scribed with the subject written in the second-person plural, we, rather than third-person singular, he, and then suffixed with *huw'* | he as the object]), **because** (*wa*) **we will not properly assess his contribution by contemplating what he has composed** (*lo' chashab huw'* – we will not think and thus we will fail to consider the value of his account, we will not impute the proper credit to the reporting he is offering due to our collective failure to exercise good judgment (qal perfect – when we were actually afforded the opportunity to reconsider, we did not think)).” (*Yasha'yah* / Yahowah Liberates / Isaiah 53:3)



While the foregoing could speak of either Dowd or Yada, from this point forward the prophet is addressing the Zarowa's fulfillment of the initial Miqra'ey...

**“Surely** (*'aken* – it can be verified as accurate and true that indeed), **the malignant and malevolent pandemic of twisted perversions which plague and weaken us** (*choly 'anachnuw* – the infectious and injurious diseases which sicken us and our religious maladies which mortally wound us by distorting the truth), **he will lift from us, accept, and carry away** (*huw' nasa'* – he [the Zarowa'] will, himself, sustain on behalf of the relationship and remove at this moment in time, actually forgiving (qal perfect third-person masculine singular active)).

**The cause and consequence of our pain and suffering** (*wa mak'ob 'anachnuw'* – the questions which anguish us and make us miserable and the implications of our grief; from *mah* – to consider the reasons behind *ka'ab* – agony and anguish), **he will incur and bear them** (*sabal hem* – he [Dowd] will pull them away, initiating the process to bear them as if they were his burdens to remove (qal perfect)).

**And yet** (*wa*), **we assess his overall contribution as** (*'anachnuw chashab huw'* – we will think and consider him [the Zarowa'] (qal perfect)) **poignantly inflicted** (*naga'* – demonstrably damaged, befallen, and plagued (qal passive participle)) **and** (*wa* – [from 1QIsa]) **stricken** (*nakah* – beaten and slain, made to suffer (hofal passive – the beatings were imposed upon him in a vivid and demonstrable way)) **by God** (*'elohym*), **in addition to being humiliated for his testimony and abused for his response** (*wa 'anah* – even denied and mistreated for his [Dowd's] answers and punished for his reply (pual participle passive participle – the object suffers the effect)). (*Yasha'yah* / Yahowah Delivers / Isaiah 53:4)

**He will be pierced through** (*wa huw' chahal* – it

[Dowd's corporeal body] will be fatally wounded by the penetration of sharp objects into the body, then profaned, defiled, desecrated, and dishonored (polal passive participle – the one suffering endures the effect in an uncommonly brutal manner)) **for us breaching our relationship through religious and political rebellion** (*min pasha* 'anachnuw – for our national, cultural, and societal revolt, our defiant crimes and transgressions, our insurgency against authority, and casting off our former allegiance; from *pasa* – pervasive missteps (pual passive participle)).

**Then he will be separated and crushed under tremendous pressure** (*wa daka* – He [Dowd's *nepesh* | consciousness removed from the body] will be placed under tremendous compression and gravity [corrected by referencing 1QIsa]) **for our guilt because we were wrong** (*min 'awon* 'anachnuw – because we pervert and corrupt as a result of our immorality, iniquity, depravity, and resulting punishment; from *'awah* – to bend and twist, to distort and pervert).

**So** (*wa* – also [from 1QIsa]) **the punishment** (*musar* – chastisement and rebuke, discipline and correction, the shackles and chains) **will be upon him** (*'al huw* – will be on him [the Zarowa's *nepesh* | soul]) **for our reconciliation** (*shalowm* 'anachnuw – our complete restoration, our wellbeing and benefit, our tranquility and peace, our safety and salvation; from *shalam* – restitution and recompense, payment for restoration).

**Therefore, by his scourging blows** (*wa ba chabuwrah huw* – then with stripes from a whip which left him [Dowd's body] wounded with black and blue welts and deep bruising; from *chabar* – to league and ally together, to unite and be bound), **we will be restored, healed, and repaired** (*rapha* 'la 'anachnuw – we will be mended and made whole; having all sickness and disease removed promoting complete renewal and restoration).” (*Yasha 'yah*

/ Yahowah Liberates / Isaiah 53:5)

Dowd is the one being spoken of, the one carrying our collective guilt into She'owl to perfect us, restoring our relationship with God in the process. Yasha'yah is, therefore, addressing that which the Zarowa' endured during Passover and UnYeasted Bread to make this possible.

Unfortunately, until quite recently, and not until the rise of the third Zarowa', did anyone appreciate what Dowd had done. As a result of rabbis and false prophets such as Paul...

**“Collectively (*kol* – all together), we (*'anachnuw*) are like sheep in a flock (*ka ha tso'n* – similar to a herd of goats and migrating animals in a collective), misled and deceived (*ta'ah* – errant and wandering away, staggered while intoxicated, betrayed, having been misinformed, lost without purpose or goal (*qal perfect*)), with humankind (*'iysh* – people) turning (*panah* – changing direction and turning) his or her own way (*la derek huw'*).**

**And so (*wa*), Yahowah (*Yahowah* – a transliteration of אֱלֹהִים, our *'elowah* | God as directed in His *Towrah* | teaching regarding His *hayah* | existence) will cause the guilt associated with having twisted and distorted the truth and resulting punishment (*'eth 'awon* – with the revolting crime and resulting liability of rejecting the proper guidance for our lives, especially our tendency to bend and twist, pervert and distort reality) of us all (*kol 'anachnuw*) to be associated with him (*paga' ba huw'* – to impact him so that He can make intercession and intervene for us (*hifil perfect*)).” (*Yasha'yah* / Yahowah Saves / Isaiah 53:6)**

**“He will be exploited (*nagas* – he will be traumatized and burdened by a political tyrant, becoming the victim of the oppressors (*nifal perfect passive*)) and he will respond by being afflicted while suffering humiliating abuse (*wa***

*huw'* *'anah* – he will become the answer, allowing himself to be subjected to browbeating and forced to kneel down while being struck, enduring pain and anguish while being mistreated, subjugated and oppressed in response (nifal participle)).

**And yet** (*wa*), **he will not open his mouth** (*lo' patah peh huw'* – he will not respond by making a statement to free himself). **Like a lamb** (*ka ha seh*) **that is brought to the slaughter** (*la ha tebach yabal* – who is led and directed to being ruthlessly killed), **and like a ewe** (*wa ka rachel* – similar to a sheep) **that is silent** (*'alam* – is speechless) **before the presence** (*la panym* – facing and in the presence of) **its shearers** (*gazaz hy'* – those who cut off and fleece), **so he does not respond verbally** (*wa lo' patach peh huw'*).” (*Yasha'yah / Yahowah Delivers / Isaiah 53:7*)

The Romans crucified those who were perceived to be a threat to their authority, anyone who might inspire people to revolt against them and seek freedom. *Yasha'yah* predicted as much, telling us 777 years in advance of it occurring that the Passover Lamb would be “*nagas* – exploited and traumatized by a political tyrant – becoming the victim of his oppressors.” And that is what occurred at the hands of Imperial Rome.

This is exceptionally revealing because there would have been only one person in Roman-occupied Judea who would have risen to the level of being a sufficient political threat to the Empire within the region to justify crucifying an otherwise innocent man – Dowd. He had not only been *Yisra'el's* most acclaimed king, but he also fought some 66 battles and never lost one. So, if the Romans were going to murder someone in *Yahuwdah*, he would have been the guy.

This realization duly noted, the story of Pontius Pilate capitulating to the plot of rabid rabbis, and then washing his hands of the affair, is religious propaganda – an

incongruent fairy tale conjured by anti-Semitic Christians to justify Replacement Theology. For the past 2,000 years, Jews have been traumatized by Christians who have falsely accused them of perpetrating a crime that the Romans were guilty of committing.

Yasha'yah correctly presented what would transpire and it played out just that way. Jews have been accused of perpetrating the wrong crime. They did not plot to kill Dowd; their crime was to deny that he offered his life for them!

Imperial Rome wanted the King of Yisra'el to bow down before them. When he wouldn't comply, they beat him to the precipice of death, torturing the Messiah with their metal-studded whips. They were not only the embodiment of Babel – they were the most monstrous incarnation of the Beast the world had ever known.

This prophetic portrayal of the *Zarowa'* | Sacrificial Lamb fulfilling Chag Matsah portrays the Messiah's silence. He would not address those butchering him. He would neither plead his case nor theirs. There would be no conniving plots, no mock trials, no debate, and no Q&A between the potentate of the province and King of Kings. Dowd would say and write nothing at this time. He provided no explanation whatsoever to reveal who he was or what he was doing because he had offered more than enough ten centuries earlier. Every horrid moment was captured in first person when Dowd wrote about what he would endure in the 22<sup>nd</sup> and 88<sup>th</sup> Mizmowr.

This realization is the antithesis of the fraudulent narratives found in the Christian New Testament where “Jesus” is tried twice, once by “high priests” and then by Rome's procurator, defending himself on both occasions. So, while the mythical misnomer wrapped in Dowd's accolades opened his mouth, the actual *Zarowa'*, Mashyach, Ben, and Melek was silent. The reason he did

not respond to them should shake the Gentile world to its fabricated core while piercing the hearts and minds of Jews.

Dowd had already explained exactly who he was and precisely why he was there. After all, why do you think *Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 53 was written? What was the purpose of Mizmowr 22, 88, and 89, *Yasha'yah* 9 and 53, and Daniel 9, Zakaryah and Mal'aky if not to explain what would occur long before it transpired? Isn't that the difference between prophecy and history, between inspired and provable versus propaganda and myth?

The Messiah, himself, revealed the exact day he would arrive and then explained in excruciating detail what would be done to him. But far more than this, rather than wasting his breath on those who were ignoring him or on the enemy poised to rob him of his sacrifice by misappropriating his renown, the Son allowed his Father to speak for him, prophetically presenting the benefits of what they would accomplish. It was the only sensible solution given the mindset of his people and the belligerence of the Romans.

Unlike Dowd's first life, where his contemporary, Shamuw'el, wrote vociferously about him, and where Dowd augmented this portrait with a hundred Mizmowr and Mashal – telling his story in his own words – there would be no contemporaneous portrayal of his fulfillment of the first three Mow'edym in year 4000 Yah | 33 CE. There were no *naby'* | prophets by this time and no prophecies to convey. The Zarowa' was fulfilling them, not issuing them!

This explains why there is such an overwhelming discontinuity between Yahowah's Towrah, Naby', wa Mizmowr and the incongruous and contradictory rubbish we find in the Christian New Testament as well as in the Jerusalem Talmud. Those who spoke for Yahowah were prophets who demonstrated that their revelations could be

trusted by accurately portraying future events. And they drew our attention to what was separating mankind from God so that Yisra'el might come to appreciate what would reunite them, thereby directing their focus to Dowd and the fulfillment of the Miqra'ey on behalf of the Beryth.

The Christian New Testament is little more than an internally contradictory and historically inaccurate hearsay portrayal of religious mythology which was crafted and then augmented by those allied with the empire torturing the Lamb – who just so happened to be the Messiah, King, and Son of God.

Dowd was exploited and afflicted by the Beast of Rome – the very monster which became the Roman Catholic Church. As the *Zarowa'* | Lamb, he was butchered by those who would soon misrepresent and replace him. He had nothing to say to them. They were the enemy. And ultimately upon his return, he will annihilate them. So why waste words on such a vicious and pervasive anti-Semitic fungus?

By contrast, what really mattered was for Yahowah's prophets, particularly Dowd and Yasha'yah, to boldly proclaim what would transpire during the three most important days in human history. Yasha'yah introduced Dowd by name in the 9<sup>th</sup> chapter, revealing that he was the child who was born, the Son who was given, the great Gibowr who would serve as the living incarnation of the Word of God. Now, after affirming that the Choter, Dowd's *Basar* | Herald, would give *Qowl* | Voice to this message prior to the Son's return, Yasha'yah is explaining what the *Zarowa'* would experience and achieve. And as is the case with everything Isaiah revealed, it played out exactly as he foretold.

What follows describes the benefits of Pesach and Matsah as an integrated whole to resolve what is plaguing humankind. It is Father and Son who are facilitating our

freedom and exoneration...

**“Away from (*min* – out of) coercion and oppression, being restrained by religion and controlled by political authorities (*’otser* – hindering limitations and vexing impositions imposed by human institutions to constrain the public and deprive them of freedom), and from judgment (*wa min mishpat* – from being judged and condemned [corrected through 1QIsa]), he has grasped hold and accepted (*laqach* – he has selected, received, collected, and taken (pual perfect – with his people receiving the result, which is to be taken away from these things at this moment)) his future family lineage (*wa ’eth dowr huw’* – the generations of his people and those who are related by birth or adoption, his household) who give serious consideration to, question, and think deeply about, then speak to the profoundly important (*my syth* – who, as a result of this information, diligently focus on this content to contemplate, inquire about, and discuss (poel imperfect)) realization that he will be separated and cut off, ceasing to exist (*ky gazar* – acknowledgment that for an exceptional and valid reason, he will be divided into two distinctly separate entities as part of the plan and thus excluded (nifal passive perfect)) as part of the land of the living (*min ’erets chayym* – away from the Earth and realm of biological life) for my people having breached the relationship through religious and political rebellion (*pesha’ ’am ’any* – for the national, cultural, and societal revolt of my nation, the defiant crimes and transgressions of my family, insurgency against authority, and casting off our former allegiance; from *pasha’* – rebellious and revolting nature), plaguing and afflicting him (*naga’ la huw’* – infecting and ravaging him [1QIsa reads *nakah* – smiting, subjugating, chastising and punishing him while the MT has *naga’* – assaulting and traumatizing him]).”**  
(*Yasha’yah* / Yahowah Liberates / Isaiah 53:8)

This begins with Yahowah affirming that the purpose



of Pesach and Matsah is to “*min* – remove us from” “*otser* – being restrained, oppressed, coerced, and controlled by others.” Father and Son are committed to liberating their people from “*otser* – the vexing impositions and restrictions imposed by governments.” God is pro-life and pro-choice as a libertarian.

The lone prerequisite of the Covenant is to walk away from the confusing, invasive, and integrated nature of religion and politics, leaving *Babel* | Babylon and never looking back. We are perfected by Yahowah when we walk along the path Dowd has provided through the Miqra’ey – beginning with Pesach and Matsah. As a result, His chosen are considered free of these plagues and thus vindicated.

Far more than freeing us from the debilitating consequences of politics and religion, Dowd’s sacrifice on our behalf, the Zarowa’s fulfillment of Chag Matsah, delivers us from “*mishpat* – judgment.” The Covenant’s children are acquitted, seen as right before God, and thus not subject to trial because of what the Messiah achieved.

This is the payoff line of *Yasha’yah* / Isaiah 53. The Zarowa’ Dowd offered his body and soul to remove the stench and stigma of religion and politics from us so that we would be free from judgment and therefore, free to enter the Covenant and God’s presence. Our Savior grasped us by the hand and brought us into his Family.

All of this, from Bare’syth to Mal’aky has been presented so that those who give serious thought to what the prophets have shared might be redeemed. We have come to realize and accept that the Zarowa’ was cut off from the living and separated into She’owl so that we might live in harmony with God. Having breached the conditions of the Covenant, we are restored into fellowship in this way. Through his affliction, we are afforded the opportunity to respond to our Father’s invitation and come Home.

The great Zarowa' came for his people, to save the Children of Yisra'el, just as the first Zarowa' had nearly 1,500 years earlier from religious and political oppression in Mitsraym. This was a family affair, still focused upon Yisra'el. Far from justifying the claims made on behalf of the Christian "Jesus Christ," this prophecy is eviscerating them.

And speaking of Christian nonsense, their Bible publications would have you believe that *my*, which they correctly translated as an interrogatory in the opening statement of this prophecy, suddenly became a pronoun in Isaiah 53:8. Nonetheless, *my* asks the question: "How is it, and why is it, that he is continually considered and spoken of as divisive, cutting things in two, then excluded from what was decreed and from the realm of the living because of the rebellion and defiance of My people, stricken and killed for this?"

Nevertheless, *Sha'uwI* | Paul hoodwinked billions into believing that "Jesus Christ" divided things into two parts, with an Old Testament and a New Testament. Then Paul proposed that the Old was discarded, considered obsolete and excluded. Even worse, Sha'uwI opined that rebellious and defiant Jews were responsible for God's death – as if God can die or that Rome didn't crucify the Lamb. It was all a paper-thin lie, one devoid of a shred of truth, and so Yahowah is asking this question: Do you really believe he was assaulted and afflicted for this?

In truth, the Passover Lamb came to reconcile the relationship between Yahowah and Yisra'el, not destroy it. His mission was to save his people from the likes of Rome and Roman Catholics, not hand them over to them to "otser – coerce and control."

The next statement is markedly different than what you will read in a Bible published by religious institutions. Most have altered God's words to coincide with the

mythology found in their Gospels. They would have the faithful believe that their “Jesus” died among thieves but was buried in a rich man’s tomb. Neither is true, including the absurd conversation between criminals whereby one was supposedly told that he would be in paradise with “Jesus” on this day. The truth is far more compelling since this day, Passover, ended with the crucifixion and during the next, on UnYeasted Bread, Dowd’s soul was in *She’owl* | Hell – which is a long way from Heaven.

In search of it, there are three options for who is doing the *nathan* | giving in this next statement. In 4QIsa as well as in the MT, we find “he gave.” In 1QIsa, we read “they gave.” Finally, the LXX presents “I gave.” Unless the speaker has changed and God is now conveying this in first person, the *Septuagint’s* rendering is not plausible. “They gave” is also problematic, because if this is still being presented in Yahsha’yah’s voice, “they” would be the Romans. He would have used “we” to address his fellow Jews. According to the New Testament lore, “Jesus” was “buried” by a Pharisee and attended to by his mother and the women in his entourage – all Jewish.

In keeping with the context and the prophet’s intent, the one who would be given is the Zarowa’ Dowd, making this his gift. And this being the case, we should translate *qeber* consistent with how it is presented in Mizmowr 88. Dowd’s Psalm was written to specifically address the soul’s journey into *She’owl* to fulfill Matsah. And there, *qeber* | grave is used synonymously with *She’owl* | Hell – the darkness of the pit of death for those separated from God and forgotten. This would not only be the most revealing way to present *nathan* in conjunction with *qeber*, in this context, but it also cannot be rendered as “tomb” or “sepulcher” because there would be no point to the prophecy.

**“So then, he offered as a gift (*nathan* – he actually gave, actively allowed, and genuinely placed with unfolding implications resulting from the gift over time**

(qal imperfect active third-person masculine singular)) **his internment in the depression of She'owl** (*geber huw'* – his grave cast off in the absolute darkness of the lowest depths of the pit, hidden from God and terrorized, among the souls of the deceased who are separated, restrained, and afflicted there because they were corrupted and polluted by the abomination of religion [translated based upon the two appearances of *geber* in Mizmowr 88 which details this very moment]) **to be with the guilty and convicted who were evil** (*'eth rasha'* – with those who were condemned for having been wrong, wicked, and in violation of the standard, with bad people and unGodly souls).

**Even though he will have engaged in nothing violent or unjust, he will act** (*'al chamas 'asah* – although he will not have done anything to wrong or plunder anyone, he will be) **in opposition to those who have accumulated a great many things and who have grown exorbitantly rich through exploitation and taxation** (*wa 'eth 'ashar* – so among the people who have amassed wealth by taking a tenth of the productivity; from *'ashar* – to gain riches and *'ashaq* – through exploitation, oppression, and crushing violence [derived from treachery and deceit in *Yirma'yah* 5:27, presented as unredeemable in *Mizmowr* 49:6, and potentially condemnable in *Mashal* 28:20] [from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> which refers to rich people versus a wealthy individual in the MT]) **on his elevated place** (*bamah huw'* – on his mountain, hill, mount, and ridgeline [a.k.a., Mount *Mowryah* | Moriah]).

**No deceit or dishonesty, nothing misleading, beguiling, or betraying** (*wa lo' mirmah* – nothing fraudulent, feigned, or false) **will be in his mouth** (*ba peh huw'* – will be spoken by him).” (*Yasha'yah* / Yahowah Delivers / Isaiah 53:9)

When *Yasha'yah* received this prophecy from Yahowah, he would have been keenly aware of what Dowd had written in Mizmowr 22 and 88, collectively explaining

what would occur on these two days. And it is obvious that Yasha'yah is expecting those of us seeking to understand his narrative to have done the same. With this approach, we not only come to appreciate exactly what the prophet is describing, we actually witness the journey of Dowd's *nepesh* | soul into *She'owl* because the Mizmowr provide an extraordinary presentation of Matsah's fulfillment.

So now, the *Basar* | Herald lets out a giant sigh of relief, feeling vindicated for having presented the fulfillment of Pesach and Matsah leading to Bikuwrym in such a detailed and exacting manner. Set against Yahowah's last statement, this loquacious approach will encourage more Yahuwdym to return to Yahowah. They can study this translation and analysis and appreciate when the text is addressing Dowd's *basar* | corporeal body representing the Lamb and then his *nepesh* | soul.

This is Dowd's ultimate gift to his people. He took their guilt with him into *She'owl* | Hell and left it there, never to be seen again. The man who was proclaimed *tsadaq* | right with God and, thus vindicated, would endure Matsah with the most evil among us to reveal the best in us.

In contrast to those who would exploit God's people, becoming rich in the process of misleading them, Dowd would remain as honest as he was forthright, talking the talk and then walking the walk. As a prophet, everything he said would come true.

Reliability would be especially important at this time because according to Yahowah, Chag Matsah is the most important of the Miqra'ey. It is why Dowd, alone, was qualified to fulfill it. The initial three Mow'edym provide the means for Father and Son to perfect the Covenant Family, where, by working together, they remove the stain, stench, and stigma of religion from our souls. There is no alternative, and without this gift, eternal life is served in

She'owl. This makes Pesach counterproductive without Matsah. Together, and leading to Bikuwrym, they are glorious.

To best understand the relationship between the initial Miqra'ey, recognize that the consequence of religious and political rebellion, which is death, is resolved during Passover by the Zarowa's redemptive sacrifice. And then the penalty for leading others astray and away from Father and Son, which is eternal incarceration in She'owl, is remedied by UnYeasted Bread. The Messiah endured that sentence in our stead, perfecting our souls in the process.

This explains why *nathan* | He placed Dowd's *nepesh* | soul in *geber*, the lightless depression of She'owl where those who advanced the corrupting influence of religion are detained forevermore. The Messiah's consciousness was incarcerated among the convicted and condemned even though he was carrying our guilt.

Christian translations render *geber* as buried, even though that is a verb, so that they can present '*ashar* as "a rich man" to infer that "Jesus" fulfilled the prophecy of being buried in a rich man's tomb. The problem with that theory is that, even if true, not only would there be no way to validate the prophecy, but it is irrelevant where Dowd's body was placed because it was incinerated that night, consistent with the Towrah's instructions regarding the remains of the Passover lamb. Moreover, '*eth 'ashar* is not a positive thing. It was used to condemn the Roman Empire, not one wealthy dude with an empty tomb on his hands who was looking for a short-term rental. '*Ashar* depicts the people who had "accumulated a great many things and had grown exorbitantly rich through exploitation and taxation." It is derived from '*ashar* – to gain riches and '*ashaq* – through exploitation, oppression, and crushing violence. Further, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> affirms that it is addressing rich people versus a wealthy individual, thereby spoiling the Christian plot.

Continuing to miss the point, Christian “Babels” render *bamah* as “death” to create the impression of another fulfillment, claiming that he was crucified between thieves. But *bamah* means “elevated place, a mountain, or ridgeline” and was, therefore, addressing the location which was on Mowryah.

As for *lo’ mirmah* | nothing misleading or beguiling being spoken by him – that cannot be said of the Church which misrepresented his purpose to justify their existence. Both sides of this coin are relevant to the Passover Lamb. Not only was he to be perfect, but his sacrifice also resolves the betrayal of religion.

Now, to be fair, religious Jews are no closer to the truth. They deny what Yahowah and Dowd have done for them, too. Shame on the rabbis. *She’owl* | Hell awaits, even though they do not believe in it.

What would transpire, and now has been fulfilled, is the result of Yahowah honoring His promise through His Son. Here, we find Yasha’yah speaking for Yahowah to state that it was God’s preference and will to resolve His people’s guilt in this way. And in the Mizmowr, Dowd states that the decision was mutual, with Father and Son being of like mind and in total accord. And yet, no one seems to care about what either wanted or achieved. The most wonderful and brilliant, courageous and compassionate, indeed, loving and poignant expression in history remained completely unheralded and unappreciated until just a few years ago.

There is no denying the realization that Yahowah supported His Son’s choice to serve as the *Zarowa’* | Sacrificial Lamb. They realized that through the momentary affliction of one, the guilt of many would be resolved forevermore.

**“And yet (*wa*), it was the will and preference (*wa chaphets*) – it is the inclination and desire in this matter (*qal***

perfect)) **of Yahowah** (*YaHoWaH* – an accurate presentation of the name of *'elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence) **for him to be wounded and endure this pressure** (*daka' huw'* – for him to be subjected to the intensely oppressive nature of extreme gravity).

**He will suffer injury, be afflicted, and grieve** (*chalah* – he will be sickened and suffer the debilitating disease of the plague as he is weakened throughout the travail), **when, as a concession, the Mother** (*'im / 'em* – surely in the larger context of an oath performed by the *'em* – Mother [*'im* – if and when and *'em* – mother are written identically in Hebrew]), **She will render** (*suwm* – She will direct and appoint, determine and place (qal imperfect third-person feminine)) **his soul** (*nepesh huw'* – his consciousness, his capacity to observe by seeing, hearing, and feeling and then responding) **to be a reconciling offer to pay the penalty for the culpability and resulting guilt** (*'asham* – as a sacrifice to resolve the consequence and damage of poor decisions, as well as the resulting impairment suffered from being offensive).

**Then he will witness** (*wa ra'ah* – he will see, inspect, view, and observe (qal imperfect) [from 1QIsa]) **the result of what is sown, the offspring** (*zera'* – the seed, fruit, children, and posterity) **whose days he will prolong** (*'arak yowmym* – whose time he will lengthen and maintain (hifil imperfect)).

**Therefore, it is the will and intent** (*wa chephets* – so it is the pleasure and delight, the motivation and desire, the willingness and preference (qal perfect) [from 1QIsa]) **of Yahowah** (𐤏𐤓𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤏 – a transliteration of *YaHoWaH* as instructed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **to successfully accomplish this task, advancing the ability to prosper and thrive** (*tsalach* – push forward making progress with overpowering force, sweep in suddenly and victoriously winning the case, being



profitable and prosperous) ***ba Yad huw'*** | **with His Hand and influence** (*ba yad huw'* – by His direction and support).” (*Yasha'yah* / Salvation is from Yah / Isaiah 53:10)

Yahowah supported His Son's decision to serve as our Savior. This is because God realized that Dowd's choice was right. The boy who, a thousand years earlier, had risen to the occasion and toppled the loud-mouthed, uncircumcised giant menacing his people would earn their trust and respect yet again. His *basar* | corporeal body would be sacrificed and discarded and his *nepesh* | soul would be laden with our guilt en route to Hell to deliver Israel from a far more troublesome enemy – themselves.

The *Dabar* | Word made *basar* | flesh '*abad* | served as the *chayym* | living embodiment of the *Beryth* | Covenant by *halak* | walking a *gibowr* | courageous and *racham* | compassionate *derek* | path through the *Miqra'ey* | Invitations to be Called Out, expecting his '*am* | people to follow the *Towrah's* | Guidance, becoming *Yisra'el* | Individuals who Engage and Endure with God and *Yahuwdym* | Beloved of Yahowah. He did. They did not – at least not yet.

No greater love has any man demonstrated for his family. His was the most thoughtful decision ever made – one confidently calculated by the brightest man in the history of our planet. And for our benefit, he was also the most articulate and inspiring – as a prophet, he left a trail of words we could follow.

His people would muck it all up, foregoing the benefits of eternal life as God's children, by denying what Dowd and Yasha'yah had written and then accomplished. What I'm sharing with you now has been available for 27 centuries. It was sufficiently clear, and that was ample time, for one among many to figure it out and share it with others. But they didn't – not a single Yahuwdym

recognized what had been written about them and him.

Today, that is changing. And so leaving His people yet another gift, and proving the prophetic nature of this revelation, the Great Isaiah Scroll was written and preserved 200 years before these promises played out in Yaruwshalaim. We have had absolute proof that Yasha'yah's witness could be trusted since 1947 when three shepherd boys chasing after some lost goat tossed a rock into a dark recess. When they responded to the sound of shattered pottery, they discovered this scroll emblazoned with the words that would prove more valuable to Jews than the formation of the nation the following year.

There would be three Zarowa', prolific writers and shepherds striving to save lost sheep, responding to these events by sharing the story of the boy who flung a stone at a foulmouthed Philistine and changed the world forever. This is Dowd's story, and it is rationally undeniable. No faith is required to capitalize upon what he achieved and has lovingly offered.

With Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym working in unison to provide the benefits of the Beryth, this connection was affirmed when the living embodiment of the Covenant, Yahowah's Chosen One, our Messiah and King, volunteered to fulfill the first three Miqra'ey over three successive days. With his Father's support, Dowd, as the Zarowa', offered his *basar* | corporeal body as the Pesach 'Ayil on the 14<sup>th</sup> of 'Abyb in year 4000 Yah / Friday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 33 CE. His *nepesh* | soul would fulfill Matsah in She'owl the following day, Saturday, April 4<sup>th</sup> of the Yowbel year.

By reflecting upon Dowd's own testimony, we know that after his body was wounded on Passover, his soul endured the extreme gravity of She'owl, experiencing the enormous pressure and responsibility of carrying the guilt of every Child of the Covenant with him into the equivalent

of a Black Hole. He would deposit it there, never to be seen again. By removing the evidence against us, we have been perfected and are prepared to enter Heaven.

As a tangible expression of his Father's support, the *Ruwach Qodesh* | Set-Apart Spirit, our Spiritual Mother, took Dowd's soul from Mowryah to She'owl on the 15<sup>th</sup> of 'Abyb, year 4000 Yah to accomplish the mission. Ladened with our guilt, and particularly the plague of religion, his *nepesh* would suffer grievously in Hell during UnYeasted Bread on behalf of our reconciliation. He paid our penalty, rendering us innocent and, thus, perfect in the sight of God.

On the third day, the 16<sup>th</sup> of 'Abyb, *Bikuwrym* | Firstborn Children on the Towrah's calendar, the Firstborn of his Father was released from She'owl by the Spirit and returned to Shamaym, where he witnessed the result of what he had achieved. The lives of his people, fellow Covenant members, would be prolonged.

More than this, it was the will and intent of Yahowah to assure that the beneficiaries of what His Son had sown, would prosper and thrive, achieving victory over guilt and death. As a result of the Zarowa' being deployed as the *Yad* | Hand of God, the mission was accomplished and the benefits of the *Beryth* | Covenant were successfully delivered.

Should anyone question how I came to these conclusions, interpreting *Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 53:10 this way, I would encourage them to reconsider the 89<sup>th</sup> *Mizmowr* / Psalm where each of these connections was made. And then crack the covers of *Coming Home* and listen to Dowd as he makes all of this so very clear for us.

There was a reason for three Zarowa'. The first would explain the Beryth and Miqra'ey, conveying Yahowah's plan through the Towrah. The second would become the living embodiment of the Covenant and then fulfill the Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God. The third

would awaken Yisra'el to this profound truth so that a remnant might capitalize upon the Harvests of Shabuw'ah and Taruw'ah, attend the Family Reunion on Kipurym, and Camp Out with Father and Son during Sukah. Without all three, the human experience is for naught.

To more fully appreciate what occurred on the *Miqra'* of *Matsah*, it's important to recognize that on *Pesach* Dowd's body was whipped, pierced, and hung, but it was not subjected to the undue pressure of intense gravity. Therefore, it was Dowd's soul that suffered this indignity in *She'owl* on the Shabat of UnYeasted Bread. Moreover, this is what the Messiah chose and God wanted. Our Father supported His Son's decision to endure the worst of *She'owl* to spare his people. There is no greater act of devotion or display of confidence, courage, and character.

*Chalah* was selected to paint this picture accurately. Dowd's soul was subjected to the intense gravitational forces we associate with a black hole – the lightless place of eternal separation. It will serve as a prison for demonic beings and the wayward individuals who have allied with them in order to hold them accountable and keep them away from the rest of us.

This pronouncement also affirms that, for a moment in time, Dowd's *nepesh* was enveloped in the stigma, stain, and stench of religious malfeasance and political intrigue to remove these imposters from Yisra'el. In this way, it is analogous to Moseh going into Mitsraym to remove the Children of Yisra'el from similar conditions long ago – setting this example. And on both occasions, these two Zarowa' did so willingly to serve their people.

The *Ruwach Qodesh* | Set-Apart Spirit, who is the *Mala'kah* | Maternal Counselor, our Spiritual 'Em | Mother, was tasked with the responsibility of “*suwm* – rendering” Dowd's *nepesh* | soul unto *She'owl*. She did as directed because Father and Son had agreed to provide an “*asham*

– reconciling offer to atone for the culpability and resulting guilt” the Covenant’s children derived as a result of prior religious and political entanglements.

Throughout this presentation of the fulfillment of the initial three Miqra’ey in the Yowbel year of 4000 Yah, I have consistently written Pesach and Matsah leading to Bikuwrym because that is how they work. When we enter the doorway to life during Passover and cross the threshold of our perfection during UnYeasted Bread, we are ready to be adopted by our Heavenly Father and Spiritual Mother on Firstborn Children. And this is the very transition being recognized by the concluding statements of Yasha’yah 53:10. The *Ruwach Qodesh* | Set-Apart Spirit releases Dowd’s *nepesh* | consciousness from She’owl during *Bikuwrym* | Firstborn Children, allowing the Son to return to *Shamaym* | Heaven.

While it would take time, ultimately from this perspective, the Zarowa’ would witness the result of what he has accomplished. He has sown the seeds that will produce a thriving and growing family whose days will be prolonged forevermore. This was God’s intent from the beginning, a mission He predicted 777 years prior to His Son’s fulfillment at a place 777 strides above the sea. Those who answer His Invitations to be Called Out and Meet during Passover and UnYeasted Bread, with an appreciation of what Father and Son have accomplished, will be adopted into the Covenant Family.

For those who have read the *Mow’ed* | Appointments volume of *Yada Yahowah*, you have witnessed this all play out from beginning to end over the course of 2,000 years through the eyes of the Prophet *Zakaryah* | Remember Yahowah. He revealed...

**“Yahowah (YaHoWaH) will rescue and deliver, save and protect (yasha’), Yahuwdah’s (Yahuwdah) homes and households (‘ohel) first and foremost, and in the**

**initial phase** (*ba ha ri'shown*), so that (*la ma'an*) the honor and glory (*tiph'areth*) of the House and Family (*beyth*) of Dowd (*Dowd*) and the splendor (*wa tiph'areth*) of the inhabitants of (*yashab*) **Yaruwshalaim** (*Yaruwshalaim*) are not surpassed by (*lo' gadal*) **Yahuwdah** (*Yahuwdah*). (*Zakaryah 12:7*)

**On that day** (*ba ha yowm ha huw'*), **Yahowah** (𐤏𐤃𐤏𐤃𐤁) will defend (*ganan*) the inhabitants of (*yashab*) **Yaruwshalaim** (*Yaruwshalaim*) and have their backs (*ba'ad*). So, it will exist (*wa hayah*) that the wavering and weak-kneed (*kashal*) among them (*ba hem*) on that day (*ba ha yowm ha huw'*) will be likened unto (*ka*) **Dowyd** (*Dowyd*), and the House of Dowyd (*wa beyth Dowyd*) will be like God (*ka 'elohym*), similar to a spiritual implement and heavenly messenger (*ka mal'ak*) of **Yahowah** (*Yahowah*) in their appearance (*la paneh hem*). (*Zakaryah 12:8*)

**And it will come about** (*wa hayah*) at that time (*ba ha yowm ha huw'*) that I will seek to hold responsible and thus accountable, thereby choosing (*baqash*) to decimate and exterminate (*la shamad*), all of (*kol*) the Gentiles (*ha gowym*) who will have come against (*ha bow' 'al*) **Yaruwshalaim** | **Source of Guidance on Reconciliation** (*Yaruwshalaim*). (*Zakaryah 12:9*)

**And I will pour out** (*wa shaphak*) upon (*'al – over*) the House and Family (*beyth*) of Dowyd (*Dowyd*), and on the inhabitants of (*'al yashab*) **Yaruwshalaim** (*Yaruwshalaim*), the Spirit (*ruwach*) of genuine mercy, compassion, loyal love, and favorable acceptance (*chen*), pleading for clemency and forgiveness (*tachanuwn*).

**Then, they will look** (*wa nabat*) to Me (*'el 'any*) accompanied by the one whom (*'asher*) they had reviled and pierced (*daqar*), and they will lament, being exceedingly emotional (*wa saphad*) over Him (*'al huw'*)

**as one shrieks (*ka misphed*) when reunited with someone special, making the family whole ('*al ha yachyd*), anguished (*wa marar*) over him ('*al huw*') as one despairs (*ka marar*) over the firstborn ('*al ha bakor*).'"**  
(*Zakaryah / Zechariah 12:10*)

Our Father offered His Son on Pesach, honoring the promise He made to 'Abraham and Yitschaq in this same place 40 Yowbel previously. Then our Spiritual Mother rendered his soul unto She'owl on Matsah as an act of compassion so that the Covenant Family would become acceptable. On *Bikuwrym*, God's Firstborn Son took his rightful place at His Father's side.

But that is not the end of the story, just the beginning. *Shabuw'ah* is next, with those who have embraced what Dowd has done becoming part of the Harvest of Standing Grain. We will be enriched and empowered by our Father. And now, fulfilling the intent of *Taruw'ah*, the Messiah's *Basar* | Herald is announcing the Firstborn's return on *Yowm Kipurym* | the Day of Reconciliations – the last chance for *Yisra'el* to get right with God. Five days after the *Zarowa's* triumphant homecoming on October 2<sup>nd</sup> as the sun sets in Jerusalem in year 6000 Yah / 2033, Dowd will reprise his roles of Shepherd and King.

Returning to *Yasha'yah's* prophetic portrait of our redemption, now that Dowd's soul has been rendered as a guilt offering on our behalf on the *Miqra'* of *Matsah*, it's time to celebrate *Bikuwrym* with its spiritual reunification and relational reconciliation with the Father. In so doing, we find ourselves in the company of the foremost *Zarowa'*, *Yahowah's* Son, the returning Messiah, Dowd.

**“Out of (*min* – as a result of and from) the miserable circumstances and vexing challenges endured ('*amal* – the hostile situation, the exceedingly unpleasant, grievous, and distressing ordeal experienced) by his soul (*nepesh huw'* – his consciousness, making him completely aware**

of his circumstances such that He is responsive to what he is enduring), **it will witness** (*ra'ah* – it will observe and see (qal imperfect)) **the light** (*'owr* – the brilliant illumination and enlightenment [from 1QIsa – not in MT]), **thereby** (*wa* – as such [from 1QIsa and 4QIsa]) **abundantly satisfying and completely fulfilling what was required** (*saba'* – content to have overwhelmingly exceeded what was necessary (qal imperfect)).

**And through this knowledge and understanding of him** (*wa da'ath huw'* – as a result of being perceptive and discerning regarding him, recognizing and acknowledging the information which leads to comprehension of the relationship with him; from *yada'* – to know in a relational sense, to be familiar with and acknowledge (qal active infinitive construct – actively, literally, and continually learning about Him throughout time [written as presented in 1QIsa])) **and what he has done to justifiably vindicate and validate what is right** (*tsadaq* – to acquit, validate, and verify what is correct), **My coworker** (*'ebed 'any* – My servant who works with Me [from 1QIsa]), **the Righteous One** (*tsadyq* – the means to acquittal by being correct), **will bear** (*huw' sabal* – will sustain and incur then drag off and carry away (qal imperfect)) **for many** (*la ha rab* – for a great number) **the guilt they derived from their distortions and perversions** (*wa 'awon hem* – their tendency to be wrong and the liability they incurred from their twisting and bending the truth).” (*Yasha'yah* / Salvation is from Yah / Isaiah 53:11)

This is exactly as Chag Matsah was fulfilled – and why. Therefore, Yahowah wants us to be aware of what His Son has done to save us so that we are properly positioned to capitalize upon the blessings offered through Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children.

Yahowah's Beloved Son has earned and deserves our respect for perfecting us. And yet, his sacrifices are for naught so long as his people remain unaware of what he



has provided. This is the reason that we translate these prophecies, contemplate their meaning, and then share their intent with God’s people.

Matsah leads to Bikuwrym just as the Spirit leads the soul back Home – from the darkness to the light. Reunited with Yahowah, Dowd’s *nepesh* has completed what was intended, having fulfilled what was required to redeem the Covenant’s children.

Typically, when we see *tsadyq* | right, righteous, and upright describing an individual, it is addressing Dowd. And so, it is once again, directing our attention to the Zarowa’s *nepesh* – which is seen animating the Passover Lamb and fulfilling UnYeasted Bread. By being *tsadaq* | right, Dowd became the perfect choice.

With the transition from the darkness to the light, the ‘*ebed* | associate and coworker God wants us to *da’ath* | appreciate, the One who has done what was required to vindicate his people from their ‘*awon* | religious distortions and political corruptions, is Dowd’s *nepesh*. This means that the Zarowa’ is our Savior.

Leading the flock astray, the Jewish Publication Society’s Tanakh perpetuated the Masoretes’ deception with a translation that is completely disconnected from the actual text: “Out of his anguish he shall see it,” removing “soul” and “light.” Hebrew scholars know that *nepesh* is “soul,” not “his,” as “his” is *huw’*, but it is apparent that they don’t much like the notion of a soul because it suggests that all of their elaborate cleansing rituals and religious attire, their restrictive diets and physical accouterments are for naught because it’s the *nepesh* not the *basar* which matters.

On the other side of the shekel, this was Yahowah’s HalahuYah moment. All of the planning and suffering had borne fruit. By fulfilling Pesach and Matsah with His Chosen One, the one He had called *Tsadaq* | Right was now

*Bikuwr* | His Firstborn – just as He had promised. Yahowah had reconciled humankind with the man He most loved.

It is a result of Dowd’s brilliance that by seeking to comprehend his life and lyrics, we come to appreciate what this remarkable man means to Yahowah – and to us. God would have done it all for His Chosen One, alone! Dowd was the be-all, do-all, and for-all of Yahowah’s Family, defining what it means to be *Yahuwd* | Beloved of Yah. He is the lone individual Yahowah said, “**He is My son** (*ben ‘any*) **and I am his Father** (*wa ‘any ‘ab huw’*).” And yet, it was the one who was offered the most who gave more than any other.

God anointed him *Mashyach* | Messiah on three occasions and he would live three lives. Yahowah chose David to be *Melek* | King of Yisra’el and then to return as King of Kings. He is the *Ra’ah* | Shepherd’s Shepherd – the ultimate *Zarowa’* | one who leads and protects the flock while sowing the seeds of truth. And then he became the Sacrificial Lamb.

As the *Yad* | Hand of God, Dowd began defending His people when he was eight – slaying the vicious and uncircumcised Philistine with a single stone. He matured into the *Tsemach* | Branch through whom we would all grow and become productive. He was Yahowah’s foremost *Ebed* | Servant because he was the epitome of what it means to be *Tsadyq* | Right.

There are three *Zarowa’*, all important in their own way, but the man in the center of Yahowah’s world is *Dowd* | His Beloved. And that is why God announced 300 years in advance of this prophecy, 1,000 years prior to its fulfillment, that Dowd would be His *Bikuwr* | Firstborn. In this role, *Dowd* | David has rightfully earned a disproportionate share of the inheritance Yahowah is offering to the Children of His Covenant. And therefore, God is celebrating the moment His promise to His Son

became a reality.

This declaration in Yahowah's voice also suggests that there will be another, someone in a different time, a student of Dowd, who will bring this exclamation point to His people so that they too will understand. As such, he is the same person introduced at the beginning of the prophecy – the *Basar* and *Qowl*. His mission is being fulfilled.

This is the crescendo of the most important event in our lives. We become right with God and are vindicated based upon who and what we know and understand regarding the fulfillment of Chag Matsah. Coming to recognize, appreciate, and accept what Yahowah and Dowd did for us on Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children leads to our acquittal and adoption. Dowd's soul endured She'owl on Matsah to remove our 'awon | every mistake, making us *tsadaq* | right and thus vindicated.

Returning to first person, the Father draws a connection between His Son and the inheritance provided to the Children of the Covenant. This pronouncement also reveals that Dowd is the antidote for the Plague of Death...

**“Therefore** (*la ken* – this is right, just, honest, true and verifiable that as a result, assuredly), **I will allocate and disburse a share** (*chalaq* – I will apportion and assign, allot and distribute, a portion of everything through separation (piel imperfect)) **to him and through him** (*la huw'* – at his direction during his approach), **for many and in great abundance** (*ba ha rab* – with a significant number of enriched individuals) **such that** (*wa 'eth*) **they will be empowered** (*'atsuwm* – they will be strengthened and potent, able to accomplish their intended purpose).

**He will share** (*chalaq* – He will apportion, assign, and allocate, dividing and disbursing) **the valued property and possessions** (*shalal* – that which is gained and is of tremendous benefit, the plunder and spoils taken when the

enemies of Yisra'el and Yahowah are vanquished) **through the orderly succession of events as a benefit of the relationship** (*tachath 'asher*).

**To resolve the plague of death** (*la ha maweth* – as a consequence of the pandemic disease which infects entire populations and at the point of death), **he poured out and exposed** (*'arah* – he left destitute and abandoned) **his soul** (*nepesh huw'* – his consciousness, projecting his ability to perceive, experience, and respond).

**And therefore, with** (*wa 'eth*) **the rebellious and revolting** (*pasha'* – the defiant and offensive, the indignant and disloyal), **it was numbered for a time** (*manah* – it [Dowd's soul] was destined, assigned, appointed, and counted at this instance (nifal perfect)). **Thereby** (*wa*), **he lifted up and carried away** (*huw' nasa'* – he forgave (qal perfect)) **many who had gone astray** (*cheta' rab* – numerous who had been wrong and missed the way [plural in 1QIsa]).

**For their transgressions** (*wa la pesha' hem* – to resolve their offenses and missteps [for the misled in 1QIsa versus those who mislead in the MT]), **he has interceded** (*paga'* – he has intervened to spare them (hifil imperfect – he enables their ongoing reconciliation)).” (*Yasha'yah / Yahowah Saves / Isaiah 53:12*)

To which *Yasha'yah / Isaiah 54:1* adds: “**Sing for joy** (*ranan* – rejoice, expressing your appreciation),...”

If somehow, someone missed what Yahowah had announced previously regarding the way He and His Son, the Zarowa', would provide the benefits of the Covenant, God has summarized the process. We will inherit our share of the universe because Dowd resolved our guilt. He was counted among the religious in She'owl so that we might be disassociated from them and enter Shamaym. He interceded on our behalf, going down so that we could be lifted up.

Yahowah sent Dowd as 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 Paul's doing.

☩

*Kauchaomai* | Bragging

*I do not recall...*

Could it be? Is it possible that Dowd 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 get 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**” 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 is 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 and 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.

There was no shortcut to understanding then and still isn't now. The bookshelf at YadaYah.com may appear daunting, but it's all there for a reason.

Until a person appreciates the connection between Yahowah and Dowd, and between Dowd and the Towrah, there is no way to properly respond to and thus benefit from *Pesach*, *Matsah*, and *Bikuwrym*, and capitalize by becoming one of those harvested during *Shabuw'ah*. As the Passover Lamb, Dowd'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 his Greco-Roman death-defying man-god 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 Messiah 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 wasn't, and his advice 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 or Dowd, 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, at least I

know that the only source of knowledge worth considering as it pertains to God is Yahowah's testimony. If Paul were a fraction as smart as he claimed, 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 Dowd's fulfillment of 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." (2 Corinthians 11:9) The Torahless One, known as the

“Antichrist” to Christians, will also come from Macedonia. For those interested in early recognition, come to know Paul and you will know the “Antichrist” – or more correctly, the Anti-Mashyach.

Recognizing that Paul never quoted Yahowah or even Gospel Christ 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.**” (2 Corinthians 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 the 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 whom Paul could have viewed as being in competition with him, and whose message was opposed to his, were Yahowah’s prophets. 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 did not occur, Paul’s prediction that a “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 as “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 not only a depiction of how Paul saw him, but it is also indicative of Sha’uwl’s personal propensity to change his outward appearances to mislead his audiences. And as always, Paul’s inadequate writing style remains especially prone to misinterpretation, leaving us wondering what he actually meant to say.

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 his being judged a false prophet. So Paul says that, rather than being evaluated objectively based upon his words, comparing them to God’s, he wants to be viewed subjectively based on 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)

Unless they reveal it and are trustworthy, assessing someone’s motivation, and their intent, often goes well past speculation and more typically reflects the assessor’s personal feelings about them. And since Paul has positioned himself as the right hand and voice of his god, he would have the faithful move from facts and reason to opinions in judging him. That does not sound right to me.

Illuminating this problem, *telos*, rendered as “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 likely 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 senseless), **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 nincompoop, 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 but was, instead, foolishly bragging on his own behalf – or worse, on behalf of the spirit possessing him.

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.

This is a Devilish predicament for Christian publishers. If they convey Paul’s words accurately, they reveal that he was not speaking for his Lord but, instead, out of arrogance. But if they change what he wrote, they become coconspirators and are guilty of fraudulently enriching themselves while cheating their readers of their souls.

And Paul was not finished exposing himself. “**Because (epoi – 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)

Sha’uwl’s personality and Satan’s are beginning to morph, becoming indistinguishable. This is similar to Muhammad and Allah in the Quran where it becomes readily apparent that Islam’s first and foremost terrorist was the corporeal manifestation of Satan. But even if you are not yet comfortable with this assessment, surely you recognize that the man who wrote these words was smitten with his own greatness and 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 ‘Adam or Noach,

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

And it gets worse...

“**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)

Unless he was speaking for Satan, why was Paul taunting and demeaning his audience? At this point in this letter, it is becoming increasingly difficult to deny that he was psychotic and delusional, likely schizophrenic and obviously demon-possessed. He has not only lost touch with reality, but he is also trying to pull the faithful into the abyss with him. He has so little respect for “Christians” that he cannot help but deride them, pulling back the veil that hides his hideous nature in the process.

Unfortunately, but undeniably, Paul’s arrogant sense of superiority has led him to believe his audience was so stupid by comparison that they’d never figure him out, much less hold him accountable. And once again, this reads just like the Quran where Satan, in the guise of Allah and Muhammad, plays Muslims for fools.

And again, as was the case with Muhammad, those who knew Paul, who heard him convey these words firsthand, rejected him. It is obvious that he was mentally deranged, as was Muhammad. So, as occurred with Allah’s Messenger after the Satanic Verses, everyone abandoned the Devil’s Advocate. We know this to be true because Sha’uwl wrote the following to Timothy in his final letter... “**You are aware of the fact that all who are in Asia turned away from me.**” (2 Timothy 1:15) But alas, with the advent of Mark’s and Luke’s Gospels and Luke’s Book of Acts,

coupled with Marcion as a future publicist and promoter, flooded the Greko-Roman world with so much nonsense, billions were fooled. We know their legacy today as “Christians.”

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” demonstrates that we are witnessing serious 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 demonstrate 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.

As a result of Paul’s psychosis, we are in the throes of another “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 processes in his writings. His arguments, even the best of them, are irrational and insane. His emotional outbursts are

atypical and inappropriate. His speech and thinking are disorganized. His antagonism toward perceived rivals 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. Although, he was not alone. Those who have read *God Damn Religion* will see all of these same symptoms in Muhammad – the only other man who, while claiming to speak for his god also admitted to being demon-possessed.

Should you wonder why God hates religion, consider this: the two most popular religions in human history were instituted by demon-possessed psychopaths. And billions believed them, over the word of God, anyway.

This is nauseating, making my stomach churn...

**“Because (gar) you put up with (anechomai – you accept as valid or true and accept) 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 tragically inappropriate 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 Towrah 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 Towrah, 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. And since there was no political, religious, economic, or military presence in Corinth between 50 to 55 CE that was enslaving Greeks, forcing them to be subservient, that was exploiting and controlling them while savaging their bodies, Paul’s assessment is delusional and demeaning. This pronouncement is added proof that he was psychotic.

Recognizing how horrendous this statement and the one which follows becomes in light of Paul calling Yahowah and His Towrah 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 as a celebration of the death of Melicertes, who was worshiped as a god throughout the region. These annual funeral games became nearly as popular as the Olympics. Paul even alluded to them in 1 Corinthians 9:24-26, speaking of everyone running a race in honor of the deceased god-man 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 the city, 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 even bestowed upon this thriving metropolis a grand 14,000-seat amphitheater and a combined agora forum edifice that was larger and more beautiful than any in Rome. 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 were 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 deliberately 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 people. And when we witness a bias against Yahowah and Yahuwadm of this magnitude, the instigator is Satan. As it was with the New Testament, so it would be with the Quran.

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.” And so in these words, we see Satan clawing his way above God by demeaning his rival.

According to Sha’uwl, the correct response is *“tolmao – to dare to become extremely”* *“aphrosyne – stupid, irrational, and ignorant, indeed, completely thoughtless.”* While it is the perfect recipe for belief, it is also, well, *aphrosyne*. If 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 rules.

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 Yahowah 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 as a Progressive or Conspiratorialist. 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 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 Yahuw'dym (Jews)."

Yahowah's Chosen People were now ensconced as Paul's enemies. As a result, Christianity would dehumanize and demonize Jews for a millennium, subjugating and persecuting them. And while there is something exceedingly creepy about Paul's continued self-indulgence, his delusions and paranoia, and his inability to even feign respect for Gospel Jesus, my concern and God's is the hell his mental illness and demon-possession brought upon Yisra'el.

Frankly, Yahowah does not much care how believers squander their souls so long as they don't harm His people in the process. But alas, that is what Christianity, Judaism,

Islam, Conspiracy, and Progressivism have done.

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. Paul, like Muhammad after him, was a self-loathing Jew.

“**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.

This propensity is seen in American and European Jews marching alongside Muslims in support of Islamic terrorism being deployed against Israel. It is seen as Paul’s insistence on misquoting the Towrah to support his positions which are all opposed to the Towrah.

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 chose 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 Towrah by stating in Galatians 3:16 that the “seed” of Abraham was singular, and that it referred exclusively to “Christos,” thereby excluding all other descendants of Abraham, and thus the Hebrews and Yisra’elites – and by implication, the Towrah as well as Dowd. 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 the religion started by a Jewish cast of characters, all 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 continues to be valid. This man who was obviously psychotic and delusional, indeed, schizophrenic, 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 admitted 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-man – the aforementioned Iesou Christou. 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 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, collaborator, and Lord – Satan.

This is getting so out of hand, so obviously delusional, egomaniacal, and psychotic, *ha Satan* would soon intervene to restrain the Devil’s Advocate. As Sha’uwl will admit, he has gone off the rails and overstepped his bounds. The kind of fame Sha’uwl was seeking requires a patron and sponsorship, one whose ego won’t tolerate a rival. Paul’s 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, the answer is that psychosis is contagious – much like a plague. And when the pandemic affects a lot of people, they call it religion. And while psychosis in the individual is tragic, mass psychosis becomes known as religion.

While Paulos will soon blame Satan for his indiscretions and 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 done against religion and in support of my God. I have never wanted for anything that Yahowah 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. (2 Corinthians 11:24) Three times I was beaten with sticks, once I was stoned, three times I was shipwrecked. A night and a day (*nuchthemeron* – 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). (2 Corinthians 11:25)**

**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, (2 Corinthians 11:26) 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, (2 Corinthians 11:27) 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 the fables of 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 résumé.

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. But I suppose, since their crucifix presents a tortured and dead god on a stick, it may never have occurred to Christians that their god cares about such things.

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 endured their embittered betrayals while assisting them. So, 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.” Therefore, if even marginally true and stripped of hyperbole, the world’s most infamous punching bag must have simultaneously been the forerunner of the Zombie Apocalypse.

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 epic proportions. He was also demon-possessed and insane, but who of us is perfect?

Rather than conveying the extent and purpose of Dowd’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’uwl* | Paul made this all about himself, claiming imaginary ordeals without reason or merit. The Devil’s Advocate 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 salvation.

Beyond the anguishing litany of abuse, if we are to judge the validity of a message by the extent of the messenger’s torments, rather than the merit of their testimony, we should turn to the Quran 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’uwl* | 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 Jerusalem Summit, and of his interactions with Jews were all contradictory and inaccurate – even inarticulate. Therefore, the likelihood

that Paul endured any of these things was remote. And yet it is hard to miss the intent: Sha'awl had surpassed his god in the quotient of personal sacrifices. Or, Paul, like Muhammad after him, became the corporeal manifestation of his Lord.

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 Messiah 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. It is as if he was celebrating it.

And now he seems to be telling us that when he is empowered, Yahowah and His Towrah 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)? (2 Corinthians 11:29) **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 previously 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 – 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. Therefore now, simply laying claim to the Gentile world was insufficient. So in the midst of this braggadocious diatribe, and with Sha'awl presenting himself as the source of universal truth, the most rational conclusion is that this may be Sha'awl'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'awl'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 the feigned Messiah in the wilderness, he would accomplish by having Paul claim that he was the lone authorized apostle for the Christou. This enabled Paul to construct a revisionist and preplacement identity, to corrupt the testimony attributed to him, and to counterfeit every aspect of the Messiah's 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 was play the cards from the hand they had dealt to themselves from the bottom of the deck.

While every aspect of this premise is invalid, once the poison is ingested, the antidote, which is Moseh's presentation of the Towrah and Dowd's fulfillment of it, 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 this delusional man'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*). (1 Corinthians 9:20)**

**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 *chrio* – 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*). (1 Corinthians 9:21)**



**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 even lied about lying.

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 deception. 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). (2 Corinthians 11:32) 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 Galatians 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. The notion that Aretas controlled Damascus between the death of Herod Philip in 33 to 34 CE and his death in 40 CE is contradicted by substantial proof 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 Dowd'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. This is because 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. In the process, he captured the West Bank of the Jordan River. In response, Herod complained to Emperor Tiberius, who dispatched the governor of Syria to deter Aretas. The attack, however, was not actually carried out because of Emperor Tiberius' death in 37 CE. But with all of this positioning and intrigue, suffice it to say, there is no chance that Aretas had control over Syria, and thus Damascus, during this period. And even if so, the last people he would have assisted would have been Jews. Therefore, by reviewing Aretas' history, Paul's evolving and conflicting stories are exposed as contradictory fabrications – not that we needed additional proof of psychosis.

Collectively, this means that Paul was not only a false prophet, he was unable to keep his own history straight. So much for the myth that he was not able to lie.



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 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 condemnable 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 I have concluded 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 – 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 – 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 his 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 his god can be counted upon to remember them, 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 his Lord, and his subsequent march through Syria and Cilicia. And while that means he lied about how he claimed his 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 as a basket-case is further suspect.

And speaking of psychotic delusions, since this 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.” To some extent this 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 Gospel Jesus’ description of the 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.” So, Gospel Jesus and the Epistle’s Apostle are not on the same page.

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 the myth and the man.

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 that 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 "Allah's Delusions of Grandeur" chapters of *God Damn Religion*.)

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 Quranic “Jesus”) and Yahya (the Quranic “John”) were relegated to the second heaven. Rising above them in Allah’s third heaven, Sha’uwl would have met “Joseph,” at least according to Muhammad. Climbing the prophetic ladder, the Quran and Hadith reveal that Sha’uwl 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 both he and Sha’uwl renounced – 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. But then again, there may have been more ergot to go around.

Nevertheless, 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 – 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 the reason for him to brag, which he did while not boasting, unless self-glorification is evidenced by incapacitating timidity. I kid you not.

**“On behalf of such things like this (*hyper tou toious*), 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 chaotic mind of devils and demons.

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

I realize that this has been a gut-wrenching journey to a place more horrible than anyone could have imagined.

All we can hope for at this point is to keep as many souls as possible from following Sha'owl 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 capacity to glorify himself and learn what made him ill. Although to be fair, all attempts at the latter failed, and with regard to the former, 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 or 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 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 the goad, 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 make serpentine what was once straight.”

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 *Satanæ* / 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 paraphrase, 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 God’s purpose. Therefore, to be *aphistemi* is to be separated from

Yahowah.

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 the author of the Sermon on the Mount 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. (Matthew 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.’ (Matthew 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.

In context, this insightful declaration reads...

**“I will take an inventory and record (*wa peqad* – I will recount and keep a record) against her (*‘al hy*) for the time in association with (*‘eth yowm*) *ha Ba’alym* | the Lords (*ha Ba’alym* – those who seek to control, to be masters and lord over, to possess and seek to own) because (*‘asher*) she blew smoke, burned incense, and made offerings to them (*qatar la hem*).**

**Then she was adorned, playing religious dress-up** (*wa 'adah* – she wore clothing designed to show off her status) **with her ornamental rings and circular objects** (*nezem hy'* – with round sun disks on her ears, nose, and fingers). **Bejeweled** (*wa chelyah*), **she went after** (*hy' wa halak 'achar*) **her lovers, pursuing her desires and illicit relationships** (*'ahab hy'*).

**And she ignored and then forgot Me** (*wa 'eth 'any shakach*), **' prophetically announces** (*na'um*) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of YaHoWaH, our *'elowah* – God as directed in His *ToWRaH* – teaching regarding His *HaYaH* – existence and our *ShaLoWM* – restoration). (*Howsha' / He Saves / Hosea 2:13*)

**'Therefore, and by contrast, long thereafter** (*la ken* – to facilitate an upright and honest approach), **behold** (*hineh* – please pay attention), **knowing that she has been deceived, I will leave the way wide open to persuade her should she become open-minded** (*'anoky pathah hy'* – since she is easily seduced and enticed, having been readily misled and gullible, I will provide ample space (*piel* participle – God is enabling the receptive to benefit in a demonstrable and active way)).

**At that moment, I will walk with her** (*wa halak hy'* – I will go with her (*hifil* perfect – Yah is making it possible for them to walk together in one accord at this time)) **to ponder the word, even in the place where these statements are questioned** (*ha midbar* – in the desolate wilderness; from *my* – to question and consider *dabar* – the word), **such that I speak words** (*wa dabar* – so that these statements are transmitted) **to her heart, making an impression upon her judgment and thinking** (*'al leb hy'* – upon her inclinations, motivations, and thoughts, thereby enabling sound decision-making). (*Howsha' 2:14*)

**Beginning then and there** (*min sham*), **I am prepared to give to her, so that she can approach** (*wa*



*nathan la hy* – I will offer her at that time to draw near (qal perfect)), **her vineyards and vinedresser, her garden and resulting fruit** (*'eth kerem hy'*).

**The Valley of 'Akowr | Troubles** (*wa 'eth 'emeq 'Akowr* – accordingly, the deep depression and profoundly cunning plot to deviate from what is known and is, therefore, disturbing, stirring up trouble, addressing the approaching Time of Israel's Troubles) **will become the open doorway** (*la petach* – a portal to a more expansive realm, the gateway to liberation, an opening for the free to encounter) **of hope, of confidently expecting a good and beneficial future** (*tiqwah* – a way to be optimistic and move forward).

**Then and there, along with the name** (*wa sham*), **she will respond with the answer** (*'anah* – she will reply, offer her declaration, and sing, lifting up her voice (qal perfect)) **as in the days of her youth** (*ka yowm na'uwrym hy'* – consistent with her childhood, early in life, when she was served), **and as in the day** (*wa ka yowm*) **when lifted up, she ascended** (*'alah hy'* – she was taken away and withdrawn) **out of the land** (*min 'erets*) **of Mitsraym | the Crucibles of Political and Religious Oppression** (*Mitsraym* – the cauldrons of cruel persecution where the people were confined and restricted by military and economic institutions; plural of *matsowr* – to be delineated as a foe and besieged during a time of testing and tribulation, from *tsuwr* – to be bound and confined by an adversary, assaulted and shut up in the likes of a concentration camp by those showing great hostility).” (*Howsha'* 2:15)

This is unequivocal and impactful. Yahowah is equating His people's association with religion to the conditions they endured while enslaved in *Mitsraym* | the troubling Crucibles of Religious and Political Oppression.

**“During** (*wa ba* – in, with, and on) **this specific day**

(*ba ha yowm ha huw'*), **it shall be** (*hayah* – it will happen and come to exist at this moment (qal perfect)),’ **prophetically declares** (*na’um* – reveals in advance of it occurring) **Yahowah** (*YaHoWaH* – our ‘*elowah* | God as directed in His *ToWRaH* | teaching regarding His *HaYaH* | existence and our *ShaLoWM* | restoration), **‘you will invite, welcome, and meet with Me as an individual** (*qara’ iysh* ‘*any* – you shall move toward and greet with Me as your marriage partner, summoning Me as if I were a husband, as One who is extant, present, and in existence, even as a person in your midst).

**And then you will never again call Me** (*wa lo’ qara’ la* ‘*any* – you will not summon Me or recite aloud to Me (qal imperfect – literally never refer to Me and forevermore never proclaim)) **Ba’aly** | **‘My Lord’** (*ba’al* ‘*any*) **ever again** (*’owd* – now or forevermore). (*Howsha’* 2:16)

**For I will remove** (*wa suwr* – renounce and reject, separating Myself from, revolting against, repudiating and abolishing), **accordingly** (*’eth*), **the names and reputations** (*shem* – the designations and renown) **of ha Ba’alym** | **the Lords** (*ha Ba’alym* – of the false gods seeking to possess and control) **from** (*min* – out of) **her mouth** (*peh hy’* – her lips and language), **and** (*wa*) **they shall not be remembered, recalled, or mentioned** (*lo’ zakar* – they will not be proclaimed or be brought to mind) **by** (*ba*) **their name** (*ba shem hem*) **ever again** (*’owd* – any longer).” (*Howsha’* / He Saves / Hosea 2:17)



Demon possession is yet another thing Paul and Muhammad had in common. And that is relevant because the Islamic Quran 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)*

“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*) **Charis** (*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 – 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* / *Gratia* 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, Gospel Jesus is shown defining *astheneia*. This is accomplished by referencing *Yasha’yah* / Isaiah 53:4 in Hebrew. The scribe translated *choly*, the word *Yasha’yah* wrote, into the Greek *astheneia*. So, since *choly* / *holy* became the descriptor of the Christian Spirit, and since we can correctly define Sha’uwl’s *astheneia* | sickness by referencing it, let’s reconsider its use in the prophecy addressing Dowd’s fulfillment of Chag Matsah (Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Bikuwrym)...

“**Surely** (*‘aken* – it can be verified as accurate and true that indeed), **the malignant and malevolent pandemic of twisted perversions which plague and weaken us** (*choly* or *holy ‘anachnuw* – the infectious and injurious diseases which sicken us and our religious maladies which mortally wound us by distorting the truth), **he will lift from us,**

**accept, and carry away** (*huw' nasa'* – he [the Zarowa'] will, himself, sustain on behalf of the relationship and remove at this moment in time, actually forgiving).

**The cause and consequence of our pain and suffering** (*wa mak'ob 'anachnuw'* – the questions which anguish us and make us miserable and the implications of our grief), **he will incur and bear them** (*sabal hem* – he [Dowd] will pull them away, initiating the process to carry them as if they were his burdens to remove).

**And yet** (*wa*), **we assess his overall contribution as** (*'anachnuw chashab huw'*) **poignantly inflicted** (*naga'*) **and** (*wa*) **stricken** (*nakah* – beaten and slain, made to suffer (hofal passive – the beatings were imposed upon him in a vivid and demonstrable way)) **by God** (*'elohym*), **in addition to being humiliated for his testimony and abused for his response** (*wa 'anah* – even denied and mistreated for his [Dowd's] answers and punished for his reply). (*Yasha'yah* / Yahowah Delivers / Isaiah 53:4)

Obviously, Paul didn't get the message. He must have been standing alongside the rabbis in the religious line rather than next to the Passover Lamb. To have still been suffering from what the Messiah resolved for the Covenant Family, Paul was clearly playing for the wrong team.

Now based on what we just discovered, the Greek translation of Gospel Jesus reads:

**“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*) **Isaiah** (*Esaiou* – an inept transliteration of the Hebrew name *Yasha'yahuw* – Deliverance 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 Dowd 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** (*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).” (2 Corinthians 12:9)**

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* who were offered to the Devil’s Advocate by Satan, himself.

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 can still walk out of the asylum of our own accord. 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 (*eudokeō 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 – 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 is almost impossible to fathom, requiring a second bite of the apple. So, once again, the primary author of the Christian New Testament wrote...

“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*).” (2 Corinthians 12:10) 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.**

So, is Paul a tragic figure, a man desperate for an exorcism? Is he crippled by schizophrenia? Are his words those of a psychopath or of a man who should have been institutionalized as criminally insane? All signs point to the fact that he needed an orderly to wrap him in a white jacket because he was a danger to himself and to others. He was stark-raving mad in every sense of the word.

Nevertheless, 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 along with all of his imaginary fiends. 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 Dowd endured them so we might enjoy the result.

By claiming these things, Paul is saying that his imagined sacrifices and delusional 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 plagued 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 and psychotic. These are the kinds of things Satan delights in and the institutionalized and medicated inflict upon themselves.

Galatians, as we have already seen, perverts and corrupts Yahowah's testimony to imply the inadequacy of His Torah. 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. So was Paul a masochist, sadist, or both?

To his shame, 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.”

Therefore, 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 Christou’s unyielding and unrelenting support of the Towrah with sickening and perverting him. Then in the next breath, Paul claims that he was capable of overcoming this problem due to his considerable expertise and influence. Yikes, I’m beginning to wonder if She’owl is big enough to accommodate Sha’uwl’s massive ego.

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 Dowd articulated and walked by replacing it with unspecified, unsubstantiated, and unrestricted faith. This is what made Paul popular, and thus influential. And the more fashionable he became under Roman Catholicism, the more plausible and credible his letters were perceived. 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. Well, that and the fact that Jesus never existed.

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.**”

This pronouncement is so bizarre that I have separated each of the four sentences so that we can process them individually.

“**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)**

Thankfully, insanity isn't contagious, otherwise we'd be in trouble, exposed as we have been to this egregious and debilitating case of mental illness. Immune as we are, let's run that gauntlet again since it is breathtaking in its scope and implications.

**“I have come to be (ginomai) ignorant and irrational, senseless and stupid, out of my mind and acting rashly (aphron).**

**You (umeis), yourselves, compelled me, driving me to this and forcing it on me (anagkazo me).**

**For this reason, therefore (gar), you all (umon) are obligated to me and owe me, needing me (opheilo upo umon) to be commended and recommended, to be approved and legitimized (synistemi).**

**For indeed (gar), I lacked nothing, never falling short, inferior to none, holding every advantage (ouden hystereo), the (ton) most preeminent and exceptional (hyperlian) if even (ei kai) I am (eimi) nothing, a worthless and meaningless nobody (oudeis).” (2**

Corinthians 12:11)

While the first line is true, it means that the New Testament is not. It is rendered irrational and senseless.

The second line reminds me of my ex-wife who suffered from the debilitating, corrosive, and toxic effects of Borderline Personality Disorder. As the perpetrator of an endless succession of hate speech, she always blamed those she was relentlessly condemning.

Her psychosis, like Paul's, invariably led to her sense of victimization as if the world she was mischaracterizing owed her something for the anguish she inflicted. She, like Sha'awl, craved the approval and legitimacy that her own words and deeds precluded.

The psychotic outwardly project themselves as perfect, always deserving praise, and superior to every rival, real and mostly imagined. And yet, deep down, their rage and conceit are products of haunting insecurity – which is why they strive to emasculate any sign of strength in others.

Having lived with this debilitating and incurable malady for three decades, I understand what was plaguing Paul, causing him to be so delusional and driving him to promote his revisionist and replacement reality. Fortunately for me, at great expense, I was able to divorce this psychotic woman and live the rest of my life free of her insanity and hellish torments. Unfortunately, she imprinted my sons with her disease, and they are now crippled by it, not unlike Christians exposed to Paul.

As for Paul, he previously 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, well, by comparison to what he would have been otherwise. But it is like comparing a nuclear bomb to an asteroid strike; either way,

the consequence is messy.

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

Now despite 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). Although, so as not to disparage chameleons unfairly, since they color themselves to mimic their surroundings to more effectively eat bugs, let's keep in mind that Sha'awl was using this tactic to devour human souls.

**“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 as “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 justifies the means,” wasn’t this blatant or perverted. Paul was a uniquely special form of horrible, or should I say, appalling.

To heighten the conflict, Gospel Jesus is quoted 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 opheléo* – 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) Considering this, perhaps Sha’uwl’s elaborate justification for personal gain in 1 Corinthians 9:20-22 should be written on his tombstone.

The tactic Paul is bragging about is what we might expect from an unscrupulous politician or conniving 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. So, by admitting this, Paul has just told everyone that his words, his behavior, and his claims cannot be trusted. Big surprise.

Also driving nails into Paul's coffin, Gospel Jesus 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 as “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'owl 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 are no "Towrahless" in association with God. Further, to suggest that there are two different Torahs, one authored by Yahowah and the other by Gospel Jesus 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 a bad look for Christianity.

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. He is on record, actually etching in stone, that as a result of man’s propensity to be religious, thousands among billions will be favored by Him. And for those doing the math, that is only one in a million.

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’uwl’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’uwl say that he would impersonate anyone to save everyone, when he, himself, is destined to Hell, 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’uwl’s message and that of God or the myth, Yahowah or Gospel Jesus. So by any standard, Sha’uwl’s approach wasn’t inspired.

The notion of “**in order that joint-partner of his I**

**might become,**” is a little sketchy too. While it is true that Yahowah works with, alongside, and through us, even Moseh and Dowd, the ultimate exemplars of this, were more comfortable presenting themselves serving God rather than being His “joint-partner.” And in Paul’s case, the notion was as preposterous as it was egotistical. He wasn’t qualified to wipe Moseh’s tuchus. And Dowd would have treated him as he had the notoriously foul-mouthed, inarticulate and crude, delusional and uncircumcised, forever-prostrate, Philistine.

Lest we forget, Dowd fulfilled Chag Matsah. In all of his oratory regarding this, he never solicited a co-savior.

Since we have been comparing Sha’uwl 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’uwl 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 – 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 ΘY).”** (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 Quran, Sha'awl 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:

“To ('el) the woman (ha 'ishah), He said ('amar), ‘I will substantially increase (rabah rabah – I will in magnitude, quantity, and time multiply) your labor, discomfort, and strenuous work ('itsabown 'atah – the



physical sensations of stretching for a period of time along with the expending of considerable energy and toil) **in association with** (*wa 'eth*) **your childbearing** (*herown 'atah* – your pregnancy, the period of gestation, and giving birth, addressing the intensification of the pains and pleasures of sex and rearing children). **With** (*ba – in*) **challenging physical sensations and hard work** (*'etseb* – considerable effort and difficulty), **you shall bear** (*yalad* – you will give birth to and bring forth) **children** (*benym* – offspring). **And** (*wa*) **toward** (*'el*) **your man** (*'yish 'atah* – your male individual and / or husband), **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 responsible than you** (*huw' mashal ba 'atah* – he will be answerable for educating you and so he will use concise language, vivid examples, and pithy quotes, he will lead along with you, he will speak of himself in comparison to you (the *qal* stem reveals that this will actually occur in the relationship while the imperfect conjugation tells us that the condition will be ongoing)).” (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:16)

Chawah's ill-informed and irrational decision, as well as her lack of self-control, had censured life and removed Yahowah's protection, putting them at risk. Therefore, to remedy these issues, Yahowah would give Chawah the responsibility of restoring what she had truncated and harmed. Women would bear and raise children, but without Yahowah's help, it would not be easy – nor always enjoyable.

Not only is childbirth the most rewarding and painful experience for women, but there is also that once-monthly period of messy discomfort and emotional upheaval which makes it possible. While giving birth would be painful for

some hours, this time would pale in comparison to the ongoing effort required to raise children.

But there would be a silver lining. The relatively brief periods of pain would be overwhelmingly offset by the greatest joy life has to offer: being a mother. Having witnessed it and having listened to women speak of the ordeal and aftermath, even as a man, I understand that the pain is forgotten the moment the newborn child is laid upon the woman's breast. Giving birth and then raising that child gives women a wonderful sense of fulfillment and satisfaction. While it would take tremendous effort, life's most rewarding and joyous blessings would be born in travail.

*Tashuwqah* is an emotional term with an interesting twist – one fitting the crime. Chawah clearly lusted for what she felt the forbidden fruit would offer. She coveted the wrong thing. And she was driven by her desires. She had been added to the mix to be with and to support 'Adam, but her inclination was to circumvent man and be like God. She not only forfeited her role in the relationship, but she also damaged his as well. Rather than help, she had become a hindrance.

Yahowah's response was perfect. He redirected Chawah's emotions and feelings back to 'Adam. She would want him, need him, and be inclined to do many things with and for him.

*Mashal* speaks of using word pictures and easily understood examples to elucidate the most intriguing aspects of complex familial relationships. Man would speak to woman in terms she would understand. This was role defining, not a pejorative. Second only to his *Mizmowr* | Songs, Dowd's *Mashal* | Proverbs contribute more to our understanding of how to grow and thrive as a family than any literature ever written.

The religious are wont to render *huw' mashal ba 'atah*

as “he will rule over you.” And yet, the primary meaning of *mashal* is “to cite a proverb or saying using words to draw pictures, to share succinct and witty quotes, to liken one thing to another to enhance understanding.” Its secondary meaning is then derived from the way words are wielded, which gives those who convey them with aplomb the ability to govern effectively. They are put in charge because of their ability to reason and communicate appropriately. It is why Yahowah appointed Dowd king.

Man was not being authorized to wield his superior strength over women, ruling over them with the force of arms. No, he was being appointed to speak rationally and intelligently to her and influence her thinking.

It is, indeed, possible, even likely, that ‘Adam had done an inadequate job of explaining the instructions he had been given regarding the Tree of Knowledge, such that Chawah simply did not understand the consequences of her actions. Further, Yahowah may have remained closer to ‘Adam because he would be driven by reason while the woman would be more emotionally inclined. And yet, since they are both essential elements of a loving and productive relationship, they would not be complete without one another. Dowd, for example, was both cerebral and emotional, and he remains God’s favorite child.

If I may point out a bit of religious malfeasance, not only is *mashal* rendered inadequately and misleadingly as “rule” in most English translations, *ba* means “with,” not over as ‘*al* is the Hebrew word for “over and above.” This means that even the governance aspects of *mashal* that apply to men must be rendered in conjunction with women, not against them. *Ba* conveys the ideas of proximity, and should be translated as “in, with, or among.” Moreover, the primary meaning, as you have just learned, of *mashal* is not “rule, governance, control, or dominion,” or even “have one’s way with,” but instead “to convey a message using a comparison which leads to understanding.”

Continuing with our comparison, 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 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 to be witnesses 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. Simply set someone's words next to those revealed by Yahowah and see if they are similar or if they differ. If, like Paul's, they are incompatible, he is shown a liar. It is only when they agree that we can claim to have spoken truthfully.

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 when it comes to reporting the weather or espousing our approval of our spouse's wardrobe. No one is saved or condemned based on 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 actually obvious. By having Sha'awl 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 Quran. 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 Quran.

But what bothers me the most about all of this is that Satan and his accomplices are so "bold in their foolishness" that 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 affect 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 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 (*hoes*) the One might appear, existing (*ginomai*) from out of (*ek*) the midst (*mesos*)." (2 Thessalonians 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 become heirs with an apportionment, 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 another chilling confession – one which should always be considered in conjunction with this one 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.

**"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*) **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 *epiphany*, to be conspicuous and illustrious) **of the (tes) personal presence (parousia** – coming arrival or advent in person) **of him (autou)** (2 Thessalonians 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. In fact, in *Yirmayah* / Jeremiah 31, the integration of the Towrah into our lives is an essential aspect of the Covenant’s restoration. So, while individuals like Paul can advocate its abrogation, such pontifications are invalid and ineffectual.

Third, by deliberately referring to Gospel Jesus as “*o Kurios* – the Lord” in a document originally written in Greek, Paulos has disassociated himself from Yahowah while excluding himself from heaven. This then contradicts his claim to being his apostle, which affirms that he was the Devil’s Advocate.

Fourth, as a myth against a spiritual being, Gospel Jesus 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” – only the religions he has sponsored.

*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 as “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 Israel’s Troubles during the final seven years prior to Yahowah’s return with Dowd, and thus from May 22, 2026 through October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2033, Satan will be concealing his presence, possessing and manipulating the Towrahless One (a.k.a. the “Antichrist”), as they attempt to destroy Israel, exterminate Jews, and preclude Yahowah’s Homecoming on Yowm Kipurym. 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.

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 is 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.

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 the most foreboding and sorrowful laments attributed to Gospel Jesus:

**“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).” (John 5:43)

Dowd 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 Dowd, foolishly discarding the unity of their message by calling one old and the replacement new. They even claimed that Jews were able to kill their god. But to reject Dowd in this way, Christians have to disregard almost 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 and demeaned all rivals, real and imagined. 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 Yahowah 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?



*Learning Something...*

The moment Sha'uw1 finished incriminating himself at the Yaruwshalaim Summit with his testimony about the “signs and wonders he had performed,” *Ya'aqob* | Jacob, the brother of Gospel Jesus, stood up, having heard more than enough. His brother by a different mother, a Yahuwd named Dowd, had served as the Passover Lamb. And this was news that the beneficiaries were called to share with the world. Gentiles were not Sha'uw1's private domain.

**“But after** (*de meta*) **their silence** (*to autous sigao*), **Jacob** (*Iakobos* – an unprofessional transliteration of the Hebrew *Ya'aqob*, meaning Reward or Consequence, describing My Stance, I grab the heel; from *'aqab* – to receive a benefit or suffer a penalty for circumventing and overreaching, digging in by being stubborn or embedding one's heels to be steadfast; 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)

**‘Simon** (*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)

While we do not know how much of this actually occurred and how much of it is fable, if I had been among these men I would have told both Sha’uwl and Shim’own to sit down and shut up. Both were whiny egomaniacs without a trifle of sense. Everything they had said in defense of themselves had been wrong. So, for “Jacob” to respond is good, to have waited until after the silence was ill-advised, and to have commended Shim’own was wrong – even if Sha’uwl were the bigger idiot.

While it is true that Yahowah wants His message conveyed to gowym, Yahuwdym come first. Gentiles, however, were not to be received but, instead, instructed. And the fact remains, not one of these fellows ever came close to saying Yahowah’s name. They didn’t even know Dowd’s name, or that of the myth they were advocating in his place.

Also, while it would have been infinitely better to have advanced knowledge over “belief,” Shim’own’s rebuttal was a far cry from “*exegeomai* – telling the whole truth, providing detailed information, carefully describing, explaining, and teaching to make everything fully known.”

In an attempt to underscore his point, *Ya’aqob* | Jacob 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*): (Acts 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 David** (*Dauid* – a plausible 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 autēs* – 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 autēs* – I will straighten them up from a position which is bent over).” (Acts 15:15-16)

Nice try, but it’s another swing and a miss. The cited statement says nothing of receiving various ethnicities. Quite the contrary, those who are called by Yahowah’s name will be inheriting that which formerly belonged to the Gowym. Jacob could not have picked a less appropriate citation to advance the notion of reaching out to the Gentiles.

This known, we can still learn from it, especially as we compare what Yahowah inspired against what the Christian scribes wrote. For example, *skene*, translated as “sheltered dwelling place,” is synonymous with *Sukah*, which is most often translated as “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. So that’s good.

Further, the lexicons reveal that *skene* is related to *skeuos*, which is “a vessel, implement, and protective covering” – all of which are somewhat analogous to one of the Spirit’s intents, which is to protect Her children. 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 spiritually into the Covenant with the assistance of our Spiritual Mother, we become more like God, reflecting 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 acknowledgments of His Spirit and affirmations of His love, all in concert with Shelters, His final Feast.

For reasons we may never understand, Gospel Jacob elected to quote the prophet, Amos, who spoke of the impending destruction of the nation of Yisra’el and then of its restoration. 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. Over the course of many centuries, 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. It is even more likely that Yahowah was addressing the Time of Ya’aqob’s Troubles, and of the horrors awaiting God’s people in the decade prior to His return. I say this because that is when Yahuwdym would be restored in Yisra’el, according to the words Yahowah revealed to the prophet *Amows* / Amos.

Yahowah speaks of using a filter mechanism to determine which souls are allowed to remain in Yisra’el, using the Towrah to decide who makes the final cut. Thereafter, Yahowah reestablishes the Sukah of Dowd which the religious have ransacked and misappropriated.

**“Please pay attention because, by contrast (*ky hineh*), I will either instruct (*‘anoky tsawah* – I will direct) or I will shake (*wa nuwa’* – or I will stagger, moving others out of the way with regard to) every one of the Gentiles (*ba kol ha gowym*) associated with or against (*‘eth*) the House of Yisra’el (*beyth Yisra’el* – the Home and Family of those who Engage and Endure with God), similar to (*ka ‘asher* – consistent with) how one moves a sieve back and forth (*nuwa’ ba ha kabarah* – waves and shakes a mesh screen, sifter, and filtering device) such that nothing which is troublesome will fall (*wa lo’ naphal tsarowr* – while nothing adversarial, vexing, or hostile, binding or oppressing, is neglected or allocated; from *tsar* and *owr* – pertaining to anything harassing or confusing) to Earth (*‘erets* – toward the Land).” (*‘Amows / Amos 9:9*)**

It is imperative that God establish the means to ascertain who lives and who dies, such that Yisra’el and Shamaym are no longer corrupted by the plagues of religion, politics, and conspiracy. As always, this determination will be made based upon our acceptance of the Towrah and our willingness to go where Yahowah’s words lead.

**“By the *Choreb* | the Cutting Edge and Dividing Line (*ba ha chereb* – by sword of the mountain of God where the Towrah was revealed and the flame burned brightly, the cutting instrument and double-edged engraving tool), every one of My People (*kol ‘am ‘any*) who have missed the way (*chata’* – who are wrong and induced to be offensive) will die (*muwth*), including those who protest (*ha ‘amar*). ‘The implication of wrongdoing associated with our companions (*ha ra’ah* – the connotations pertaining to the perversions among our friends) will not be associated with us (*lo’ nagash* – will not be implicated against us) nor will we have to confront it (*wa qadam* – nor will we have to deal with it as is claimed) such that it comes around to us and exacts a**

**price from us** (*ba'ad 'anachnuw* – that it comes back to us as a *quid pro quo* and demands retribution).” (*Amows / Amos 9:10*)

Religious Jews, in particular, will remain entrenched and stubborn right to the bitter end, as they continue to live in denial. Believing that they will never be implicated for committing the most egregious crime in human history – changing Yahowah’s testimony and name – there will be a time for accountability. As they say: what goes around comes around, a *quid pro quo*. And payback couldn’t happen to a more deserving drove of asses.

With all the ways Yahowah speaks of reestablishing the Sukah of Dowd, it becomes readily obvious that it has been abused and that God is not pleased. That is not good for the rabbis, as they are prone to putting him on trial and they don’t measure up. But it is far worse news for Christians because it was by misappropriating every promise Yahowah made to Dowd and transferring them to the myth of Gospel Jesus that they turned a Father and Son relationship into a religion and the Passover Lamb into a god.

So, this is the passage Gospel Jacob inappropriately cited...

**“During that day** (*ba ha yowm ha huw*’), **I will erect and establish** (*quwm* – I will fulfill the promise to raise up and confirm) **the Sukah | the Sheltered Dwelling for Camping Out** (*sukah* – the covered canopy serving as the family home, the tent and tabernacle) **of Dowd | David** (*Dowd* – the Beloved) **which has fallen** (*ha naphal* – which has been neglected, redistributed, and reallocated).

**I will repair and restore** (*wa gadar* – I will rebuild out of stone as a master Mason) **its breaches** (*’eth perets hen* – whatever was broken or destroyed by the opposition) **and then raise up** (*quwm* – reestablish and confirm, fulfilling the promise) **whatever is in disrepair** (*wa*



*harysah huw'* – anything demolished, ruined, or brought down) **and then I will rebuild it** (*wa banah huw'*) **so that it is like long ago and will endure forevermore** (*ka yowmym 'owlam*).” (*Amows / Amos 9:11*)

It was during this very discussion in *Shamuw'el / 2 Samuel 7*, the one which led us to Yahowah, that we learned all about God's perspective on His Sukah versus that of His Son. As a symbol of Yahowah's priorities, it will be restored to its former glory and endure forevermore. And so as a prophecy for someone to advance in favor of the myth of Iesou being the Christou and replacing Dowd as the Messiah, Son of God, and Passover Lamb, it was a dunderhead move.

This is Yahowah's promise to restore Yisra'el and establish the Millennial Shabat in harmony with the prophetic symbolism of the *Miqra'* of *Sukah* and His collaboration with His Son. The timing of this anticipated reconciliation coincides with their 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. This will help make the time when we are invited to live with God as ‘Adam once did, even more 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 the Kingdom of Dowd during this time, taking us back to a united Yisra’el under the perfect Shepherd and to the 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 on the basis of the Towrah’s integration into the lives of His people.

Recognizing that Gospel Jacob’s citation of this passage had to pass through several languages, Hebrew to Greek and then Greek to English, and through the hands of countless scribes, unlike what we have experienced with Sha’uwl, it 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).”

Seeing how easy it would have been for either Luke, or 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, the good news here is that unlike the citations provided by Paul, Luke was not compelled to invert the intent of God’s message.

This, however, 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 or Constantinople 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 monastery ovens. Giving further weight to its Roman Catholic 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 *'Amows / 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*) Lord (KN – a placeholder based upon *kurios* | lord and master 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*) **the Lord** (ΚΣ – placeholder based upon the Greek *kurios* | lord and master which was used throughout the Septuagint as a substitution and replacement for Yahowah’s name), **doing** (*poieomai* – performing) **this** (*tauta*) (Acts 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.”

As mentioned, there is no extant 1<sup>st</sup> through 3<sup>rd</sup> century manuscripts of this particular citation in Greek, so scribal error may have contributed to some of the discrepancies. Of particular issue is *Edowm*, usually transliterated as “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 *adon* | lord,” scribes could easily have become confused. Therefore, in place of *Edowm*, we find both “*anthropos* – mankind” and a placeholder for “*kurion* – lord and master.”

“As a result (*la ma’an*), all of those who are called

**by My name** (*‘asher qara’ shem ‘any ‘al hem* – as a benefit of the relationship the called out who summon Me by name) **will inherit** (*yarash* – they will gain possession of) **that which is associated with** (*‘eth*) **whatever remains of ‘Edowm** (*sha’ryth ‘Edowm* – the residue of bloody Roman influence and that which was controlled by the Roman Catholic Church and thus all of Europe) **in addition to the Gentile nations** (*wa ha gowym*),’ **prophetically declares** (*na’um*) **Yahowah** (*YaHoWaH* – the name of *‘elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence) **who will make this happen** (*‘asah zo’th* – who will engage and do this).” (*Amows / Amos 9:12*)

Throughout *Yada Yahowah, Observations, and Coming Home*, we have had the opportunity to consider ‘Edowm from near and far, and each time its modern incarnation is seen as what has emerged out of Imperial Rome and Roman Catholicism. Should we be right, the nation and religion most responsible for abusing God’s people will be dispossessed by those they robbed.

This known, it’s hard to fathom the utter stupidity of early Twistians. Gospel Jacob misquoted a passage which nullifies the point he was trying to make in favor of embracing Gentiles. In Amows, rather than being included, they are being excluded. Rather than Gowym and Yahuwdym singing out of the same hymnal, all people, nations, and institutions in opposition to God’s people are being dispossessed. It is like having Hitler quote Churchill to rally the SS.

Equally troublesome, **“So that (*hopos*) then (*an*) will diligently scrutinize and seek out (*ekzeteo*) this remnant (*oi kataloipos*) of mankind (*ton anthropos*) of the (*ton*) Lord (KN), and (*kai*) all (*pas*) of the races and nations (*ta ethnos* – of the ethnicities) upon (*epi*) whom (*ous*) has been called and surnamed (*epikaleomai*) in association with (*to*) My (*mou*) name (*onoma*) upon (*epi*) them**

(*autous*) **says** (*lego*) **the Lord** (ΚΣ), **doing** (*poieomai*) **this** (*tauta*) (Acts15:17) **which was known** (*gnostos*) **from** (*apo*) **world and universal history** (*aionos*),” is a horribly inaccurate rendering of “**As a result** (*la ma’an*), **all of those who are called by My name** (*‘asher qara’ shem ‘any ‘al hem*) **will inherit** (*yarash*) **that which is associated with** (*‘eth*) **whatever remains of ‘Edowm** (*sha’ryth ‘Edowm*) **in addition to the Gentile nations and institutions** (*wa ha gowym*),’ **prophetically declares** (*na’um*) **Yahowah** (*YaHoWaH*) **who will make this happen** (*‘asah zo’th*).”

If Acts 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 demonstrate just how desperate Luke was for credibility and the lengths Paul’s associate would go to achieve the pretense of justifying their Satanic plot.

In one simple sentence, we find the unwarranted replacement of “are called” with “scrutinize and seek,” disassociating “remnant” from the proper noun it was modifying, changing “‘Edowm” to “mankind,” arbitrarily adding “Lord,” moving “*gowym* | non-Yisra’elites” forward in the text to give the wrong impression, excluding “will inherit,” replacing “Yahowah” with a second iteration of “Master and Lord,” then replacing “prophetically declares” with “known,” only to substitute “from world history” for “who will make this happen.” If it were not for the fact that Jews have been horrifically abused by this religion for the past two millennia, this would be a sick joke.

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 hearsay accounting to be no more credible than Homer’s Odyssey. I’m surprised he didn’t name Iesous, Odysseus.

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 anyway.

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 of providing a witness, was not remotely 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, 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 inerrant 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 replace Yahowah's name. And since it is the only name that matters, and that it never once appears in the text of the New Testament, its message is not from God. Of that, we can be certain. And the same can be said of the Talmud and Quran.

At first blush, however, unless it was a legacy of the Septuagint, it is curious that anyone would have chosen a



placeholder which was based upon a title Yahowah despised. Why not predicate the placeholder on 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 somewhat challenging to write an abbreviation for Yahowah’s name in the Greek alphabet. The four Hebrew vowels which comprise God’s name have no direct 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 were able to 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 stolen by Imperial Rome and its legacy, the Roman Catholic Church and Western Europe, from *Yahuwdym* | Jews over the course of the past two thousand years. The irony is sweet.

While Ya’aqob did not cite the final three verses of Amos’ prophecy, there is no reason we shouldn’t consider them. They read:

**“Look now and see (*hineh* – behold, stand up, look up, and reach up to God), the day (*yowm*) is coming (*bow*),’ prophetically declares (*na’um*) Yahowah (𐤏𐤃𐤕𐤇𐤃𐤁 – a transliteration of *YaHoWaH* as instructed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), ‘...when I will return and restore (*shuwb* – come back and reestablish) the property and that which makes life easier and more secure for (*sabuwt* – the fortunes, restoring that which is good and establishing more**

favorable circumstances for) **My** (*'any*) **family** (*'am* – people and nation), **Yisra'el** (*Yisra'el* – individuals who engage and endure with God).” (*'Amows / Bearing a Burden / Amos 9:13-14*)

This is a powerful statement. It not only affirms that Yahowah will return, thereby excluding “Jesus,” but also that His purpose will be to “*shuwb* – reestablish” His family and to “*sabuwt* – fortuitously restore all that is good” on behalf of “Yisra'el,” not a church. And that is why the related title, *Shabuw'ah*, is defined as Yahowah’s “vow, His sworn and contractual promise between parties in a relationship to truthfully attest to our innocence.” The fact is, the *Miqra'ey* of *Shabuw'ah* and *Sukah* are related, with one bringing God’s Family to the other.

In His closing statement, Yahowah may be describing what will occur in the aftermath of Muslims pummeling Israel over the next ten years...

**“And they will rebuild (*banah*) their desolate (*shamem*) cities (*'iy*) 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, once His people returned, they would never be uprooted again. Therefore, the final Islamic invasion will be thwarted on Kipurym in 2033. After the Roman Diaspora, German Holocaust, and Islamic genocide, Yisra'elites are home for good. Progressive 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 failing miserably in his attempt to cite Yahowah's prophecy in Amows, *Ya'aqob* | Jacob (renamed “James” to flatter the English king) is alleged to have 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** (*epistrepheo* – who are

changing their perspectives, attitudes, thinking, and ways).” (Acts 15:19)

Yahowah has asked Yahuwdym not to emulate the religious and political ways of the Gentiles, but He is actually supportive of Gowym embracing His people and ways. And so while this statement is plausible under those circumstances, allotting the world between them was tangential to the swine in the room – the message that would be conveyed to them. Both sides were grossly misrepresenting the word of God.

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)

That may represent the worst effort yet. It’s like telling the passengers on the Titanic that all that matters is that you don’t bring your pajamas, jewelry, or toothpaste. You can disregard all other advice, including saving other passengers, entering lifeboats, or wearing life jackets.

*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 Towrah. 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 Towrah 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. Gospel Jesus made no attempt to summarize any such instructions. The Ten Statements bear no resemblance to this list. 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 that 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 an improvement...

**"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,” but didn’t bother to mention “*Towrah* | Guidance” – so he misses the point. He then speaks of those who introduced him, but there were none. Further, synagogue is a Greek concept and bears no association with the Towrah or Yahowah. And while he mentioned the Shabat, Christians ignore it in favor of their Sunday god.

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 rely upon) **Him.**” (*Mashal / Word Pictures / Proverb 30:5*)

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*)

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*), **in your house and home** (*beyth*), **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)

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** (*‘ysh*), **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 Moseh’s contribution to 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 the 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 Gospel Jesus’ hand-picked and personally trained disciples in this debate over the role of Yahowah’s Towrah in our lives is to conclude that God was incompetent. This undeniable conclusion mirrors another even more profound realization: if the Towrah, which was authored by Yahowah 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? This has to be the single most irrational position that has come to be widely held.

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, and 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 maternal messenger** (*mala'kah* – the Spirit’s duties).

**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** (יהוה – 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 maternal representative and messenger** (*mala’kah* – feminine of *mal’ak*, the ministry and mission of our Spiritual Mother), **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.” The first step toward Covenant membership is away from religion, not toward it. The second step is to walk to Yahowah and be perfected by Him during the Miqra’ey by being Towrah-observant.

This next line suggests that the disciples did not trust Sha’uwl.

“**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 Paulos** (*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 crude 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** (*adelpois*).” (Acts 15:22)

It was the conclusion of the disciples, the elders, and the entire Yaruwshalaim Ekklesia that Sha’uwl required supervision. Yahuwdah / Barsabbas and Silas were given the authority to act on behalf of the disciples to muzzle the Lowly One (Paulos). It obviously didn’t work.

**“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** (*adelpois*) **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)

While this all blew up in everyone’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 in the “Joyful Greeting” would bring hellish torments on God’s people.

With that in mind, remember, this meeting had been called to confront Paulos’ contrarian testimony against the Torah generally and circumcision specifically. And while anyone with a pair of functioning brain cells knew that Paul

was on the losing side of this argument with God, not a single *Yahuwd* | Jew in the room had the intelligence or conviction to stand up for Yahowah against the imposter. This catastrophic and now endemic failure by God's people opened the door for Christianity to prevail – such that Jews would be degraded and abused by them for the next two millennia.

The collective decline in the character and conscience of Yisra'elites began with Ya'aqob and worsened with his sons, deteriorating further while exiles and then slaves in *Mitsraym* | the Crucibles of Oppression. By the time they were *Yatsa'* | Withdrawn, they had become supersaturated in religion, political preferences, and their own egos, leaving them embittered, immoral, unappreciative malcontents opposed to Yahowah and Moseh. Their animosity toward God grew so great that in the midst of rescuing them, they told Yahowah that they never wanted to see or hear from Him again.

As a direct consequence, their history is abysmal, with only two brief flirtations with Yah, His Towrah, Beryth, and Miqra'ey, first under Dowd and then with Chazaqyah. God became so unpopular among *Yahuwdym* | Jews that after Zakaryah, Yow'el, and Mal'aky, Yahowah's voice went silent. There was no one among the descendants of Ya'aqob interested in listening to the God of 'Abraham, much less speaking for Him.

Of course, Yahowah didn't leave His people in the dark. There was a vast reservoir of prophetic revelations at their disposal, just as it remains available to us today. But they started filtering His message through their religious preferences and completely lost sight of Yahowah. By the time Dowd arrived to fulfill Chag Matsah, few, if any, Jews recognized the most famous among them accomplished the greatest feat in human history. And now, sitting in this room, they were jockeying for position, arguing over turf, and lost in religious minutia.

As a consequence, rather than benefit from the Messiah's and Son of God's gift of life and perfection leading to being part of Yahowah's Covenant Family, they threw it all away, replacing the Zarowa' with a myth of their own creation, robbing the genuine article in the process. The result was Pauline Christianity as advanced through his anti-Semitic New Testament. This would lead directly to Rabbi Akiba's foisting of another false Messiah to counter the one promoted by this gaggle of goons. It was now Religion by Romper Room. But the only ones laughing were the newly minted Christians as they replaced, degraded, and tormented Jews.

With time, the separation became irreconcilable, as the Children of Yisra'el trashed and disposed of Yahowah's name, then plastered over His *Towrah* | Guidance by contributing to the Talmud, New Testament, Quran, Zohar, and Communist Manifesto. And that is the state I found God's people when Yahowah asked me to work with Him to awaken the Children of Yisra'el from their four-thousand-year stupor.

But on this tragic day, as these argumentative Jews sat in this room, they listened to two demon-possessed men vying for power, both of whom were eager to infuse the resulting religion with their sentiments and preferences, but neither of whom had any interest in listening to God. I suppose that is understandable since He was opposed to everything they were saying.

The Father of Lies had positioned himself as his 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. It was a triumph for the greater of two weasels.

Clearly, there was nothing 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. And appeasement, which is what they sought, was akin to making concessions with a Muslim regarding peace with Israel.

The correct response is the one I am providing. But these men didn't know Yahowah or what He had provided through Moseh, Shamuw'el, Dowd, or Yasha'yah. And so, by doing the wrong thing, they sowed the seeds that would choke God's people for twenty centuries.

Instead of rebuking Peter and Paul, they sought to outmaneuver one another. They sought to work out an accommodation – which is the mother's milk of politics. By compromising on essential values and issues, they degraded and devalued themselves, and postponed the inevitable, such that Jews would ultimately pay a much higher price.

While the Yaruwshalaim Summit began and 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 through reconciliation, Sha'uwl 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. And should it have existed, this is the germ that

became the New Testament – the first words written on behalf of the appalling imposition of Replacement Theology that became Christianity. Too bad this is buried in the Book of Acts and not highlighted within the Gospels.

“**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 and intimidating** (*tarasso* – distressing, disturbing, and agitating, without scruples perplexing by causing doubts, frightening and terrorizing so as to threaten) **you** (*umas*) **with statements** (*logos* – with words, speech, a message, acquisition, or treatise) **with unsettling and troubling words and irrational notions** (*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)

It was true, but nonetheless a complete waste of ink and energy. They didn't have the courage to name the enemy of their people when he was sitting in their midst. This left the door open for Paul to claim that those stirring up trouble and confusing the people were the Towrah-observant Jews who had opposed his contrarian and perplexing taunts in the first place. Specificity is essential in any rebuke.

Further, the authors of this confrontational letter didn't bother explaining what made Paul's statements so irrational, unsettling, and destructive. They knew that he had been speaking out against the Towrah and Covenant by misappropriating the word of God. Why didn't they say so?



Why did they complain by saying that they hadn't provided Paul with the authorization to intimidate and confuse? The only relevant issue was that Paul was lying when he claimed that the God he was rebuking had appointed and inspired him to contradict and nullify the Towrah. The argument that mattered was the degradation of Yahowah, His people, son, guidance, invitations, and relationship by the Plague of Death.

Yes, the letter was “*tarasso* – disturbing” and “*anakeuazo* – distressing” because it states that the message of the unnamed assailant was so irrational and intimidating that it subverted souls. But why was what caused this left unspoken? As a result, all this accomplished was to demonstrate that Christianity was born in hostile antipathy and divisiveness while further engendering the animosity of a certifiable psychopath. Naturally, the result was horrific for the kin of those who wrote it.

Should a reader want to exonerate these men and opine that it was perhaps possible that the disciples were unaware of much of what Paul was saying against the Towrah since they were not eyewitnesses to his speeches and since there was nothing to read – no epistles or gospels – then why was their language so inflammatory? Why kick the wolf and then send him back out to ravage the world? And why, once Galatians was scribed and distributed within two years of this summit, isn't there a letter from them similar to this retort in *Twistianity*?

The fact is that Christianity did not begin with the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. They were scribed decades after Paul's letters were written, widely disseminated, and their author had done his damage and died. Further, at the time this inflammatory letter was inked, 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, all those in this room knew at the time was that Paulos was lying about Yahowah, Yahuwdaym, the Towrah, Beryth, Miqra'ey, and Mashyach. They would not have known that Sha'awl would admit to being insane or demon possessed.

Luke's portrayal of this man's life, from which this excerpt was derived, would not be compiled for a score of years. Therefore, it would be some time before Paul's preposterous conversion experience or his duplicitous and conflicting testimony was known. So, to some extent, all Sha'awl had to do at this meeting to appear plausible was to lie. And that is what he did best. He may have even relented somewhat, curtailing his anti-Torah vitriol long enough to fool the disciples into believing that the wolf in him could be tamed and made 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 may not have known enough about Pauline Doctrine to categorically state that it was entirely divergent from what they knew to be true. But whose fault was that and what was the consequence – especially among men who claimed that their god had authorized them to sit in judgment?

Confused by Paul's conflicting testimony, it is possible that those lost in their own delusions came to the conclusion that condemning the Devil's Advocate 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. So, they deployed a tactic called "the art of emphasis." They shared their disdain without confronting Paul's deceptions

because they were afraid that they would lose the argument and look foolish in the process. They were inadequately prepared to stand up and prevail. And so, whose fault would that have been in this scenario? Did I hear someone timidly whisper, “Gospel Jesus?” But wouldn’t that make the whole paradigm of having Disciples a complete sham?

While the art of emphasis is often an effective marketing strategy, it is inappropriate 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 are *An Introduction to God*, *Observations*, and *Coming Home*, in addition to *Babel*, *Twistianity*, and *God Damn Religion*.

We do not have an answer to every question, and there are many things that we are still learning, but there are essential truths which are readily known, easily verified, and must be shared. First among them is that we cannot go wrong when we convey Yahowah’s testimony accurately, or when we advocate and excoriate those things which He approves and condemns.

For example, Yahowah has introduced Himself by name. He asked that we walk away from religion and politics and that we circumcise our sons as our sign that we want to be part of His Covenant Family. He has encouraged us to observe His Towrah and listen to Him. He is inviting us to meet with Him during the Miqra’ey and, along with His Son, is offering to make us immortal and perfect children within His family. That is good enough for me.

Based upon Yahowah’s Word, unity with Him 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 with other agendas. This notwithstanding, the conciliators wrote...

“...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 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)

It just went from bad to worse. This is inexcusable. They were not speaking on behalf of Yahowah or His Towrah but, instead, on “a supposition that occurred to us.” Unlike Yahowah who is uncompromising, and even discordant with Gospel Jesus who stated that he came to bring division, these religious politicians sought to promote a “unifying emotional appeal.”

But all was not lost; akin to the rabbis, they democratically elected their spokesman. And then, in the spirit of campfire songs and scary stories, they all held hands as they embraced the Devil. “*Oh dear Barny and Paulo, let’s all sing our song together. Oh what a religion we could make if only we try.*” So, how does this square with the vitriol in the opening sentence?

By using a derivative of *dokei*, the 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 effective. 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.” As such, this was an emotional appeal. Further, the disciples were hedging their bets by calling the spokesmen “*eklegomai* – ones who speak out.”

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 Lord** (*tou KY*), **our Christou** (*XY* – placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to usurp the Septuagint’s credibility and infer divinity) **Iesou** (*IY* – 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”).”** (Acts 15:26)

The inference is that the “men who had given over their souls for the sake of the name of the Lord, our Christou Iesou” were Barny and Paulos since they were the last mentioned. If so, there were only snakes and wolves in this room, no sheep. They were coconspirators in an epic

crime and cover-up. Yahowah was being replaced by the Lord. The Mashyach was now rendered a Christou. And Dowd had been renamed Iesou.

In the midst of these delusions, only one thing is certain – the cast of characters responsible for Christianity are all in She’owl, making Hell a very religious place.

But to be fair, this might have been poorly written such that I suppose Yahuwdah and Silas were being flattered rather than Barnabas and Satan’s Messenger. But even then, they were off promoting a demonic fable so what does it matter?

**“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)

Umm, excuse me for interrupting this kumbaya emotional appeal by these repulsive replacement theologians, but what was the god damn message? Have they progressed from telling the passengers on their sinking ship what not to take with them as they plunge into the chilly waters of faith? If so, this continues to be a waste of ink.

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 many insightful revelations found in *Yada Yahowah, An Introduction to God, Observations, and Coming Home, Babel, Twistianity, and God Damn*

*Religion* 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.

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 untrue, and that which cannot be affirmed or rejected based upon the Towrah is suspect or superfluous. By that standard, this is misleading:

**“For (gar) the Holy (hagios – a Greek variation on the Hebrew *qodesh* – set apart but more akin to the Hebrew holy/choly in practice) Spirit (PINA – a 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 judgment on this statement, let's consider the Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear 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 as “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 was fraudulent.

There are five requirements that 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 liberating, rewarding, and enjoyable. Nothing is better than being adopted into our Heavenly Father’s Family. And not one of the five requirements is a “burden” or a “hardship.” This oppressive 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 conditions and benefits in Yahowah's own words, suffice it to say for now that God asks the following of us: 1) Walk away from your country, including all things Babylon, which means disassociating from the confounding integration of 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 through the seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet. 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 as a result of Dowd's sacrifice. 2) We become perfect from God's perspective on UnYeasted Bread, our flaws are no longer seen or known because Dowd removed them. 3) The Covenant's children are adopted into God's Family on Firstborn Children, following the Firstborn home while inheriting everything Yahowah has to offer. As a result, we are 4 & 5) Enriched with the Towrah's teaching and empowered by God's Spirit.

Yahowah, working with Dowd 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 wonderful. There

are no other requirements, there are 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 they obey 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 Towrah liberates us from "suffering and sorrow" by bringing us into a familial covenant relationship with our Heavenly Father. Yahowah says as much in the Book bearing His Guidance:

**"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 (*chugah* – 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)

Based upon God's assessment and my experience, circumcision is not a “considerable hardship causing great suffering and sorrow,” which is why Yahowah is comfortable asking 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 Dowd 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, these represented the only “*epanagkes* – indispensable requirements” of the Torah – neither of which is even remotely accurate making what follows a hideous joke. The totality of their absurd 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** (*diatereo* – 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)

This is reprehensible and revolting. As just mentioned, if looking for a list of mandates from Yahowah which must be met to enter His Home, that list would include: 1) knowing and using His proper name, 2) avoiding associating the names of false and additional gods with Yahowah, 3) recognizing that Yahowah, as our Father, is not soliciting obedience, worship, or prayer but, instead, a family relationship, 4) disassociate from religion, politics, and babel, 5) accept the five conditions of the Covenant, 5) attend the seven Invitations to be Called out and Meet while also observing the Shabat, 6) celebrate Dowd’s role in fulfilling the Miqra’ey, and 7) closely examine and carefully consider Yahowah’s testimony throughout the Towrah wa Naby’.

Nothing important to God found its way to the Apostle’s list. Therefore, we can correctly conclude that they did not know Yahowah or speak for Him. All they were doing was conveying their religious preferences.

The Apostolic list was no better than the previous occasion when they listed three items, only one of which was potentially meaningful – and it’s the one removed

from the revision. This itemization is wholly inconsistent with the 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, nor even that of Gospel Jesus, 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 religious 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 advice. Yahowah's instructions warn us against incest, rape, and bestiality.

*Diatereo*, rendered as "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 Gospel Jesus was said to have returned to fabled "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 there was no city or town named Nazareth, or even in that location, 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 Volume 4 of *Twistianity*.

It is true, albeit an afterthought, that 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 worshipping) **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** (יהוה) – 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** (*zabach* – 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 personally 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 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 Christ 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)

Paul just renounced everything we just read. Knowing is counterproductive because emotional appeals are the elixir of faith. Additional gods and gods by other names are okay because they are amalgamated into his god. “Consume whatever religious byproduct you like,” said the Serpent.

For those who value consistency, Paul constantly contradicts himself, the disciples, Gospel Jesus, 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. Moreover, drinking blood is a foundational aspect of the Catholic Eucharist and Protestant Communion.

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 Yahowah condemns – as does Gospel Jesus). 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. We find nothing on Yahowah’s Ten Statements on this list. Nothing was even mentioned 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 reconciliation. 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.

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*). (Acts 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. But humor aside, this

statement validates Yahowah's prophecy which predicted Sha'awl's fascination with male genitalia and of him going round about over circumcision.

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'awl 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. Or better yet, join me in condemning the Devil's Advocate.

✠

*Kataginosko* | *Condemned*

*Peter Judges Paul...*

What follows is not pleasant. But we find it written, nonetheless. It shows Sha’uwl viciously attacking Shim’own. 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 the disciples of Gospel Jesus.

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 indicate 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, from my businesses to my sons, 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. ‘*Abraham* twice pimped out Sarah for additional sheep. Lowt was an incestuous lush. Ya’aqob had a tendency to hallucinate. His sons sold a brother into slavery. *Moseh* | Moses had a speech impediment. ‘Aharown had a lingering affinity for cows. *Dowd* battled with inappropriate emotional longings. Solomon collected wives and toyed with pagan religions and covetous desires. They are all testaments to the fact that Yahowah can work through people who recognize that they are useless without Him. That, however, was not the case with Sha’uwl / 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 eminently 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 conjured up and tossed before

us, leading to the point of our reengagement...

“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, (Galatians 1:1) and all the brothers with me to the called out of the Galatias, (Galatians 1:2) *Charis* | Grace to you and peace from *Theos* | God, *Pater* | Father of us and Lord Iesou Christou, (Galatians 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, (Galatians 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, (Galatians 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, (Galatians 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. (Galatians 1:11) But neither because I by man associating myself with it. Nor was I taught. 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 Ekklesia of God as I was and am devastating her,

continuing to undermine, overthrow, and annihilate her. (Galatians 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. (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 (Galatians 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* and returned again to Damascus. (Galatians 1:17)

Then later in the sequence of events, after three years' time, I ascended to Jerusalem to investigate and inquire about *Kephas* | Rock and remained against him fifteen days. (Galatians 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. (Galatians 1:21) But I was not known or

understood personally by the Ekklesia of Judah in Christo. (Galatians 1:22) 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. (Galatians 1:23)

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, (Galatians 2:2) to the contrary, not even Titus, a Greek being, was compelled, forced or pressured, to be circumcised, (Galatians 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, (Galatians 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. (Galatians 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” dished up by a psychopath, 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’uwl and listened to him in Yaruwshalaim, when Shim’own went to Syria, the niceties were not reciprocated...

**“But (de) when (hote) Kephas (Kephas – 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 overall authority 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 Kephas 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’uwl’s word salad, believers must remain ignorant of his ingredients.

One of the most telling traits of chronically insecure individuals is that they cunningly 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’uwl has effectively deflected attention away from himself, while at the same time blurring the issue in people’s minds. This strategy makes it more difficult for Shim’own / “Peter” to demonstrate that Sha’uwl / 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 focus a critical eye on 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’uwl, this was personal. He 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 Kephas did not agree with Paul and that Shim’own 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 Gospel Jesus’ 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 Dowd’s purpose, all of which Paul had done, there was nothing Shim’own could say or do that would justify this level of attack.

Shim’own may have been wrong about something, and if he was, it wouldn’t have been the first time. But, as passionate as Kephas was, he seldom bothered to defend himself personally. He turned the other cheek, and left Syria. Sha’uwl, however, would continue to press his case against him. And in the process, he would incriminate Ya’aqob, the brother of Gospel Jesus, 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 Kephass’ 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 (*to*) 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 “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 was breaking bread in fellowship with brothers whom we can only assume were interested in what he had to say. Then, we are told that a *Yahuwd* | Jew arrived. And even though Sha'uwl 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," then why did Paul leave Damascus hidden in a basket?

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 chronic propensity for spin, it is likely that Shim'own had a valid reason to leave (like being allergic to Sha'uwl), but Paul left this reason out in order to make the man Gospel Jesus is said to have 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'uwl was cleverly trying to infer that Kephas was compelled to leave because of the crushing control mechanisms of Rabbinic Judaism. He then positioned 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 the disciple, we are compelled to consider Sha'uwl'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 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 while acting falsely), **and also (kai) the remaining (oi loipos) Jews (Ioudaios** – a crude 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 pretense).” (Galatians 2:13)

This is yet another affirmation that Galatians was

written after the Jerusalem Summit in 50 CE, but before Barnabas and Sha'uwl split up the following year. And based on 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 or second written document, the religion could not have had a less credible foundation even if Satan, himself, had written it.

Yahowah consistently encourages us to be critical of false teaching, telling us to expose and condemn lies and liars, but even though "the Rock" was both a false teacher and a liar, neither is relevant without proof – none of which was provided. And if Paul were right, even without specificity, the books of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Peter would have to be expunged from the canon. Sha'uwl's condemnation makes it impossible for anyone to accept Paul's and Peter's letters as both being true. One or the other must be wrong if not both.

This being the case, it has irrecoverable consequences for Christian theology. The lone, thin, truncated, misquoted, and grossly misunderstood pretext for considering Paul's letters "Scripture" is allegedly found in 2 Peter 3:12-17. But if Shim'own "was convicted and condemned, judged to be guilty, devoid of understanding, and thus ignorant," then "Peter's" letters would not be credible. And considering what Sha'uwl just wrote, and what had been said earlier that year in Yaruwshalaim, it is not even remotely plausible that Shim'own would have written a ringing endorsement of Sha'uwl. And as a result of these undeniable conclusions, Christianity's New Testament dies yet another ugly death and is beginning to look as tattered and lifeless as its image of a dead god on a stick.

With the authenticated disciple being condemned by the wannabe Apostle, the Christian New Testament has

nullified its own credibility in catastrophic and irreconcilable fashion. 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 nefarious characters. However, since Paul will also oppose Yahowchanan and Ya'aqob, the discord between the early witnesses requires us to discard 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 – leaving nothing to substantiate anything. 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."

Sha'awl / Paul has negated the witness of Shim'own / Peter and will soon disparage the testimony of Yahowchanan / John. Without them, nothing can be known about the myth of Gospel Jesus. And while that is no loss since it is Dowd's words and deeds which matter, it is a death blow to Christendom.

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, (Galatians 2:11) because, before a certain individual came from Jacob, 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 Jews. 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'awl's vicious attack on the rival disciple, Shim'own Kephas, 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 taken 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, 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. Paradoxically, when Shim'own's evaluation of Sha'uwl'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 the disciple authored them, and if he was inspired, all of Paul's letters have to be discarded as "misleading," because Shim'own besmirched them. And if 2<sup>nd</sup> Peter is fraudulent, then there is no justification anywhere else for considering Paul's pathetic 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 the sayings attributed to Gospel Jesus 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 the God** (*parousia tes tou ΘY hemera* – arrival of the day of the Almighty) **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** (*tekomai* – 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 is unsupported by the prophets and inaccurate. The Day of Yahowah would be 2,000 years removed from this letter so there was no reason to wait patiently. Peter neither knew Yahowah’s name nor the name of the event he was predicting. Further, when Yah

and Dowd return on Yowm Kipurym, the sky will be dark, not ablaze or molten hot. So this is an inopportune start.

Beyond this, if Peter was suggesting that Gospel Jesus would be returning, he would have been mistaken. Having fulfilled his role as the Passover Lamb, there is a lot more for the Messiah and King of Yisra'el to accomplish. Therefore, according to God, it is Dowd who will be returning.

This next statement was taken from *Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 65:17 and 66:22 and then inappropriately augmented without properly crediting the prophet...

**“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** (*dikaio syne* – 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)

It is hard to explain why he was anticipating this event nearly 3,000 years before it was predicted to occur in year 7000 Yah. And why would he pilfer one of Yasha'yah's prophecies if not to give the false impression that he was also a prophet?

**“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*)

Wrong again. We make no effort in the process of being perfected. This is Dowd’s gift to us. Further, no one in this audience would be experiencing “reconciliation” because this was slated to occur 2,000 years into the future.

“**Also** (*kai*) **this regarding** (*ten tou* – of, about, and in association with in the accusative feminine addressing reconciliation and genitive masculine addressing) **our** (*emon*) **the Lord** (KY – a placeholder used in the Septuagint to convey Lord or to replace 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)

When speaking of salvation, the focus must be on Dowd’s role in fulfilling Chag Matsah, neither of which Peter mentioned. And in this regard, there was no correlation between Paulos and any form of salvation. Further, to refer to Paul as esteemed is either tongue-in-cheek or displays a phenomenally poor ability to judge the character of the man. It is also completely out of step with Yahowah who referred to Sha’uwl as the Plague of Death.

This known, it was a somewhat clever use of human philosophy that permeates Paul’s letters. At the time, it was known as Gnosticism.

The first of many intriguing words, *makrothymia*, is from *makrothumos*. It was translated as “steadfast endurance and constraint,” *macros*, meaning “lengthy and for a long time.” It 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 “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 that 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. To the contrary, *Shim’own* is “inflamed with righteous indignation.” He is also

“exasperated and angered” by what Sha’uwl 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.” In Peter’s view, Paul is “sacrificing lives” and “injuring” souls by representing the “adversary,” whom 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 as “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 his followers “to think” so that they aren’t “misled.” Now, if only he would provide them with something to think about.

Had he articulated them and explained the Miqra’ey, there are few things as vital to our wellbeing as “*soteria* – the process of salvation.” But since there is nothing controversial about the term, other than Peter’s inability to explain it, 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 a Jew.

At first blush, *agapetos* is awkward in this derogatory evaluation. But its primary meaning is not “beloved,” or even “dear,” instead “uniquely esteemed, welcoming as 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. While he had a posse, he lorded over them. 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 on how Sha’uwl treated Shim’own, and based on the way he vociferously condemned him in the very letter Peter was now referencing, it strains credulity to believe that the disciple penned the word “*agapetos* – uniquely esteemed” – unless the “esteemed” connotation was a tongue-in-cheek reference to Paul’s notorious ego. And if not that, it is also possible 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 was not afforded him, and since Peter has now associated Paul with the Jewish ethnicity the wannabe apostle has been trying to discount in favor of his Roman citizenship, 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’uwl / 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 define the Christian New Testament. I suspect he did so in light of the foreboding warning he received from Gospel Jesus: **“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.”** (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, almost 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'awl. The disciple was a fisherman with no formal education. He had learned everything he knew from walking in the footsteps of Gospel Jesus if we were to believe the myths. Sha'awl, 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'awl studied Judaism in Jerusalem at the feet of one of Judaism's 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 to, we have to conduct an investigation. In 2 Peter 3:1, Shim’own 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 comprised 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)

The acclaimed disciple is announcing 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.

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 as “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'awl 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 Dowd and his sacrifice, Sha'awl 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 Dowd's lives, this is his crowning achievement. And the combination of Yahowah's prophetic warnings, the concerns conveyed during the Instruction on the Mount, and now the disciple'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'awl'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 Iesou, and yet by separating the myth from the Towrah, Sha'awl, not the rabbis, or the 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 and completely as 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’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, 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 (*malytsah* –**

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*)

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 the Lord, 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 Lord: 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 from 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 nor the prophets 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* convey 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. With “scripture” serving as a transliteration of the Latin word for writing, it holds no special distinction and could have been used to describe a bar tab.

The Christian religious interpretation cannot be salvaged by association with Iesou Christou since he spoke neither Greek nor Latin. And the few times his words were translated using *graphas*, he 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 as “the Writings” from *graphas*. The same is true in Mark 12:10.

Beyond this, the 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.

To the extent that any of this occurred, and if 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 *Miqra'ey*. Shim'own is thereby warning Christians about the ultimate outcome of Pauline Doctrine – calling it deadly and destructive. While the character known as “Peter” stubbed his toe and tripped on his tongue more often than not, when it finally came time to stand up and boldly declare the truth, the disciple may have led the way.

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 convoluted by Replacement Theology, and 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 must 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, almost 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 as "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 as "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 as "others' writings," not "other scripture." But there is only one text referenced by Gospel Jesus which he considered Divinely inspired – the "Torah and Prophets" which he described 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 during the fabled Christian Pentecost.

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 merit our attention.

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. 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 addition 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'awl'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 Dowd's, if it is his assessments which were prophetically presented within the Instruction on the Mount. So while we considered that pronouncement in the first chapter, it is especially relevant here since Dowd would have seen Sha'awl as both a Benjamite wolf and a false prophet.

**“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 (*syllego*) 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*). (Matthew 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 (homologeoo 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 Dowd are of one mind, affirming the same testimony. The only one bellowing a different story in an effort to shift our attention is Paul.

Although the Rock 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 Kephas* / 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 and the religion he championed.

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 that the Torah was and will always be the source of life.

The Galatians, and even the world at large 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, *dikaiosune* 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 reconciliation? 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 alleged discipleship, the Rock's conclusion affirms he was condemning Sha'awl's epistles, not commending them.

Notwithstanding the last statement, if 2 Peter 3:16 represents the lone Christian affirmation that Paul's letters were "Scripture" – inspired word-for-word 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 canonize 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, Iesous 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 Roman Catholic 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 Iesou the Christou 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 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 that artificially elevates Paul – especially when derived from the hand of Sha'awl's most outspoken critics, Shim'own, Ya'aqob, and Yahowchanan.

Although, in actuality, Paul's most outspoken critic is Yahowah, followed by His prophets and especially His Son. And somewhere along the line, I suspect that I have earned my place among Sha'awl's most vocal opponents.

☩

*Thanatos* | Deadly Plague

*Feed My Sheep...*

The third of the three men to feel the sting of this scorpion's toxin, Yahowchanan / John may have had the last laugh. Just as Shim'own's last words warned us about Sha'uwl, the following prophetic admonition was among the last attributed to Gospel Jesus in the Book of John.

In this case, the preamble is instructive to the prediction, so let's begin where this specific conversation began. But keep in mind, this is actually a translation of what John recalls being expressed 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 conversation. So while the fragment from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century suggests that this may have been communicated, and that Yahowchanan recorded it six decades thereafter, we must be careful reading too much into the words themselves as they were subject to faded memories, mythological characters, translation imperfections, and copyediting.

This discussion followed a theme which undermines Christianity and its fixation on bodily resurrection. *Yahowchanan* | John, who is alleged to have recorded these words as an eyewitness, was with Shim'own Kephas / 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 meeting following the fulfillment of Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym, those who claimed to know him, 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 or if Iesou Christou had actually existed.

These things known, notice the change from “*agapas* – taking pleasure in love” to “*phileo* – engaging in a loving familial relationship” as the conversation with Shim’own progresses.

“**This was already the third time** (*outos ede tritos*) **Iesous** (ΙΣ – a placeholder used for Iesous) **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 faculties 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). (John 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 Kephass** (*Simoni Petro* – an awkward transliteration of the Hebrew Shim’own, meaning He Listens, combined with a translation of the Hebrew Kephass to the Greek word for “rock”) **being Iesous** (*o ΙΣ* – a placeholder used in the Septuagint to convey following the article *o* in the nominative: “being Iesous”), **‘Shim’own of Yahowchanaan | 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), **Lord** (KY – a placeholder used in the Septuagint to convey *kuriou* – lord and master), **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).' (John 21:15)

**He said to him** (*legei autos*) **again, a second time** (*palin deuterous*), **'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), **Lord** (KY), **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).' (John 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*), **‘Lord (KY), 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 for my association with you, see you as friend and family).’

**Being Iesous** (*o ΙΣ*), **said to him** (*legei auto*) **‘Nurture and tend** (*boskomai* – feed and nourish, care for and guide) **my sheep** (*probaton mou* – my adult flock).’” (John 21:14-17)

Since the mythology of Gospel Jesus was predicated upon misrepresenting Dowd, this is either the Messiah speaking to a fellow countryman following his fulfillment of Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym, or mythological dialog without a historical basis. But for our purposes, it doesn’t matter since it impugns Christianity either way.

The speaker wasn't talking to his pupil about grazing, about sheep, or animal husbandry – although Dowd was an expert in these things. “Sheep” are 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,” he may have been asking a fellow countryman “to guide and protect” his flock, keeping his sheep out of harm's way, while keeping the wolves at bay. After all, they were and remain his flock, 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 as “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 the Shepherd was telling Shim'own Kephas to fend off false prophets by properly feeding, directing, and protecting His children, regardless of place or race, it appears as if Dowd may have provided this prophecy to Shim'own regarding Sha'uwl after fulfilling Bikuwrym...

**“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 *zonnyimi*)), **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)).’ (John 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 God** (*doxasei ton ΘN* – he will impart and extol as being supposedly worthy regarding his opinion and estimate on how to properly judge, value, and view theos).

**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)).’” (John 21:18-19)

Since this follows the request made to Peter to shepherd his flock, 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 by encouraging Shim'own to follow the proper Way instead of the path proposed by his future adversary, 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'uw!* | 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 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, Christians are controlled by the religion that claimed to free them. Moreover, all who follow the Messiah 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, but they bequeath Yahowah's promised benefits: eternal life, perfection, adoption, enrichment, and empowerment. This is the Way of the Miqra'ey, the path Dowd not only followed but also explained and fulfilled.

This explains why Shim'own of Yahowah's Mercy was told to be wary of the man who would try to put his own yoke upon him. It would not lead 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, “Sha'uwl is the plague of death.”

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 this warning seventeen years earlier.

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 the flock to be devoured by a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Adding fuel to the fire, as we shall soon witness in Ephesus, in Acts 19, Paul admits to “setting boundaries” for the disciples, notably Shim'own and Yahowchanan. And even Kephass' 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.

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.”**

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 (*apothoimai* – 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 the Songs he wrote regarding the Towrah, and all of the Hebrew prophets who regaled Yahowah’s Guidance.

Since we know that Paul had 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’uwl’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 Gospel Jesus, bypassing Ya'aqob and the Towrah. But now according to Sha'uwl, he, himself, is that seed.

Before we consider Yahowah's prediction regarding Sha'uwl, the Benjamite, remember that in the *Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk prophecy which calls Sha'uwl 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 – the first by the mother, Rachel, who knew him but died in childbirth and the other by his father, Ya'aqob, who was

not paying attention. 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'awl, 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: *Ben 'owny* – 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* / In the Beginning / 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'uw1 – 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, the thirteenth child who was 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 *Binyamem* 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 of those who will be egregiously harmed** (*chalaq* – being deceptive 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 *Twistianity* is the first series of books you have considered in the *Yada Yahowah* family, it might be reasonable for you to assume that I have read too much into the text, extrapolating each word beyond its primary intent. Therefore, I 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’uwl* | Paul would foist on His creation 1,500 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 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* / Genesis 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 of what he would do, with whom he would do it, how he would achieve this result, and the consequence of 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 *chaqaaq* – 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 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. Even more relevant, as the Zarowa’, Dowd was the Passover Lamb, fulfilling the Miqra’ of Matsah which perfects us in God’s sight.

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 Dowd serving as the Pesach 'Ayil, 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 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 *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 the Tabernacle to Yahowah erected in this city which was some twenty miles or thirty kilometers 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 practiced in Shiloh, denouncing them in 7:12-14 and again in 26:6-9. As a result, the Christian translation, "until Shiloh comes," is as ludicrous as 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 in time to the close of the fourth millennium and see how *Bare'syth* / Genesis 49:27 becomes inescapable for Sha'uwl. Every tribe except Yahuwdah, Lowy, and Benyamyn was 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 the 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 Dowd and Yisra'el. 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 of replacing Dowd, the oft-acclaimed Right Hand of God. And it has become obvious that Sha'uwl, a man whose name is indistinguishable from

She'owl, served at Satan's dominant side.

Perhaps, we should also look at *yam* based on its root because *yam* is the Hebrew word for "sea." It is symbolic of *Gowym*, distinct from *Yahuwdym*, who are associated with the "erefs – land." It is hard to miss Paul's repetitive and braggadocious 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 as "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 the 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 disciples 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," denoting 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 as "in the morning," and interpreted as "the first part of the day," we find that Paul was the first to mangle the purpose and message of the Passover Lamb. 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))) While Jefferson was bright enough to write Paul out of this story and is famous for being among the first to openly rebuke him, I wonder if he ever took this realization to its natural conclusion and considered the devastating consequence of Replacement Foolology? Whether he realized it or not, the demonizing of other ethnicities and the unjustified sense of divinely awarded superiority, played an enormous role in the emerging nation’s horrific treatment of the native population.

As for Paul’s treachery, it transpired 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.

Sha’uwl began his career murdering those who came to know and trust the Messiah. (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 as “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 what transpired. Sha’uwl viciously savaged and devoured God’s flock. 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.” Sha’uwl 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.”

The final thought expressed in Bare’syth 49:27 presents 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 the prophetic warning affirmed during the Sermon on the Mount. Benjamin was not only the last name on Yahowah's list, and the last prophecy in *Bare'syth* / Genesis, the prophetic reference to Sha'uwl was the last prediction made by the replacement cast of characters.

There is but one man who fits these prophecies: Sha'uwl...

**“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 with 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. *Dowyd* | David) **Yahowah** (𐤏𐤃𐤏𐤃𐤁 – 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.

—✠—

*Kakos* | Pernicious

*Do not Accept...*

As we contemplate the mounting evidence against Sha’uwl / Paulos, we find that it comes in many forms. He was so egregious and destructive that Yahowah condemned him throughout the Towrah and Prophets. As we have witnessed, he is even assailed within the New Testament he helped shape, which I suspect is because Replacement Foolology was never able to eliminate the words and deeds of the actual Messiah and Son of God. And while Paul became his own worst enemy by committing a plethora of logical fallacies and contradicting himself and the word of God, his contemporaries were opposed to him as well.

As was the case with Shim’own and Ya’aqob, Yahowchanan / John was no exception. With animosity still kindled after the Jerusalem debacle and subsequent intrusion on his turf, the disciple appears to have taken one final shot at the wannabe “Apostle” and those who were creating Christianity along with him – namely Timothy, Luke, and Mark. And it is from this perspective that I’d like to present some of the introductory comments in his revelation...

**“To the messenger of those Called Out in Ephesus write...”** (Revelation 2:1)

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 at the time. There, the man named “Yahowah is Merciful” was challenged and attacked 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 now being subjected to the disparate pleas of the religious revisionists, John wrote...

**“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 inquiry, 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 presented as a prophetic book due to its extensive commentary on future events foretold by prior prophets, this commendation was written in the present and past tense. And that is significant because *Yahowchanan* | John likely scribed the introduction to his 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.

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 John 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 extensive conflict with Yahowah, Christians still cannot claim that they were not warned about this horrible man because their beloved John, Peter, and James did so. Paul was exposed and condemned at the beginning (Matthew 5-7) and at the conclusion of their “New Testament” in Revelation 2.

Yahowchanan, whose name means “Yahowah is Merciful,” would go on to encourage his people to favor the message conveyed by his name and to avoid

capitulating to faith...

**“And you have demonstrated loyal steadfastness and enduring consistency (*hupomone*) and have endured (*bastazo*) through my name. You have worked hard (*kopiao*) and have not grown tired.”** (Revelation 2:3)

Since I have made the claim that *Sha'awl* | Paul and his posse preached in Ephesus, that they presented a contrarian view to that of the disciples, notably, *Yahowchanan* | Yahowah is Merciful, 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, his personal healer and propagandist, 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 the 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 the disciples’ preaching, and he was convinced that one or more of them, John in particular, 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 the faithful 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 – which is funny since Paul was the maestro of this madness. 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'awl's disciples.

Make no mistake: this was a competition. And frankly, since these devastating revelations are presented within the New Testament, it makes no difference if they are historically valid or fables. Either way, the credibility of Christianity is destroyed by them.

In this light, it is especially revealing that the character played by Gospel Jesus never immersed or baptized anyone. Therefore, it was either irrelevant or inappropriate. And if perceived permissible, there was obviously no need for it nor any established way to do it. Therefore, it was absurd to suggest that Yahowchanan's technique was wrong and Sha'awl's was right.

Baptism is not the means to approach Yahowah, and it will actually ensure that the Set-Apart Spirit isn't anywhere around the recipient or baptizers. It is among the Gentile religious rites the Towrah condemns. And as we know from the confession 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. Nevertheless, spiritually aligned, one false prophet would continue to zealously promote the other while inadvertently impugning one another at the same time...

**“But having gone into the synagogue he was preaching fearlessly (*paresiazomai*) 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’uwl’s message and that of his Lord. 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 by presenting an alternative.” In a word, it reveals that Paul was a contrarian promoting Replacement Foolology.

Even *peitho* is telling. It could have been rendered as “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 very crime John accused him of committing in his revelation to those living in Ephesus.

And from this perspective, this gives new meaning to the second church on John’s list – Smyrna. Speaking of Paul, the infamous demon-possessed Roman, and of his contrarian preaching in the synagogue, John would say the following of him and his entourage... **“I know your**

tribulation and your poverty and the blasphemy by those who say they are Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan...so behold, the Devil is about to cast some of you into prison.” (Revelation 2:9-10 NASB) Clearly, Yahowchanan had Sha’uwl’s number. And this means that the Synagogue of Satan which is used to condemn Jews is actually addressing Sha’uwl’s seductive preaching. It serves to confirm that Paul was a demon-possessed charlatan – a wolf in sheep’s clothing – serving Satan.

While that was damning, it actually gets worse. Yahowchanan would continue to expose Paul’s affiliation with Satan in the next ekklesia / church, which was Pergamum, also in Asia Minor. Of Paul’s second ekklesia, John wrote: “The one who has the sharp two-edged sword says this: I know where you dwell, where Satan’s throne is...where Satan dwells. So, I have some things against you because you have there some who hold the teaching of Balaam [meaning: the Lord negates the family and restrains the people] who kept teaching Balak to put a stumbling block before the children of Israel to eat things sacrificed to idols and to commit immorality. Thus you also have some who in the same way hold the teaching of the Nicolaitans.” (Revelation 2:12-15 NASB)

The man who indiscriminately swung a two-edged sword, thrashing Christians and Jews, was Paul. John was yet again reminding all who would listen that Sha’uwl and Satan were Apostle and Lord, the hand and glove of the new religion. And as a result of Paul’s rhetoric and epistles, Satan would have the throne he coveted. As was foretold by Yasha’yah in the 14<sup>th</sup> chapter, Satan would rise above Yahowah in the eyes of the religious. Christians were now worshiping the Devil. The demonic Lord is glorified and lives in Paul’s letters and within his church.

As for Balaam, there are a number of possibilities regarding his name. It is similar to *ba’al* which, as Satan’s designation and title, means “Lord and Master, one who

controls and possesses.” Ba’al was also the name of the supreme divinity of the Phoenicians and Canaanites, and thus a well-known false god – not unlike Iesou Christou and his progenitor, Dionysus.

Balaam is a compound of *bal* | to negate and ‘*am* | people. It is related to the Hebrew *bela*’ | to swallow something harmful and *balam* | to hold back and restrain.

When Balaam is used in conjunction with Balak, we are drawn back to the dark days of the Exodus. Following the horrendous episode of Jewish rebellion against Moseh and Yahowah associated with the Waters of Contention, Edom blocked Yisra’el’s passage toward the Promised Land. ‘*Aharown* | the Alternative died and, as the people continued to bellyache against their Liberator and Savior, Yahowah responded by sending fiery serpents (i.e. demons) who began to strike and envenomate the Children of Yisra’el. It was only fair, since they didn’t like God, God sent an alternative because He is keen on giving people what they deserve. Not surprisingly, the Jews didn’t like Satan’s brood any better. So when they complained, as was their custom, Yahowah, rather than remove the fiery serpents serving as toxic representations of demonic spirits and false gods, had Moseh build an effigy of a flaming snake on a stick. This was Yahowah’s preferred interpretation of the Christian crucifix, giving his wayward children a foretaste of their own medicine.

With their newfound faith in the Snake on a Stick, which, of course, they immediately started worshiping, those who were envenomated lived out their miserable lives with neurotoxin flowing through their veins. If nothing else, it may have tranquilized them so that their rebellious attitude was less irritating. Therefore, the story reveals that a special Someone in High Places has a wicked sense of humor and no doubt reveled in the irony of it all.

Thereafter, the route of the Yisra’elites was blocked a

second time, now by the Amorites. Mean-spirited and covetous, these early anti-Semites decided to annihilate God's people, but to no avail as Yahowah did to them what they intended to perpetrate – serving as a harbinger of what awaits future Islamic mujahideen.

Not being particularly adept, the kingdom of Bashan brought their swords to bear against the Yisra'elites immediately thereafter, only to suffer the same fate. Then, not far from Jericho, on the East Bank of the Jordan River, the King of Moab, who was the aforementioned Balak, decided to tempt fate using a religious approach. He hired Balaam to curse the Children of Yisra'el – not unlike what Sha'uwl was doing for Satan. Only this time, Yahowah intervened such that, after a long conversation with his ass, or donkey as the case may be, Balaam decided it would be asinine to oppose God. He renounced his previous calling and encouraged Balak to listen to Yahowah and accommodate His people rather than condemn them.

But alas, that didn't jive with Balak's agenda, so with the curse having backfired, the Moabite king leagued with the Midianites against the Jews. This time, rather than attack them with foul words, Balak infiltrated the Israeli camp with pretty girls in order to entice and distract the previously envenomated Jewish boys.

Thinking as was their custom with the wrong head, the Children of Yisra'el sought to garner favor with the pretty pretties by becoming even more rebellious and religious. They started worshiping the Midianite gods in the presence of Yahowah, engendering God's animosity.

**“While *Yisra'el* | those who contend with and strive against God (*wa Yisra'el*) established their homes (*yashab*) among the Adversary's most embittered, hostile, and hateful in Shitim (*ba ha Shitym* – among those *satan* | the adversary has caused to be *satam* | hateful and opposed, holding a grudge while cherishing their**

animosity while *set* | rebellious), **the people were dishonored and became common, profane, and contemptible** (*wa chahal ha 'am*) **by prostituting themselves to by trading favors for sex with** (*la zannah 'el*) **the daughters** (*bath*) **of Mow'ab | Who is your Father** (*Mow'ab*). (*Bamidbar* / By Questioning the Word / Numbers 25:1)

**So they (feminine plural) called out to and invited the people** (*wa qara' la ha 'am*) **to make sacrifices** (*la zebach*) **to their gods** (*'elohym henah*) **and the people ate, swallowing and devouring it all** (*wa 'akal ha 'am*) **and they, without coercion or provocation spoke on behalf of and bowed down to** (*wa chawah la*) **their gods** (*'elohym henah*). (*Bamidbar* / By Questioning the Word / Numbers 25:2)

**Therefore, Yisra'el | those who contend with and strive against God** (*wa Yisra'el*) **joined in to associate with and yoked themselves together with** (*tsamad la*) **the Lord** (*Ba'al* – the false god known as Satan, the lord and master who possesses and controls men, the supreme deity to the Phoenicians and Canaanites and, thus, of the Philistines) **of the wide-open way** (*Pa'owr* – popular enlightenment).

**And so the frustration and resentment, even anger and rage** (*wa 'aph*) **of Yahowah** (*Yahowah*) **were aroused and burned, kindled as intense displeasure** (*charah*) **against Yisra'el | those individuals who were contentious with God** (*ba Yisra'el*).” (*Bamidbar* / By Questioning the Word / Numbers 25:3)

Just as the envenomating fiery serpents served as an alternative to God, the very name of Yisra'el provides this same contrast between life and death. On the positive side, it means “Individuals who Engage and Endure with God and who are Liberated and Empowered by the Almighty. But the way they were acting, the dark side of Yisra'el

conveyed the people's ongoing rebellion.

As a result of continually choosing religion over relationship, being antagonistic instead of agreeable, God's wayward children were hanging out with the Adversary and his fellow serpents in Shitim. Once again, they got what they deserved and were where they belonged. Rather than being called out and special and thriving in the Promised Land, the Yisra'elites were now common trash, as useless and perverted as all other religious people.

Since they had nothing to offer, the Children of Israel became prostitutes, trading favors for sex. Having disowned their Father, and having rejected His invitations to be called out and welcomed into His home, Jews started worshipping pagan gods, making sacrifices and speaking for them – something which hasn't changed much over the years. But now they were doing it in the very presence of God and while He was trying to save them. Israel had become the prototypical religious whore, so it should be no surprise that they were the principal contributors to Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and Socialism.

And let's be clear since Yahowah has been with us. The Lord, translated from *ba'al*, is the designation, name, and title of a false god. The Lord Jesus Christ and the Lord Allah are nothing more or less than Satan in the guise of a religious deity. It is the Devil's preferred way to control and lord over men.

Also, the Lord is open to anything and everything so long as those things fool the foolish into worshipping him as if he were a god. Satan is the Lord of the Open Way, which means his religions are varied, accommodating, and popular. If you are among the majority, or even with a plurality, you are very likely influenced by the Adversary.

It is as obvious as words allow – religious Jews who claim to be Towrah-observant are lying and only fooling themselves. If they considered Yahowah's *Towrah* |

Guidance they would know how totally disgusted God is with them for being religious. This is why Yahowah selected and equipped a gowy to awaken a final remnant of Yisra'el. It is why He waited until the last possible moment to restore fellowship. It is why He will be more than satisfied if there are only thousands among billions who respond. It will still be better than at any other time during the past 4,000 years when Jews have been exceedingly caustic, embittered, unappreciative, belligerent, and religious.

Now that we know the players in Yahowchanan's retort against Sha'uwl, and the mess they had made, the disciple's continued condemnation of Sha'uwl is beginning to take shape. He is not only saying that Satan dwells within Paul and reigns through his euangelion, but also that those associated with the Devil's Advocate are reminiscent of Jews under the influence of Balak. In fact, it is obvious that their god is the Lord of the Broad and Open Way. Therefore, while claiming to please and worship God, Paul and his ilk are irritating and disgusting Him.

By way of reminder, Yahowchanan wrote...**“The one who has the sharp two-edged sword says this: I know where you dwell, where Satan's throne is...where Satan dwells. So, I have some things against you because you have there some who hold the teaching of Balaam who kept teaching Balak to put a stumbling block before the children of Israel to eat things sacrificed to idols and to commit immorality. Thus you also have some who in the same way hold the teaching of the Nicolaitans.”** (Revelation 2:12-15)

Of course, John didn't communicate this very well, as we have come to expect from New Testament authors. Having just reviewed the story, Balaam's teachings were consistent with Yahowah's message and Balak's teachings, if he had any, are unknown. Further, while eating that which was sacrificed to idols was implied and disdained, it was the least of the Israelite issues at this point. And Balak



was not responsible for the horrid religious behavior of the Jewish people. He, like Allah, supplied the babes and the boys took it from there. But since Sha'owl was the ultimate stumbling block and since he authorized consuming that which was sacrificed to pagan gods, John highlighted those things to criticize the demon in their midst. Similarly, immorality wasn't the problem 3,500 years ago but, instead, religion.

That brings us to "the Nicolaitans." And while you may find a religious commentator to posture otherwise, the simple truth is that while this is the second time they have been mentioned in Revelation, no one knows who they might be. All we can deduce from the context is that they were Christians influenced by Paul, who claimed the Greek goddess of victory, Nike, as their patron saint. She became so popular at the time, she was often associated with Athena and Zeus. Even the Nicaean Council (Council of Nikea) in 325 CE under General and Emperor Constantine would flaunt the goddess' name.

So that we maintain our bearings, in his rebuke of Paul's initial church in Ephesus, the narrative ends oddly, with John writing, **"He who has an ear, let him hear what the spirit says to the churches. He who overcomes will not be hurt by the second death."** (Revelation 2:11 NASB)

Yahowah's words speak to us, not the Ruwach. Her role is to help us understand Yahowah's words and then teach them to others. Further, She is anti-religious, so the last place on Earth that you'd find Her would be in a church. Also, we die once, not twice. The souls who are extinguished at the conclusion of their mortal existence are not hurt. And the souls who have earned incarceration in She'owl do not die. So, John didn't get any of this right.

The craziness also envelops the conclusion of John's attack on Pergamum. He incorrectly wrote, **"Therefore repent; or else I am coming to you quickly, and I will make**

war against them with the sword of My mouth. He who has an ear, let him hear what the spirit says to the churches. To him who overcomes, to him I will give some of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and a new name written on the stone which no one knows but he who receives it.” (Revelation 2:16-17)

If the church Paul established through his preaching and letters to the Gentiles had been based upon the word of God, then this Revelation wouldn't have been antagonistic. And yet to the contrary, John is calling the church Paul founded, “Satanic.” From the disciple's perspective, Paul's euangelion among the Gentiles had led to a more perverted and unGodly result than when the Yisra'elites were antagonizing Yahowah while worshiping the Lord in Shitim.

Presented in the voice of an “angel” who then morphs into “the Son of God who has eyes like a flame of fire and His feet are like burnished bronze,” Sha'uwl / Paulos created such a mess with his demonic drivel that unless the Christian Church did an immediate about-face, renouncing what they had become, which did not occur, Gospel Jesus was going to return at once, which did not occur either, to “make war against them with the sword of My mouth.” This is an atomic bomb exploding in the heart of the nascent church. And it was dropped by their very own Iesou Christou and detonated by the lone Disciple with a Gospel to his name. Since he said, “let him hear what the spirit says to the churches,” so can you say, “Poof?”

Even the details are mashugana. There is no “overcoming” in our approach to God. The path is through the Miqra'ey and it requires nothing of us but a willingness to walk away from religion and a desire to walk to Yahowah on the route He has provided. Passage is free because the toll was paid in full. But there will be no manna or stones at the conclusion of this journey. They are the things of the wilderness which have been left behind.

Moreover, those who do not know Yahowah's name by this point, will never know it or Him.

Those errors notwithstanding, immediately thereafter we are confronted with the open letter from Gospel Jesus and Gospel John to "the church in Thyatira." They are not happy with it either. In fact, it's hard to imagine a more critical assessment, because after the last church was condemned for worshiping the Lord in Shitim, this one is condemned for being Jezebelian. And that means that the church was not only continuing to worship Satan as their Lord, but in addition, under Paul's tutelage, they were also venerating the goddess known as the Queen of Heaven, Mother of God, and Madonna and Child while employing hundreds of false prophets and priests. If we were to have a Top Ten Least Wanted list of appalling episodes among Israel's long history of religious meltdowns and rebellions, the demonic frenzy associated with Jezebel and the prophets of Ba'al and Asherah would be high on that list.

It is unfathomable that Gospel Jesus and Gospel John would collaborate to desecrate and demonize the Christian Church less than a decade after Sha'uwl conceived it. But that is what these words reveal...

"I have this against you, that you tolerate the woman Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess, and she teaches and leads My bond-servants astray so that they commit acts of immorality and eat things sacrificed to idols. I gave her time to repent, and she does not want to repent of her immorality. Behold, I will throw her on a bed of sickness, and those who commit adultery with her into great tribulation, unless they repent of her deeds. And I will kill her children with pestilence, and all the churches will know that I am He who searches the minds and hearts; and I will give to each one of you according to your deeds. But I say to you, the rest who are in Thyatira, who do not hold this teaching, who have not known the deep things of Satan, as they call them—I place no other burden on you."

(Revelation 2:20-24)

While insanely inaccurate, it is also overwhelmingly and irrevocably condemning of Christianity. Gospel John and Gospel Jesus are groping to find stories they can pilfer from the “Old Testament” to lash out at Sha’uwl, the Church, and New Testament for aligning themselves with Satan. This began with the announcement that Paul and pals were “evil men falsely referring to themselves as Apostles” in Ephesus. We were told that they “had fallen” and needed to “repent,” which is to admit that they were wrong.

In the next breath, we find Gospel Jesus and Gospel John condemning Paul’s preaching in Smyrna, calling it “troubling and impoverishing blasphemy.” They claimed that Sha’uwl, now Paul, was pretending to be Jewish when his fiery sermons became Satan’s synagogue. And as a result of this Satanic infiltration of the early church as a result of Paul’s demon possession, the Devil was going to cast the first Christians into prison.

Moving to Pergamum, the church to be rebuked, they were even more Satanic, with Satan dwelling among them and placing his throne inside the church. The first Christians were equated with the religious Jews living in Shitim who angered God by worshiping the Lord as if he were God. And while they got the story wrong, the inconsistencies were all designed to impugn Paul. The early Christian Church had become so overtly Satanic according to Gospel Jesus, if they didn’t do an about-face and boot Satan from their midst, he was going to immediately return to wipe them out.

And now we find ourselves in the midst of their rebuke of Thyatira, and Gospel Jesus and Gospel John are claiming that it is Jezebelian. And that means that the Christian Church was as demonic, religious, revolting, and damned as words can express. This is the one, two, three,

and four of Christendom.

While I have stated that religious Jews are total hypocrites when they claim that they are Towrah-observant since the Towrah is overtly condemning of religious Jews, now the same thing can be said of Christians. It is pure hypocrisy and an outright lie to claim that they are worshiping God when their god and his disciple say that they are worshiping Satan.

So why, since this is supposed to be the concluding book of the Christian New Testament are the two most essential characters in the Gospels, Jesus and John, continuing to cite the “Old Testament” to explain the mess they have left behind? Why are they damning what they have become? This is an apocalypse, the complete and utter destruction of Christianity at the hands of the instigators. You do not need me to tell you that this is wrong. Just read what they have to say about what they had become.

By stating that the Church had come to accept Jezebel, and that Christians had embraced the teachings of the single worst example of a political and religious woman in human history, this admission is beyond apocalyptic for believers. It is not just incriminating and damning, self-annihilating and suicidal to offer this catastrophic pronouncement, it is an irrevocable chastisement and deadly curse on the Christian church.

‘Iyzebel / Jezebel, meaning Where and Whence Bel is Exalted, was overtly political and religious and, therefore, epitomized “*babel* – being with the Lord of Babylon to confound and confuse by integrating religion and politics.” She was the arrogant and conspiring daughter of Ithobaal I of Tyre and married ‘Ach‘ab, the most pagan and immoral of Israelite kings. Together, they abandoned Yahowah and imposed the worship of the Lord Ba‘al and his consort, the Queen of Heaven and Mother of God, Asherah, the Blessed Virgin now venerated as the Madonna Mary. In the

process, they murdered their rivals, starting with those who spoke for God. And this religious soiree with Satan began just one hundred years removed from Dowd's reign over the united kingdom.

The revolting religiosity and deadly politics of Yisra'el under 'Ach'ab and 'Iyzebel became so horrific and appalling, 'Elyah | Yahowah is God, intervened. He began by explaining that the nation's misfortunes were a direct consequence of religiosity and governance of Ahab and Jezebel. And the great prophet and final witness was specific, delineating the crimes they were committing and their consequences.

The most relevant episode in Yisra'el's religiosity occurred when 'Elyah directly criticized Jezebel and Ahab and then summoned the 850 prophets of the Lord and Queen of Heaven, Jesus and Mary in Christian parlance, to a showdown on Mount Carmel. Spoiler Alert – the Lord and Mary performed poorly and were annihilated, as were their prophets. 'Ach'ab was killed in battle shortly thereafter. 'Ahab's son ascended to the throne only to die of an accidental death. He was succeeded by his brother, Jehoram, who was murdered by Jehu. And as he pursued 'Iyzebel in Jezreel, she dolled herself up with all of her finest makeup and jewels to taunt him but was instead tossed out of the window, where she was trampled and eaten by stray dogs.

While this summary of events is accurate, let's consider the damning religiosity and political malfeasance of 'Ach'ab and 'Iyzebel from Yahowah's perspective. And it is within the prophetic writings of *Melekym* / Kings that we learn that following the disastrous reigns of *Yarob'am* | Jeroboam I, Nadab, and Baasha, Yisra'el was polluted with religiosity. As corrupted by egocentric politics as could be imagined, God's wayward people fell from bad to worse, opening the gates of Hell. And this is not my opinion but, instead, God's assessment as presented in 1<sup>st</sup> Kings 16.

During this religious turmoil and political intrigue, Baasha killed Nadab. Then Zimri, a chariot commander, conspired to kill Baasha. After also murdering Baasha's sons, the Yisra'elites turned on Zimri, giving his army and kingship over to Omri. Yisra'el was setting the model Rome would follow.

Distraught over the Philistine victory at Tirzath, Zimri burned the Jezreelian palace to the ground with himself inside. And with Yisra'el fractured, Omri followed in his predecessors' evil religious ways, causing the people to worship all manner of false gods. It was in this cesspool that, upon Omri's death, Ahab, the reprobate's son, became king.

As He had with the litany of men who preceded Ahab, God announced 'Ach'ab's reign with... **“And 'Ach'ab did that which is evil in the sight of Yahowah – worse than all who were before him.”** (1 Kings 16:30) That's hard to imagine. Nevertheless, Yisra'el continued to be an exceptionally religious place...

**“And it came to be, as if it was a trivial thing to him, to walk in the offensive religiosity of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, such that he took 'Izezebel | Where Bel is Exalted because she Worships the Lord ('Izezebel – Alas, the Lord's Country Exalts and Worships Ba'al) to be his woman and wife, the daughter of 'Ethba'al | With the Lord Ba'al, king of Tsydowny | the Hunters. And they walked with and acted alongside, engaging on behalf of Ba'al | the Lord. They bowed down, prostrating themselves in worship to him.** (1 Kings 16:31)

**He erected an altar to Ba'al | the Lord in Beyth Ba'al | the House of the Lord, which he built in Shomarown | Samaria.** (1 Kings 16:32)

**Then 'Ach'ab | Father of the Brethren engaged with 'Asherah | the Canaanite Goddess of Fortuitous**

**Relationships. ‘Ach‘ab | Father of the Brethren did more to antagonize, anger, and provoke as well as grieve and trouble Yahowah, Almighty God of Yisra’el, than all of the kings of Yisra’el that came before him.”**  
(1 Kings 16:33)

As a result, when Gospel Jesus and Gospel John equated the birth of the Christian Church, the *ekklesia* that Sha’uwl / Paul had constituted with his *euangelion*, they condemned Christianity, equating it to the worst of the worst. They were saying that the Church was disgustingly religious and putridly political, especially depraved and demonic in its worship of the Lord and Queen of Heaven. And by making this comparison, Gospel Jesus and Gospel John damned Christianity and condemned the Church. This is as bad as bad ever gets.

‘*ELYah* | Yahowah is God spoke out against the corrupt religious leadership of Israel. With his words, he brought a drought upon the land. The Waters of Marybah would run dry.

All the while, Queen ‘*Izebel* | Worships the Lord was doing what the religious do best – silencing those who speak for Yahowah as a service to Satan. So, following the queen’s murderous spree, there was a showdown at the western end of the Jezreel Valley near Mount Carmel. The ensuing episode is the most entertaining and among the most revealing throughout the prophets.

The great debate between ‘*ELYah* | Elijah and the 850 prophets of the Lord | *ha Ba’al* and the Mother of God | ‘*Asherah* is presented in *Melekym* / 1 Kings 18. It reveals that Yahowah’s prophet was fully aware of the claims the Canaanites had made in favor of their gods. The Lord | *ha Ba’al*, as a storm god, was shown to be impotent by ‘*ELYah* when he couldn’t so much as ignite a fire beneath an altar. And ‘*Asherah*, as the Goddess of Fortuitous Relationships, was shown otherwise when the fortunes of her prophets



took a turn for the worse and they were killed. After Yahowah kindled the fire, and 'Elyah sought to embarrass the Prince of the Air further, it was Yahowah who caused it to rain, extinguishing the fire that *ha Ba'al* was unable to snuff out.

As the debate proceeds, we witness the oldest political trick in the book. Politicians project their flaws and vulnerabilities upon their opponents in the hope of confusing constituents and deflecting criticism away from themselves, all while muddying the waters and slandering their rivals.

**“And (wa) it came about (hayah), when (ky) ‘Ach‘ab** (*‘Ach‘ab* – Woeful Father and Father of the Brethren; a compound of *‘ach* – woe or brother and *‘ab* – father (king of *Yisra‘el* and husband of *Iyezebel* | Jezebel)) **saw (ra‘ah) ‘Elyah** (*‘Elyah* – Yahowah is God) **that (wa) ‘Ach‘ab | Woeful Father of the Brethren** (*‘Ach‘ab*) **said to him** (*‘amar ‘el huw’*), **‘Is this you (ha ‘atah zeh), you troubler** (*‘akar* – the source of hardship and anguish who distresses and oppresses, excommunicating the people) **of Yisra‘el** (*Yisra‘el* – Individuals who Strive and Struggle against God)?” (1 *Melekym* 18:17)

**And (wa) he answered** (*‘amar*), **‘It is not I who has troubled** (*lo’ ‘akar ‘eth* – I am not the source of hardship or anguish who distresses and oppresses, excommunicating the people of) **Yisra‘el** (*Yisra‘el*) **but you (ky ‘im ‘atah), and your father’s household** (*wa beyth ‘ab ‘atah*), **by (ba) neglecting, rejecting, and abandoning** (*‘azab ‘atah*) **the instructive conditions pursuant to the relationship with** (*‘eth mitswah*) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah*). **You have followed after** (*wa halak ‘achar*) **the Lords** (*ha Ba‘alym* – the ones who control and possess in the name and title of Satan, the god of Babylon and Canaan). (1 *Melekym* 18:18)

**So now (wa ‘atah), send for (shalach), assembling together (qabash) unto me** (*‘el ‘any*), **all (kol) Yisra‘el**

(*Yisra'el*) to (*'el*) **Har ha Karmel | the Mount of the Garden** (*Har ha Karmel*) **along with** (*'eth*) **the 450** (*'arba' me'ah wa chamesh*) **prophets** (*naby'* – those claiming to be messengers who can predict the future) **of Ba'al | the Lord** (*ha Ba'al* – the master and owner who possesses and controls, the name and title of Satan and the god of Canaan and Babylon) **and the 400** (*'arba me'ah*) **prophets** (*naby'*) **of the 'Asherah | Beneficial Relationships** (*ha 'Asherah* – the Queen of Heaven and Mother of God in the Babylonian and Canaanite religions, the basis of Easter, a pagan goddess associated with Venus; from *'ashar / 'asher* – to benefit by blessing and the basis of the Christian Mary as the Mother of God and Queen of Heaven) **who eat** (*'akal*) **at 'Iyzebel's | Worships and Exalts the Lord | Jezebel's** (*Iyzebel* – the Beast of Ba'al Dwells with Me because the Controlling Lord is Exalted; from *'ay* – alas, a howling beast, *zabal* – is honored and exalted while dwelling, and *Ba'al* – the Lord) **table** (*shulchan*).” (*Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:19*)

These relative numbers are actually far more favorable than Yahowah is accustomed to when it comes to differentiating Himself from false gods. Today, it is more like a million to one, with the religious overwhelmingly outnumbering Yahowah's witness. But then, again, the prophets were only part of this dire picture. Corrupted by their leaders, the Yisra'elites had become incurably religious, with the preponderance of the people favoring *Ba'al* | the Lord and his cohort, *'Asherah* | the goddess of Beneficial Relationships who was venerated as the Queen of Heaven. In today's parlance, King Ahab and Queen Jezebel were practicing Catholics.

When we compare Yahowah's testimony regarding 'Ach'ab and 'Iyzebel to what Gospel Jesus told Gospel John to write, we discover that they were neither well-informed nor accurate. If you recall, they began, **“I have this against you, that you tolerate the woman Jezebel, who**

calls herself a prophetess, and she teaches and leads My bond-servants astray so that they commit acts of immorality and eat things sacrificed to idols. I gave her time to repent, and she does not want to repent of her immorality.” Should the Christian intent have been to cite the story accurately then Jezebel would not have been cited apart from her husband, Ahab, whose murderous politics and repulsive religious edicts advancing Replacement Foolology by substituting the Lord Ba’al for Yahowah were far more offensive. While Jezebel was overtly political and religious, and while her religious preferences were surprisingly similar to Christianity, she hired a full cadre of prophets and was not herself a prophetess. Yahowah does not have “bond-servants” because He is a liberator. At the time, there were a number of men and women who knew and respected Him, including ‘Elyah, but they were never led astray. They did not commit immorality or eat things sacrificed to idols. Jezebel was not given anything by “I” if I was supposed to be God. Repenting is a religious concept, one never articulated by Yahowah. And rather than providing her with more time, God intervened with ‘Elyah to curtail the lives and religiosity of Jezebel and Ahab. Therefore, Gospel Jesus got all of this wrong, which is unbecoming for someone pretending to be God.

The harbinger of the impending demise of Pauline Christianity was foretold in these words...

**“And (wa) ‘Ach’ab (‘Ach’ab – Woeful Father or Father’s Brother) reached out (shalach) to all of the children of Yisra’el (ba kol ben Yisra’el) and assembled (wa qabash – gathered together) the prophets (‘eth ha naby’) on the Mount of Karmel | the Garden (‘el Har ha Karmel – mountain, hill, or range of the vineyard, orchard, or grain). (Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:20) Then (wa) ‘Elyah (‘Elyah – Yahowah is God) approached and presented himself (nagash – drew near) to all of the**

people (*'el kol ha 'am*).

**He said** (*wa 'amar*), **'For how much longer** (*'ad matay* – until when) **will you waver and vacillate** (*'atah pasah* – will you continue to pass by and dance about the issue of Passover, becoming mentally unstable by failing to confront it, bouncing between such things, incapacitated and unable to commit) **over** (*'al* – among) **the two** (*shanaym*) **opposing views** (*sai'phym* – different perspectives, variant thoughts, contradictory conclusions, conflicting opinions, and irreconcilable divisions; from *sa'aph* – to cut off the ambivalent, lopping off half-hearted branches)? **If** (*'im*) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of YaHoWaH based upon His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **is God, Almighty** (*ha 'elohym* – the God), **choose to walk after Him** (*halak 'achar huw'* – you should want to go to and follow after Him, choosing to conduct your life thereafter as He would (qal imperative)). **But if** (*wa 'im*) **ha Ba'al | the Lord** (*ha Ba'al* – the Master who Owns and Possesses), **make the choice to follow after him** (*halak 'achar huw'* – you should want to go to him and behave like him, choosing to conduct your life thereafter as he would (qal imperative)). **'But** (*wa*) **the people** (*ha 'am*) **did not respond to him** (*lo' 'anah 'eth huw'* – did not answer him) **with a word** (*dabar* – with any statement).” (*Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:21*)

Stupid is hard to resolve, and neigh on impossible when Stupid is religious. Even when confronted by one of God’s most articulate and brilliant prophets, every Jew was dumbfounded. And that is Satan’s greatest victory, the reason he is the author and advocate of religion. And while Christianity and Islam may be worse, this is the intent and consequence of Judaism.

It should be noted that as a noun, *Pesach* is Passover. As a verb, it can be either “to pass over” or “to waver and vacillate, failing to confront the issues.” This is the same

dichotomy we witness between *yare*’, meaning revere or fear, and *‘anah*, meaning respond or afflict, further demonstrating that our choices determine our fate.

This is the most life-altering and cathartic proposition any of us will ever encounter. With the referendum between God and the Lord, Yahowah or Satan, it is stunning, gut-wrenching, and essentially unfathomable to realize that most people cannot or will not distinguish between them. For most, the Lord is God. They unwittingly worship Satan and irrationally view Yahowah as their adversary.

And yet, according to ‘Elyah, the prophet whose very name declares that Yahowah is God, there wasn’t a single person who could correctly distinguish between the Lord and God. That is breathtaking. And this sorry state of religious affairs remained true until twenty-two years ago and is only marginally different today as a result of *Yada Yahowah*.

Considering for a moment that ‘Elyah was Yahowah’s Divinely inspired and authorized prophet and that he was speaking directly to the Children of Yisra’el regarding the life-and-death choice of walking to the one and only God or following after the Adversarial Lord, and he didn’t get so much as a single person to respond, after a score of years translating and sharing what Yahowah revealed through His prophets, this flawed implement and co-witness, is pleased so many have recently responded.

The fact is, the way to death and destruction is broad, and many follow it. The way to life is narrow, and few find it.” Christianity, Islam, and Judaism are wrong for many reasons, not the least of which is that they are popular – as is the Lord.

The most incredulous part of this lingering conundrum is how much more rational and rewarding one option is over the other. Yahowah has proven through prophecy that

He is God and has demonstrated that He can be trusted. The Lord has demonstrated that he isn't God and that he cannot be trusted. This comparison becomes ever more obvious as we compare the Towrah wa Naby' to the New Testament, Talmud, and Quran. It is gleaming diamonds versus worthless coal.

Yahowah is offering to perfect our souls, make us immortal, adopt us into His Family, raise us as His children, enrich our lives, enlighten our minds, and empower our souls while liberating us to explore the universe. Satan would deny the faithful all of that, beguiling them into being fettered with him in the eternal darkness of She'owl. Yahowah has Moseh, Dowd, and 'Elyah speaking for Him, while Satan deploys the likes of Paul, Akiba, and Muhammad. It is the Towrah, Prophets, and Psalms versus the New Testament, Talmud, and Quran. It is brilliant vs. stupid, right vs. wrong, life vs. death, and the truth vs. a bevy of lies. Even Gospel Jesus and his cohorts, Gospel John and Gospel Peter can't tell the truth, and with Sha'awl / Paul, it is Satan who is elevated to God.

The choice is yours. But stop vacillating between these two wholly contradictory and irreconcilable options. If the Lord is your god, goodbye and good riddance.

If I may take a few remaining swipes at this: since Yahowah has proven through prophecy that He is God and that we can, therefore, trust His *Towrah, Naby', wa Mizmowr*, why do most people ignore, reject, or worse, oppose His testimony? It is worse than being ignorant and irrational; it is insane. And when the options include the kind of erroneous drivel we have read in the New Testament, why would anyone in their right mind choose it over Yahowah's testimony?

And speaking of ignorance, how is it that Christians have failed to accept the obvious realization that the

Canaanite / Phoenician religion of the Lord and Queen of Heaven is so similar to their own? How have they missed the fact that their faith reflects Satan's ultimate ambition? The Son of God, who is actually called "the Lord," is worshiped as the Savior for having conquered death through his own demise and resurrection and for having risen above his father, who is actually called, "God." And for the over two billion Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christians, the Canaanite / Phoenician religion of Ahab and Jezebel comes ready-made with the Queen of Heaven and Mother of God, Sunday Worship, a paid clergy, and even the forerunners of Christmas and Easter. Are you blind?

How is it that Christians have failed to recognize that what they call the "Old Testament" and their "New Testament" are not only contradictory, they are irreconcilable? This errant summation of Jezebel by Gospel Jesus and Gospel John is one of a thousand proofs that no one should trust them. And to think, it comes in the midst of a tirade, one in which the emerging Christian Church was called Satanic.

How is it that they continue to vacillate between these opposing views, remaining crippled by having danced between conflicting perspectives, unswayed by their contradictory conclusions? How is it that Christians, Muslims, and religious Jews have failed to make the obvious connection between the Lord and Satan when Yahowah is abundantly clear? Even here, this confrontation is between 'Elyah as Yahowah's representative and those who speak for the Lord and the Queen of Heaven. They are on opposite sides and are in opposition to one another. Yahowah cannot be the Lord. The Lord is adversarial to Yahowah. And that means that the Lord is "*ha Satan* – the Adversary." Wake up and smell the logic.

It is with sadness that I press on, knowing just how frustrated Yahowah must be that His creation would rather

worship Satan than get to know Him. And yet, like ‘Elyah in Yisra’el around 850 BCE, if I do not speak for Yahowah, who will?

**“Then** (*wa*) **‘Elyah** (*‘Elyah* – Yahowah is God) **said** (*‘amar* – declared and mentioned, responding (qal imperfect)) **to the people** (*‘el ha ‘am*), **‘I am the only remaining** (*‘any yathar* – I am what is left, the lone surviving (nifal perfect – for a certain period of time I am acting as and enjoying the benefits of being the lone remaining)) **prophet of** (*naby’* – man speaking for who can correctly convey the future according to) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of YaHoWaH as *‘elowah* – God instructed in His *Towrah* – Guidance regarding His *hayah* – existence).

**I am the only one** (*la bad ‘any* – approaching concerning this, I am alone, by myself, and yet part of a branch, serving as a limb, part of the body, and member of the set-apart association).

**But** (*wa*) **the prophets** (*naby’* – those who claim to speak through divine inspiration) **of the Lord** (*ha Ba ‘al* – of the Master who seeks to own and possess (singular)) **are 450** (*‘arba’ me ‘ah wa chamesh*) **individuals** (*‘ysh* – people and men).” (*Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:22*)

At least there was one. By all rights, Yahowah would have been justified in giving up on the rest. The same is true today. And while I am sure that Yahowah’s preference is to do away with all who are as overtly political and religious as were Ahab and Jezebel, He has asked me, indeed, empowered, equipped, and enabled me, to awaken a final remnant of His people so that everything He created isn’t ruined by religion and politics but is, instead, saved from them.

Today, as you should be well aware, there is no authorized and inspired prophet speaking for Yahowah. There has not been one for the past two thousand five



hundred years. But at least there is a Witness and soon there will be two with the return of 'Elyah.

As Dowd's Herald, I was called to translate and contemplate the words Yahowah conveyed through the likes of Moseh, Shamuw'el, Dowd, Howsha', Yasha'yah, Yirma'yah, Chabaquwq, Yow'el, Zakaryah, and Mal'aky, sharing what I have learned along the way. And yet, that is sufficient since Yahowah revealed more than we need to know to find our way back Home.

So that no one is confused, the fact that *ha Ba'al* means "the Lord" is readily affirmed and irrefutable. There is no question whatsoever that the Lord is neither God nor good, neither real nor right. Further, there is no debate over the realization that the prophets of the Lord were leading a popular, albeit counterproductive, religious cult. This was a referendum between the Lord and Yahowah, making the Lord the adversary of God. These facts alone, at least among those who are informed and rational, are sufficient to disavow Christianity, Judaism, and Islam because the scriptures of each present the Lord as God when the opposite is true.

Further, there are only three ways that the god of Babylon, Canaan, and Phoenicia became known as the Lord. First, there is the possibility that pagans ascribed this name to their god because they saw the sun as lording over them. If so, by continuing to use this title, a petitioner is inferring that the pagan deity was real. A person might as well call their god Ba'al, Amen Rah, Adonis, Jupiter, Dionysus, Apollo, or Zeus, or even Jesus or Allah. They are all the same.

Second, Satan may have chosen this title for himself because it serves his interests. It replaces the "*ha Satan* – the Adversary" title he is trying to dismiss while positioning himself to be worshiped as if he were God. But if so, a prayer to the Lord is a plea to Satan.

Third, Yahowah may have been responsible for attributing this title and name to the Adversary. He could have done so because it reveals Satan's ambition, which is to rule over men and to be seen as their master. It may have been designed to differentiate the Adversary's ambition from His own as Father. But no matter which of these is true, the Lord is a false god and overt adversary.

With his next statement, 'Elyah is establishing the guidelines to resolve the debate between the Lord and God, between Satan and Yahowah, between fake and real. It begins with bulls, one of the Lord's favorite guises. It speaks of cutting because this is a referendum on being cut in or out of the Covenant relationship. There is wood, but no fire, because the timbers represent the doorway to life which is for naught without light.

The propensity for almost every Bible translation to replace Yahowah's name with "the LORD" in the midst of this debate between "*ha Ba'al* – the Lord" and "אֱלֹהֵינוּ – Yahowah" makes me nauseous and, indeed, infuriated. How dare they?

**“So (*wa*) let them present to us (*nathan la 'anachnuw* – let them choose of their own volition to give to us (qal imperfect jussive – this offering is an expression of third-person volition with genuine and ongoing implications)) two (*shanyam*) bulls (*par* – a typically uncastrated adolescent to fully-mature male oxen or bullock; from *parar* – to be broken, frustrated, and ineffectual, in violation of the agreement and thus split away).**

**And then (*wa*) let them choose (*bachar* – let them select) one (*ha 'echad*) bull (*par* – uncastrated adolescent or fully-mature male oxen or bullock; from *parar* – to be broken, frustrated, and ineffectual, in violation of the agreement and thus split away) **for themselves (*la hem*).****

**Cut it into pieces (*wa nathach huw'* – slice it into**

segments, dividing it) **and lay them on some wood** (*wa sym 'al ha 'ets* – placing them upon the timbers), **but without setting the fire** (*wa 'esh lo' sym* – but the fire not causing or bringing about).

**Then** (*wa*) **I will act upon** (*'any 'asah 'eth* – I will prepare and work on, engaging with) **the other bull** (*ha par ha 'echad*), **placing it** (*wa nathan* – giving it and bestowing it) **upon the wood** (*'al ha 'ets* – on the timbers), **also without setting the fire** (*wa 'esh lo' sym* – but the fire not bringing about).” (*Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:23*)

The bull was chosen by the religious establishments in Babylon, Assyria, Egypt, and Canaan for the same reason. Almost every religion, including Christianity, bestows astronomical attributes to their gods – and most were based in astrology. The sun, representing god, crosses the Constellation of Taurus the Bull during the Vernal Equinox. Then the sun is said to impregnate the Mother of God so that nine months later, during the Winter Solstice, she can give birth to the Son of God. As the sun rises higher in the sky and the days grow longer than nights, the annual celebration of the resurrection of the Son of God on the Sunday closest to when the Sun crosses Taurus is symbolic of the earth coming back to life and crops rising.

There is yet another possibility for the bull, in that it is not a lamb. The titles “𐤅𐤁 – God” and “𐤅𐤁 – Father” both begin with the Aleph, drawn in a triangular fashion to depict a ram’s head: 𐤁. Satan, in competition with Yahowah, and as a Lord rather than a Father or Shepherd, chose a larger, more powerful, and imposing animal – one which is not nearly as curious, smart, or interactive. Walk into the children’s area of a petting zoo sometime and consider the presence of lambs and the absence of bulls.

With lightning bolts in hand, igniting the fire should have been child’s play for the Lord. But if the god of lightning could not so much as cause a spark, he was a dud.

“**You call upon the name** (*wa qara’ ba shem* – then you issue a summons in the name) **of your gods** (*‘elohym ‘atem*), **and** (*wa*) **I** (*‘any*) **will invite, calling upon the name** (*qara’ ba shem* – will summon and call out, reading and reciting in the name) **of Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – based upon *‘elowah’s* – God’s *towrah* – guidance on His *hayah* – existence). **Then** (*wa*) **let it be** (*hayah* – let it come to exist and be known (qal perfect consecutive)) **that the God** (*ha ‘elohym*) **who** (*‘asher* – who to show the way to the benefits of the relationship and to reveal the correct and restrictive path to life) **answers, responding** (*‘anah* – replies, making a declaration) **with fire** (*ba ‘ets*), **He** (*huw’*) **is God** (*ha ‘elohym* – is the Almighty).’

**And all the people** (*wa kol ha ‘am*) **replied** (*‘anah* – answered by responding), **‘This statement and resolution** (*ha dabar* – this accounting, treatise, and systematic approach, these words and this message) **is appropriately** (*wa towb* – is good, favorable, generous, and beneficial, pleasing and reasonable) **stated** (*‘amar* – presented and conveyed).’” (*Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:24*)

The pagan Yisra’elites were, of course, pleased with these conditions. This test played to their god’s attributes. The religious of the time not only associated lightning and thunder with their gods, but they also deified fire, water, earth, and air. It was like playing poker and spotting your opponent four of a kind knowing that you would be dealt a royal flush.

As is His nature, Yahowah teased these prophetic parasites with *qara’* because this was also a referendum on the *Miqra’ey* vs. the pagan holidays. *Qara’* lets us know that we can “invite” God into our lives and enjoy a relationship with Him or be “summoned” before Him during a trial. We can “read and recite” His Word or listen to the rantings of the religious buffoons. We can be “called out” and “meet” with God, “welcomed” into His Home and Family, or we can remain outcasts with the rest of

humankind.

Sometimes, especially among people who are not good listeners and who are prone to making ridiculous excuses, repetition is required.

**“And (wa) ‘Elyah** (*‘Elyah* – Yahowah is God) **said** (*‘amar* – declared and mentioned, responding (qal imperfect)) **to** (*‘el*) **the prophets** (*naby*’ – those who claim to speak through divine inspiration) **of the Lord** (*ha Ba’al* – of the Master who seeks to own and possess (singular)), **‘Examine and choose** (*bachar* – test and select, probe and accept (qal imperative)) **for yourselves** (*la ‘atem*) **one** (*ha ‘echad*) **bull** (*par* – uncastrated adolescent or fully-mature male oxen or bullock; from *parar* – to be broken, frustrated, and ineffectual, in violation of the agreement and thus split away) **and act upon it first** (*wa ‘asah ri’shown* – and engage, doing your thing, preparing it first), **for you are many** (*ky ‘atem ha rab* – because you are more numerous).

**Then call upon the name** (*wa qara’ ba shem* – summon the reputation and renown) **of your gods** (*‘elohym ‘atem*), **but without setting the fire** (*wa ‘esh lo’sym* – but the fire not bringing about).” (*Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:25*)

It is interesting that God is so patient. He waited, allowing the Lord and his multitude of prophets to go first, probing and choosing the best bull and the most auspicious pile of wood. The Lord and his clerics would be given an opportunity to perform a simple act, doing something any man could do – light a fire.

The reason I mention the Lord’s inability to kindle a fire is that most people give Satan as the Adversary, or in the guise of HaShem, G-d, the Lord Jesus Christ, or Allah, far too much credit. He’s a pathetic, self-absorbed, braggadocious liar and show-off, but nothing more. This was probably the largest gathering of his prophets in

human history up to this point in time, and he didn't even show up.

Satan can only be in one place at a time; he cannot do anything Yahowah has forbidden, and he only knows what he has previously witnessed or heard. He is just one of countless spiritual implements Yahowah created and is hopelessly outnumbered and overpowered. *Allahu Akbar* my ass (pun intended).

**“And they grasped hold of** (*laqach* – obtained and accepted, leading away) **the bull** (*'eth ha par* – male oxen or bullock; from *parar* – to be broken, frustrated, and ineffectual, in violation of the agreement and thus split away) **that they had produced for their benefit** (*'asher nathan la hem* – which they had offered for their advantage and given to show their way) **and prepared it** (*wa 'asah* – engage and acted upon it).

**Then they called upon the name** (*wa qara' ba shem* – and they called out in the name, summoning the reputation) **of the Lord** (*ha Ba'al* – of the Master who seeks to own and possess (singular)) **from the morning** (*min ha boqer* – from the dawn and rising sun), **(wa) up until midday when the sun is at its highest and brightest during the day** (*'ad ha tsoharym* – as far as and up to noon), **saying** (*la 'amar* – commanding and hoping to be obeyed, pleading and declaring), **‘O Lord** (*ha Ba'al* – Master), **answer us** (*'anah 'anachnuw* – respond to us, reply to us and provide some evidence, lift up your voice and speak!)

**But** (*wa*) **there was no voice** (*wa 'ayn qowl* – there wasn't a sound), **and no one answered** (*wa 'ayn 'anah* – no one responded).

**So** (*wa*) **they vacillated and wavered, dancing about** (*pasah* – crippled over their failure to confront Passover, becoming mentally unstable by improperly engaging, bouncing between and incapacitated) **over** (*'al* –

concerning the Almighty) **the altar** (*ha mizbeach* – platform for placing gifts or sacrifices to a deity) **which they had made** (*‘asher ‘asah* – which to show the benefits of their way they had acted upon).” (*Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:26*)

I cannot help but think of evangelical and Pentecostal Christians swinging their arms in the air and laying hands on one another while beseeching their god to do something for them. Having witnessed it, it always gave me the creeps.

Once again, God is toying with the Lord’s ministers. Their “*qara*’ – summons” began as their god was rising in the sky, his dim light emerging from the darkness. And it continued until the sun was at its zenith, its highest and brightest point of the day. But 93 million miles away, the big ball, fusing 620 million metric tons of hydrogen per second and 333,000 times the mass of the Earth, was neither God nor capable of igniting a fire.

But can you imagine the sense of futility? It takes about five seconds to say, “O Lord, answer us.” Repeated twelve times a minute and 720 times an hour, they would have petitioned the sun 4,320 times without so much as a spark. But then compare that to 15,000,000 priests, rabbis, pastors, and then imams in 6,000,000 synagogues, churches, and later mosques, petitioning their god in prayer for 1,213,726 days (from 1300 BCE to 2024 CE) without an answer. And yet, they continue to pray to their Lord. So, I am reminded of the definition of insanity, which is doing the same thing over and over again expecting a different result.

Among the many things I continue to find incredulous about the religious is that they never admit defeat, no matter how obvious it is that their beliefs are invalid. The fact that their god never answers their prayers does not stop them from praying to him. The fact that their religion is

based upon the cults God has impugned does not faze them. The fact that their scriptures contain thousands of invalid claims, outright lies, half-truths, logical fallacies, and contradictions is lost on them.

Set up a test to prove that they are wrong, and are thus wasting their lives and souls, and, like an irritating mosquito that has been brushed away, they will move on as if nothing has happened and bite in another place. There is no reasoning with them. Neither God nor His Word resonates. And, in fact, both irritate believers.

The most ironic thing about religion is that its proponents claim to speak for God when they all rail against Him. They all claim to lead to God when they all lead away from Him. They all claim the ability to save when none has ever saved anyone.

**“And it came to be** (*wa hayah* – so then it came to pass) **at midday, when the sun was at its highest and brightest point** (*ba ha tsoharym* – as far as and up to noon), **that** (*wa*) **‘Elyah** (*‘Elyah* – Yahowah is God) **mocked and taunted them, pointing out the irony to them** (*hathal ba hem* – ridiculed them, scorning and deriding them, openly showing his contempt for them while playing with them and laughing at them (piel imperfect – whereby the object, those praying to the Lord, came to continually embody the irony and ridicule)), **saying** (*‘amar*), **‘Call out** (*qara*’ – summon) **in a loud voice** (*ba qowl gadowl* – with a great many important voices) **for** (*ky*) **god** (*‘elohym*) **because he** (*huw’ ky*) **is meditating** (*syach* – is preoccupied with his devotional, pondering a frivolous conversation, and complaining about something senseless), **or perhaps** (*wa ky*), **he is having a bowel movement and is relieving himself** (*syg la huw’* – he has withdrawn to defecate in private and pee), **or rather** (*wa ky*), **he is out on a walk** (*darak la huw’* – he is shooting his arrows as he travels down the road, displaying his vigor and might).



**Maybe** (*uwlay* – what if) **he is sleeping** (*yashen huw'* – he is old and asleep, even chronically comatose) **and he must be awakened** (*wa yaqats* – so he needs to be roused from his stupor).” (*Melekym* / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:27)

Now that is funny. It is snarky and sarcastic. I rather enjoy ‘Elyah’s sense of humor, but I don’t suppose the Canaanites would agree.

Just as I am certain that Jesus Christ didn’t exist and was not God, that Paul was a false prophet, that the New Testament is unreliable, and the Christian religion is invalid, ‘Elyah realized that Ba’al wasn’t God and that the Canaanite / Phoenician religion was deplorable, so he did what Yahowah wanted – he mocked them. But more than laughing in their faces and taunting these reprehensible clerics, he pointed out the irony, sarcastically that it was noon, and their god was now at his most powerful, highest, and brightest point, but all his devotees were getting from him was a sunburn.

Sarcasm is intellectual humor, also known as satire or cynicism. It points out the irony in things and disparages them by making comparisons.

This narrative proves a number of things I’ve been harping on for years. There is nothing wrong with mocking religious advocates and clerics. In fact, it’s the most appropriate response. That is what ‘Elyah did, and there is no disputing that the Spirit of Yahowah was on him, that he was inspired by God, or that Yah cherished His relationship with this man to such a degree that, rather than have him continue to endure the religious, political, and militaristic malfeasance of his people and their foes, God was calling him Home.

The religious seldom refute criticisms of their faith with evidence or reason but instead dismiss critics by inferring that it is inappropriate and impolite, even unGodly, to criticize the underpinnings of their faith. They

go so far as to claim that an individual attacking their religion is influenced by Satan.

Based upon this account, and so many others, however, the opposite is true. They deserve to be taunted and ridiculed. It is Godly to show one's contempt, utter disdain, and complete disrespect for what they have done and said. In their positions of power and influence over people, they have misled them. Pretending to lead them to God and save their souls, they have done just the opposite. Religious advocates are reprehensible.

Also relevant, 'Elyah was the right man to do this job because he not only knew and loved Yahowah, he understood and despised religion. Yes, Yahowah inspired him, enlightening and empowering him, but it's evident from the way this test was structured that 'Elyah knew just how to embarrass the Yisra'elites who were worshipping the Lord. He was an expert in the Canaanite / Phoenician religion. That is one of many attributes that made him the perfect man for this job. It is expressly why Yahowah is sending him back during the Time of Ya'aqob's Troubles. Who better to mock the religious, to point out the irony of their faith, than the man who proved he could do so?

And that means that the Christians and Muslims who survive deep into this fateful time will find 'Elyah, and especially the second witness who will accompany him, distasteful. Yada, as the second witness who speaks for God will be resolutely opposed to man's religions – and he will laugh at them with God's support and blessing.

I tend to suffer religious edicts and religious fools poorly – particularly the far right and far left, the Conspirators and Progressives, Christians and Muslims. I will toy with those who call into my radio programs to irrationally defend their religion, often pointing out the ironic nature of their claims. And while I was once concerned that doing so might be needlessly inflammatory,

now we know otherwise.

We should all endeavor to be like ‘Elyah. Yahowah’s prophet mocked 850 religious clerics in front of their following, suggesting that their god was either out meditating as part of his devotional, had been out taking a nap, or, best of all, was having a bowel movement. God has a sense of humor – and so should we.

Throughout *Yada Yahowah*, I have striven to understand and explain the connections between religion and death, between plagues and Paul, between Paul and Christianity, between Christianity and the Whore, between the Whore and Satan, between Satan and Babel, and between Babel and the Bible, even between the Lord and the Adversary. And as a result, this adventure with ‘Elyah has been especially rewarding.

You will note that, just as is the case today with Christians, the Lord’s ministers were either unwilling or unable to accept the fact that their religion was as worthless as their gods. Rather than shut up and listen to Yahowah’s “*qara*’ – invitation,” they continued to jibber jabber to the sky. It reminds me of the foolishness of Paul’s “Pray without ceasing.” When we flap our lips and wag our tongues, we are not listening to Yah.

**“They called out** (*wa qara*’ – so they continued to summon (qal imperfect)) **with a great many loud and important voices** (*ba qowl gadawl*), **and cut themselves with their blades** (*wa gadad* – they banded together and sliced themselves as part of their worship (hitpaal imperfect – they acted upon their own initiative and made a habit of cutting themselves with sharp objects)) **as was their way of resolving disputes** (*ka mishpat hem* – consistent with their prescription and practice), **using swords and lances** (*ba chereb wa ba ha romach* – with double-edged swords and spears) **until blood gushed out** (*‘ad shaphak dam* – while blood poured out) **upon them**

(‘*al hem* – over them).” (*Melekym* / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:28)

Rather than accept Yahowah’s terms and cut themselves into the Covenant, they cut themselves out of it, lacerating their bodies in the process. And they were not alone. Self-inflicted wounds have long been part of religion. Christians did it throughout the Middle Ages, from 400 to 1600 CE, and some continue to do so today, carrying crosses during Easter.

Shi’ite Muslims whip themselves during the celebration of ‘Asherah Day – in honor of the Queen of Heaven and Mother of God. Even Rabbinic Jews afflict themselves each year during Yom Kippur. It is hard to fathom why the faithful would want to spend an eternity with a god who enjoys watching his devotees hurt themselves.

Rather than celebrate that Yahowah’s beloved Son volunteered to serve as the *Zarowa*’ | Sacrificial Lamb, with Dowd shedding His blood so that we might live, they shed their own. This is akin to bowing down when Yahowah tries to lift us up. It is like Paul, who claimed to have suffered so as to complete the insufficient sacrifice of his god.

Having debated countless religious individuals, I have come to realize that no matter how many times you prove them wrong, instead of listening, they turn the page and cite another inane verse from their twisted scriptures. That is what occurred on this day as well.

**“It came to be** (*wa hayah* – it came to exist) **as** (*ka*) **the sun passed by its highest and brightest point** (‘*abar ha tsoharym* – the sun crossed its zenith and it was past noon), **they prophesized** (*naby*’ – they claimed to speak on behalf of their god, predicting what would soon occur) **until the time** (‘*ad la*) **to lift up** (‘*alah* – to offer up) **the sacrifice** (*ha minchah* – the obligatory tribute in submission), **but** (*wa*) **there was no voice** (‘*ayn qowl* – not

a sound), **no answer** (*'ayn 'anah* – no response or reply), **and (wa) no one paying attention** (*'ayn qesheb* – no one alert, listening, or responsive).” (*Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:29*)

“And no one was paying attention.” That, indeed, is the blight of religion and politics. And it has never been worse than it is today. The putrid voices of the many drown out the lone voice speaking on behalf of God. Predicting a dark and dire fate for the few who are willing to convey Yahowah’s words, they fail to consider what He has already done. There is no answer that will prevail with such deluded individuals. And the irony of this is that they actually believe that the Lord they are speaking for and serving is God, when in truth, they are worshiping Satan. And please, don’t lose sight of the fact that it was the King and Queen, the political leadership of the nation of Israel, who were funding and advocating religious rebellion against God.

This should have been the death knell of religion, at least for those who stopped praying to the Lord and listened to God. But the religious and political never acknowledge that they are wrong.

“**Elyah** (*wa 'Elyah* – Yahowah is God) **said** (*'amar* – declared) **to all the people** (*la kol ha 'am*), **‘Move toward me, drawing near** (*nagash 'el 'any* – come to me).’

**All the people** (*wa kol ha 'am*) **approached him** (*nagash 'el huw'*). **Then he repaired** (*rapha'* – he restored) **the altar** (*mizbeach* – place for offering sacrifices representing the mount where the Pesach 'Ayl was sacrificed; from *zebach* and *zabal* – an offering on behalf of an honorable dwelling place) **to Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – an accurate transliteration of the name YaHoWaH, our *'elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence and our *shalowm* – reconciliation) **which had been previously destroyed and**

**lay in ruins** (*ha haras* – that had been torn down).  
(*Melekym* / 1 Kings 18:30)

**And** (*wa*) **‘Elyah** (*wa ‘Elyah* – Yahowah is God) **took** (*laqach* – obtained and grasp hold of) **twelve stones** (*shanaym ‘esreh ‘eben*) **according to** (*ka* – similar to and in the manner of, representing) **the number of tribes** (*mispar* – the written record and accounting of subdivisions based upon related family groups) **of the children of Ya’aqob** (*beny Ya’aqob* – the descendants comprising *Yisra’el*), **because it was unto them that** (*‘asher ‘el huw’* – to whom to show the way to the benefits of the relationship) **the Word** (*dabar* – the statements and communication) **of Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of YaHoWaH as *‘elowah* – God instructed in His *Towrah* – Guidance regarding His *hayah* – existence) **had come to exist** (*hayah* – exists and came to be (qal perfect)). **He declared** (*la ‘amar* – to affirm, expressing in words), **‘Yisra’el** (*Yisra’el* – Individuals who Strive and Contend or Engage and Endure with God) **is your name** (*hayah shem ‘atah* – will serve to convey your proper designation and reputation (qal imperfect)).”  
(*Melekym* / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:31)

The fact that it was twelve stones, not ten, reveals that this referendum was for all *Yisra’el*, including *Yahuwdah*. And stones were chosen to represent the twelve tribes for one of two reasons: to demonstrate that Yah’s commitment to His people was rock solid or to infer that they were now dumb as stones – and no more responsive.

When Christians and Muslims dismiss *Yisra’el* with disdain, believing that they are somehow superior, they obviously have missed the point. Everything Yahowah revealed to humankind has been conveyed through *Yisra’el*ites. Without them, God is unknowable. Without the promises He made to them, God would be unapproachable.

Yahowah gave His people a name that would correctly represent the best and worst in them. *Yisra'el* is a compound of 'ysh – individual, *sarah* – who either strives and struggles or engages and endures, with 'el – God.

**“When it came to be the time for the offering to rise (*hayah ba 'alah minchah*), the Prophet (*ha naby'* – the one who is inspired to speak for God) ‘Elyah (*'Elyah* – Yahowah is God) **approached** (*nagash* – came near), and **said** (*wa 'amar* – declared), ‘Yahowah (*Yahowah* – based upon '*elowah*'s – God's *towrah* – guidance on His *hayah* – existence), **God** (*'elohym*) of ‘Abraham (*'Abraham* – Merciful and Enriching Father) and **Yitschaq** (*Yitschaq* – Laughter and Play), **this day** (*wa ha yowm*) **let it be known** (*yada'* – let everyone choose to acknowledge and accept, become aware of and understand (nifal imperfect jussive – the subject provides the means to understanding and receives the benefit as an expression of volition in the third person with unfolding implications throughout time)) **to Yisra'el** (*Yisra'el* – to the Individuals who Engage and Endure with God) **that You are Almighty God** (*ky 'atah 'elohym*) **in Yisra'el and with Individuals who Engage and Endure with God** (*ba Yisra'el*), **and that I am Your associate and coworker** (*'any 'ebed 'atah* – I am your helper, implement, and willing servant; from '*abad* – to work, expending considerable energy and intensity to accomplish a task). **In accordance with Your Word** (*wa ba dabar 'atah* – so then in and with Your Word), **I have engaged and made all of these statements** (*'asah 'eth kol ha dabarym ha 'eleh* – I have acted and accomplished all of this, conveying all of these words).” (*Melekym* / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:36)**

Everything 'Elyah has said and done is in full accord with the Word of Yahowah. He spoke and acted in accord with everything he came to know and understand. That is the most that can be asked of any of us.

By comparison, the Lord, as the Serpent in the Garden,

took snippets of Yahowah's words out of context and then embellished them, changing the original intent. By so doing, he beguiled and confused Chawah. This would be the same strategy Satan would use with his Apostle Sha'uwl / Paul, and then again with his Messenger, Muhammad.

It should be readily apparent, but if not, while I have done my utmost to prepare complete and accurate translations of Yahowah's Word, always presenting what God had to say in context, I am incapable of performing to 'Elyah's standard, which is to be in full accord. It is why I encourage you, and everyone who reads these books, to verify the meaning of God's words for yourself.

When we listen to Yahowah, when we come to know Him and accept what He is offering, He responds to us. In fact, by listening to God, every important question we could ever ask is answered. We do not need Yahowah to kindle a fire or to burn brightly before us. Instead, we should come to know Him and then radiate His light as a result of observing and then contemplating His testimony.

God reveals who He is, shares what He is offering, and clearly conveys what He expects in return. He also admonishes us, warning us about what is not in our interests. Therefore, while we can appreciate why it was important for 'Elyah to request this of God, and thereby impress upon Yisra'el that Yahowah is God and that the Lord is not, since he did so, we ought not have to.

**“Please choose to reply to me** (*'anah 'any* – of Your own volition and because it is what You want, respond by testifying, offering evidence (qal imperative)), **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – based upon *'elowah's* – God's *towrah* – guidance on His *hayah* – existence), **choosing to answer me** (*'anah 'any* – electing to make a declaration, shouting out, vocally communicating to me (qal imperative)) **so that this people** (*wa ha 'am* – so that this family of related



individuals) **may come to know** (*yada'* – may choose to observe, accept, acknowledge, understand, and reveal (qal imperfect jussive – genuinely and literally, consistently and habitually as a matter of choice come to know and accept)) **that indeed, You** (*ky 'atah* – that surely and truly, You), **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – an accurate transliteration of the name YaHoWaH, our '*elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence and our *shalown* – reconciliation), **are God Almighty** (*ha 'elohym*). **And You** (*wa 'atah*) **have turned around** (*sabab* – have changed, encompassing (hifil perfect – causing them to be more like You for a finite period of time have transformed)) **their thinking and judgment** (*'eth leb hem* – their ability to observe what is happening and respond appropriately, taking to heart what they have witnessed and evaluated) **bringing them back again** (*'achoranyth* – returning to the original design specifications, as it was originally intended).” (*Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:37*)

This is the underlying message of *Yowm Kipurym / the Day of Reconciliations*. The surviving Yisra'elites are going to change their thinking, and by observing what has transpired and been said, they will respond differently, taking to heart for the first time in three thousand years that Yahowah is indeed, God. It will serve as the basis of their reconciliation and fulfill the intended purpose of the *Miqra'* | Invitation to be Called Out and Meet with God.

We are now afforded a word's-eye view of a miracle. And every word is dripping in portent...

“**Then** (*wa*) **the fire** (*ha 'esh* – representing the radiant light and warmth) **of Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of YaHoWaH as '*elowah* – God instructed in His *Towrah* – Guidance regarding His *hayah* – existence) **descended, moving from a higher position to a lower one** (*naphal* – fell and was allocated and distributed). **It consumed** (*wa 'akal* – and it devoured) **the**

**offering which elevates** (*ha 'olah* – uplifting sacrifice; from *'alah* – to lift up (representing Passover)) **and also the wooden timbers** (*wa 'eth ha 'eshym* – in addition to the wooden pillars comprising the doorway to life and the upright pole of Passover), **along with** (*wa 'eth*) **the stones** (*'eben* – symbolizing the rock-solid relationship Yahowah intended with the twelve tribes of Yisra'el) **and the dust** (*wa 'eth ha 'aphar* – the infinitesimal ash representing the descendants of Yisra'el, and thus the seeds which had been transformed by the fire), **licking up** (*lachak* – consuming by evaporating) **the water** (*'eth ha maym*) **such that to show the way to the benefits of the relationship** (*'asher* – revealing the correct path to walk to give life meaning), **was in the healing and restoring channel** (*ba ha ta'alah* – in the renewing trench and repairing conduit designed to carry life-giving water).” (*Melekym* / 1 Kings 18:38)

The pieces of the puzzle comprising this test have been brought together. They collectively speak of Yahowah’s nature as light, fulfilling the Miqra’ey with His Son so that He might restore and reconcile His relationship with Yisra’el, healing the rift that had come to exist between Him and His people as a result of their affinity for the Lord.

Stupid is as the religious do. Trying to lift them up, they all fell down...

**“And when each and every person** (*wa kol ha 'am* – when the entire family of related individuals) **witnessed it** (*ra'ah* – observed it, seeing it with their eyes and considered it, paid attention to what was being revealed), **they fell upon their faces** (*wa naphal 'al paneh hem* – they dropped, falling away and prostrate, foreheads lowered, ultimately appearing to die, their presence cast down, as a result of their neglect, in front of and before this appearance and presence; from *panah* – to turn toward or away, to turn and look or to turn back). **They said** (*wa 'amar* – so as to convey and utter, proclaim and announce, so as to repeat), **‘Yahowah (Yahowah), He (huw’) is the Almighty God**

(*ha 'elohym* – the Almighty).

**Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – an accurate transliteration of the name YaHoWaH, our *'elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence and our *shalowm* – reconciliation), **the title, God, applies to Him** (*huw' ha 'elohym* – the Almighty).” (*Melekym / Rulers / 1 Kings 18:39*)

It is hard to talk when your mouth is in the dirt. Their reply was a product of their fear, not respect. They did not know Yahowah any better at that moment than they had in the minutes before the fire devoured everything arranged before them. They did not understand any of the symbols that you and I have considered. And within a number of years, they would exclude Yahowah’s name and presence from their lives – a condition that exists to this day.

But by falling down, they clearly demonstrated that they were still clueless. I have no doubt that they mumbled “Yahowah, He is the God” with dust in their noses and dirt on their lips, but their words would ring hollow for nearly three thousand years. Their proclamation was for another time, for 2033 CE rather than 1300 BCE, when a tiny remnant of the Children of Yisra’el will finally come to embrace the Light, and actually mean it when they look up and call out, “The title of God applies to Yahowah.”

This is why Yahowah seldom conveys His presence through signs and wonders. It does not lead people to know Him but instead to be in awe of Him. That is not the intent of a loving Father.

And yet, even though the Yisra’elites were dumb as stones, and although ‘Elyah had agreed to represent them, it didn’t mean Yahowah’s prophet could be counted among the religious. He understood the consequence and fate of false prophets – of those who speak for the Lord. Therefore, as a lesson to all who would dare be religious, especially Yisra’elites, we read...

**“So then (wa) ‘Elyah (‘Elyah – Yahowah is God) said** (*‘amar* – conveyed and declared, responding) **to them (la hem), ‘Seize (taphas** – of your own volition, having caught them in the act, capture, arrest, and control, dealing with (qal imperative)) **the prophets (‘eth naby’** – those who claimed to speak on behalf) **of the Lord (ha Ba’al** – of the one acting as master and owner with the intent of possessing and controlling), **not letting a person among them find salvation or escape** (*‘ysh ‘al malat min hem* – choosing to not allow a single individual who is part of them to be spared (nifal imperfect jussive – a third-person expression of volition with ongoing implications throughout time whereby the people who were doing this would be influenced by their actions)).’

**And they, after catching them in the act, captured and took control of them** (*wa taphas hem* – they caught them and seized them, dealing with them). **They brought them down** (*wa yarad hem* – they either fell down or were made to bow down before) **to ‘Elyah (‘Elyah – Yahowah is God) and to the Qyshownn (Qyshownn** – to Lure and Snare in Serpentine Fashion; from *qowsh* – to bait, lure, and then snare (winding through the Plain of Megiddo and dumping out into the Mediterranean)) **River (nachal** – brook or stream, gorge, valley, or ravine). **He killed them then and there (shachat shem** – he took their lives, slaying and slaughtering them as a result of the name and reputation).” (*Melekym / 1 Kings 18:40*)

God would have them do to the prophets of the Lord what the name and title *ha Ba’al* implies: take control of them. They would not be allowed to continue plaguing God’s people, killing them. For these politicized religious ministers, there would be no chance of salvation or escape. Their souls were on a collision course with She’owl. They would spend eternity incarcerated with the likes of Sha’uwl.

You will note that ‘Elyah did not try to rehabilitate

them or save them. He did not negotiate with them, respect them, compromise with them, or tolerate them. They, like every religious cleric before and after, sought to negate the value of Yahowah's name by referring to their god as "the Lord." It is the unforgivable sin that serves as the basis of the Third Statement Yahowah etched in stone.

They would be killed because they were promoting and spreading death. The outcome was appropriate and fair. There is no mercy, no salvation, for those who withhold the benefits of the Covenant from Yahowah's people. But, I hope you noticed, that with all we have learned about the futility of the politics and religions of the Lord, of 'Elyah's stirring oratory on Yahowah's behalf, and of the demise of the religious, not a word of this made it into the letter written by Gospel Jesus and Gospel John. So why was their agenda so contrary to God's – especially since they were pretending to speak for the God they were convoluting and contradicting? Their message was about "tolerating the woman Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess, and she teaches and leads My bond-servants astray so that they commit acts of immorality and eat things sacrificed to idols. I gave her time to repent, and she does not want to repent of her immorality," none of which was part of Yahowah's story and the message God was delivering to His people through the prophet Gospel Jesus failed to mention.

'Elyah is exceptionally unique. He was Yahowah's sole representative on Earth on this occasion. He was a prophet and exceptional orator, capable of expressing the life-and-death consequences of the intended relationship versus the Lord's politicized religions. 'Elyah was one of only two men who was taken directly to heaven without first experiencing mortal decay or death. Moreover, 'Elyah will be one of the two witnesses during the Time of Israel's Troubles when his words will pierce and kill the remaining advocates of religion, politics, militarism, and conspiracy.

It will be as if his words are ablaze.

Gospel Jesus and Gospel John continued to butcher the story they were using to collectively condemn Paul and his church while acknowledging that Christianity was Satanic. If you recall, this is how they concluded their diatribe against the church...

“Behold, I will throw her on a bed of sickness, and those who commit adultery with her into great tribulation, unless they repent of her deeds. And I will kill her children with pestilence, and all the churches will know that I am He who searches the minds and hearts; and I will give to each one of you according to your deeds. But I say to you, the rest who are in Thyatira, who do not hold this teaching, who have not known the deep things of Satan, as they call them—I place no other burden on you.” (Revelation 2:22-24) That is not what occurred. And it is stunningly stupid since Jezebel was pushed out of a window onto the street by her eunuchs, where her lifeless body was trampled to death and then eaten by dogs. So then for Gospel Jesus to say to those in this church, “who do not hold this teaching, who have not known the deep things of Satan, as they call them—I place no other burden on you,” is nothing more than gobbledygook cloaked in religious jargon.

Since he hasn't figured it out by now, perhaps I can educate Gospel Jesus. Satan is a dunderhead. He is no more articulate than Peter, Paul, or Muhammad, his messengers. He tries to counterfeit God, but he can't even copy credibly – always scribbling nonsense outside the lines. His message is as deep as the flaked skin of a snake and his teaching is nonexistent. While my job entails coming to know him and explaining him to you while thwarting his agenda, this isn't a calling for anyone else or a burden even for me. If you want to know Satan, read Bare'syth 3 and Yasha'yah 14 for Yahowah's perspective, then Ezekiel, the Quran, and New Testament for Satan's own testimony.

As bad as this is, Gospel Jesus and Gospel John were not done impugning themselves, Paul, or his church. In their fifth pronouncement, they told the Church of Sardis:

“He who has the seven Spirits of God and the seven stars, says this: ‘I know your deeds, that you have a name that you are alive, but you are dead. Wake up, and strengthen the things that remain, which were about to die; for I have not found your deeds completed in the sight of My God. So remember what you have received and heard; and keep it, and repent. Therefore if you do not wake up, I will come like a thief, and you will not know at what hour I will come to you. But you have a few people in Sardis who have not soiled their garments; and they will walk with Me in white, for they are worthy. He who overcomes will thus be clothed in white garments; and I will not erase his name from the book of life, and I will confess his name before My Father and before His angels. He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches.’” (Revelation 3:1-6 NASB) It is Dumb and Dumber Part Five.

To begin, I am especially familiar with “He who has the seven Spirits of Yahowah” because that would be me. I am the *Choter* | Secondary Branch and Sucker from the Fallen Stump of Yisra’el composing Yahowah’s *Nes* | Sign. The only “stars” in Yahowah’s program are Moseh and Dowd. There are not seven of them. Paul created Christianity to be faith-based, making deeds irrelevant. They are not even relevant to Yahowah.

Further, what is their “name?” Why didn’t Gospel Jesus share it if he knew it? How can the early Christian Church be “alive” while at the same time “dead?” They are one or the other. And if the early Church was dead, what was the purpose of the New Testament? Would Gospel Jesus resurrect them, and if so, why and when?

Once someone is dead, they cannot be awakened so as

to disavow lies and accept the truth. It's too late for that. And why are the few things which remain, about to die? Who is "my God?" What "deeds are not found completed?" Is Gospel Jesus talking in riddles to further confuse the Pauline Christians in the Synagogue of Satan where the Devil lives and has his throne, religiously established in Shitim along with Jezebel? What has Gospel Jesus told them that has any merit other than to warn them against telling anyone that he was the Christ? If they are just getting started with the new religion, why reboot and repent?

Just as I can assure you that Gospel Jesus wasn't afforded the Seven Spirits of Yahowah, I am certain that when Dowd returns, it will not be as a "thief." And since I know the hour, the day, the month, and the year, why is everyone else in the dark? What is it that Gospel Jesus intends to steal? Was Gospel Jesus as scary as Sha'uwl such that they were all pooping in their pants – all but a few? Since being born into the Covenant transforms flesh into spirit, why will we need fancy robes? Is Gospel Jesus advocating the idiotic and counterproductive nature of bodily resurrection for the dead church which housed Satan?

With the reference to "My Father," who does Gospel Jesus think he is – Dowd? Isn't it rude, even criminal, to steal another man's identity?

Perhaps this is the clue we foresaw, the very act of Replacement Foolology and identity theft that lies at the heart of Christendom...

**“And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write: He who is holy, who is true, who has the key of David, who opens and no one will shut, and who shuts and no one opens, says this: ‘I know your deeds. Behold, I have put before you an open door which no one can shut, because you have a little power, and have kept My word, and have**



not denied My name. Behold, I will cause those of the synagogue of Satan, who say that they are Jews and are not, but lie—I will make them come and bow down at your feet, and make them know that I have loved you. Because you have kept the word of My perseverance, I also will keep you from the hour of testing, that hour which is about to come upon the whole world, to test those who dwell on the earth. I am coming quickly; hold fast what you have, so that no one will take your crown. He who overcomes, I will make him a pillar in the temple of My God, and he will not go out from it anymore; and I will write on him the name of My God, and the name of the city of My God, the new Jerusalem, which comes down out of heaven from My God, and My new name. He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches.” (Revelation 3:7-13 NASB)

Gospel Jesus is the thief who stole “the key of David.” While I appreciate the confession, it’s too late to make amends and transform the ultimate wrong into the perfect right. The single most important realization apart from Yahowah’s name, knowing the conditions of the Covenant while acknowledging the Miqra’ey, is recognizing that Dowd fulfilled them. He opened the Door to Life and to God’s Home. But far more than this, he perfected us so that we can enter and become part of his Father’s Family. Gospel Jesus stole all of this as well.

Iesou Christou is never associated with Passover, and therefore, he did not open this door. That is pure and unadulterated Foolology. But he does not shut the door either because the religious do that to themselves.

I also beg to differ. The religious, particularly those lost to Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, have all denied Yahowah’s name, and they continue to do so.

We have been given another clue as to the identity of this thief because he, like the Lord of Ezekiel, wants to

replace Jerusalem. Fortunately, and largely as a result of what the Seven Spirits of Yahowah have accomplished through the Choter to create *Yada Yahowah*, Satan will fail.

Recognizing as we do that Luke ensconced Paul as the fiery preacher in the Synagogue of Satan, the religion he founded has evolved from it, even as we transition out of the sixth nascent church. The fact is that Gospel Jesus and Gospel John have associated all of them with Satan, and that's a bummer for the faithful.

Wrong again, but that's hardly news, the "Hour of Testing that will come upon the whole world" was not imminent. In fact, it would be 1,957 years from this bit of braggadocio before the commencement of the Time of Israel's Troubles beginning on Shabuw'ah, May 22, 2026. As another swing and a miss, Gospel Jesus has joined demon-possessed Paul as a false prophet.

There is only one crown that matters, and while it was stolen by Christian Replacement Theology, it belongs to Dowd. Further, there is but one Upright Pillar in Yahowah's Covenant Family and Home – the Messiah and Son of God, Dowd. Moreover, the Covenant Home is not a prison. Freedom of ingress and egress is afforded to every Covenant Member. There is a universe to explore and we will not be kept from it.

And alas, there is yet another confession – Yahowah and Dowd have a new name within Christendom. They are allegedly following in Sha'awl's footsteps. However, since Yahowah is not changing His name and while Dowd's name is eternal, we should see Halal ben Shachar, a.k.a., Satan, the Adversary, attempting to change his identity. Such is the intent of the Christian New Testament and the Book of Ezekiel, even the Quran. So it's back to Shitim.

So now after all of this demonic drivel spewed out of the Synagogue of Satan, we digress to vomit. I kid you not...

“To the angel of the church in Laodicea write: The Amen, the faithful and true Witness, the Beginning of the creation of God, says this: ‘I know your deeds, that you are neither cold nor hot; I wish that you were cold or hot. So because you are lukewarm, and neither hot nor cold, I will spit you out of My mouth. Because you say, “I am rich, and have become wealthy, and have need of nothing,” and you do not know that you are wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked, I advise you to buy from Me gold refined by fire so that you may become rich, and white garments so that you may clothe yourself, and that the shame of your nakedness will not be revealed; and eye salve to anoint your eyes so that you may see. Those whom I love, I reprove and discipline; therefore be zealous and repent. Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if anyone hears My voice and opens the door, I will come in to him and will dine with him, and he with Me. He who overcomes, I will grant to him to sit down with Me on My throne, as I also overcame and sat down with My Father on His throne. He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches.’” (Revelation 3:14-22)

“Amen” is the name of an Egyptian god. This “witness” is less “faithful” than the Devil in a pickle. Yahowah is our creator, not Gospel Jesus. He wasn’t even a man. Deeds are irrelevant in a faith-based religion. Being right matters, not being hot or cold. Those who do not know Yahowah are not spewed out of His mouth as that would require ingesting those He will estrange and eliminate. The rich and poor game was played previously and to no effect. There was no moral to the story.

We cannot bribe God nor purchase anything from Him. And we are enriched by Him the moment we accept the conditions of His Covenant and capitalize upon what Dowd has done for us during the Miqra’ey.

The “eye salve to anoint your eyes” was especially revealing because the application of this drug was

conveyed using the *chrio*, which is the verbal root of Christo. It serves to affirm that this title, one that wasn't mentioned among the initial churches, was based upon a verb which speaks of the "application of drugs." That is as incriminating as it is embarrassing.

The Drugged One never existed. He is nothing more than a mythical misnomer designed by the early church to replace the Messiah Dowd. So, he has no door and cannot knock. Even Dowd, who opened this door as the Passover Lamb, does not knock. Further, we cannot open that door. We either find it open or shut based upon our approach to Father and Son. And when it is opened for those who accept the Covenant and Invitations, they travel inside, not the other way around. Since this is Dowd's throne, and since Yahowah has made this point clear, Gospel Jesus is attempting to steal yet another possession that rightfully belongs to another.

Therefore, Gospel Jesus and Gospel John were wrong about almost everything. The only thing they got right was that Satan had made his home and established his throne within the Christian Church. Nicely done, fellas. I found your tour of Hell entertaining.



As we return to the Acts of Paul, when last we saw the Plague of Death, his hypocrisy was in full bloom, delivering his fiery sermons in the Synagogue of Satan. He was captured presenting his unGodly "Gospel of Grace" as the alternative to observing Yahowah's Towrah, while misrepresenting God's Guidance as a list of onerous 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 Gospel Jesus) **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)

I am continuing to use 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, I am presenting Luke’s assessment of Paul’s fight against John and the other disciples without prejudice, fairly and accurately.

If you recall, in Gospel John’s Revelation, we were specifically told 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. Moreover, the very people Revelation commended, Sha’uwl condemned, calling them “*sklerynomai* – stubborn, hardheaded, and obstinate, even offensive and intolerable, for refusing to listen to him.”

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 the disciple “disobeyed him and rejected his faith.” If that does not take the wind out of Christendom’s sails, considering whom he was rebelling against, you may want to check to see if they are still fluttering.

One of the most egotistical and presumptuous men to ever purport to speak for God called the 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 as “speaking abusively of and maligning” as a rendering of *kakologeō*, 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.

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'awl 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 attributed to Gospel Jesus. In just one of his fourteen letters, including Hebrews, he made a brief passing attempt, citing a few words spoken about Passover, albeit taking the testimony completely out of context while misquoting it. So rest assured, when Sha'awl 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'awl'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 were truthful, John, Peter, and James were liars, as was Gospel Jesus, even Yahowah. But 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.

Now Sha'awl is saying that supernatural power and extraordinary mastery and skill were the work of his hands, conceived, fashioned, and brought forth without God's assistance...

**"The ability to perform miracles and wondrous supernatural powers (*dynamis* – signs 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 incriminating, 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)

This repulsive narrative even surpasses the Quran in grossness. Paul wanted the church he was conceiving to perceive him as a god. He was truly Roman.

“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 individual.

This is creepy in the extreme, but not unlike today’s Christian 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.” And to think, Christians claim that the author of this voodoo presentation was a physician. Not likely.

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, the 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 Yahuw dym, 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 poneros* – 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), **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. In fact, in Judaism, Satan and demons don’t exist, making this stupid in the extreme. 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 – one designed to inappropriately demean Jews. 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 the 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 little in common with Gospel Jesus and nothing in common with the Messiah Dowd, 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 by Romans:

“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. ii. C. 4). The Ptolemies being patrons of literature and of science, learned men of all nations resorted to Alexandria, which soon became the theater of religious disputes, and each party in turn appealed to the Egyptian monuments, on which the secrets 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 favor 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 to 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 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 Iesou 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 Iesou. 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” the myth of Gospel Jesus, 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'awl, who, like Satan, wants to be seen as having a higher status than even his supposed 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 “*amphoteroi* – 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, 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. But in this case, the damned were disciples.

The point has been made, and it is obvious that Paul was the false, self-proclaimed, and dishonest apostle whom the Revelation prophecy warned against in the letter to the Ephesians, specifically, but to every other church due to the Satanic overtures. 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 the 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.

This diatribe was spoken against Gospel Jesus’ 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’uwl, the scrolls and books which were burned were almost certainly the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms along with the eyewitness accounts of Dowd’s words and deeds as they were recorded in Hebrew by the ‘Ebownym. They were in irreconcilable conflict with Paul’s message, proving that he was lying.

And with Paul now providing uncontested claims through his sermons and letters, claiming 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 Qurans, 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 compose a 4,100-page condemnation of this 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," we find that the ones "intrigued by conspiracy theories while overemphasizing satanic influences," are from Paul's perspective, "irrelevant and superfluous meddlers interfering." He views them as involved in his affairs while "fussing over other people's business in a disrespectful and unnecessary way." Sha'awl is taking one last swipe at the 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 or 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 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 the disciples, Sha’uwl 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 *periegos* 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 referred to as a wolf in sheep’s clothing during the Sermon on the Mount is the same individual called a false apostle and deceitful liar in Revelation’s final public statement...

**“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 Corinthians 15:32. (Since the only opponents this brute has mentioned in association with the metropolis of Ephesus are 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 Revelation 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'uw1 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 Timothy 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 Timothy 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 Satanic war against Yahowah's Torah and the disciples. Having fought for years against both, he would deploy every resource the Devil could muster 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 that 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 Gospel Jesus’ 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 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. He was the antithesis of love and the embodiment of hate.

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 qodesh*) **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 deliverance and 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'awl'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 Gospel Jesus loving, even nice, when he lashed out so viciously at most all of those who opposed him? By Paul’s standard, Gospel Jesus 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 the 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** (1 Timothy 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,** (1 Timothy 9) **sexually immoral ones, male bed partners, man trappers, liars, perjurers, and if some other in the being healthy teaching lies against** (1 Timothy 10) **by the good message of the splendor of the fortunate God which was trusted I.**” (1 Timothy 1:11)

Now if I may, 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 (*anyptaktos 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; (1 Timothy 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, (1 Timothy 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; (1 Timothy 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 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, or 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, however, find Sha'awl'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'awl says of those who prefer God's instruction to his own is that they are "*anypotaktos* – disobedient." That can only mean that Sha'awl is demanding obedience, which is to say that he is now reflecting his Lord's persona. And he is a hypocrite.

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'awl'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 reconcile the guilty 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’uwl 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.

Beyond discouraging incest, rape, pedophilia, bestiality, and prostitution, the Towrah has very little to say about human sexuality. Even the instruction against adultery speaks of religious infidelity. It is Sha'awl, not Yahowah, who is fixated on " *pornos* – fornication." And while homosexual pedophilia made Paul's list, he was likely guilty of both with the much younger Timothy. 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 Dowd? Why were Dowd's and Paul's messages 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. 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 Dowd 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 rescue a disobedient sinner, even a murderer 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 reconciliation 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 that 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'awl 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 Gospel Jesus 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'awl 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 God 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 originated.

So, we are left with three less-than-ideal choices:

- 1) Gospel Jesus revealed himself to Sha'awl 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'awl 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 the Messiah. 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 the mythos associated with Gospel Jesus. 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 Eucharist, and Gospel Jesus made wine, Dionysus was the god of wine. Just as it was alleged that Gospel Jesus had a divine father and a virgin mother, Dionysus had a divine father, Zeus, the father of the gods, and a mortal virgin mother, Semele. Just as there is a myth that Gospel Jesus’ father took the baby god to Egypt, when Dionysus was born, Zeus carried him away to Egypt to protect him from the envy of rival gods. And so on and on it goes.

As we press deeper into the mythology, we find that many other 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 offered 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 mythical mission of Dionysus was to bring an end to burdens and worries like you know who. 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’uwl.

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 are symbolic of Nimrod, the father of the Babylonian religion. The thyrsus staff he is depicted holding is distinguished by the adornment of a large pinecone – a phallic symbol representing “coming forth from the seed,” 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’uwl 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 Shim’own and Yahowchanan had to say about Sha’uwl and his letters, there are additional ways to ascertain the merits of his Foolology. 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 as early as 95 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 duly noted, the earliest witness reads:

**“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 “Judaically” or a “Judaizer.” Rabbis do not proselytize like Christians. They want Jews to practice Judaism and for Gentiles to leave them alone. The name of the ethnicity according to Yahowah is Yisra’elite and the name of the religion according to man in Judaism. One does not constitute the other.

If Paul had told the truth when he claimed that faith alone saves, then a person’s walk through life would have been irrelevant. Besides, who appointed Paul a *Shaphat* | Judge – one who determines who is right and who is wrong pursuant to the Towrah? Moreover, what was the basis of his verdict? This time, the grand usurper and maligner couldn’t even find a Godly proclamation to misappropriate

or corrupt.

While poorly worded, unexplained, and, thus, worthless, 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 – good 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 the Towrah and common sense, Shim’own’s actions were in conflict with Sha’uwl’s egocentric view of the world. However, the reason Sha’uwl did not explain why he believed the Rock was wrong is that, according to the Towrah, Shim’own was likely 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 Kephaz 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.”* And since Sha’uwl habitually 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. Also, 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 either Yahuwdah or Yahuwd which is Yahuwdym, but then ends in an attempt to magically transform the proper noun into a verb, which is incriminating since it is quite similar to the Quran.

If we were to play along, *Ioudaizein* in the modern vernacular would convey “being or acting Jewish.” But then Sha’uwl’s argument falls apart because he is opposed to what he is proposing. Moreover, the Towrah never asks Yahuwdym to convert Gowym. While everyone is offered the same advice, opportunity, and benefits, Gowym become members of the Covenant, not Yahuwdym, by acceptance. Our souls are transformed, not our genes.

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 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 in the sense of being political or religious. This is because the Babylonian influence which metastasized into the beasts of Persia, Greece, Rome, and Roman Catholicism have been caustic to God’s people. Their religions and political aspirations shaped the world as we know it, a world from which Yahowah wants us to disassociate ourselves because it is deceitful, destructive, and deadly. Therefore, Yahowah does not want Yahuwdym to adopt the cultures and traditions, the politics or religions, the militarism or

conspiracies of the Gentile nations.

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 guidance for those who want to enjoy 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 a grievous crime and misled billions in the process.

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 Cephias 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 like it,

Christians have been beguiled into believing that being Jewish and Torah-observant are synonymous with the religion of Judaism. Most people cannot distinguish between the race and religion today, commingling them as if they were one and the same. This God-damned *babel* 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 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.

More importantly, Yahowah loves and distinguishes Yahuwdym over all others and God despises Judaism even more than Christianity, Islam, Conspiracy, or Progressivism. And since Sha’uwl sought to condemn both, including *Yahuwdym* | the Beloved of Yah, he was and remains a plague.

The reason this crime has been so catastrophic is that now, as a result of Paul’s mythical “Judaizers,” when someone who is actually Towrah-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 Dowd, as the Son of God and Messiah, observed it and fulfilled it.

Similarly, they reject Yahowah’s encouragement to make the Shabat a special part of our relationship with God, 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 Christians 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 and have rebuffed His Invitations, precluding them from forming a relationship with God and forestalling any opportunity for their reconciliation.

In this regard, Gospel Jesus, not Sha'awl, provided a compelling example of how the Pharisees, the ultra-religious Jews who were devoted to their traditions and Oral Law (akin to the Haredim today), tried to impose their ill-conceived rules on Jews.

**“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*) God (ΘΥ) 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). (Mark 7:9)**

**For (*gar*) Moses (*Mouses*) revealed (*eipon*), “Recognize and respect (*timaō* – highly value, honor, and revere) **your father** (*ton IPA sou*) **and (*kai*) your mother** (*ten MTA sou*),” **and also (*kai*), “The one maligning (*o kakologeō* – the one reviling, cursing, and speaking badly about using unjustified and abusive language so as to denounce and insult) **the Father (IPA) or (*e*) 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** (*teluueutao* – let this be the end of his life).”” (Mark 7:9-10)****

Even as a myth, Gospel Jesus is said to have 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” suggests that he was also aware that they represent our Heavenly Father and our Spiritual Mother in the Instruction carved in stone.

In this regard, *kokologeo* 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.”

This assessment 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 transliteration of a Hebrew word designating a gift offering used to approach 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*), (Mark 7:11) **therefore, you no longer permit** (*ouketi aphiemi* – 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*), (Mark 7:12) **invalidating the authority of** (*akyroo* – nullifying and voiding) **the Word** (*Logos*) **of of God** (*tou ΘY*) **through your traditions** (*te paradosis umon* – by your teachings and instructions) **which you have handed down as if it were an authorized** (*eparadidomi* – 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 defiance of the Towrah's instructions. Misrepresenting and falsely interpreting the Towrah has become a game in Judaism, as it was to Sha'awl. 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)

According to God, it is the Towrah or nothing. Those who reject His *Towrah* | Guidance are forgotten. Therefore, rather than nailing Martin Luther's thesis against indulgences on the doors of a Catholic cathedral, distributing Yahowah's testimony would have served a higher calling.

At this point in his diatribe against Jews in general and the disciples in particular, Sha'awl 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 religious and political ways of the Gentile nations and says so regularly in the Torah and Prophets. But He is even more 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 fact, as we have seen, the opposite is typically true. 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. 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 xenophobic pejorative to demean those he was asking to believe him and yet it did not faze them. But we should not be surprised. He told them that he was a sexual pervert, a murderer, insane, and demon-possessed, and that did not cause them to question him either. Religion is a neurotoxin, paralyzing the victims’ ability to think and respond rationally or morally. And it renders them capable of perpetrating horrible crimes against humanity, who the believers torture and kill at the behest of their god. This is what makes religion so deadly and damning.

☩

*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 a person believe Sha’uwl’s “Gospel of Grace,” or should they trust Yahowah’s Towrah? Okay, so the deck is stacked against Christianity, but since they deal counterfeit cards from the bottom of the deck, we will still proceed with caution.

Recognizing that the last thing Sha’uwl scribed was a sentence fragment, since his next sentence has an unspecified subject, let’s transition into the debate by restating the previous clause... **“We (*emeis*) Jews (*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 accurately 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) **Iesoun (IHN) Christon (XPN),...**” (Galatians 2:16)

The realization that we do not earn salvation but, instead, receive it by acting upon Yahowah’s instructions is firmly established throughout the Towrah. Our inclusion into the Covenant Family is permissible because of what Yahowah and His Son, Dowd, accomplished by fulfilling Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym. Therefore, redemption is available 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, therefore, provides the Instructions and Guidance needed to be adopted into our Heavenly Father’s Family and to have our souls perfected and made immortal.

Said another way, the Towrah, its God, Covenant, and Invitations to Meet announced the way Home on behalf of Yahowah’s children long before Dowd entered Yaruwshalaim a second time to fulfill Passover and UnYeasted Bread. Yahowah etched this truth in stone

before His Son was born. And apart from accepting the *Beryth* | Covenant's terms and answering the *Miqra'ey* | Invitations, Dowd's second of three lives 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 so, then respond appropriately. None of these things can be known or understood apart from Yahowah's "*Towrah* – Teaching."

Dowd 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 Dowd's role as the Passover Lamb.

Paul was attempting to make "belief" 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 the Messiah and Son of God has done by honoring its promises.

Since Sha'awl's hypothesis that the Towrah cannot save is untrue, it follows that his remedy, "if not by belief and faith in Iesoun Christon," 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 a myth is beside the point. What matters is that the Towrah is true, reliable, and dependable which Yahowah proved through fulfilled prophecy and accurate depictions of ancient history. Further, it was Dowd's understanding of and reliance on the Towrah that made it possible for him to fulfill it and enable what Yahowah had promised and demonstrated through it.

Taking this one step further, since Yahowah authored the Towrah and His Son, Dowd, lived it, wrote of it, supported and loves it, and returned to fulfill it, Yahowah's Towrah explains the Messiah's purpose. And this brings us



back to the realization that Sha'owl created a distinction where none actually exists to create a false hypothesis. But by doing so, by pretending to solve a problem which did not exist by way of faith in a false proposition, Sha'owl negated Dowd's sacrifice, his example, his testimony, and his purpose. It is all for naught for all who believe Paul.

To be redeemed, we must walk to Yahowah the way He has provided, along the path Dowd enabled, 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 testimony and Dowd's example.

If what Sha'owl wrote were true, 'Adam and Chawah, Noach and His family, 'Abraham and Sarah, Yitschaq and Ya'aqob, Moseh and 'Aharown, Yahowsha' ben Nuwn and King Dowd, Enoch and 'ElYah, Shamuw'el and all of the prophets from Yasha'yah to Yirma'yah, from Howsha' to Yow'el, Zakaryah, and Mal'aky were all subjected to a cruel hoax by a God who lied about their redemption and inclusion within His Covenant, 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'owl'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 eloquence and purpose of Yahowah’s Towrah and 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 as “know,” *oida*, which was translated as “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, “we Yahuwdym” from the preceding clause. One or the other have previously realized without due consideration how to

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 as "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 on 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 independently. 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. However, ever duplicitous, 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 as “tasks and activities associated with,” but could have been just as accurately rendered as “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'uwl 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 on whose side you may be on in this debate, Yahowah's or Sha'uwl'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 assert that according to Sha'uwl, Yahowah's Towrah is a set of laws which cannot be obeyed and thus condemns rather than saves. And Paul, himself, translates the Hebrew word *towrah* in his Galatians 3:10 citation from the Towrah using *nomou*, forever rendering this question 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 as "law," and even "Law" as the Torah is often misrepresented in these same English Bibles. According to Strong's, *nomos* is rendered as "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 *nemos* 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 [five books of the Torah]) 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 *Exegetical Dictionary of*

*the New Testament* (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 with whom 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 as “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* [632]) 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 632, *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.”

While not His language, this would suggest that our Heavenly Father is nourishing His children’s minds with His instructions and teaching us how to live as members of His Covenant family so that we inherit all that He is offering. Therefore, while it is apparent that Paul was



denouncing Yahowah's Towrah, the original meanings of *towrah* and *nomos* did not communicate what Paul intended to convey. This is because someone who benefits from nourishment, becoming an heir and receiving an inheritance, would be right with God, growing, living healthy lives, vindicated and acquitted as a result of the instruction and guidance provided. 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 Towrah.

Therefore, while Paul meant for 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 was 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 his ludicrous proposition that the Towrah is unable to save those who act upon it “*ean me dia pistis IHN XPN* – could be, but probably isn’t, faith in Iesoun Christon.” 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’uwl’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 as “belief and faith,” because Paul’s letters leave no other informed or rational option. Sha’uwl never provides sufficient information to know his fabled Iesoun Christo, much less to trust Yahowah, or to rely on His Towrah, 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 as “faith” or “belief” in English Bibles when penned by Sha’uwl, when spoken by someone else, we should remain cognizant 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 a rational person’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, 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 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 the legend of Gospel Jesus. Paul wallows in his name, Iesou Christou, but it is surrounded within a swamp of his own edits and diatribes.

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.

A person cannot rely upon and thus benefit from Dowd’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, the Messiah'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, 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 Iesoun Christon" is completely misdirected. Even if the Towrah had been properly presented and even if Dowd's name and title had not undergone the assault of Replacement Foolology, it is Paul's perceptions of the Towrah that are at issue. So to have any hope of being right, rather than placing one's faith

in a mythical misnomer, we should be celebrating the realization that Dowd's reliance was on Yahowah and that he trusted His Towrah, observed it, affirmed it, lived it, and then fulfilled its core mission.

In this regard, since the placeholders point to the mythical name and erroneous title Iesoun Christon, there is also the issue with the title in that Dowd was anointed as a Mashyach under Yahowah's instructions while there is no mention of an Iesoun, affirming that he cannot be the Messiah. This title was stolen by Sha'awl to create an errant impression. And he was wrong, even according to Gospel Jesus who ordered his disciples to never use that title regarding him.

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 – stolen from the most important man in human history? Is humankind so foolish, so ignorant and irrational, that it is possible to fool almost all of the people almost all of the time? Are the religious so unaware and misled that billions believe a reprehensible and inarticulate man over the word of God? Evidently so.

The moment we acquiesce to the inevitable and adjust our rendering of *pistis* in Sha'awl's epistles to "faith," which is what he obviously intended, and then convey "Iesoun Christon," as Paul most likely said it and wrote it, the few things Paul conveyed that 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 (Galatians 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 *Iesoun Christon* is an invalid moniker for a myth unrelated to the reality of Yahowah. It directs the faithful's attention to the fable of a man who was killed by men and then resurrected like the pagan gods of the heathen races.

The sum and substance of most religious systems is embodied in the means its members embrace to earn their salvation. Depending upon the religion, the faithful either obey religious edicts, make significant monetary contributions, lead what is deemed to be a good life (which is depicted as committing mass murder in Islam), advance the common good (which in Islam is to wage war against all mankind), 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 was 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 52 CE, Yahuwdym represented the overwhelming majority of the followers of The Way. As a result, most of them understood the relationship between the Son of God 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 tradition of our society, that it’s difficult to ignore its influence.

Sha’uwl was equally conflicted. As a student of Gamaliel, whose esteem Paul exaggerated, he would nevertheless have had some 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. The same is true today. As I have said, and it bears repeating, Ultra-Orthodox Jews who claim to be students of the Torah are lying. They study Judaism’s Talmud. We know this not only from analyzing their academic curriculum but also through the realization that the Towrah constantly criticizes Jews for being religious.

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 Mishnah. The Talmud is similar in that it consists 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 Quran, which Talmud readings also inspired. Likewise, Rabbinic Law references 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 comprising 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, Gospel Jesus did a far better job because he removed 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 his man-god's example – in this or any other way.

When Gospel Jesus criticized the inappropriateness of Jewish Law, according to the mythology, 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 Iesoun Christon,...”**

Therefore, “faith in Iesoun Christon, now known as “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 the Messiah observe them and fulfill them? Why did even the events chronicled within the

Christian fables play out during Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children in year 4000 Yah? Why do they celebrate Pentecost when it represents Shabuw'ah? Why did Paul attempt to predict the timing of the fulfillment of Taruw'ah when he was clueless about it?

While there is no rational answer to any of these questions, it is now undeniable that Galatians establishes a war between Yahowah's Torah and Paul's Gospel. It is trust in Yahowah versus belief in Paul. 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 Dowd, and to pitting his Iesoun Christon against Yahowah. But when any of these things are done, the Messiah's lives become 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 – placeholders used by early Christian scribes for the misnomer *Iesoun Christon* | 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), **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 or set free, not be declared innocent or 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 Iesoun Christon,”** 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 the Messiah 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.

It is not the biggest problem in this pile of religious rubbish because our *“sarx – flesh”* is irrelevant. 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'awl 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, and 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 Yahowah’s guidance such that 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 this 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 its 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

was 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 notion that Gospel Jesus observed it, affirmed it, and lived it was ignored. Inexplicably then, faith in him was established as the means to salvation, even though the god-man’s alleged 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 Gospel Jesus’ attack on the Scribes and Rabbis in Matthew 23, he identifies his foes. He explains what they have done to earn his condemnation. And then he reveals why it would be inappropriate for anyone 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 the fable’s expressed attitude toward political and religious leaders, it is relevant in our condemnation of Paul since believing the one he is contradicting would be insane...

**“Then, at that time** (*tote*), **Iesou 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*), (Matthew 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 Pharisaioi* – the rabbis devoted to the Oral Law and Talmud, fundamentalist clerics engaged in the public acceptance and expression of perfunctory religious rites, those who claim 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**. (Matthew 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 or elect to really perform the assigned tasks on an ongoing basis (present active indicative)).” (Matthew 23:3)

In this instance, Gospel Jesus was warning Jews 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 reportedly called those with the most influence “hypocrites.” The claim is that the religious and their leaders say one thing while doing another. In opposition to them, he 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 Gospel Jesus is equivocal, telling Jews that there is no 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, Gospel Jesus is “*tereo* (in the present active imperative) – encouraging Jews to be observant, to keep their eyes open and be on their guard, so that they can survey and assess the situation, gathering information, and then contemplate what they would learn by listening to Yahowah so that they might make an informed and rational decision.”

In complete discord with most English Bibles, Gospel Jesus did not ask anyone to “keep or obey” what clerics say. He was instead asking Jews 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 phrase “*autos me poieomai*,” when scribed in the present imperative, tells Jews that they should not only refrain from religious and political behavior, but that they should attempt to thwart the political and religious agenda, bringing it to an end – stopping it here, now, and always. He said, “Don’t do it,” therefore encouraging his people to refrain from engaging in religion or politics.

This particular variation of negation expressly encourages Jews not to get into the habit of participating in national customs, societal traditions, political parties, or religious rites. In other words, don’t follow their example or their 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. He wanted Jews to question their political and religious leaders, to be averse to them, and to be hesitant to follow them. He asked them to consider the negative consequences of the religious agenda.

Similarly, Yahowah's Guidance is the antidote for the plague of religion. God repeatedly encourages His children to listen to Him rather than religious men and doing so through closely and carefully observing His Towrah. Yahowah is anti-religious and anti-political.

Gospel Jesus had more to tell us about the hypocrisy and negative influence of societal leaders, both religious and political. It is as if the myth of Gospel Jesus saw people in positions of authority as parasites, burdening their citizens so that they are compelled to serve them. As fables go, he was much smarter than most, and clearly brighter than those who would come to claim him.

**“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) Sounds like he's berating the Haredim today. I would say the same of them.

Gospel Jesus was blunt when he exposed and condemned the Scribes and Pharisees. He was not only

rebuking their hypocrisy, he demonstrated how Jews should respond to all religious and political proclamations. They ought to be wary of Rabbinic Law, of the Talmud, and of religious and political parties. His advice was to scrutinize everything they say and to avoid doing anything they did. And in this context, it is worth noting that Sha'owl bragged about being a Rabbi. He was and remains one of them. He acts and sounds remarkably similar to those Gospel Jesus scorned and warned about. And that would make Paul an outright liar.

But there was more to the instruction of Gospel Jesus. 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 and His Son have provided. Said another way, by fulfilling Matsah, Dowd lifted the burden of guilt from us, taking it upon himself and then depositing it in She'owl.

It is an odd thing to be writing about the words attributed to a myth under the label of Gospel Jesus. But in a rebuke of Paul, it is incumbent upon the critic to explain that his mantra was not only diametrically opposed to Yahowah, but that it was also contrary to the testimony of his god-man, Iesou Christou. Beyond this, there is also the realization that the narrative attributed to "Jesus Christ" did not fall from the sky. As was foretold by Dowd, himself, someone exceedingly well known appeared, and something exceptionally important occurred, on schedule in Yaruwshalaim during Passover, Matsah, and Bikuwrym in April, 33 CE | the 80<sup>th</sup> Yowbel year of 4000 Yah. The

Messiah, Son of God, and Savior was here. So, much of what was subsequently attributed via hearsay to Iesoun Christon four to eight decades after the fact by non-participants, was likely said and done by Dowd.

And it is the specificity and proper perspective attributed to the substitute which is in contrast to what was missing in Paul's writings. On the surface, Paul's 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'awl has done by denouncing God's demonstrated ability to save His children.

Therefore, don't be confused by Sha'awl's repetitive claims to have been authorized by God. Muhammad did the same thing, and in his religion, Allah is Satan. Both sought to satiate their lust for unchallenged power and to neuter their critics.

Sha'awl neither met, spoke with, nor knew Yahowah. He never once explains the meaning behind the name or title attributed to his replacement for Dowd, both of which are essential to knowing who he is and what the genuine article sacrificed for us. Paul never once explained 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 the Instruction on the Mount, where it is probable that Dowd conveyed the enduring nature of the Towrah to all who would listen. Not once does Sha'awl present Dowd as the Passover Lamb, and twice he lied by promoting the preposterous myth that "the completeness of the godhead resided on him bodily." It is like saying that a grain of sand

represents the entirety of the Earth, every form of life, and all pertinent information.

Everything Paul has written is untrue. And while we have not yet seen an example, should one arise, the occasional accurate statement would 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.



Since we are dispelling myths, this is as good a place as any to reveal that, just as the words and deeds attributed to Jesus didn't just fall from the sky, but were predicated upon what the actual Messiah and Son of God did in Jerusalem at this time, the fables associated with Christianity also have a past.

I first stumbled upon them when trying to accurately convey the name Shachar in the following prophetic portrayal of Yahowah's revulsion over Israel's continued flirtation with religion. My favorite prophet revealed...

**“And when** (*wa ky* – so to the contrary, rather and instead) **they say to you** (*'amar 'al 'atem* – they plead with you, encouraging you), **‘You should consult** (*darash* – you should choose to seek previously unknown information, expecting answers, resort to, petition, and ponder, seriously consider revelations (qal imperative active)) **with** (*'el* – in consideration of, moving toward) **the mediums** (*ha 'owb* – those who claim to communicate with ghosts of the dead which is a form of sorcery, the witches, wizards, soothsayers, and occultists speaking for saints and familiar spirits; a conjunction of *'ab* and *'owr* – fathers of light) **and** (*wa*) **the spiritualists** (*ha yada'ony* – those claiming to possess spiritual insights, revealing knowledge gleaned

from the spiritual world, false prophets, diviners, and necromancers; from *yada'* – to know and claim familiarity) **who meditate and mutter** (*ha hagah* – who ponder selected information, devise a plot, and express their woeful and imaginative opinions) **and** (*wa*) **who twitter satanic musings** (*ha tsaphaph* – who chirp like birds, whisper, and mutter that which is deadly; related to *tsapha'* – the offshoots of venomous serpents and poisonous vipers), **instead, shouldn't the people** (*ha lo' 'am* – as a rhetorical question, would it not be better for the family) **consult** (*darash* – seek information and expect answers, petition and seriously consider the revelations, look for, care about, and seek to develop a relationship (qal imperfect active)) **with** (*'el*) **their God** (*'elohym huw'*) **through** (*ba'ad* – from and for the benefit of) **the living** (*ha chay* – those who are alive, nourished, growing, and actually exist as a conscious being) **not** (*'al* – as opposed to) **the dead** (*ha muwth* – those absent of life)?” (*Yasha'yah* / Deliverance is from Yahowah / Isaiah 8:19)

With the answer so obvious, why do as few as one in a million consult with Yahowah through the living and why do billions listen to the dead – particularly in rabbinic Judaism and its fascination with Kabbalah? Paul is dead, as are Akiba and Muhammad. So is every Christian Saint, the sages among Rabbinic Talmudists, and successful suicide bombers among Islamic jihadists.

Even if you are not checking, I want you to know that there were a number of options regarding the translation of *'al* as “not.” To begin, *ʿl* can be transliterated as either *'el* or *al*. As a noun, *'el* is “Almighty God.” As a preposition, *'el* is translated: “to, toward, in the direction of, on, at, by, among, or for.” But *'al* can also serve to negate a verb or a noun as it is here with *ha muwth*. It seemed logical to select the definition which best fit the context of the discussion.

While there are shades of grey for those who have read the wrong material and listened to misleading people, for

those speaking publicly about God there is only light or darkness, right or wrong, truth and lies, life and death. It is Yahowah or Shachar. The single adjudicating factor determining which side of this divide the speaker or writer is on is whether or not their testimony is consistent with the *Towrah* and *Ta'uwdah*, Yahowah's Source of Teaching and Guidance and His Written Testimony Regarding Restoration...

**“According to (*la* – approaching and concerning) the **Towrah** (*Towrah* – Source of Teaching, Guidance, Instruction, and Direction) and (*wa*) according to (*la*) the written Testimony which presents correct and corroborating information regarding restoration (*Ta'uwdah* – the authorized documentation regarding the confirmation of the binding relationship agreement pertaining to an inheritance, a compound of *towrah* – source of guidance, instruction, direction, and teaching and *'uwd* – to repeatedly testify about restoration and to continually bear an affirming witness), if (*'im* – whenever and whosoever on the condition) **they do not speak** (*lo' amar* – they do not answer and respond (qal imperfect active)) **consistent with** (*ka* – in a manner which is comparable to and compatible with, in accordance with, like, and overlapping, the same as and in agreement with) **this specific word and message** (*ha dabar ha zeh* – these statements, accounting treatises, and communications), **then by association** (*'asher* – then as a result) **they lack discernment, are for naught, are without light, and are approaching Shachar** (*'ayn la huw' shachar* – they are without and are negated, black, having nothing, failing to seek or earnestly inquire, they are lacking even so much as the first glimpse of light, and are moving toward Satan).” (*Yasha'yah* / Salvation is from Yahowah / Isaiah 8:20)**

In the 14<sup>th</sup> chapter of *Yasha'yah*, which is where we are eventually headed in our rebuke of Pauline Christianity, we discover Satan's ploy, the Adversary's name, fate, and

association with the Babel that became the Christian Bible. As for the Adversary's name, it was stated here as Shachar – meaning “darkness seeking the light reminiscent of the rising sun.”

If a person is preaching from any one of *Sha'owl's* | Paul's fourteen letters, they lack discernment, their words are for naught, and they are headed to Shachar in She'owl. If a person is speaking or writing in a manner that is consistent with the *Towrah* and *Ta'uwdah*, Yahowah's Source of Teaching and Guidance and His Written Testimony Regarding Restoration, they are discerning, their words matter, they are enlightening and on their way to Yahowah. In the end, this is the only litmus test that actually matters.

As it relates to *Shachar*, we discover in the Canaanite and Phoenician iteration of the *Ba'al* | Lord myth as memorialized in the Tell Ras Shamra texts, *Shachar* refers to the “dawn and its dim light emerging out of the darkness.” As such, it served as the name of the Canaanite and Phoenician god, Shachar. He is especially relevant because the central character in these myths is the Lord Ba'al, the name and title Yahowah ascribed to Satan. In that they are fascinating, and incriminating, I'll discuss the Ras Shamra texts momentarily.

But first, here is the conclusion of the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter where Israel is accused of having chosen to be religious rather than participate in the Covenant, having associated with Shachar rather than Yahowah. So, once again, Yisra'el was headed in the wrong direction. Worse, no matter how bad things became for them, they remained stubborn. It was, indeed, perplexing and exasperating.

**“Then (wa) they will pass through it (‘abar ba hy’ – intoxicated, they will travel through and cross over the darkness of Shachar) stubborn and stiff-necked, strong-willed and perplexing (qashah – wholly resistant to any**



advice or assistance due to a puzzling lack of humility and an attitude of superiority, and will experience cruelty and brutality as a result, enduring hardship and distress) **and** (*wa*) **starving and famished** (*ra'eb* – malnourished and weakened; akin to *roa'* – willfully malicious and overtly evil, afflicted and injured).

**And it shall come to pass** (*wa hayah* – so it will come to be) **when** (*ky*) **they are malnourished and weakened** (*ra'eb* – starving and famished as a result of being willfully malicious, overtly evil, and deliberately afflicted), **they will become antagonized and provoked to anger, struggling with their change in status** (*wa qatsaph* – they will be enraged and vengeful, displeased and furious, suffering from cognitive dissonance and dissidence in conjunction with their strife, fretting that the situation in which they find themselves is unfair and undeserved, showing dissension at having been uprooted and splintered). **Their status will diminish, and they will be treated with contempt as a result of their propensity to slander and insult the reputation** (*qalal* – they will be despised and seen as vile, they will curse and blaspheme, becoming an object of scorn as a result of their reputation) **of their leaders** (*ba melek huw'* – against their kings, dictators, and elected officials) **and** (*wa*) **against their God** (*ba 'elohym huw'* – in opposition to the Almighty), **turning away** (*wa paneh* – facing away (qal perfect)), **unfaithful in the relationship** (*la ma'al* – moving toward adultery).” (*Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 8:21)

How many times have we heard Jews lament being “God’s Chosen People?” To quote Tevye from *Fiddler on the Roof*, “I know, I know. We are Your chosen people. But, once in a while, can’t You choose someone else?” It is as if the abuse they have suffered was at His direction and not as a consequence of their own actions – and inaction.

The Towrah is resolute in this regard. If a people

embrace the Covenant, they will prevail, and if they reject Yahowah's testimony they will fail. And as it is so clearly stated in the Towrah, the status of those who reject Yahowah will be diminished. Why then have Yisra'elites chosen to slander and insult their God for having done precisely what He said He would do? Why do so many people find it so difficult to accept responsibility for their mistakes and then correct them?

**“Unto the Land** (*wa 'el 'erets* – then to the region) **they will look** (*nabat* – they will gaze), **but** (*wa*) **behold, they will see** (*hineh* – pay attention, they will find) **disfavor** (*tsarah* – anguishing trouble, calamitous distress, and unfavorable circumstances as a result of an antagonistic and competitive rival mistress who is vexing and adversarial) **and** (*wa*) **darkness** (*cheshkah* – obscurity with an absence of light) **with discouraging** (*ma'uwph* – dejection and sadness, gloom) **oppression** (*tsowqah* – anguish as a result of being constrained and distressed). **And** (*wa*) **into a place devoid of light** (*'aphelah* – into total darkness, lacking any light), **they will be driven and stray** (*nadach* – they will be exiled and enticed, lured and scattered, outcast and banished).” (*Yasha'yah* / Deliverance is from Yahowah / Isaiah 8:22)

For most, being devoid of light will simply mean that their souls will fade away. But for some, their souls will be exiled, banished to the place wholly devoid of light in *She'owl*.

The conclusion of the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of *Yasha'yah* reveals that Jews should not go along with the flow, acquiescing to the ploys of their religious or political leaders. The excuse that we were observing cultural mores but that is not what they mean to us, just following orders, or that others are doing the same thing, is not going to fly with God. Further, while Yahowah is Spirit, being spiritual is a bad idea because the most active spirits are those of demons. Moreover, the affinity civilizations and religious

institutions have for their founding fathers is not shared by God. If only we could effectively convey this to every religious person who believes they do not have to study because “the spirit will guide them.” One may, but more likely than not, it will be in the wrong direction.

As promised, I would like to share some of what I have learned by researching the Ras Shamra texts because they explain the origins of Christianity. The ancient Mediterranean city of Ugarit where they were unearthed between 1929 and 1994, rose and fell during the Late Bronze Age, circa 1450 to 1190 BCE. It was located on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea in what is northern Syria today. The Canaanite / Phoenician civilization traded with the Hittites to the north, Egypt to the south, Mycenae to the west, and Assyria and Babylon to the east, because it was the closest port to the headwaters of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers.

The Ras Shamra tablets were inscribed in a previously unknown variation of cuneiform, mostly in the decades before the city’s fall at the hands of the “Sea People” in 1190 BCE. Wedges were used to form twenty-nine or thirty letters, twenty-two of which were decidedly Hebrew, written in the same order, conveying the same meaning, all while presenting similar sounds. The grammar, vocabulary, and syntax recorded in these tablets are decidedly Hebrew. Two additional inscriptions in this same alphabetic form were also found in Yisra’el, one on a tablet at Beth-Shemesh and the other on a bronze knife near Tabor, demonstrating that this depiction of the Hebrew alphabet was widespread.

As far back as 1930, the tablets were readily deciphered by University of London professor of Assyriology, D.J. Wiseman, because the alphabet presented a Canaanite dialect of Hebrew – among the best-known ancient languages. Further, many of the names and accounts on the first 350 tablets were recognizable because

they were part of the Towrah's historical portrayals of these people, places, and cultures even though the Towrah predates the Ras Shamra tablets. In other words, the Towrah in its original paleo-Hebrew script served as the Rosetta Stone for the Ras Shamra tablets.

To the utter amazement, and quiet disdain of many linguistic scholars, the alphabet used by the early Canaanites and Phoenicians unearthed in the ruins of Ugarit was Hebrew, revealing that the phonetic writing system we have been examining was used more than 3,500 years ago – dating to the time of Moseh and beyond. The earliest known abecedaries prove that the order and expression of the Hebrew alphabet – a b g d h w z ch th y k l m n s e ph ts q r sh t – had long since been established and was passed along to the Canaanites, Phoenicians, Hittites, Greeks, and Romans. This is remarkable in that the initial phonetic writing system is inarguably our single most valuable invention and useful tool, and it forms the basis of the Towrah. In fact, the names attributed to the first twenty-two letters are a perfect match for the Hebrew alphabet.

As the Towrah suggests, most of the tablets are religious in nature. The “*Ab* – Father” of the gods was named “*El* – the Almighty.” This is not surprising since Satan not only covets Yahowah's title, but the Adversary also wants to be worshiped as if he were “*el* – god.” But that was not all Satan plagiarized. *El*'s favorite number was seven, reflected in the seventy gods and goddesses he originally surpassed in supremacy.

But that's just the beginning. In a nod to what would become Christianity, the old god was ultimately discounted. He was a standoffish and shadowy father figure, uninvolved in human affairs. Also, in keeping with Christianity, *El*'s consort, *Ashirath* (called *Asherah* in the Towrah and Prophets), and then later, *Elat* (who is also mentioned as a goddess and intermediary in the Quran),

was the Queen of Heaven and Mother of God. Providing the model for the Trinity 1,500 years before Christians would borrow the concept, the Lord | *Ba'al* was 'Ashirath's most popular and beloved son.

While it is required in Christianity for Paul to be credible, 'El | God was a capricious and schizophrenic character, lost in a fog of contradictions in an arcane world of his own making. At times, he was unable to refuse any request, and at others, he was either impotent or uncontrollably violent. The cult craved a kinder, less imposing and wrathful, more involved and caring, merciful and loving god. Continuing to forge the groundwork for Christianity, the *Ba'al* | Lord became the *Ben* | Son of 'El | God by way of 'Asherah | the Queen of Heaven and Mother of God.

As a result of his supposed benevolence toward man, his cult elevated Lord *Ba'al*'s status above 'El | God, the 'Ab | Father. The Lord, as the Son of God, is said to have driven his Father from his throne, becoming the principal object of worship, with the help of 'Asherah | the Mother of God and Queen of Heaven, who would now be worshiped in her own right. These prototypes served as the predecessors of Mary and Jesus, with the Roman Catholic Church establishing them as their primary objects of worship.

Also telling, the cults of the Lord | *Ba'al* and the Mother of God | 'Asherah celebrated annual holidays which both plagiarized and bastardized Yahowah's *Mow'ed Miqra'ey*, in similar fashion to Christianity. The Roman Catholic Church established their Good Friday, Eucharist, and Easter Sunday to replace *Pesach*, *Matsah*, and *Bikuwrym*. Pentecost, now signifying the Birth of their Church, replaced *Shabuw'ah*. Among Protestants, their Rapture replaced *Taruw'ah*. Their Second Coming has served to replace *Kipurym*. And for all Christians, Christmas has replaced *Sukah*. I don't call it Replacement

Foolology without reason or justification.

The quintessentially Canaanite culture had long been forgotten. It was buried under sixty feet of sediment when in 1929 a peasant's plow struck the first of many tablets to be unearthed from the Tell Ras Shamra site. Archeologists found a massive royal palace with ninety rooms laid out around eight enclosed courtyards. Crowning the hill upon which the city was built, two temples rose above the people. The larger was for Lord Ba'al, the *Melek* / King, and the Son of 'El / God. The smaller was to Dagon, a deity now memorialized by the pope's elongated hat.

Among the ruins of the neighboring High Priest's palace, the scriptures of the Ba'alym religion were found. The most important literary documents present the Cycle of Ba'al, depicting the basis of the Lord's religion. Over the span of six clay tablets, presenting 1,500 poetic verses, a royal scribe named Ilimiku composed the sweeping tale of the Lord Ba'al's struggle to rise above every god and obtain the most elevated position within the pagan pantheon. It was exactly as Yasha'yah described Shachar in his 14<sup>th</sup> chapter.

The epic tale begins with Yam, the god of the sea (read: Gentiles) and of chaos (read: evil), serving as the Adversary. He was the embodiment of the identity Satan is desperate to disown. Also telling, Yam is afforded Dowd's title.

In the midst of this divine intrigue, the priestly texts reveal that 'El orders the gods to build a palace for Yam. He then bestows his authority and power upon his son, symbolizing that opposition to Yam is useless. Holding a banquet in Yam's honor at the confluence of the rivers, 'El, after anointing Yam with curdled milk, reveals that henceforth, "Yam's personal name shall be Yaw, and he shall be known as the *Dowd* / Beloved of 'El." Then 'El tells Yaw, his Beloved, that he must drive his other son,

Lord Ba'al from the throne.

As the myth progresses, when Yaw, formerly Yam, pursues Ba'al, Kothar and Chasis come to the Lord's aid, providing him with supernatural clubs with magical names to strike *Yaw*, promising Ba'al that "he will be victorious and will win a kingdom without end." Wielding the clubs, Ba'al kills Yaw. With the Beloved of *'El / God* dead, the Lord Ba'al cries out that he should be King and worshiped as God.

The Lord Ba'al's rebuff of Yam, the god of the sea and of chaos, who is now masquerading as Dowd, is consistent with the Assyrian and Babylonian religious myths. It also portrays the Lord as the hero, with his victory over death establishing a new religious order on the ruins of the chaos and infighting that came before.

This is the model upon which Christianity's "Jesus" and his New Testament would prevail over the God of the "Old Testament." And in all of this, we should see Satan, in the guise of the Lord Ba'al establishing the battleground for his rivalry with Dowd. Also in this way, Allah, who is Satan, can be worshiped as God while creating the illusion that he is opposed to the Adversary. The same is true in Paul's letters, where the wannabe apostle appears opposed to the spirit possessing him.

Ba'al, of course, wants to rise above the Most High and be worshiped as *'El / God*. Swelling with pride, the Lord, with the help of 'Asherah, his mother, who is revered in her own right as the Queen of Heaven and Mother of God, after receiving a number of bribes is persuaded to allow him, her son, to have a Temple of his own. He commissions Kothar and Chasis, the Skillful and Wise, who supplied the bribes, to construct it for him. He is both soothsayer and carpenter, magician and stone mason. The resulting palace of cedar, silver, and gold is replete with a single window which the Skillful and Wise opens each

year, traveling from his home in Memphis, Egypt, so that Ba'al can come and go, bringing rain and fertilizing the earth, providing for the continuance of life.

All the while, Anath, Ba'al's sister and virginal lover, is shown attending a banquet in Ba'al's honor. And in true Canaanite fashion, she murders the guards, slays the warriors, and then exiles the townsfolk, all while claiming to embody the religion of peace. She then tells Ba'al that she knew the secret behind lightning and would perform the religious rite on the Lord's behalf to give him control over thunderbolts in the sky and flashing lights. Is it any wonder then that Paul witnessed his Lord as flashes of light speaking to him with a thunderous voice on the road to Damascus? Should we be surprised that Yahowah describes Satan as the Prince of the Air and thus with limited command over the weather?

The Lord's arrogance was now aligned with Satan's hubris and reminiscent of Sha'awl's ego. He would brag about his victory over Yam, now Yaw, the *Dowd* / Beloved of God. Sitting upon the throne of god, he boasts that should anyone attempt to resist his power he would send Mot, the god of death, to deal with them. It is the basis of the line Paul would repeat from Dionysus: "It is difficult to kick against the goad." In fact, it would be through the myths of Dionysus that Satan would beguile billions to worship him as "Jesus Christ."

Now worshiped as the King of the Gods and Ruler of the World, the Lord Ba'al invited Mot, who was the personification of death, into his temple so that Mot / Death could acknowledge the Lord's sovereignty over him. But by inviting Mot to a banquet of bread and wine (Pesach and Matsah), Mot becomes offended, saying, "Like a lion in the desert (read Yahuwdah in Yisra'el), I constantly hunger for human flesh and blood." Mot threatened to "wilt and collapse the Heavens and break Ba'al into pieces, eating him." Knowing the power of death, Ba'al tries to deceive



Mot, the Lord telling Death that he will be his slave.

At this point, Shapash, who is Shachar in Yasha'yah, representing the Rising Sun, addressed Ba'al, advising him to find a substitute in his image that can be sought out and slain by Mot. There are echoes of this in the Quran. She then promises to bury his body if he agrees to enter the underworld. After doing so, the Lord God is presumed dead. This myth would be repeated in Christianity.

Thereafter, and reminiscent of Lent and the Weeping for Tammuz, Anath seeks after Ba'al "like a cow for its calf" and finds his body, which she "buries with sacrifices and weeping." Oddly, then, she goes to 'El and 'Asherah, telling them that they can rejoice because the Son of God is dead. Knowing, however, that it is all a lie, Anath searches She'owl for the "shade of her brother, demanding that Mot restore him to her."

But Mot claims to have eaten him. At this point, Anath, the Virgin, and Ba'al's incestuous lover, goes into jihadist mode. As the mythical embodiment of Quran 5.33, she is depicted wading knee-deep in blood, slashing off heads, hands, and feet, binding the decapitated heads to her torso and hands to her sash, her heart filled with joy as she shoots her arrows into the enemies of Ba'al she is trying to terrorize. Slaying Mot, the personification of death is "burned in the fire and ground with millstones."

Anath then boasts that she has put an end to the Seven-Headed Serpent who is the Darling of 'El, to Atik, the Quarrelsome Calf of 'El, and tellingly, to 'Ishath, the Feminine Fire of 'El who is the "Bitch of the Gods." Satan clearly holds the Set-Apart Spirit in low esteem.

In the process, Lord Ba'al is reborn, bodily resurrected, returning to his Temple on Mount Zephon. Not to be outdone, Mot is also resurrected, complaining to Ba'al about the treatment he received. In response, Ba'al tries to appease Death by offering to feed Mot his servants.

Unimpressed, Mot and Ba'al meet to duke it out on Mount Zephon, at which time Mot capitulates because Shapash, speaking for 'El, has declared that fighting against Lord Ba'al is futile. Mot's submission not only allows the Lord to rise above every god, by defeating death, Ba'al is seen as the Savior of mortal man. With the Lord Ba'al, a.k.a. Satan, having triumphed, and now reigning as 'El / God, the Canaanite religion would serve the Adversary for the next 2,500 years.

As the Lord does battle against the personification of death, and against the influence of Dowd, Yahowah's Beloved, and his devotion to the Towrah, Ba'al is afforded Dowd's attributes while embodying Satan's ambitions. The myth even plays along the lines of a Trinity, with the elderly father-god, 'El, and his consort, 'Asherah, the Queen of Heaven and Mother of God, playing roles in Ba'al's, the Son of God's, rise.

Now that it has become obvious that the Towrah and Prophets convey a historically accurate depiction of the Canaanite religion, and that the Canaanites established the underpinnings of Christianity, it is no longer surprising that Yahowah presents Ba'al and 'Asherah as the mythological building blocks of the most popular Satanic religion ever conceived – consistently railing against their cults. And while it is true that many Yisra'elites adopted these reprehensible heathen myths, the principal participants in the Canaanite religion were dead and all but forgotten not long after the Children of Yisra'el entered the Promised Land. So, it wasn't of them that Yahowah was speaking of per se but, instead, of what would emerge from their religious myths: Christianity and Islam.

But there is more to all of this. For example, the Ras Shamra tablets attest to the fact that there were male and female prostitutes serving in the Lord's / *Ba'al's* and the Mother of God's / *'Asherah's* temples, and that making donations to them would grant the petitioner's plea for

abundant harvest, success in some worldly endeavor, or renewed health. But if bribes proved insufficient, the Canaanites resorted to child sacrifice (also attested in 2 Kings 3:27).

Indeed, proving that their “iniquity was complete” (*Bare’syth* 15:16), a plethora of religious canisters have been found with the bodies of young children distorted by suffocation as they struggled for life after having been buried alive as a sacrifice to the Canaanite gods. This helps to explain why Yahowah insisted upon ridding His home of these people before His children moved into the Promised Land.

It is interesting to contrast the real with the myth. Unlike ‘El, ‘Asherah, and Ba’al, Yahowah does not personify the characteristics of natural phenomena, He was not represented by the stars, constellations, sun, or moon, He does not love or war with other gods, He does not die, and He is not resurrected. Unlike the pagan myths which were embroiled in subversive dramas with other gods, Yahowah intervenes in human history to free His people and lift them up.

He created humankind in His image, whereas Ba’al, ‘El, and ‘Asherah were created by men and women in their image. Further, Yahowah is alone. He has no consort. There is no Queen of Heaven, Mother of God, or Virgin with Child. In fact, Hebrew does not even have a word for “goddess.”

There are no images of Yahowah, no pictures, carvings, or statues. Not a single figurine of Yahowah has ever been found. And while the Canaanite, Phoenician, Assyrian, and Babylonian gods and goddesses were relentlessly immoral, Yahowah is the living embodiment of the world’s most moral text. His singular purpose is His Covenant, a family-oriented relationship with His creation rather than competing for supremacy with other gods.

Also, let's ponder the difference between *hayah*, an always-existing, eternally living God of light as Yahowah has defined Himself, and the dying and resurrected gods like Ba'al, Tammuz, Osiris, Dionysus, Bacchus, and, of course, the Christian Jesus. It is why we find in Yahowah's rebuke of Sha'awl / Paul and Christianity in *Chabaquwq*, the prophet clearly stating, "God, You cannot die."

Speaking of the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter of *Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk, there is even more that we can learn by studying the Hebrew text of the Ugaritic legal documents. Scholars who have read them have determined that the first word in the 3<sup>rd</sup> verse of the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter, the adverb, 'owd, should have been diacritically marked as the noun, 'uwd, and therefore have been translated as "testimony" rather than "still" or "yet."

Not knowing this, in the *King James Bible*, rendered three hundred years before these tablets were unearthed, we find: "For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry." Similarly, in the *New American Standard Bible*, we find: "For the vision is yet for the appointed time; It hastens toward the goal, and it will not fail. Though it tarries, wait for it; For it will certainly come, it will not delay."

*Chabaquwq* 2:3 reads: "**Indeed** (*ky* – so therefore it is truthful and reliable), **the testimony** ('*uwd* – the restoring and eternal witness) **of this revelation from God** (*chazown* – this divine communication) **is for the Mow'ed Appointed Meeting Times** (*la ha mow'ed* – for the time of the *Mow'ed*). **It provides a witness to and speaks, pouring out evidence** (*puwach* – it reveals facts which condemn, trapping and ensnaring) **in the end** (*la ha qets*). **The extended period of time required for this question to be resolved** ('*im mahah* – question him, because no matter how long it takes) **shall not prove it false** (*lo' kazab* – this revelation shall not deceive, delude, nor fail).

**Expect him in this regard** (*chakah la* – be certain concerning this) **because indeed** (*ky*), **he will absolutely come** (*bow' bow'* – he will certainly come upon the scene and make his appearance), **neither being delayed nor lingering** (*lo' 'achar*).” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:3)

Immediately prior to this, we find...

**“Then** (*wa*) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – an accurate transliteration of the name YaHoWaH, our *'elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence and our *shalowm* – reconciliation) **answered, approaching me** (*'anah* – responded to me), **and He said** (*wa 'amar*), **‘Write** (*katab* – use the alphabet to inscribe) **this revelation** (*chazown* – this communication from God), **and then** (*wa*) **expound upon and reiterate it using those letters** (*ba'ar* – teaching others its significance by plainly and clearly declaring it using large and distinct alphabetic characters) **upon** (*'al*) **writing tablets** (*luwach* – engraving it in stone) **so that** (*ma'an* – for the express purpose and intent that), **by reciting this** (*ba qara'* – by reading this), **he might run and go away** (*ruwts* – he might flee).” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:2)

Yahowah’s prophetic testimony regarding Sha’uwl needed to be recorded so that when Paul came along 666 years thereafter and fulfilled it, the world should have known to reject him. The written record proved God to be trustworthy when His prediction was actualized in human history, while at the same time proving that the founder of the world’s most popular iteration of the Canaanite religion was dead wrong.

Also interesting in light of the Ras Shamra texts, the presupposition of natural explanations required by the scholastic endeavor of “higher criticism” has subsequently been proven invalid with these archeological discoveries. The scientific, historical, political, and religious basis of

Yahowah's arguments is consistently shown to be valid. And the miraculous nature of His prophecies was indeed committed to writing long before the events He predicted transpired.

Moreover, the principal argument rendered in favor of five authors of the Towrah by higher criticism hinges on words the skeptics claim were not ever written by the same author, when the Ras Shama tablets, which date to the same time period, reveal quite the opposite. In particular, the pronouns said to have indicated different sources are routinely used in conjunction with one another in the same clay tablets. Even the words for "sacrifice," which allegedly required a different author and time period for the "Leviticus" text, were shown to be in common usage circa 1450 BCE, further nullifying the scholastic arguments.

Of particular interest relative to the controversial declaration in Yasha'yah 7:14 of a young woman versus a virgin giving birth to a son, a tablet unearthed in Ras Shamra dating to 1400 BCE uses both "*bethuwlah* – virgin" and "*'almah* – young woman" in the same verse, speaking of *Anath*, the unmarried goddess who was both virginal and young when she served Ba'al by killing Mot.

Further, beyond proving that the Canaanite religion served as the model for Christianity, there are some interesting additional nuggets that can be gleaned from it. For example, prior to reading the Ras Shamra tablets and learning that the Canaanites boiled a kid (a young male goat) alive in their mother's milk to appease their deities as part of their religious rituals, it wasn't clear why Yahowah issued a prohibition against doing so in *Shemowth* 23:19, 34:26, and *Dabarym* 14:21.

Yahowah was trying to convince His people not to ascribe to a sickening religious custom. After all, roasted meats are healthier, and they offer improved flavor. Then there is the ambiance of the fire, in addition to its

symbolism relative to the smoke rising up and the flames providing light. Additionally, we ought not forget the fire's ability to eliminate the body of the sacrificial victim.

God wanted His people to be healthy and He wanted His children to enjoy themselves. If He could convey some meaningful symbolism along with the fire, so much the better. Moreover, He did not want His people to mimic heathenism.

Similarly, the instruction in *Dabarym* 23:17-18 against male and female prostitution was designed to differentiate Yahowah's family from the surrounding civilizations. God wanted to inoculate His children from the prevalent immoral religious practices of man. The "Most Holy One" in the Canaanite religion was the most acclaimed temple prostitute – a sacred whore.

The message here is simple. Yahowah does not want us to corrupt our relationship with Him by bringing other gods to His parties. And when it comes to violators, none were worse than Sha'awl / Paul. But at least now, you know where he stole his material.

✠✠✠

*Christo* | Drugged

*Intoxicating...*

When Yahowah warned us that Sha'awl / Paul 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. And since we concluded the last chapter with *Chabaquwq*, let’s pick up where we left off...

**“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, or live, whoever is open to the broad path, the duplicitous and improper way, associated with Sha'awl. 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, (*Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk 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.

Now continuing 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 – a placeholder for the errant title *Christou* which was used as a name since it is a better grammatical fit without the definite article), **we were found** (*heuriskomai* – we were discovered and were experiencing), **also** (*kai*) **ourselves** (*autos*) **sinners**

(*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 Christos (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, self-centered, and self-serving 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, no worship, no Sunday services, no Christmas, and no 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 Dowd's fulfillment of the *Miqra' of Matsah* that makes us perfect, not Christo. Yahowah promised to remove the fungus of religious rebellion from the souls of those who answer His Invitation to be Called Out and Meet on UnYeasted Bread. Dowd's soul paid the price to ransom those who avail themselves of this promise by carrying our collective guilt into She'owl and leaving it there, never to be seen again. His was a perfect solution.

This is not complicated.

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 Towrah that resolves the issue of our guilt. Also, based on the tenses, this cannot be inferring that by continuing to sin after being saved that we are somehow disrespecting the sacrifice. From Paul's warped perspective, it is the Torah that causes everyone to be evil and misled in the first place

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 is 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'awl 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 the Messiah's life, lyrics, and contribution 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 promise of Firstborn Children, the Messiah's ordeal and life no longer have any purpose or benefit. Apart from the Towrah, Dowd's lives and lyrics were a waste of time and energy and he endured it all for nothing.

What follows is so awkwardly worded, it was not until I came to understand Sha'awl 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, just as Gospel Jesus 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 depth of Sha’uwl’s depravity knows no bounds. He is fully aware that the Hebrew word, *beryth*, meaning “Familial 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 that 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 Towrah advice on how to live, our lives are more joyous and productive. And our relationship with God is enhanced. Second, while our mistakes do not lead to our expulsion from Yahowah’s family and home, a steady diet of them can influence the choices we and others make with regard to associating with God. When it is obvious that someone does not respect what Yahowah has revealed by disregarding His *Towrah* | Teaching, then why

would anyone trust what they have to say regarding Yahowah's Guidance?

While we have to smile at the use of "prevaricator," it would be unfair to criticize these translations based on 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 continues 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 that comprise Sha'awl's next puzzle, in the order of their appearance in the Greek text, reveal that, according to Sha'awl, 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." (Galatians 2:19 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 – 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'awl, first-person singular)).” (Galatians 2:19)

Before we consider this iteration of Sha'awl'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 Gospel Jesus, 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'uwI, 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 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 Gospel Jesus 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 *torah* 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-two translators were deployed on the project.) So this is the basis for and validation of Sha’uwl’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’uwl 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’uwl 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’uwl 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, the fable of Gospel Jesus did not speak English – a language derived from Anglo-Saxon in the 15<sup>th</sup> century CE. He did not speak Greek either. The Instruction on the Mount would have been delivered in Hebrew. So, Dowd, if he delivered it, would have said “Towrah” in his native tongue, iterating a concept as familiar to his audience as were the names and identity of Yisra'el and YahuwDAH.

Further, the only eyewitness account of this essential public address was written in Hebrew by the 'Ebownym, 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 this speech. And in it, we find *nomos* used as distinctly as words allow to depict the Towrah.

As evidence of this assertion, that Hebrew copies of these words were destroyed by rabbis, consider this confession from the Babylonian Talmud: *Tosef., Shabbath xiii. 5; Tractate Shabbath, Folio 116a, Yer. Shabbath 15c, 52; and Sifre Number 16*. There we read: “The Gilyonim [a Hebrew corruption of *euangelion*] and the books of the Minim [Yisra'elite followers of the Messiah] 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 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 the “worthlessness of a scroll.” The eyewitness accounts scribed by the Jewish ‘Ebownym in Hebrew, replete with Yahowah’s name, 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 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 the Messiah many have said was problematic prior to recognizing the etymology of *nomos*. Christian publishers are wont to render it “Law” – which is 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 manner 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 when *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, Gospel Jesus is alleged to have spoken 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’uwl’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 that 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 that conveys many of these things, albeit a relatively small portion of the Torah is dedicated to establishing directions, and even then, they all serve as insights to educate and guide us.

In that few insights are more vital to our understanding, please consider the etymological definition of Towrah based on 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* – תורה. 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: ה. 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 to do is reach for His Towrah and observe what it reveals.

Yahowah’s “*Towrah* – Teaching, Instruction, Guidance, and Direction,” therefore, written הָרָאָה to 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 an argument as to which *nomos* he was claiming to have "torn 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 ( $XP\Omega$ ) I have actually been crucified together with ( $\Omega$  *suneotrai*)." (Galatians 2:19)**

Moving on to the next interesting term in the 19<sup>th</sup> verse of the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter of Galatians, we find *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, rendering it as devoid 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 Gospel Jesus, 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 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 the subject, which would be either Sha'awl 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'awl 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 the sacrifice of Gospel Jesus 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 as “I might currently live,” was written *zesō*, 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, *sustauroō*, translated as “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 – a Roman torture implement – as a religious symbol. This may represent the strangest and most horrific image ever immortalized.

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 *stauroō*, 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 Christ.”

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 was saying 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 that 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 Yahuw dym by nature and not from the social outcasts of sinful and heathen races (Galatians 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 Christou, 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, (Galatians 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* that the Messiah Dowd fulfilled.

Therefore, instead of availing himself of what Father and Son accomplished, Sha'uwl presented himself as a contributor. So he imagined that his work was at the very least equivalent, but likely more important than Dowd'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 on his god's credibility problem, even Sha'uwl was uncertain of his destiny. To which I have good and bad news. Based upon his own admission of his spiritual affiliation, Sha'uwl lives and will never die. He is separated from God, spending his eternity with Satan in

She'owl. With his ego, Sha'uwl is probably claiming that She'owl was named in his honor.

According to Yahowah, His Son, our Messiah and King, 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 Dowd paid the toll.

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 Christo 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 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 anymore) **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 the** (*te tov* – perhaps he meant to say “that the”) **God** (ΘΥ – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God) **and** (*kai*) **Christou** (XPY – 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 the 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 resides 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 his god-man’s deficiencies, is further

underscored by the grammatical tenses, voices, and cases Sha'awl 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'awl is deliberately isolating the Lamb's actions, disassociating them from Yahowah's promise and purpose. Without consideration for the process that made these things possible, there is no longer an association between Dowd's sacrifice and the Towrah in the minds of those beguiled by this myth. This negates everything Yahowah accomplished through His Son.

To believe Sha'awl, a mythical character decided to allow mortal men to kill immortal God, nailing God to a pagan cross. The fact that it happened on *Pesach*, the doorway to life was irrelevant. Dowd 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'awl's devotees the eyewitness accounts all say that no one recognized the most important individual in the world 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 fulfillment.

And it gets worse. Rather than presenting God's love and His Son's 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’uwl 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 Quran, this is because Muhammad is the corporeal manifestation of his god, also known as Satan, making the man and his lord indistinguishable. But here, we have now transitioned from “we,” used similarly, suggesting that Sha’uwl 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.” Secondly, 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.

Paul would be lord and master – man’s savior and the

one controlling humankind. Rather than the Towrah being the authorized source of teaching and instruction, its authority was surrendered, and yielded to Sha'uw1. For those who know Yahowah, it is more than enough to make one want to scream.

If Paul had wanted to say that Gospel Jesus “offered himself sacrificially for our benefit,” he would have written *zabach* (Strong’s H2076) or *dabach* (Strong’s H1685) in Hebrew, or *thuo* (Strong’s G2380 meaning “to sacrifice, immolate, slay, slaughter, and kill”) in Greek in the first-person plural. But deliberately, egotistically, and deceptively, he selected *paradidomi*, and then he scribed it in the singular genitive.

Gospel Jesus 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 Iesus 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 (*dikaiois* – 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 that is restricted to a singular individual. It thus conveys that Gospel Jesus 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, Gospel Jesus and his alleged understudy have become the focus, when our eyes should be on the Father. While we should all love and respect Dowd for his contribution to our eternity as the Passover Lamb, he is God's Son, not God.

Additionally, this verse says: "God (ΘΥ) and (kai) Cristou (XPY)." The conjunction separates them as if they were different individuals, which is only a problem since in Christianity they were both supposed to be God.

Had Sha'uwl 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 and Dowd tangibly demonstrated their love for us, fulfilling His Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children, thereby enabling all five of the Covenant's benefits. But Sha'uwl 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** (ΘΥ)...”

The reason 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 about Sha’uwl’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** (*dikaiosyne* – 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 – 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 His Son 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 three days – *Pesach*, *Matsah*, and *Bikuwrym* – 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 Dowd's fulfillment of Passover that either would be in vain. But that only happens under the specific scenario Sha'owl 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 but, instead, isolated and vulnerable.

On *Pesach*, Dowd'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, Dowd's soul went to She'owl, fulfilling *Matsah*, known as UnYeasted Bread, on a Shabat by carrying our guilt with him. 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 Dowd's mutilated 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,” the Son of God's soul, now released from She'owl, was reunited with the Set-Apart Spirit and with his Father. In this way, following him, 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 will bring His children home on Seven Shabats, liberating us on *Shabuw'ah* so that we do not have to endure the anguishing time of Israel's Troubles. Therefore, Dowd's observation of the Towrah mattered because the promises of the Towrah matter.

Yahowah, in concert with His Son and the Set-Apart Spirit, honored and enabled 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 Dowd's lives, and by mischaracterizing it, the result can be worse than severing the overall connection between the Messiah and the Towrah.

Therefore, it bears repeating: the opposite of what Sha'uwl has just written is true. If Christians believe him and focus on God's impossible “death,” they will die. And should they make the connection between the Towrah 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'awl 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 Gospel Jesus had done. And if Sha'awl 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 why it was so essential for Dowd to serve in this way. 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 the fulfillment of it.

Because they do not know or understand the Towrah's presentation of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, FirstFruits, Seven Sabbaths, Trumpets, Reconciliations, and Shelters, Christians believe that Paul was authorized to undermine the value of the Torah and thereby replace it with the death of God on a cross – even that he was murdered by Jews. In their mind, it is as if these things provided a solution that was afforded by faith. But that's totally inconsistent with God's message. Moreover, unless Yahowah had a clearly articulated plan to reconcile His people, one which His Son 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. Dowd's lives, his words, his deeds, and his sacrifice, are irrelevant without the Towrah. Apart from the Towrah, the Messiah and Son of God become irrelevant, and his sacrifice was a complete waste of time. If not for the Towrah, no one would have been saved by his actions. Therefore, as a standalone concept, “believing in Jesus Christ” is as meaningless as the name and title are erroneous.

Dowd's lives matter 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, our Shepherd 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 Dowd's lives 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 His Beloved Son, or we can reject it as Sha'awl 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. Dowd, Yahowah, and the Set-Apart Spirit fulfilled the first three, Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children. The Seven Shabbats Harvest is on our horizon and will be fulfilled at the beginning of the Time of Ya'aqob's Troubles, and thus on May 22, 2026 as Israel is cut into pieces to reward Islamic terrorists. Seven years thereafter, on the 25<sup>th</sup> of September, the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> of October 2033, Taruw'ah, Reconciliations, and Sukah will be honored on schedule with the desired results.

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 Dowd described and 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 (Galatians 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, (Galatians 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 Christ 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 Towrah, here is a breath of fresh air from the man who wrote about it and lived it:

“**Yahowah’s** (*YaHoWaH* – an accurate presentation of the name of ‘*elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence) **Towrah** (*Towrah* – source of instruction and teaching, direction and guidance) **is complete and entirely accurate** (*tamym* – without defect, lacking nothing, correct and unobjectionable, sound, genuine, and right, helpful, healing, and beneficial, sincere and true), **returning, restoring, and transforming** (*shuwb* – turning around and bringing back, changing and renewing) **the soul** (*nepesh* – consciousness, the ability to be observant and responsive).

**Yahowah’s** (*YaHoWaH*) **enduring testimony and restoring witness** (*‘eduwth* – eternal message) **is trustworthy and reliable** (*‘aman* – verifiable and readily confirmed, supportive and establishing), **making understanding and obtaining wisdom** (*chakam* –

becoming educated and enlightened to the point of comprehension, teaching which leads to becoming intelligent) **simple for the open-minded** (*pethy*).” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:7*)

And this from His Father...

“**I am** (*‘any*) **Yahowah** (יְהוָה) – a transliteration of *YaHoWaH* as instructed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence). **This is My name** (*huw’ shem ‘any*). **And** (*wa*) **My honorable distinction and respect** (*kabowd ‘any* – My attribution of status, My conspicuous reputation and presence, and My manifestation of power, especially My glorious reward) **I will not give** (*lo’ nathan* – I will not ever offer or allow, bestowing) **to another** (*la ‘acher* – one who appears later or lingers around) **or** (*wa*) **My renown and reputation** (*tahilah ‘any* – the adoration I have earned and admiration I deserve) **to religious constructs** (*la ha pasyl* – idolatrous notions and objects of worship believed to represent gods).” (*Yasha ‘yah / Yah Liberates / Isaiah 42:8*)

יְהוָה

*Ignorant and Irrational...*

The third chapter of Galatians opens with some pejorative language. After propping himself up, it was time for Paul 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)

This is already the second slur, 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, is inexcusable and sounds eerily similar to the ongoing rant between Muhammad and those who knew him best throughout the Quran. 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, or the least bit unfair, you have not been paying attention. Or, should

someone still side with Paul, it is likely that religion, politics, or conspiracy has disoriented or broken their moral compass. Having lost the ability to be judgmental, they no longer possess the means to discern an informed and rational conclusion. It is why those who perpetrated this fraud put, “Judge not lest you be judged” on the lips of their god before he died.

Affirming this conclusion, *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 mentally incapacitated by religion, politics, and conspiracy in America and the West.

In particular, with the overtly religious, unassailable evidence and irrefutable logic becomes irrelevant. They will even reject God’s testimony when it impugns what they believe. When their faith is challenged, a religious mind becomes impervious – similar to what Yahowah has been saying of His people throughout the Towrah and Prophets. When the evidence needed to make an informed decision is provided, the faithful refuse to process the facts rationally. Their indoctrination is so pervasive, they are rendered incapable of thinking. They become embittered and hostile, typically slandering and demonizing the rare individual who isn’t afraid to tell them the truth and then prove it. The same is true today of the overtly political and conspiratorial, whether they are on the far right or left. Even misguided cultural mores can incubate hostile and visceral reactions.

I am also familiar with *baskaino*, translated as “bewitched and deceived.” Based upon *phasko*, it shows Paul accusing the Galatians of having been fooled by people who “affirmed that what they were professing” was Godly, when it, 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.

The reason that Sha'awl's retort to rejection was fallacious is because he was denouncing the people who rejected him as opposed to having countered their arguments and criticisms. By doing so, Paul not only lost this debate, he demonstrated that he was irrational and should not be trusted.

Based upon the evidence at our disposal, and consistent with what we learned in Acts and have read thus far in Galatians, those Paul was slandering were Towrah-observant, while Paul sought to dissolve and dismantle the Word of God. It is like the Quran 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 while those who were being honest 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 only one side of these "arguments," billions believe that both deceivers were messengers of God and that those who knew them best were wrong. Sure, it's irrational, but that is the nature of religion.

I would be remiss if I did not point out that it is always appropriate, even compassionate and caring, to expose ignorance and criticize deception when the subject is the Word of God. It is Godly to demonstrate 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 and counterproductive.

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 have denounced his opposition without substance? And while it is clear to those who are neither ignorant nor irrational that Paul is the furthest from the truth, this remains a conundrum for the faithful.

Had Sha'awl 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 use against us. 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 – because they 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.

*Prophet of Doom* was a gift to Muslims, just as *Questioning Paul* provides a lifeline to Christians. However, that is no longer true and by intent. The comprehensive augmentations of these volumes have repurposed *God Damn Religion* and *Twistianity* such that they are now a gift to Israel – to those these religions have tormented the most egregiously.

My mission isn't to lure the religious or political away from the beliefs that incapacitate their thinking but, instead,

to awaken and protect God's people so that they are prepared for what is to come. Further, by proving that Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Politics, Militarism, Progressivism, and Conspiracy are without merit, I am able to help those on the periphery of these deceptive schemes disassociate from them while defending what will be an unpopular decision.

So while it is compassionate and courageous to impugn religion and politics with evidence and reason, it is uncouth and inappropriate to besmirch the conveyor of truth. We should care sufficiently about the victims of religious and political malfeasance to protect them. And while ten to twenty years ago I was keen on helping those deceived by religion and politics extricate themselves from the mass delusions, it is too late for that now.

The height of ignorance is to do what Paul has done. Those he addressed in the synagogues criticized and rejected him. Rather than debate with them or refute their arguments, Paul demeaned them. He offered no explanation of what they thought, nor how his position 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.

Nothing Paul wrote was ever sensible or revealing. This is no exception...

**“To whom** (*os* – which) **down from** (*kata* – extended downward toward and according to) **eyes** (*ophthalmos*) **Iesus Christos** (ΧΡΣ ΙΗΣ – placeholders used by early Christian scribes to imply divinity) **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 Iesus or Christos. Look as one might, they are not there. So to create the illusion otherwise, Christians steal

them from Dowd. Yes, they steal them! Replacement Foolology is identity theft.

Jesus Christ is not mentioned by name anywhere in the Towrah, Prophets, or Psalms. Every prophecy, without exception, religiously attributed to him was written of Dowd, the actual Messiah, Son of God, and Savior. This includes the “One like me” prophecy in Dabarym 18, the “He is My son and I am his Father” pronouncement in 2 Shamuw’el 7, and the “My God, my God” citation in Mizmowr 22 which describes the fulfillment of Pesach and Matsah leading to Bikuwrym. This included the Choter explanation, “the Son who is given” proclamation, and the “He laid upon him the iniquity of all” pronouncement in Yasha’yah 11, 9, and 53. And of course, for those paying attention, this is all laid out for us in the 89<sup>th</sup> Mizmowr – Dowd’s Song. Even the “One to be cut off but not for himself” prophecy regarding the Mashyach in Daniel 9 spoke of Dowd as it was delivered by *Gabry’el* | God’s Most Capable and Courageous Man.

Returning to Paul’s rant, *prographo*, rendered as “described beforehand in writing,” is a compound of *pro*, meaning “beforehand,” and *grapho*, the Greek word for “writing.” So while Dowd’s fulfillment of Passover was predicted by him 1,000 years in advance, and by others 700 to 1,500 years prior to his fulfillments, and all 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.”

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 Dowd’s fulfillment of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children. But he didn’t, and that speaks volumes. We should never call someone “ignorant and irrational” unless we are prepared to either prove it or 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 the Messiah 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, Dowd 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 redemption and reconciliation, if you want to benefit from the path home Father and Son have provided, if you want to capitalize on Dowd'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, then the responsible party is illiterate or, at the very least, inarticulate.

Sha’uwl advances his theory by asking a rhetorical question. And by doing so, he revealed the reason he demeaned the Galatians. They agreed with God regarding the Towrah rather than Paul’s lunacy regarding placing one’s faith in his euangelion.

“**This** (*houtos*) **alone** (*monon* – only) **I wish** (*thelo* – I propose, want, and desire) **to learn** (*manthano* – to be apprised 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 an inheritance, nourishment which is bestowed to be possessed and used by heirs, a 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 *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'awl 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'awl has openly admitted that his preaching differed materially from Yahowah's testimony, especially in His Towrah, and he has inferred that his message delivered superior results to God's Instructions.

This being the case, 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. He bore false witness about God. Case closed.

Before we contemplate God'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 were fully aware 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 the 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?” Or is this proof that religious scholars lack the professional integrity one should 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*). (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 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** (*pane*) **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, brooding over Her infant creation, She served by energizing and promoting growth through superintendence) **the appearance** (*pane*) **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* / In the Beginning / 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 while affirming Her role as our Spiritual Mother. More powerful than all 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, and helping us better appreciate the Light. She perfected creation, just as Her Garment of “Light” makes us look perfect in God’s eyes.

The *Ruwach* | Spirit is the “manifestation of God’s power and enlightenment,” available to us so that we might be enlightened and grow.” When 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 empowers and enriches our lives.

The nature of the spirit a person chooses to associate with 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 as “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 *rachuwmm* 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.” Therefore, *rachsah* is “to wash and cleanse, removing all contaminants and filth.” *Rachem* is “mercy, love, and compassion.” *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 of the Almighty 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 of Yahowah 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 ‘*Ishah* | Maternal Manifestation of the Light on the *Miqra*’ of *Matsah*, the day each year when 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 are permanently separated from God in She’owl, where they will spend eternity with Sha’uwl.

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 known and acquired was by observing the Towrah. After all, he is credited with transcribing the following spiritual conversation. And as we listen in, please be mindful that, to the extent this was actually stated, it would have been 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, nevertheless, interesting...

**“Now there was a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus, a member of Yahuwdah’s ruling council.**

He came to Iesous 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 Iesous 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.’

Iesous 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?’

Iesous 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.” (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 Towrah 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, Iesus 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 as a placeholder for *Ruwach* using *pneuma*), **now** (*nyn* – at the same time) **in flesh** (*sarx*) **you are completing** (*epiteleo* – you are undergoing and finishing, bringing to a close (present tense which portrays an uncompleted action in process, middle voice reveals that those Sha’uwl is calling ignorant are doing this to themselves, and indicative mood indicating that this assessment is real))?” (Galatians 3:3)

Therefore, according to the Plague of Death, the Galatians were ignorant and irrational because their answer to the following question was consistent with Yahowah, His Towrah, Iesous, 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 that is consistent with the Word of God – just as She did for Dowd. Once we have been born into the Covenant by way of our Spiritual Mother as a result of the Towrah, Beryth, and Miqra’ey, we become heirs in God’s Family, perfected, enriched, enlightened, and empowered – just as was the case with Dowd 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 Covenant as a result of the Beryth benefits and the Miqra'ey of Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym, we are eternal and perfected children in Yahowah's Family. 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 during the Miqra'ey of Pesach, Matsah, and Bikuwrym, to which Yahowah is inviting His children, we are the beneficiaries of life, love, 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 Beryth and Miqra’ey, which consist of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and FirstFruits, then eventually to Seven Sabbaths, Trumpets, Reconciliations, and Shelters, which Dowd has and will fulfill, are comprised of thoughtless, random, and chaotic events that are neither part of an overall plan nor productive. The Plague of Death is saying that by answering God’s *Miqra ’ey* | Invitations to *Chag* | Celebrate these Feasts with Him, the participant suffers greatly, and 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 – as if Heaven has a revolving door.

The primary meaning of *pascho*, rendered as “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 or 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'awl'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 *Chag* | Festive Celebrations. Further, the message of *Yowm Kipurym*, the Day of Reconciliations, is that Father and Son have restored our relationship with them so that we can enjoy *Sukah* – camping out with our Heavenly Father.

The Covenant is the most beneficial agreement in the universe and the Invitations are to celebrations of life, 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* ΠΙΝΙ – placeholder for *pneuma*, the Greek neuter noun for spirit), 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)

Should anyone still be clinging to the myth that this was inspired by God, they may feel like 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* enable the benefits of the Beryth. During them, the *Ruwach Qodesh* | Set-Apart Spirit enlivens, perfects, 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 no one is at liberty to besmirch it, change it, or replace it without dire consequence.

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 if 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 which makes Him reliable. And He just so happens to be God, the Creator of the universe and Architect of life. He is everything *Sha'uwil* | 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'uwil* 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 them to believe that God failed and was impotent and that His Towrah was cruel and counterproductive. According to the religion articulated in these letters, the old god was unable to save anyone.

For Paul's diatribe against Yahowah, Moseh, Dowd, and Yasha'yah, against the Towrah, Beryth, and Miqra'ey, and in opposition to Yisra'el and Yahuwdym, indeed, counter to common sense, to be considered accurate, the faithful have to believe that his failed deity recognized his ineptitude and dispensed with the prophets, passed on the Messiah, rebuked the witnesses, and turned to a megalomaniacal moron to come up with a new plan to save Gentiles while condemning the Chosen People. So what are the odds that Yahowah inspired an irrational narcissist

to contradict and misquote Him?

So why do over two billion Christians believe that the resulting schizophrenic word salad supersedes and annuls one thousand years of inspired prophetic testimony? That is what is required to believe what Paul has written. Little wonder his religion was based upon faith. No wonder it condemns those exercising good judgment.

Incredulously, Paul is saying that believing his preaching provides direct access to spiritual power while Yahowah's Towrah'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 reality. In this regard, this passage is blowing in the wind without support. In reality, we are empowered because of our response to the *Beryth* | Covenant's 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 or 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.

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? (Galatians 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'awl will say that 'Abram had faith in Yahowah before the Towrah 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 Towrah and Covenant.

Without the Towrah, there is no Covenant. It is the only place where the relationship is formed and described. And without the Covenant, the Towrah does not exist, because there would be no purpose for it.

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 Beryth came before the Towrah. How is it that the fact that the Covenant is only known to us through the Towrah is lost on billions of people?

Literally and rationally irrefutably, nothing would be known of 'Abraham had Yahowah not shared His experience with him in Bare'syth – the first book of the Towrah. It would be like saying: Captain Ahab's obsessive quest for the White Whale, and the adventure introduced by Ishmael, have nothing to do with Herman Melville's novel *Moby-Dick*.

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* | teaching, guidance, instructions, and directions with Abraham. Listen...

**“Therefore (*wa*), I will grow and thrive (*rabah* – I will greatly increase) **with** (*’eth* – alongside) **your offspring** (*zera’* – your seed and what is sown) **in connection with** (*ka* – corresponding to) **the highest and most illuminated** (*kowkab* – speaking of the light emanating from stars in the loftiness of) **heavens in the spiritual realm** (*shamaym*).**

**I will give** (*nathan* – I will bestow and deliver, I will grant a gift) **to** (*la*) **your offspring** (*zera’* – your seed and what is being sown by you) **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** (*chukah* – My clearly communicated and engraved instructions regarding what you should do to be cut into the relationship), **and My towrah | teaching, guidance, instructions, and directions** (*Towrah* – My education, supervision, leadership, and explanations; 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 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 and, thus, Christianity. This is one of many Divine pins pricking the balloon of faith.

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)

With that introduction to the Covenant's inheritance presented in summary form, we will continue fully amplified...

**“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)

The Covenant 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 his *towrah* | teaching and

guidance.

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** (*dikaiousune* – 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 a previous chapter, we were informed by Shim’own / Peter, that Sha’uwl / Paul “wrote around and about *dikaiousune*,” the word translated as “righteousness” in Galatians 3:6. And he was correct. We discovered that it “describes the manner in which souls are approved by God.” *Dikaiousune* 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 that 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 Towrah, 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, and 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 – just as he did. We can come to trust Him, and as a result, we, also, can be considered right.

The written record of their meetings brought to us through the Towrah is actually superior. Not only can we take our time and explore the meaning of every word, we can evaluate them as part of God's entire story from beginning to end. We have been made aware of much more information than was possible for Abraham to know at that time, putting us in a vastly better position. In addition, we have the advantage of validating Yahowah's testimony as a result of countless fulfilled prophecies, none of which were available to Abraham. Therefore, just as it was possible to know and trust Yahowah 4,000 years ago, it is much easier today.

Paul is trying to establish a distinction between the promises made to Abraham and the Covenant

memorialized in the Towrah, 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 Towrah, the one scribed for our benefit on Mount Sinai (more often called Choreb), enslaves because it was established with Hagar, not Sarah, Abraham's wife. Of course, the opposite of what Paul claimed is true. The Covenant was affirmed with Sarah's child, Yitschaq, while Hagar's child, Ishmael, was expressly excluded.

Therefore, Sha'awl's / Paul's epistle has become as schizophrenic as its author. Since Abraham and this Covenant are completely unknown apart from the Towrah, citing the Towrah 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 *dikaiosune*," 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 someone or something, 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’uwl 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’uwl’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 Quran, ‘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 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 – 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 celebrations of life, 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 Towrah, this is only possible when we appreciate the connection between 'Abraham and Yahowah, between the Covenant and the Towrah, and between observing and responding. And yet these are the very associations which Paul severs.

Therefore, what Sha'awl wrote is not true. The message of the Towrah is that we can become Yahowah's Covenant children by accepting 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, especially Matsah. 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 only possible 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 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** (*prooraō* – 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** (*dikaioō* – 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** (*o* ΘΣ), **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)

This is ignorant and irrational. 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*, and *Bikuwrym* with His Son, Dowd. 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 Towrah along the way and all of ‘Abraham’s descendants along the way, including Moseh and Dowd. It will be as if the promises were somehow in conflict with the only document that memorialized and explained them.

Further, Sha’uwl 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 Towrah 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, which is one of many reasons it was conceived. Moreover, Sha’uwl’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 *EDNT* 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 affirmed that we can “depend upon someone and can give credence to their message, so long as it is understood.”

The *EDNT* 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.”””

The 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 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** (*alethinos* – 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 “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 confidence that *pistis* was originally conveyed as “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 against 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 an ally nor an excuse. They have passed off their product as the inerrant Word of God when it is not even remotely 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 as “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 I have explained the transformation of *pistis* from trust to faith.

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 said during the Instruction on the Mount. It was the speaker’s 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’uwl / Paul told the Galatians, whom 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* | Respect Yah, Abraham demonstrated that he was willing to trust Yahowah, not that he, himself, was trustworthy. So once again, Paul has twisted the Towrah to serve his agenda. He has artificially elevated the status of a man instead of acknowledging the status of his 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 Towrah and God which and who brought both is illogical.

As the years progressed, Abraham’s continued relationship with Yahowah was strengthened by Yahowah’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. ‘Abraham, by contrast, proved to be a bit of a scoundrel, and could not always be trusted. And it was Yahowah who promised and then provided the sacrificial lamb this day, and again through

His Son 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 Noach, the Ark, and the subsequent rainbow. Then we are exposed to the Covenant, witnessing its conditions and promises as Yahowah’s relationship with Abraham grew and developed over time.

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 Towrah, 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 reconciliation.

Should you not be familiar with the unfolding of the Beryth in Bare’syth, this story is presented in all of its glory in the Family volume of Yada Yahowah and again in the Covenant volume of Observations. It is repeated because

the formation of the Covenant is central to Yahowah's message and essential to developing a relationship with Him. The *Miqra'ey* | Invitations to be Called Out and Meet serve to make it possible.

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)

✠✠✠



## RESOURCES

---

[YadaYah.com](http://YadaYah.com)

[BlogTalkRadio.com/Yada](http://BlogTalkRadio.com/Yada)

Facebook: [Facebook.com/YadaYahowah](https://Facebook.com/YadaYahowah)

X: [X.com/YadaYahowah](https://X.com/YadaYahowah)

Instagram: [Instagram.com/YadaYahowah](https://Instagram.com/YadaYahowah)

YouTube: [YouTube.com/@YadaYahowah](https://YouTube.com/@YadaYahowah)

Rumble: [Rumble.com/YadaYahowah](https://Rumble.com/YadaYahowah)

Amazon Music: [Yada Yah Radio](https://YadaYahRadio.com)

Apple Podcasts: [Yada Yah Radio](https://YadaYahRadio.com)

Printed Books: [Amazon.com \(Craig Winn\)](https://Amazon.com/CraigWinn)

Contact: [email@YadaYah.com](mailto:email@YadaYah.com)

---

*Cover photo is the property of Yada Yahowah*