



YADA YAHOWAH
QUESTIONING PAUL



VOLUME ONE

LIARS LIE

CONTRADICTING GOD

CRAIG WINN

About the Author...

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

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

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

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

discusses insights gleaned from his translations.

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

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

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

You may contact Craig at YadaYah.com. 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 site provides links to his other books, to Yada Yah Radio, to many of his audio archives, as well as to friends and forums.

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

QUESTIONING PAUL

LIARS LIE

CONTRADICTING GOD

Prologue:

Truth or Consequence *Appalling* ix

Table of Contents:

1	<i>Sha'awl</i> Question Him <i>Prelude to the Truth</i>	1
2	<i>Katara</i> Curse <i>Plagued by Whom?</i>	26
3	<i>Grapho</i> It is Written <i>Invalidate or Fulfill?</i>	56
4	<i>Tsadaq</i> Being Right <i>Comparative Analysis</i>	113
5	<i>Poneros</i> Worthless <i>Tossing Out the Trash</i>	136
6	<i>Thanatoo Nomo</i> Killing the Towrah <i>Really?</i>	193
7	<i>Tarasso</i> Confusing <i>A Different Message</i>	232
8	<i>Pseudomai</i> I Lie <i>Into the Darkness</i>	292
9	<i>Towkechath</i> Rebuke <i>Say What?</i>	336
10	<i>Alla</i> To the Contrary <i>Discordant</i>	397
11	<i>Dauchaomai</i> To Brag <i>Previously Functional</i>	434

RESOURCES

Truth or Consequence

Appalling...

Considering the consequence, why have so many people placed their faith in the Apostle Paul's promises when they are so readily shown to be unreliable? Since even a modicum of research and reason demonstrate that the man who became the inspiration behind most of the Christian *New Testament* deliberately contradicted God, why are his letters considered to be the word of God?

Are 2.5 billion Christians ignorant, irrational, insane, or just hopelessly indoctrinated?

Paul's epistles – Galatians, 1 & 2 Corinthians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Philemon, and Titus – the hearsay accounts of his associates and devotees – Matthew, Mark, and Luke, including Acts and Hebrews – are riddled with inaccuracies, errant citations, erroneous assumptions, historical anomalies, countless contradictions, and rational fallacies. Yet inexplicably, the world's most popular religion is based almost entirely upon the words of a man who not only demeaned and negated the testimony of the God he claimed inspired him, but who also admitted to being demon-possessed. Since these facts are irrefutable, this systematic evaluation of Paul's letters, and especially his foundational epistle, Galatians, may be among the most valuable and challenging books you have ever encountered.

You should know that this book does not stand alone. For those seeking irrefutable proof that Islam is a nightmarish fairytale, that Allah is not God, that Muhammad was not a prophet, and that the *Qur'an* is among the worst books ever written, I would encourage you to read *Prophet of Doom – Islam's Terrorist Dogma in Muhammad's Own Words*. It is the best documented, most

comprehensive, chronological, and contextual presentation of Islam's five oldest and most credible sources.

For those curious as to whether Judaism is Torah adverse rather than Torah observant, you may want to consider the five volumes of *Observations* and initial two of *Coming Home*. They provide amplified translations along with an analysis of Yahowah's testimony. By considering God's perspective, readers will discover that Judaism is similarly spurious.

Should you read any of them, you will learn who Yahowah is, what He had to say, what He is offering, and what He expects in return. But fair warning: unless your mind is open, and until you are willing to question and then disassociate yourself from religion and even politics, you are not yet ready to meet God.

For agnostics, and most particularly Jews, who are reading these words, I have compiled *Yada Yahowah* for you. Over the course of many volumes, it proves beyond any doubt that Yahowah exists and that He, as God, authored His Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. Beginning with the creation account, the story of the garden, the flood, the inception of the Covenant, the quest for freedom, and the revelation of the Torah, readers are introduced to Yahowah and those He inspired to tell His story. *Yada Yahowah* reveals that the agnostic arguments that are postured against God are in opposition to religious myths – human constructs to which God, Himself, is opposed. Yahowah prefers evidence and reason and wants you to be able to find Him through observation and contemplation. Most agnostics find that they rather like God.

Christians will chafe at the notion that “Paul,” not “Jesus,” created their religion, but that is the only informed and reasoned conclusion which can be drawn from the evidence. “Jesus,” whose name was actually, Yahowsha' (meaning Yahowah Frees and Saves), was Torah

observant, upholding every word scribed by Moseh. He could not have been a “Christian.” And to claim that “Jesus” inspired those who contradicted him would be irrational.

Therefore, the underlying purpose of *Questioning Paul* is to prove that Paul’s testimony is inconsistent with Yahowsha’s and in irreconcilable conflict with Yahowah’s Torah Teaching. Therefore, Paul’s letters could not have been inspired by the God he contradicted. His claims are not credible.

If you are religious, I am going to tell you something about yourself that you may not realize. The tendency of the vast preponderance of religious individuals is to avoid evaluating evidence, no matter how credible, even irrefutable, which undermines their faith. Believers dismiss well-documented and reasoned presentations by demeaning the character and motivations of the messenger who bears disquieting news. So while *Questioning Paul* isn’t about me, I am willing to share the following information.

At the onset of this investigation in 2009, I was inclined to believe Paul’s testimony. I thought that Sha’uwl (Paul’s given name which is indistinguishable in Hebrew from *She’owl*, the realm of the dead and demonic, meaning “to question”) was “an Apostle,” that he encountered “Jesus” on the road to Damascus, and that he spent three years in Arabia in preparation for his mission – just as he had claimed. At the commencement of what would become a comprehensive evaluation of Paulos’ (Paul’s chosen name which means “lowly and little” in Latin) testimony, I was predisposed to think that scribal error, misleading translations, errant transliterations, unsupported interpretations, confusion over whether Sha’uwl was assailing the *Towrah* or *Talmud*, and an overall ignorance of the *Towrah*’s purpose had collectively abetted religious doctrines which were inconsistent with Paul’s intended

message.

And while I know better now, it will be Paul's letters, his words, not my preconceived notions, which will ultimately determine whether the world's most influential religious icon had the audacity to contradict God, to undermine His testimony, and to establish a "*New Testament*" in place of an "Old Testament" – especially recognizing that according to Yahowah there is still only one Covenant and it has yet to be renewed. If it can be shown that his case is invalid, billions of Christians have been misled – their souls shortchanged.

To arrive at the truth, we will determine whether the man born as Sha'awl, who wrote as Paulos, and who is known as Paul was assailing: Natural Law, Roman Law, Rabbinic Law, the *Talmud*, or Yahowah's *Towrah* – which means "Teaching, Guidance, Direction, and Instruction." We will compare the oldest textual witnesses to modern-Greek manuscripts to determine if Sha'awl's words have been affected by scribal error, attributing things to him that he did not actually write. And after presenting *Sha'awl's* / Paulos' letters in English, rendering them as completely and accurately as possible using the oldest manuscripts, we will compare these findings to a variety of other translations to ascertain whether or not translational errors have artificially altered our impression of Paul's purpose in writing his epistles.

For those who may be wondering why I am intent on revealing this man's given name in addition to his chosen moniker, the answer is that Yahowah used the former and Yahowsha' referenced the latter to convey their exceptionally candid impressions of *Sha'awl* / Paulos / Paul and his letters. No matter your present stance on him, you will no doubt be stunned by what God revealed about this man centuries before he scribed his first word.

We will strive to be as precise as possible in our

translations, transliterations, assessments, and analysis. By being resolutely accurate, the intended meaning of the words God and this man chose to communicate will be assessed such that we will learn the truth.

By way of background, the first rendition of *Questioning Paul* was composed after I had written *Yada Yahowah – A Conversation with God*, which is composed of amplified translations of prophetic pronouncements derived from the oldest manuscripts. This approach was augmented by commentary designed to help us better understand the insights Yahowah revealed based upon the words He selected.

As a result, I have grown very fond of Yahowah, His nature, purpose, and plan. I am, therefore, not without bias. And that perspective is pertinent because Paul purports to speak on behalf of the God I have come to know, the God I have come to love by closely examining and carefully considering His Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. As a result, when Sha’uwl contradicts, misquotes, and misappropriates Yahowah’s Word, I am sufficiently informed and motivated to hold him accountable.

Four years after *Questioning Paul* was first published, it underwent a comprehensive edit based upon what I had learned while compiling *An Introduction to God*. In addition to producing more exacting translations, I included a considerable amount of additional evidence. While I should not have been surprised, it was then that I discovered that Yahowah had spoken of Sha’uwl by name, exposing him for our benefit through one of His minor prophets. This revelation is initially presented in the “*Yaruwshalaim – Source of Reconciliation*” chapter of *Questioning Paul* because it is keyed off a comment Sha’uwl made about “running.”

Since that time, I have discovered so much more about Yahowah’s hatred of *Sha’uwl* | Paul and what he has done

to malign His Word and harm His people that, in the winter of 2021, I began to update and augment *Questioning Paul* once again. This time I added entirely new chapters exposing a plethora of additional prophecies excoriating the man Yahowah calls the “Plague of Death” and “Father of Lies.” In this supplemental volume, I not only share some disquieting insights into the formation, content, transmission, and translation of the Christian *New Testament*, but also demonstrate that Paul’s opening salvo against Jews was filled with lies.

God’s testimony in this regard is so utterly devastating to Sha’uwl’s credibility, the question of bias becomes moot. To remain rational, and thus moral, I was compelled to embrace a far more judgmental approach to Sha’uwl much earlier in this review of his life and words than his first letter, Galatians, alone, at least up to that point, might otherwise justify. But more on this in a moment.

Having personally met with Islamic terrorists from al-Qaeda in the immediate aftermath of September 11th, 2001, I wrote *Tea with Terrorists – Who They Are? Why They Kill? And What Will Stop Them?* Thereafter, I compiled *Prophet of Doom – Islam’s Terrorist Dogma in Muhammad’s Own Words*. As a result, I have come to understand Muhammad and Islam. That is important because Sha’uwl and Muhammad share many traits in common, making Paul’s epistles, and especially Galatians, remarkably similar to the *Qur’an* in substance and style.

I do not say these things to brag, because I have no basis for pride. Apart from being willing to invest the time to learn, and then share what I have discovered, I possess no other qualifications which would impress anyone. I am not a scholar nor am I a theologian – which is good because God works with neither. And since we are discussing labels, I have no affiliation with any political party or religious group. I do not seek a following and I do not profit from this research (at least not monetarily). And since it

seems to be of interest to many, racially I am a mutt, part Sioux, Irish, Scottish, and English. I am, therefore, not Jewish (or more precisely: neither a descendant of Yahuwah nor any other tribe comprising Yisra'el).

As I have shared, I have rewritten *Questioning Paul* a number of times, largely because the evidence I was uncovering warranted it. I am constantly learning. I began this project defending Paul, positioning his every word as favorably as the manuscripts and lexicons would allow. I emphasized the positive aspects of what he had said, and all too often glossed over those things which were of concern, remaining silent when I should have spoken. Frankly, it was not until the end of the third and fourth chapters of Galatians that I realized that I had been played for a fool. But even then, I was blind to the ploy Sha'awl was using to manipulate his audience.

It was not until having lived with this material for many months, twelve hours a day, six days a week, that I finally came to understand Sha'awl's strategy. It had been there all the time, blatant and obvious for all the world to see – but I had read right through it. So when I warn you that this will be hard to accept, I speak from experience.

Fortunately, I can also assure everyone that once Paul's ploy is understood, once we have extricated his doctrine from our minds, we find God right before our eyes, speaking directly to us from His Towrah: His voice clear, His purpose unmistakable, His offer perfect. If you reject Paul and Christianity as I have done for Yahowah and His Covenant, you will lose nothing and gain everything.

Confessions aside, I knew that Paul's letters were not "Scripture" (a transliteration of the Latin word for "writing"), in the sense of being inspired word-for-word by God, long ago. They were poorly written and filled with contradictions; that much was obvious. And yet I still

believed that he aspired to tell the truth, that he had personally met with Yahowsha', and then had spent three years with him before he embarked upon his mission. Therefore, I considered his insights to have merit.

As a result, I initially skipped over his propensity to misquote Yahowah and to never quote Yahowsha'. I missed the significance of what he changed, and thus I was blind to the strategy he was deploying. This is especially painful for me to admit, because rationally evaluating rhetoric was the one thing I had thought I had a propensity to do reasonably well. But with *Sha'awl* | Paulos, that was not the case – at least not initially.

The reason was simple enough. Paul's letters sit at the heart of the Christian *New Testament*, claiming a proud place in the "Bible." I had once been a Christian and taught Bible studies based upon his letters. His fall from "Apostle" to the "Plague of Death" was unexpected.

Eventually, however, as I embarked upon a systematic and comprehensive journey through the text of Paul's first epistle, it became obvious that something was dreadfully wrong. And while I immediately recognized the character flaw emerging before my eyes as being the same one that had made Muhammad, the founder of Islam, easy to manipulate, I still could not put my finger on exactly what Paul was trying to accomplish.

Then I compared Sha'awl's review of a meeting he had been summoned to attend at the behest of Yahowsha's ("Jesus" actual name, meaning Yahowah Frees and Saves) disciples (a transliteration of the Latin word which means "to learn as a pupil") in Yaruwshalaim (Jerusalem's actual name, properly transliterated, meaning Source from which Teaching and Guidance Regarding Reconciliation Flow) with the detailed history of that same event in Acts. The differences are alarming. But when I reached the preamble of Paul's ultimate manifesto, beginning with the second

and running through the third and fourth chapters of Galatians, during my second pass through this material, the charade was finally over. My eyes were opened and I came to understand the edifice he was establishing. It was then that I discovered seven very specific prophecies whereby Yahowah and Yahowsha' admonished us to be skeptical of Sha'awl – to avoid all association with him. After that, I found Paul's ultimate confessions lurking in statements I had read many times before. Suddenly the pieces of the puzzle all fit together. There were no longer any loose ends, no more mysteries or questions.

Frankly, I was deceived initially by the purported relationship between Sha'awl and Yahowsha', and between Sha'awl and Yahowsha's disciples: *Ya'aqob* | James, *Shim'own* | Peter, and *Yahowchanan* | John. I was also seduced by Paul's place as the inspiration behind the world's most popular religion. Questioning such an individual was well beyond my comfort zone. And yet, Yahowah, Himself, reveals that far too few of us have been willing to do this very thing – and with devastating and deadly consequences.

Also challenging is the fact that we have all been conditioned to think in terms of black and white, believing that everything a false prophet says must be wrong. And yet that is not how charlatans deceive. Wrong is made to appear right by blending misconceptions with accurate statements. A counterfeit is worthless, and yet it prevails because it looks real on the surface, fooling the unsuspecting into believing that it is the genuine article. Such is the nature of Paul's epistles. The casual reader who is not keenly observant, closely examining and carefully considering the text, while comparing Galatians to the Torah and Prophets, is easily misled by the blending of truth and lies.

In this regard, the last thing Paul's inspiration, Satan, desires is to be known as the Adversary. He wants to be

called “the Lord” and to be worshiped as if he were “God” – things Yahowah opposes. So we should expect the Adversary’s religious schemes to discredit the occult and attack the Devil, all while corrupting Yahowah’s testimony to produce a counterfeit religious deity which appears worthy of veneration. This is accomplished by discrediting and demeaning the nature, intent, and testimony of the real God, and then by replacing these things with a new deity and beliefs which appear more accommodating.

As for claiming that Paul was inspired by Satan, that is not as controversial as it may appear, since Paul, himself, acknowledges it. Should you be unaware of this fact, you may want to consider his admission in 2nd Corinthians 12:7. It is there for all to see.

Credible lies are woven side by side and intertwined with strands of truth, which makes the resulting deceptions vastly more beguiling. This is exactly how the serpent, representing Satan, confused Adam and Chawah (Eve’s actual name) in the Garden of Eden, thereby setting a precedent many others would follow. It would be the strategy Sha’uwl would deploy in his first epistle and then again in every subsequent letter. But that’s only part of the story.

Recognizing the human aversion to such sweeping changes in perspective, the following chapter is specifically designed to motivate Christians to follow Yahowah’s guidance and Yahowsha’s example, encouraging them to begin questioning what they may believe and have been told. If your mind is open, even just a little, perhaps you will be exposed to something in the first chapter which will trigger a willingness to think. And sometimes the smallest crack in a façade can lead to the floodgates being opened.

Even with all of this, there is yet another fundamental flaw in Paul’s reasoning, now known as Replacement

Theology. There is no support for his supposition that either Jews or Israel have been written out of Yahowah's plans or that He has transferred His promises to Gentiles. To the contrary, every end-time prophecy focuses upon restoring the Chosen People to their rightful place within the Covenant.

☞☞☞

If you are an atheist, agnostic, Secular Humanist, Hindu, or Buddhist, while you are welcome to read *Questioning Paul*, your time would be better spent, at least initially, reading *Yada Yahowah, An Introduction to God*, or *Observations*. It is more important that you come to know what is true than what is not. And at this point, your thinking isn't corrupted by religious sentiments which have to be jettisoned prior to establishing a reliable foundation predicated upon evidence and reason.

If you are a Christian, and depending upon your attitude and inclinations, this may not be the best place for you to start your journey of discovery. If you have been given this material by a friend, and you do not yet know Yahowah or understand His Torah, please consider reading *Yada Yahowah* and learning what God has to say, in the order He said it. His story will make a great deal more sense if you begin where He began. This is especially important advice as it relates to the Covenant and to your salvation. It is also essential to this evaluation because I will be consistently comparing Paul's words to God's Word, exposing where and how they differ – which is often diametrically opposed.

If you elect not to heed that advice, consider this a friendly warning: having responded to over ten thousand emails from religious individuals over the past ten years, I

have come to realize that evidence and reason are irrelevant to those who are passionate about their faith. So if you define yourself as a Christian (as I once did), especially an Evangelical or Catholic, if you believe that everything in your “Bible” is the inspired and inerrant Word of God, if you go to church most Sunday mornings, if you celebrate Christmas and Easter, if you are unwilling to consider irrefutable proof that God’s name is not “the Lord,” and that there was no one named “Jesus Christ,” or if you believe that your faith or religious affiliations determine your fate, then you aren’t even remotely ready to consider the evidence presented in this book.

The majority of Christians are predisposed to believe that Paul’s letters are “Scripture,” and are thus inspired and truthful. By that definition, they are beyond reproach – and thus cannot be questioned. As evidence of this mindset, while Christians will say that their faith is predicated upon “Jesus Christ,” when asked to explain it, they will invariably cite Paul rather than Yahowsha’. And when confronted with the realization that Paul’s teachings differ substantially from “Christ’s,” and are the antithesis of one another, this irresolvable conflict is lost on believers, as is the reality that faith is an impoverished substitute for knowing.

If your mind is open, if there are aspects of your faith which trouble you, if you realize that there are serious problems associated with Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, and Secular Humanism, if you really want to know God, then what follows is for you.

The evidence you are about to consider will be shocking. It leads to a place I could not have imagined before I embarked upon this voyage. And that is why I had to rewrite *Questioning Paul* several times based upon what I learned along the way. Words are insufficient to express how divergent my preconceived notions were from what I discovered.

It would have been easier if I could have resolved the differences. But since I cannot, reason and compassion dictate that I should be honest regarding what I've learned. In this regard, while ninety percent of what I had written in *Yada Yahowah* had nothing to do with Sha'awl, based upon what I have discovered, it has now taken a year to cleanse those volumes of Paul's statements.

Also, while *Yada Yahowah*, *An Introduction to God*, *Observations*, and *Coming Home* recount the greatest story ever told, this particular episode is not pleasant. In fact it saddens me to forewarn you that there is something horribly wrong with the written legacy of the most influential person who ever lived. But in due time, he will hang himself with his words, not mine.

What you are going to read is thoroughly researched, comprehensively translated, rationally presented, and overtly judgmental, which is the only proper response to that which claims to be from God and yet is in discord with His testimony. And once a person comes to know for certain that the edifice billions of people are risking their souls upon is unworthy and unreliable, they cease to be moral by keeping that realization to themselves. Those who think that it is loving and kind to respect everyone's faith, no matter how faulty, are wrong.

While I have done my best, if you find error with my translations of the oldest extant manuscripts, or with my comparisons or reasoning, feel free to express your concerns. I will address them and then correct the record if necessary. But please, do not quote a conflicting passage from one of Paul's epistles to negate something he said elsewhere, as this would only prove that Paul contradicted himself.

Yahowah's Word (the *Towrah wa Naby'* | Torah and Prophets) and Yahowsha's testimony (to the degree it was accurately translated and reliably maintained) comprise the

lone reservoir of evidence worthy of our consideration relative to evaluating *Sha'uwel's* / Paulos' / Paul's veracity. The feelings and opinions of others, while important to them, are irrelevant to this endeavor.



If you are a Christian, and if you are still contemplating whether to turn the page or close this book, I have a proposition you may want to consider. Suppose I told you that by comparing Paul's words to God's Word, and also to Yahowsha's example, that I could prove beyond any doubt that Paul was not an Apostle, and therefore that the religion predicated upon his letters was unreliable, would you be willing to risk considering the evidence if it meant losing your faith? What's more important to you: your beliefs or the truth? And if it can be shown that these things not only differ, but are irreconcilable, which would you choose?

But that is not all. What if in addition to proving that Paul's epistles, and thus Christianity, are neither trustworthy nor reliable, I could also prove beyond any doubt that there is a God whose testimony is dependable and unchanging, would you sacrifice your religion for a relationship with Him through it?

These propositions are not hypothetical. What lies before you will do both. It will take something rotten from you and it will replace it with something extraordinarily wonderful. If you are ready for the exchange of a lifetime, here is something for you to consider...

“Yahowah's (𐤃𐤏𐤅𐤃𐤏 – a transliteration of *YaHoWaH* as instructed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **Towrah** (*towrah* – teaching, guidance, direction, and instruction) **is complete and entirely**

perfect (*tamym* – without defect, lacking nothing, correct, genuine, right, helpful, beneficial, and true), **returning and restoring** (*shuwb* – transforming) **the soul** (*nepesh* – consciousness).

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

That is God's perspective on the nature and purpose of His Towrah. What is yours?

— ۞ —

Questioning Paul
V1: Liars Lie
...*Contradicting God*

1

Sha'awl | Question Him

Prelude to the Truth...

Most Christians believe that Paul, a self-proclaimed Jewish rabbi born as Sha'awl, a man who wrote under the Roman pseudonym, Paulos, was the principal agent chosen by “Jesus” to communicate the precepts of their religion to the world. They refer to his message as “the Gospel of Grace.”

This is surprising since there is only one, albeit inaccurate, citation from “Jesus” and not a single statement from the “Gospels” in the corpus of Paul’s fourteen letters.

In spite of this, or unaware of it, these same Christians believe that this lone wannabe Apostle, someone who never walked a step alongside *Yahowsha’* | “Jesus”, was authorized to denounce and discard Yahowah’s Torah (which is more accurately spelled *Towrah* and means Teaching and Guidance), replace His Covenant (from the Hebrew word *Beryth* | Family Relationship), dismiss His annual Feasts (called *Miqra’ey* | Invitations to be Called Out and Meet), and reject His Shabat – and even contradict *Yahowsha’*. On the surface, this appears preposterous, and yet no matter how illogical the presupposition required to accept Paul may be, it does not matter to believers.

The miracle which makes the resulting religion popular is performed in *Sha'awl's* / Paulos’ / Paul’s epistle to the Galatians – which serves as the blueprint for Pauline Doctrine. In its pages, a stream of arguments are presented

against the Torah and on behalf of placing one's faith in Paul's "but I say...."

Is there any plausible scenario under which Paul could have annulled and discarded the *Towrah* | Teaching and Guidance God called "perfect" and "eternal?" And while the answer is obviously, no, Paul had the audacity to claim that, since God's testimony was incapable of saving anyone, this same inept "God" after communicating His message through prophets throughout the centuries, authorized him, and only him, to devise a new and different plan.

Should we play make-believe, and pretend that God actually "inspired" Paul to contradict Him and negate His testimony? If God's plan for His people was ineffective and, worse, if it were an enslaving curse, what would make Paul's replacement believable since it is allegedly "inspired" by the same incompetent God? And yet, unless this preposterous proposition is seen as believable, then Paul's every claim is invalid.

As a result, the question before us is whether Christianity was established on the bedrock of Divine revelation or on the shifting sands of one man's delusions.

In the end it all comes down to Galatians – Paul's first letter, as evidenced by the epistle itself. It is the first time where the Torah was assailed by someone claiming to speak for God. Without Galatians, there is no credible debate between observing the Torah, which is to examine its teaching, or faith, which is to believe in the unknown or uncertain. So while there are many critical passages in Paul's other letters, and most especially in Romans, Galatians provides the most methodical approach to obfuscating God's testimony and plan of salvation.

Galatians is one of only two epistles in which the Shabat and Feasts are placed in doubt, the other being Paul's letter to the Colossians. It is one of only two letters

where a “New Covenant” is presented, the other being Paulos’ letter to the Romans. Without Galatians, there is considerably less justification for rejecting anything Yahowah (God’s one and only name) shared with us.

Galatians is the place where “faith,” which has become synonymous with “religion,” was first pitted against trusting God’s proven and prophetic testimony. This was accomplished by Paul mischaracterizing the Torah’s nature, implying that to observe it was to obey it and that God’s intent to guide was instead to command. As a result, a book filled with Yahowah’s teaching became known as “the law.”

Wanting to be free of “the law,” and thus “authorized” to establish his own “rules,” Sha’uwl strives to discredit and then discard Yahowah’s Torah in the second and third chapters of Galatians. He does this so that, in the fourth chapter, he can position his advocacy for an entirely new and different covenant, relegating the one scribed by Moses (actually Moseh, meaning to “draw out”) on Mount Sinai to “being of the flesh.”

Inverting reality in Gnostic fashion (as was the rage among Greeks and Romans), Paul claimed that the Torah’s Covenant was with Hagar and thus enslaved, condemning everyone. He would have you believe that God lied when He stated that Hagar and her son, Ishmael, were expressly excluded from the Covenant and banished, because the truth didn’t suit Paul’s agenda. And yet in the Towrah, Yahowah said that His Covenant was established with Abraham and Sarah’s son, *Yitschaq* | Isaac. He also said that His *Beryth* | Covenant was the means to life eternal, being perfected, adopted into His Family, enriched, enlightened, and empowered.

Who are you going to believe? Paul’s claims and God’s testimony are the antithesis of one another. They cannot both be true.

More than just being ground zero for Christianity's disdain for all things Yahowah – His Name, His Word, His Torah, His Covenant, His Instructions, His Shabat, His Invitations to Meet, His Land, His Chosen People, and His Way – Galatians pits Paul's new religion against the relationship Yahowah proposed.

Yahowah is not Paul's only adversary. In Galatians, Yahowsha's Disciple, *Shim'own* | Peter, is mercilessly condemned by Paul, and *Ya'aqob* | James and *Yahowchanan* | John are dismissed and demeaned.

In this light, Galatians and the book of Acts present conflicting accounts of the Jerusalem Summit – further isolating Paul from Yahowsha's Disciples. Based upon its timing and content, it is obvious that Galatians was Paul's response, his rebuttal, to having had his message censured, his authority questioned, and his reputation besmirched by Yahowsha's Disciples in *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem (source from which guidance regarding reconciliation flows).

Paul's summation of this meeting is found in the heart of his first epistle, along with Paul's animosity toward the issues which prompted the summit – the purpose of the Torah and the merits of circumcision. These themes dominate Galatians, with Paul's position consistently running in direct opposition to Yahowah, and therefore to the Word of God. In due time we will juxtapose these texts. So do not be concerned if you are currently unaware of this meeting or of the incompatible accounts of it.

Especially relevant to this discussion is Shim'own's (He Listens, but errantly called Peter's) overall evaluation of Paul and, especially, his Galatians letter, in *Shim'own* | 2 Peter. The disciple bluntly criticizes the content and confusion inherent in Paul's epistles. Then we are confronted with a statement which, at least when mistranslated and removed from its context, is often used

to assert that Paul's epistles should be afforded "Scriptural" status. But if this lone dubious "endorsement" falters, if it is not credible in context, or if this is not what Shim'own actually wrote, then the idea of a "*New Testament*," comprised mostly of Paul's letters and inspiration, being considered "Scripture," in the sense of having been "inspired by God," vanishes.

Without misappropriating *Shim'own's* | Peter's position, support for Paul's troubling letters would be relegated to the murk of myth and to the realm of religious traditions. Therefore, we will dissect *Sha'uwl's* | Paul's overt condemnation of *Shim'own* | Peter, just as we will study Shim'own's direct and unabashed response to Sha'uwl under a linguistic microscope, contemplating the Disciple's perceptions of the self-proclaimed Apostle's message and letters.

Christian theologians, of course, unanimously side with Paul over Peter with regard to the Great Galatians Debate. In so doing, they have established their religion in opposition to Yahowah, Yahowsha', the Disciples, and to the Word of God. But no matter: in their view, Paul was right to equate the Torah with law, Yahowah's Feasts with Judaism, circumcision with the flesh, and the conditions of the Covenant with bondage.

For Christians, as a result of Paul announcing his new covenant theory in the fourth chapter of Galatians, it is appropriate to divide their "Bibles" into two "Testaments" – one "Old" and the other "New," one failed and counterproductive with the other providing the hope of salvation by rejecting God's plan and placing one's faith in Paul's promises. For Christians, solely as a result of Paul's epistles, hell awaits everyone who clings to the past by observing the Torah, while heaven embraces all those who place their faith in Paul's Gospel of Grace.

With the stakes this high, with the credibility of the

religion of Christianity resting upon one man's letters, with the salvation of billions of souls at stake, few things could be as important as considering the possibility that Paulos' epistle to the Galatians might not be trustworthy since he openly contradicted the God he purported to represent. But if this world-renowned individual pulled off this feat, if he managed to supersede something as fundamental to God's approach to mankind in His Torah, and if Paul supplanted it with something as nebulous as faith in his convoluted diatribes and convinced the world that he had done so without offending God, even with God's blessing, Galatians would have to be the most brilliantly written thesis of all time.

To determine if *Sha'awl* | Paul legitimately changed everything, including our understanding of God and His prophetic testimony, even the means to salvation, we are going to examine his words under the lens of the world's most acclaimed lexicons while referencing the oldest extant manuscripts. Paul's thoughts will be scrutinized by juxtaposing each proposal he makes against Yahowah's position on the same topic. We will leave nothing to chance or supposition. And while we are cognizant that billions of religious individuals believe that Galatians is "Scripture," we will be honest, even if the result is judgmental and thus deemed offensive. Regardless of how many religious preconceptions succumb to the evidence, this pursuit of the truth will be relentlessly rational.

As I have shared previously, at the onset of this study I was inclined to think favorably of Paul. I simply could not have imagined that he was the focus of God's ire, becoming the single most hated man in human history from Yahowah's perspective. And yet, God's testimony against *Sha'awl* | Paul is unrelenting and unequivocal.

While this was not the first time, and will not be the last, I hope never to make a mistake this monumental again with regard to Paul. I was wrong.

And yet, as I have stated before, it will be *Sha'owl's* | Paul's words, not my preconceived notions, which will determine whether the most influential man in human history had the audacity to contradict God, to undermine His testimony, and to establish a "*New Testament*" in place of the one he sought to annul. If he did, and if he made his case, then Christianity might be on solid footing. But if it wasn't appropriate to demean and dissolve the Torah, if faith isn't the answer, billions have been tragically misled, their souls extinguished as a consequence.

As a result, it is instructive to reinforce the fact that Paul's given name was *Sha'owl*. It is of Hebrew origin, and it means "he questions" and "question him" depending upon how the pronoun is accommodated. Therefore, "questioning him" as a result of what "he has questioned" is precisely what we are going to do. And in this vein, you should also know that the name, *Sha'owl*, is indistinguishable in Hebrew from *She'owl*, which is "the grave," "the pit," and the "realm of the dead." The name, *Sha'owl*, is shared with one of the most misguided and counterproductive individuals in Yisra'el's history, King *Sha'owl* | *Saul – Dowd's* | David's mortal enemy. His life, as it transpired, was prophetic of his namesake, the wannabe Apostle *Sha'owl* | Paul.

Also relevant, *Sha'owl* chose a different, Latin, name, *Paulos*, which means "lowly and little." His avowed affinity for Rome and his choice of a fictitious *nom de plume* are aspects of his life which will loom large before we are finished.

One of the surprising obstacles we will have to overcome along the way will become obvious in short order. Paul's letter to the Galatians is poorly written, reflecting some of the worst writing found anywhere in texts comprising the "Christian *New Testament*." We will encounter a steady diet of linguistic malfeasance and worse.

Many of Paul's sentences are incomprehensible. His literacy is well beneath the dignity of God, even though this indisputable fact does not seem to matter to a religion hell-bent on distancing itself from Yahowah, from His Covenant, His Torah, or from His Feasts (Hebrew: *Migra'ey* – Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God).

Before we embark on this journey, there is something else you should know. There are a handful of individuals who would like others to believe that Paulos did not write Galatians. They use pedantic ploys to imply that this epistle, along with 2nd Corinthians, 1st Thessalonians, Ephesians, and both personal letters to Timothy were foisted as a clever fraud, and then later attributed to Paul. In support of this argument, there is phraseology prevalent in Galatians that appears less frequently in the subsequent epistles claimed by this man.

In support of Galatians being from Paul, we must recognize that the book of Acts reveals that he had the kind of contentious relationship with the Galatians which is actually reflected in the epistle. We are told that the Galatians went from believing that Paulos was the incarnation of a Greek god to wanting to stone him for his caustic rhetoric.

Second, *Shim'own* | Peter, in his second letter, evaluates an epistle Paul had written expressly to this particular audience – one that we learn from his greeting in 1st Peter has to be Galatia, because it is the only place where the addressees overlap. Therefore, based upon the Disciple's letter, we know that Paul wrote an epistle to the Galatians. And if not this letter, then the authentic document has been lost. But more than that, the language *Shim'own* (He Listens) uses to describe Galatians precisely reflects the contents we find in the surviving copy.

Third, the issues raised at the Yaruwshalaim (“Jerusalem”) Summit serve as the centerpiece of this epistle. After reading Luke’s (from the Latin Lucas) testimony in Acts, it becomes clear that Galatians was Paulos’ response to his critics at this meeting. Status was paramount to Sha’uwl, and therefore, Galatians chronicles his desire to position himself as favorably as possible, especially *vis a vis* Yahowsha’s Disciples whom he routinely slights.

Additionally, based upon the disparaging language, it appears that the letter was written immediately after that meeting, long before tempers cooled. And that means that Paulos would have had twelve subsequent opportunities to distance himself from the letter scribed to the Galatians had it been a fraud because his open letters to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians, as well as the personal notes to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon all came later – as did most of his testimony in Acts. Never once is he heard denouncing the authenticity of this epistle to the Galatians but is instead found building his case against the Towrah and its Covenant upon the foundation he laid therein.

Fourth, Galatians is all about Sha’uwl becoming Paulos, about his childhood, his religious education, his questionable calling, his self-proclaimed mission, his adversarial preaching, his suspect credibility, and his personal trials and tribulations. Within its text, we find Paul referring to himself as the parent of his faithful children, as the perfect example to follow, as a person who can do no wrong, and as someone who cannot lie. If Paul didn’t write it, Galatians was either scribed by his publicist, or by someone who spent the better part of his life polishing Paul’s sandals.

Fifth, the oldest extant codex containing Paul’s epistles, Papyrus 46, places Galatians in the midst of the other letters claimed by and attributed to Paulos. In order

of their appearance in the codex, these epistles include: Romans, Hebrews, 1st and 2nd Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and 1st Thessalonians. And since P46 is dated between 85 and 125 CE, we know that one of the earliest collectors of Greek manuscripts believed that Paul had penned this letter. As did Marcion in the 2nd century, a man who looms large in this saga.

Sixth, Paulos had a propensity to sign his letters so that his audience would have some assurance that he was the author. But with Galatians, he did more than just sign his name. He personally attests to have written the conclusion with his own hand using really big letters.

And seventh, Paul's signature term is *charis*, the name of the Greek goddesses of hospitality and merriment. Their name was transliterated into English as "Grace" as a result of the Roman moniker for these same goddesses, the *Gratia*. Apart from Paulos' letters, the use of *charis* can only be attested in one other place in an ancient Greek manuscript. Therefore, the frequency of deploying the name of the Greek goddesses of charity and licentiousness in all of these letters strongly suggests that this troubling and pagan aspect of Christianity came from Paul as did Galatians.

I suppose that this may leave us with a third, albeit highly unlikely alternative, that Paul was the author, but that he never intended this letter to be circulated, much less to be considered "Scripture." He was clearly angry and may well have dashed off an emotional response that, from a more sober perspective, he would have wadded up and thrown away.

Most of us have written letters like this; and many have had the good sense to hold on to them long enough to soften them once our passions have subsided. But if this is the case, what does it say about the credibility of the rest of the testimony this man also claims was inspired by God,

indeed, what does it suggest about the veracity of the Christian *New Testament* as a whole?

The only benefit of distancing this epistle from Paul is that it would not tarnish the remainder of the letters attributed to him. But even then, the potential benefit would be fraught with peril, in that it would open the floodgates to questioning the appropriateness of everything originally written in Greek and not Hebrew. Christianity's entire foundation would be torn asunder. Worse, because the Galatians epistle was written in first person, and because it is based upon the life of the self-proclaimed Apostle Paulos, if it is a counterfeit, not only does the authority of more than half of the "Christian *New Testament*" become suspect, the religion is deprived of doctrine. I say this because Paul's attaché wrote Luke and Acts and two of his devotees wrote Mark and Matthew, as well as Hebrews – should it not be from Paul, himself. His influence on these texts explains why they are anti-Semitic, historically inaccurate, and contradictory – the same problems which permeate Paul's letters.

As we will discover throughout this review, in substance, there is very little difference between Galatians and everything else Paul wrote and influenced. It is readily apparent that the same individual authored them, one that was promoting his own unique message in his own inimitable way.

Ultimately, however, the only question which really matters is whether or not Galatians is true. Is it the inspired Word of God or not? If it is valid, so is Christianity. But if it is invalid, the world's most popular religion is brought down with it.

This conclusion is inescapable because Galatians, even more than Paul's other letters, is devoted to systematically demeaning, dismantling, and demoting the Torah and its Covenant. This would include the recognition

that Yahowah is God's only name, that Yahowah, Himself, is our Savior, and that the Shabat remains set apart. Without Galatians, there would be no way to explain Christianity's opposition to Yahowah's seven *Miqra'ey* – Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God – as they would still delineate the path to eternal life, to salvation, adoption, enrichment, empowerment, and reconciliation, leading to living with God as His children. Without Galatians, Romans, and Hebrews, there would only be one Covenant, a familial accord which has yet to be renewed. There would be no room for a “*New Testament*,” a “*Gospel of Grace*,” or a faith-based religion.

Without Galatians, Yahowah's Towrah, as it is affirmed throughout the Psalms and Prophets, remains the sole means to liberate humankind from religious and political oppression. But with Galatians, the Torah is mankind's greatest foe, the path to enslavement and condemnation.

Without Galatians, the “*Gospel of Grace*” would be stillborn, invalidated by Yahowah's promise to heal His people through the Towrah – with its entirely different, yet overtly beneficial message. Without Galatians, our association with God would be based exclusively upon the Towrah's everlasting Covenant, upon knowing Yahowah and relying upon God's Guidance, not Paul's.

Without Galatians, admission to heaven would be predicated upon responding to Yahowah's Invitations to Meet with Him as this seven-step path is articulated in the heart of the Towrah. Without Galatians, “*faith*” becomes irrelevant, as does the religion of Christianity, because the God who authored the Towrah can be known through it.

In this regard, you should know that faith is the opposite of trust. Trust emerges from a discerning evaluation of the evidence, while faith thrives in the absence of information and reason.

So, while there may be some lingering debate among a few individuals regarding the authenticity of this epistle, we will proceed as if Galatians is genuine. After all, billions of people the world over accept it as having been written by Paul, a man they believe was inspired by God. But is that possible? Could the God who created the universe, who conceived life, who authored the Torah, who nurtured the Covenant, who freed a nation from slavery, and who enlightened the world while proving His existence and verifying His witness through prophecy, have contributed to a book which presents Him as incompetent and impotent?

Fortunately, that question can be answered. So long as we are willing to invest the time required to consider the evidence with an open mind, so long as we are willing to evaluate the facts rationally, not religiously, together we will determine with absolute certainty whether Galatians, indeed the whole corpus of Pauline literature, was inspired by God. If not, it is not reliable. And in the end, that is all this study strives to determine.

There are some far-reaching implications associated with that determination. And that is because the religion of Christianity was established as an extension of the paradigm Paulos proposed in his first public address and epistle.

The Pauline “Jesus Christ” was touted as a new and improved, more tolerant and accepting, nicer and loving, version of the jealous and wrathful God of the oppressive Law, a God out of touch with Greek and Roman sensibilities. The perception of Yahowsha’ as the Passover Lamb would be lost in the fog of myth. The realization that Yahowsha’ was Towrah observant would be convoluted, twisted and inverted, with Christians, as a direct result of Paul’s opening salvo, believing that their “Jesus” had come to annul the old god’s arcane and dreadful “Law,” freeing them from its judgmental nature.

With Yahowsha's name forgotten and replaced, the Christian Savior would become known as "Jesus Christ," jettisoning all association with Yahowah. In this way, the entirety of Yahowah's testimony, His role as Creator, Father, and Savior, even as God, would be discounted then dismissed, as would His Torah and His Covenant. Christians would not speak of Him or pray to Him, preferring to focus on their religious caricature.

The Pauline "Jesus Christ" would become an object to be painted with the impressions and opinions of believers, his own words and life ignored because most everything he said and did was now in conflict with the belief system Paul was foisting on an accepting world. He would be portrayed as a helpless infant cradled in his mother's arms or as a dead god on a stick. High praise, indeed.

As a result of what this new paradigm wrought, should Paul's epistle to the Galatians prove to be unreliable for any reason, to be in conflict with Yahowah or Yahowsha', the foundational assumptions of the Christian religion fall apart with it, as they could neither be inspired nor be accurate. It is that simple, that clear cut. The fate of the faithful rests in the balance, as does their religion.



Since Paul provides him ample lip service, I understand that Christians believe that "Jesus Christ" was the founder of their religion, but that is not accurate. I understand that Christians believe that it is appropriate to address God as "the Lord," but that is inadvisable. I understand that Christians believe that "Jesus" is the second person of a Trinity, and represents the totality of God, but that is not possible.

I understand that Christians believe that God died for

their sins, but that is an absurdity. I understand that Christians believe that God's purpose is to save us, but that is unrealistic. I understand that Christians believe that salvation requires nothing of them and that it is a product of faith, but that is ridiculous. I understand that Christians believe that all souls go either to heaven or to hell, but that is irrational.

I understand that Christians believe that "Jesus" was born on Christmas Day, but that is not credible. I understand that Christians believe that Easter commemorates God's bodily resurrection from the dead, but that would have been counterproductive. I understand that Christians believe that the Covenant's renewal is depicted in their "*New Testament*," making it possible to ignore everything in the Torah, but that is blasphemous. I understand that Christians believe that their "Bible" is the inerrant Word of God, but that is exceedingly ignorant.

I understand that Christians believe that Paul met with "Jesus" on the road to Damascus, that he had a conversion experience, that he was transformed from being a murderer to serving as an apostle, someone chosen and inspired by God to share the Gospel of Grace with the world, but that is laughable. I understand that Christians believe that the Torah was written exclusively for Jews, that it was comprised of old-fashioned laws that no one can obey, and that "Jesus" came to free us from that Law, but that is wholly incongruous with the evidence.

Quite literally, most everything Christians believe is untrue. And faith in something which is invalid is foolish.

It is an irrefutable fact that no one named "Jesus Christ" lived in the 1st century of the Common Era. The name "Jesus" was initially conceived in the 17th century, shortly after the letter "J" was invented. The actual individual was not Greek, and therefore, he did not have a Greek name. And even if he had been Greek, "Jesus" is not

an accurate transliteration of Iesou, Iesous, or Iesoun.

More incriminating still, these Greek corruptions of His name were never written on any page of any pre-Constantine codex of the so-called “Christian *New Testament*.” Following the example of the *Septuagint* (a Greek translation of the Hebrew Torah, Prophets, and Psalms), a Divine Placeholder was universally deployed to represent “Yahowsha’.” Further, the name, Yahowsha’, which is affirmed over 200 times in the Torah and Prophets, means “Yahowah Frees and Saves.” This means that “Jesus” cannot be the “Savior.”

Furthermore, a man named, “Jesus,” could not have come in His Father’s name. But Yahowsha’ could and did. So since the Christian religion has deliberately misrepresented this irrefutable and essential fact, and cannot even get his name right, what else might be untrue? And now that you know that “Jesus” isn’t accurate, are you going to start using his actual name?

“Christ” is not a last name, as in “Jesus Christ.” Further, since he was not Greek, it would be silly to ascribe a Greek title to him. Also, a title should never follow a name, but instead precede it. And when a title is conveyed, it should be accompanied by the definite article.

Making matters worse, “Christos,” the alleged basis of “Christ,” speaks of the “application of drugs.” “Christos” is not an accurate translation of “Mashyach,” which is the only Hebrew word which can be transliterated, “Messiah.” And according to Yahowah, He anointed *Dowd* | David the Mashyach, not Yahowsha’. So “Christ” is a misnomer, attributing a title that does not fit and does not belong.

Nonetheless, Divine Placeholders were used to present Yahowsha’s alleged title on every page of every Greek manuscript scribed in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and early 4th centuries CE. Also, a thorough investigation of the historical evidence demonstrates that the placeholders for this title

were based upon Chrestus, a variation of Chrestos (*Strong's* G5543), not Christos (*Strong's* G5547), with the former meaning “fit for use and virtuous.” It would have been appropriate and correct in that Yahowsha’ was a “Useful Implement.” Such is the nature of the Passover Lamb.

Sadly for Christians, however, *Christos* | Christ was a very poor choice. The only time Yahowsha’ is translated and recorded using “*christos*” or its verbal root, “*chrio*” (*Strong's* G5548), is in Revelation 3:18. There, a *mal'ak* | spiritual messenger representing Yahowsha’ is heard recommending that the Laodiceans (people living in democratic nations during the last days) symbolically “apply (*chrio*) to your eyes an eyesalve (which was a pharmaceutical or drug) so that you may see.” The word, *chrio*, the actionable root of *christos*, was used correctly because it spoke of “the application of drugs.” The community was famous at the time for manufacturing and promoting an eye balm to improve vision. The spiritual implement representing Yahowsha’ was, therefore, implying that the Laodiceans’ vision was occluded and that if they wanted to recognize who had been standing beside the door and knocking, thereby associating Yahowsha’ with Passover, he recommended they become observant. This use, therefore, implies that a “Christ” would have distributed drugs and that “Christians” would have been drugged. Replacing the Hebrew *Mashyach* | Messiah with *Christos* | Christ was a very poor decision fraught with peril.

Since the Christian religion has deliberately misrepresented this irrefutable and essential fact, and can’t even get the title which became the name of their religion right, what else might be untrue? And now that you know that “Christ” isn’t remotely accurate, and does not apply, are you going to start referring to Yahowsha’ as the Passover Lamb rather than the Christ?

Yahowsha' emphatically stated that he did not come to replace or to annul any aspect of the Torah, but instead to be the living embodiment of it. Therefore, by upholding the existing standard, he could not be the founder of a new religion. Yahowsha' was without exception, Torah observant. His every word and deed affirmed this, as did his participation on Passover in year 4000 Yah as the *Pesach* | Passover 'Ayil | Lamb. It would be impossible as a result to follow Yahowsha' without embracing the Towrah. And the moment a person becomes Torah observant, he ceases to be a Christian, which is why believers ignore almost everything Yahowsha' did and said.

Since the Christian religion has deliberately misrepresented this irrefutable and essential fact, what else might be untrue? And now that you know that Yahowsha' was Torah observant, are you going to follow his example?

Throughout the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, God ascribes the title "Lord" to Satan. The Adversary is called "*ha Ba'al* – the Lord," because he wants to control the beneficiaries of freewill. The Adversary's prime objective is for mankind to bow down to him, worshiping him as if the Lord was God. But the actual God has a name, and He has no interest in control, or desire to be worshiped. His name, Yahowah, is pronounced as easily as any of the many thousands of other words and names written throughout His witness: Y-aH-oW-aH.

Based upon the Hebrew verb, "*hayah*," "to exist," Yahowah is found 7000 times in His Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. He not only encouraged us to use this name, but said that the replacing of His name with the title, "Lord," was the most devastating thing humankind has ever done. It opens the door to mischaracterizing His nature and to the acceptance of false gods by any other name.

Further, learning someone's name is the first step in

initiating a relationship. And Yahowah wants us to relate to Him as children would to a father. The proper perspective is to see our Heavenly Father on His knees, offering to lift us up. And as the Author of freewill, God is opposed to lording over anyone. So since the Christian religion has deliberately misrepresented this irrefutable and essential fact, what else might be untrue? And now that you know that God's name is pronounced "Yahowah," are you going to use it instead of Lord?

The Trinity is a Babylonian religious concept. This notion was part and parcel of the pagan mythology of the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans as well. Yahowah never once mentions anything even remotely akin to a Trinity. He not only says that He is one, but expressly asks us not to accept religious customs such as this.

Yahowsha' is the Passover Lamb, and was here to serve us. He is not God. Further, the entirety of God would not fit into our solar system, much less into the body of a physical being.

Also in this regard, Yahowah's Spirit is set apart from Him. Her title, *Ruwach Qodesh*, which means "Set-Apart Spirit," affirms this reality. Representing the Maternal aspects of Yahowah's nature, She serves as our Spiritual Mother, thereby completing the symbolism of the Covenant Family – the very family we are invited to join. And now that you know that God is one, are you going to start focusing your attention on getting to know Yahowah instead of "Jesus" or the "Holy Ghost?"

Yahowah is immortal. He cannot die. Man cannot kill God. Therefore, God could not die for your sins. Yahowah explained this, but Christians seldom listen to Him. As the Passover Lamb, Yahowsha' cited the opening line of the 22nd Psalm, telling us that the Spirit of God had departed, allowing his physical body to die while Yahowah's soul went to She'owl to redeem us on UnYeasted Bread. The

Psalms explain all of this, including the service God's soul provided for us on the *Qodesh* | Set Apart *Miqra'* | Invitation to be Called Out and Meet of *Matsah* | UnYeasted Bread.

Therefore, according to Yahowah, He did not die. As for Yahowsha's physical body, the remains of the Passover Lamb were incinerated that same night in accordance with the Towrah's instructions. So there was no body and no physical resurrection. And that explains why, in all three encounters on Firstborn Children, no one recognized him. He was the same soul, now reunited with the same Spirit, but he was only partly corporeal.

Recognizing the relationship between energy and matter, one realizes that being corporeal would be a liability, which is why there is no such thing as bodily resurrection into the spiritual realm.

Since the Christian religion has deliberately misrepresented this irrefutable and essential fact, what else might be untrue? And now that you know that God could not die for your sins, are you going to follow His example and celebrate Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children with Him?

Speaking of the first three Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God, they collectively depict the Way Yahowah has provided to perfect us. But saving us isn't His priority. Yahowah is committed to His Covenant. Salvation is only afforded to its children.

It would be irrational for Yahowah to save souls who do not know Him, who do not care what He had to say, who don't appreciate what He is offering, and who have worshiped a god of man's making. Therefore, before a soul can be saved, that individual must first come to know, understand, accept, and then engage in the Covenant based upon the conditions articulated in the Towrah.

The first of these is to walk away from religion and politics, from all things associated with Babylon. We are encouraged to rely on Yahowah instead, walking along a path which makes us immortal and perfect children who are prepared to be adopted into our Heavenly Father's family, enabling His Spirit to enrich us and empower us. Therefore, salvation is the byproduct of participating in the Covenant.

Since the Christian religion has deliberately misrepresented this irrefutable and essential fact, what else might be untrue? And now that you know that God has established a handful of conditions that must be met to participate in this relationship, are you going to seek to understand them and then respond to God based upon what He is actually offering?

If God said, "Love me or I will send you to hell to be tortured," He would not only be unlovable, He would be sadistic. Because of this scenario, there is a serious problem with the Christian god. However, the real God, Yahowah, said no such thing. According to His testimony, most souls simply cease to exist upon their mortal demise. They do not know God. God does not know them. There is nothing more. No reward. No punishment.

Yahowah provided each of us with the gift of a soul so that we could be observant, giving us freewill so that we could choose to know, ignore, or reject Him, and the benefit of a conscience so that we could exercise good judgment during our lives. The relatively few souls who use these gifts and get to know Yahowah as He revealed Himself in His Towrah, who understand and accept the conditions of His Covenant, and who answer the Invitations to walk to Him live forever with God in His home. Those souls who are beguiled by religion, or who just have no interest in God, cease to exist. And those who oppose Yahowah, promoting anything which leads others away from God, His Towrah or His Covenant, will spend

eternity incarcerated in She'owl, something akin to a black hole.

Since the Christian religion has deliberately misrepresented this irrefutable and essential fact, what else might be untrue? And now that you know that most souls do not end up in heaven or hell, are you going to start questioning those who have tried to deceive you, promising heaven to you if you place your faith in them and their religion?

God is immortal. He was not born on any day, much less on the Winter Solstice, Christmas Day, when the Son of the Sun was born in virtually every pagan religion – nine months, of course, after the celebration of Easter. Yahowah consistently asks us to reject the religious mythology of pagan cultures, and yet Christians incorporated Babylon's two holiest days into their faith. This does not please God; it angers Him, especially since Christians celebrate these pagan holidays while ignoring, even rejecting, every one of His Meetings.

This is especially disappointing because Yahowsha's purpose was to enable the promises Yahowah had made regarding Passover, with Yahowah and the Set-Apart Spirit fulfilling UnYeasted Bread, Firstborn Children, and Seven Shabats. And after the Trumpets Harvest, He will fulfill Reconciliations and Shelters upon His return.

Since the Christian religion has deliberately misrepresented this irrefutable and essential fact, what else might be untrue? And now that you know that God hates Christmas and Easter, are you going to answer His Invitations on the days He designated?

The lone presentation of the Covenant's renewal is detailed in *Yirmayah* / Jeremiah 31. And there, Yahowah reveals that this still future restoration of His relationship will be with Yahuwdah and Yisra'el, not with a Gentile church. In the same discussion, He reveals that the only

difference between the existing Covenant and its reaffirmation is that upon His return He will personally place a complete copy of His *towrah* | guidance inside of us. This is significant because God would not have created a *New Testament* repudiating His Torah, only to return to the original plan.

With the Towrah woven into the very fabric of our nature, there will come a time when Yahowah's Instructions can no longer be corrupted or rejected. All memory of Paul, his letters, and his religion will be wiped out as a result.

So since the Christian religion has deliberately misrepresented this irrefutable and essential fact, what else might be untrue? And now that you know that God has only one Covenant, that it has not yet been renewed, and that its restoration is predicated upon the incorporation of His Towrah into our lives, are you going to consider reading it and integrating its guidance into your life?

The “Christian *New Testament*” isn't even remotely reliable. To pretend that it is the inerrant word of God is absurd. There are over 300,000 known differences between the oldest manuscripts and the texts which support legacy and modern translations. No two codices agree on which words were originally written, and that is just the beginning of the problems. No words representing church, cross, holy, saint, Christian, Jesus, Christ, Lord, God, Ghost, Christmas, Easter, communion, Last Supper, Trinity, or Gospel can be found in any ancient manuscript, making all of these things religious corruptions. There are whole sections of books that are not attested in the older witnesses, such as the discussion with the adulterous woman in the 8th chapter of *Yahowchanan* | John, as well as the concluding chapter of Mark.

Neither Mark, Matthew, nor Luke were eyewitnesses, and thus are comprised of hearsay testimony. Paul's

thirteen letters, combined with his starring role in Acts, present doctrines which are diametrically opposed to Yahowsha's words and deeds, and thus cannot have been inspired by the same God. And then we have to confront the issue of invalid, incomplete, and misleading translations, something you will more fully appreciate by the time you have completed this book.

So since the Christian religion has deliberately misrepresented this irrefutable and essential fact, what else might be untrue? And now that you know that you cannot rely on the Christian *New Testament*, where are you going to turn for answers?

Ironically, according to Yahowsha's testimony during the Olivet Discourse, Paul could not have seen him on the road to Damascus. He told us not to believe anyone who made such a claim. So if Sha'awl saw a light, it was not Yahowsha'.

Make no mistake, Paul's message was his own. He never accurately quotes anything Yahowah or Yahowsha' said. Paul's testimony is not only incongruent with the Towrah, it is contrary to all of the prophets. Even Paul's preaching was the antithesis of every credible witness.

If God can be relied upon, then Paul is a liar. You can either believe Paul or trust God, but no one can accept both. By comparing their words, this book will prove this point beyond any doubt. You will hate Paul before we are through.

As for the rest of the points that have been raised here in hopes of motivating Christians to begin questioning some of the many myths that have been woven into the fabric of their religion, irrefutable evidence to support every conclusion is provided in the many volumes of *Yada Yahowah, An Introduction to God, Observations, and Coming Home*.

Before you consider these, there was a reason for the questions. If you are not going to change your thinking when confronted with evidence that undermines your beliefs, then nothing matters. This book, any book, even God’s book cannot influence a closed or irrational mind.

And there are so many more Pauline deceptions to be addressed. I understand that on one hand, Christians, as a direct result of Paul’s letter to the Galatians, have been led to believe that the Torah was written exclusively for Jews, that it was comprised of old-fashioned laws and arcane concepts that are impossible to obey, and that “Jesus” came to free the world from it. Then on the other, Paul has convinced them that all of the Towrah’s promises to these same people still apply, but that they have been miraculously transferred to them. And this juxtaposition of unattested absurdities may be the most inane aspect of the Christian religion.

But since addressing these Pauline propositions is the purpose of this book, let’s consider the evidence.

☮☮☮☮☮

Questioning Paul
V1: Liars Lie
...*Contradicting God*

2

Katara / Curse

Plagued by Whom?...

In time, we will analyze every word of Galatians, from Sha'awl's greeting to his handwritten closing statement. But for now, I would like to commence our review of Christendom's foundational treatise at the same place Christians begin their assault on the Torah. That occurs in Galatians 3, verses 10 through 14.

Let's commence our investigation with the *King James Version* (Christianity's most influential Bible translation) and *New Living Translation* (the religion's most recent and liberal variation and among the most popular). Their depictions of these passages, juxtaposed against a literal rendering of the earliest manuscript of Sha'awl's letter, should suffice as evidence.

Reason dictates that if the following KJV and NLT translations are accurate, and the inspiration behind them valid, then the "Torah" is God's way of cursing humankind – not saving us. And if this is true, Yahowah and Yahowsha' are liars.

The *King James* reads: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." (3:10)

More clearly presented, albeit less aligned with the Greek text, the *New Living Translation* published: "But

those who depend on the law to make them right with God are under his curse, for the Scriptures say, ‘Cursed is everyone who does not observe and obey all the commands that are written in God’s Book of the Law.’ (3:10) If they are correct, God’s Word is God’s curse.

According to the most scholarly and respected resource, the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*, the statement Paul wrote actually conveys: “For as many as from works of law they are under curse they are. It has been written for (not applicable) curse on all who not stay in all the things having been written in the small book of the law to do them.”

Based upon the words Sha’uwl selected, the following is a more complete and accurate depiction of his pronouncement:

“**Because** (*gar* – for) **to the degree that** (*hosos* – as many and as far as) **out of** (*ek*) **tasks and activities of** (*ergon* – works or actions associated with) **the Towrah** (*nomou* – the means to being nourished by that which is bestowed to become heirs, precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and prescriptions for an inheritance; from *nemo* – that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to heirs to nourish them (singular genitive, and thus a specific characterization)) **they are and they exist** (*eisin eisin*) **under** (*hupo* – by way of) **a curse** (*katara* – that which a supernatural power deploys to invoke harm by promoting evil, that which is accursed, denounced and detested), **for** (*gar* – because indeed) **it has been written** (*grapho*) **that** (*hoti*): **To become accursed** (*epikataratos* – to be exposed, abhorrent, and repugnant, slanderous, hateful, and malicious (to become is a product of the nominative case)) **everyone** (*pas* – all and completely) **who** (*hos*) **not** (*ou*) **remains in** (*emmeno* – stays and continues in, perseveres with) **all** (*pas*) **that** (*tois*) **having**

been written (*grapho*) **in** (*en*) **the scroll** (*to biblion* – the book or documented written record typically on papyrus) **of the** (*tou*) **Towrah** (*nomou* – the allotment which is parceled out, the inheritance which is given, the nourishment which is bestowed to be possessed and used to grow, the precepts which are apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and to be approved, and the prescription to become an heir (singular genitive, and thus restricted) to a singular specific and unique characterization)), **to do** (*poieomai* – to make, produce, or perform) **them** (*autos*).” (Galatians 3:10)

Trimmed to its essentials, the statement literally reads: **“Because to the degree that out of tasks and activities of the Towrah they exist under a curse which a supernatural power deploys to invoke harm by promoting evil, doing what is accursed, denounced and detested, for it has been written that: ‘To become accursed, to become abhorrent, and repugnant, everyone who not remains in all that having been written in the scroll of the Towrah, to do them.’”** (Galatians 3:10)

Recognizing that the preceding translation is a literal rendering of Papyrus 46, the oldest extant manuscript of Sha’uwl’s letter (dated to the late 1st or early 2nd century), it’s hard to explain the KJV’s and NLT’s variation from it.

Nonetheless, one of our questions has already been resolved. While we will diligently research every discernible connotation of “*nomos*,” not just once but multiple times, Sha’uwl has clearly acknowledged what you will come to know. He is using *nomou* to describe the “Torah,” as if *nomos* and *towrah* were synonymous. We know this because, in the attempt to prove this point, he translated the Hebrew word “*towrah*” into Greek as “*nomou*.”

As a result, a Pauline apologist cannot say that Paul

was condemning Rabbinic Law, or the *Talmud*, instead of the *Towrah*, without contradicting Paul's own translation. Paul is, therefore, calling the Word of God, Yahowah's foundational testimony, a curse.

If nothing else, that takes chutzpah. It is stupid, but bold.

By rendering *towrah* as *nomou*, Paul has emphatically demonstrated that he would be using variations of *nomos* to convey "Torah" throughout his letters. Therefore, to be intellectually honest, the meaning of *towrah* in Hebrew which is "teaching, instruction, direction, and guidance" must prevail over "law." As a result, not only is Paul implicating himself by disparaging the Word of God, those who publish Christian Bibles are universally guilty of misrepresenting one of the most important words ever written when they render *towrah* via *nomos* as "law."

But there is more: Paul misquoted the Towrah. The passage he cited in the context of the discussion in *Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26 conveys a message which is diametrically opposed to the point Paul was making. How then can his point be valid if he had to misrepresent God's position?

The Towrah reads:

"Invoking harm upon oneself is whoever relationally and beneficially is not established, restored, and supported by the words of this Towrah, approaching by engaging through them. And then the entire family responded, 'This is true, acceptable, and reliable.'" (Dabarym 27:26)

Since Paul's malfeasance in Galatians 3:10 is so obvious and irrefutable, so condemning of his integrity, it is in our interest to verify every word of both statements. To that end, here is a more fully amplified rendition of God's testimony:

“Invoking harm upon oneself (*‘arar* – plaguing oneself by making oneself undesirable) **is whoever relationally and beneficially** (*‘asher*) **is not (lo’) established** (*quwm* – restored, supported, encouraged, lifted up and caused to stand, confirmed, and enabled to endure) **by** (*‘eth* – with and through) **the words** (*dabar* – message and accounts) **of this** (*ha zo ‘th*) **Towrah** (*Towrah* – source of guidance, direction, teaching, and instruction [written ToWRaH in Hebrew]), **approaching** (*la*) **by engaging through them** (*‘asah ‘eth* – by acting upon them and doing productive things according to them, celebrating and profiting with them).

And then (*wa*) **the entire** (*kol*) **family** (*‘am* – people and nation) **responded** (*‘amar* – answered, promised, and declared), **‘This is true, acceptable, and reliable** (*‘aman* – this is affirming, supportive, verifiable, and dependable).” (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26*)

So what now? We have just begun, and Paul has condemned himself with his own words. Now that you are informed, if you are rational, you can no longer trust anything Paul wrote. He deliberately misquoted God. Yahowah said that we are established and restored through the Towrah and that we approach Him by acting upon its words. It is harmful to discard the opportunity the Towrah provides, and beneficial to embrace it. Paul twisted the Word of God to state the opposite.

Assuming that you searched for Greek and Hebrew interlinears on your shelf or online, and that you referenced a lexicon or two, looking up each word to verify what you have just read, how are you going to deal with this? The answer to that question may determine the fate of your soul, especially if you have believed Paul up to this point.

While we could, we are not going to stop here. Before we are finished, hundreds of nails will be driven into Paul’s coffin. But if we are seeking to know whether Galatians

was inspired by God and is trustworthy, we already have our answer. A person who deliberately misquotes God to promote the inverse of what God said cannot be telling the truth when he claims to be inspired by that same God. It is impossible.

Yahowah just said that we harm ourselves when we are not established and restored by the words which comprise His Towrah, approaching Him by acting upon them. Christianity is torn asunder by this statement, a position which cannot be refuted without calling God, Himself, a liar. The very statement Paul misquoted to establish his religion destroys it.

The Towrah verse Sha'uwl mangled in Galatians undermines the most fundamental aspect of the Christian religion, of faith in its Gospel of Grace, as well as Paulos' own position, because it obliterates the idea that the Torah is passé. But even if observing the Torah was not presented as the lone means to becoming restored and established, as God has just stated, if the Almighty was a capricious prankster, and if His Torah was really a curse as Paul and his ilk have claimed, then citing it as evidence would be irrational, because nothing God said could be trusted. Think about that for a moment.

Christian apologists, steeped as they are in Pauline Doctrine, will say that the Torah is not a pick and choose sort of thing, and that to be redeemed and righteous, a person would have to do everything the Torah requires all the time, or else they would be cursed by it – judged and condemned. But that is not the message conveyed in this *Dabarym* passage – nor the message conveyed by Yahowsha'. God knows that we are not perfect, which is why He provided the means to perfect us in the heart of His Towrah.

And yet, since Paul has attempted to neuter the Torah, and to sever the relationship between God's testimony and

His plan of salvation, most Christians are unaware of the Torah's redemptive properties. As a result of Paul's epistles, Christians do not realize that, when Yahowsha' said "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," his "Way" and his definition of the "Truth" were both found in Yahowah's Towrah. That is why, in the midst of his Instruction on the Mount, he called the Torah "the narrow way to life."

It was by fulfilling His Towrah-based *Miqra'ey* | Invitations to be Called Out and Meet that Yahowah honored the promises He had made to make His Covenant children immortal on *Pesach* | Passover, and perfect us on *Matsah* | UnYeasted Bread so that He could adopt us into His family the next day during *Bikuwrym* | Firstborn Children, so that He could empower, enrich, and enlighten us on *Shabuw'ah* | the Promise of Seven. But by severing this connection, by disassociating Yahowah's plan from His Word, the sacrifice of the Passover Lamb became as meaningless as the faith Christians created to negate it.

Should you be wondering why I am using both "Torah" and "Towrah" throughout *Questioning Paul*, the answer is that the correct spelling, according to Yahowah, is "ToWRaH, and thus Towrah. The Wah and Heh are both vowels, and they provide the "o" and "a" sounds in Torah. Then the reason the more common and less correct spelling is used is to more effectively communicate with new readers who are less familiar with Hebrew nomenclature. Therefore, "Torah" will quickly resonate while we all become more familiar with the correct spelling.

In this regard, while some would seek to limit the "Torah" to the five "Books of Moses," the Towrah is from Yahowah and His "*Towrah* – Teaching and Guidance" are found in everything He revealed, permeating the Prophets and Psalms. Rather than using the misleading and inaccurate terms "Bible" or "Scripture," the proper title for Yahowah's witness is either "*Towrah, Naby', wa Mizmowr*

– Towrah, Prophets, and Psalms,” “Towrah and Prophets,” or just “Towrah.” The Towrah is prophetic and the Prophets contain *towrah* | teaching and guidance.

Moving on to Sha’uwl’s next thought, as it is found in the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*: “**But that in law no one is made right along the God clear because the right from trust will live.**”

Amplified, and with the Greek text highlighted for your consideration, we find:

“**But** (*de* – it follows, moreover, and namely) **because** (*oti*) **with** (*en* – inside and with regard to) **the Torah** (*nomos* — the allotment which is parceled out, the inheritance which is given, and the prescription to become an heir) **absolutely no one** (*oudeis* – nothing, nobody, and not one; from *oude heis* – not even one) **is vindicated or justified** (*dikaioo* – made or shown to be correct, proper, or right, acquitted or declared righteous) **by** (*para* – with and in the opinion of) **the God** (*toΘΩ*) **becomes evident** (*delos* – becomes clear and is made plain (scribed in the nominative, where an adjective is presented influencing the subject, God, in this case, renaming Him)) **because** (*oti* – namely and for this reason): **Those who are correct, righteous, and proper** (*o dikaios* – those who are right, upright, virtuous, and guiltless) **out of** (*ek*) **faith** (*pistis* – originally meant trust but evolved to faith or belief as a result of Sha’uwl’s usage in these letters) **will live** (*zao* – will be alive).” (Galatians 3:11)

Buffed and polished in the *King James*, Paul sounds a bit more eloquent, albeit no more rational: “**But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, ‘The just shall live by faith.’**”

Updated for modern sensibilities, the *New Living Translation* passage reads: “**So it is clear that no one can be made right with God by trying to keep the law. For the**

Scriptures say, ‘It is through faith that a righteous person has life.’” (3:11)

And yet Paul’s first point was anything but “clear,” because he misquoted and misappropriated a passage which contradicted his premise. But more telling still, the Towrah does not actually say anything about “faith,” much less that one’s beliefs lead to being “just” or “righteous.”

Therefore, both positions are illogical. Even if no one was justified by the Torah, we could not imply that the righteous shall live by faith. Rather than cause and consequence, these ideas are unrelated. It is like saying: red wagons do not work so it is evident we should put our faith in blue tricycles. More to the point, if God’s Torah cannot be relied upon, in whom are we to express our “faith?”

As I previously mentioned, “the Scriptures” do not “say, ‘It is through faith that a righteous person has life.’” The passage Sha’uwl truncated actually reads:

“Pay attention, he will be puffed up with false pride. His soul, it is not right nor straightforward in him. So, 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)

Paul’s ruse is almost breathtaking in its audacity. And this time the biggest issue is not just the inaccurate or inappropriate nature of Paul’s citation, where he has once again misrepresented Yahowah’s intent by misapplying and twisting a snippet of what God said. What is amazing here is that Yahowah is specifically warning us about *Sha’uwl* | Paul, in this passage. So by quoting it, Paul is taunting his audience, arrogantly implying that those foolish enough to fall for rhetoric aren’t sufficiently resourceful or rational to realize that God is telling us to trust Him, not Sha’uwl.

This realization is so condemning, in two subsequent chapters of *Questioning Paul*, I'll amplify the entirety of God's indictment regarding *Sha'uwl* | Paul. But for now ponder these highlights...

“Upon My requirements and responsibilities, I have decided I will literally and continually stand. And I will choose to always present Myself upon that which protects and fortifies.

So then I will be on the lookout in order to see what he will say about Me, observing how he will question Me. So then, how can I be expected to change My attitude, My thinking, or My response concerning My disapproving rebuke?” (2:1)

Then Yahowah answered, approaching me, and He said, ‘Write this revelation and then expound upon and reiterate it using letters upon writing tablets so that, by reciting this, he might run and go away. (2:2)

Still 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 of time required for this question to be resolved shall not prove it false. Expect him in this regard because, indeed, he will absolutely come, neither being delayed nor lingering. (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. (2:4)

Moreover, because the intoxicating wine and inebriating spirit of the man of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal is a high-minded moral failure,

and is arrogant with meritless presumptions, 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 considered the plague of death. And so those who are brought together by him, accepting him, will never be satisfied. Most every Gentile will gather unto him, all of the people from different races and nations. (2:5)

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 arrogantly 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 apply to him.

For how long will they make pledges based upon his significance, becoming burdened by his testimony?”” (Chabaquwq / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:6)

Evidence does not get any more compelling or relevant than this. Sha’uwl took us directly to a prophecy that God had used to encourage us to “*Sha’uwl* – Question Him.”

Therefore, Yahowah revealed that a man named, “Sha’uwl” would arrogantly mislead and intoxicate Gentiles with irrational rhetoric coterminous with the time He would fulfill His *Mow’ed* – Appointed Meetings. This occurred when *Pesach*, *Matsah*, *Bikuwrym*, and

Shabuw'ah were fulfilled in 33 CE. At the time, Sha'uwl was studying to become a rabbi in Yaruwshalaim.

Further, as if He were reading Galatians, God told us that Sha'uwl would be arrogant, circuitous, duplicitous, intoxicating, deceptive, treacherous, and presumptuous – which is the antithesis of being matter-of-fact and straightforward. We were warned that this pseudo-rabbi's way would be improper, akin to a plague of death. And yet, according to God, Sha'uwl's broad, and therefore accommodating, path would become especially popular with Gentiles because too few of them would actually question his allusive sayings, his derisive words, his comparisons and counterfeits, which would all be ripe with taunts and ridicule.

Sha'uwl impugned himself with these words, twisting the knot which would become his noose. His statement is not only the antithesis of God's instructions, he has engendered Yahowah's ridicule of him. Moreover, and apart from the prophecy, if Paul was right in disavowing Yahowah's standard, it would be the equivalent of God saying: "I will save those who contradict Me and justify those who negate and belittle the plan I have established." And yet, Yahowah introduced His prophecy in Habakkuk, affirming that He was not about to change.

Continuing to mislead by way of senseless and duplicitous prose, the KJV renders Paul's next statement: "And the law is not of faith: but, the man that doeth them shall live in them."

Deploying a different tactic, the NLT authored something which could only be considered appropriate in the context of religion. "This way of faith is very different from the way of law, which says, 'It is through obeying the law that a person has life.'" (3:12)

Should the translation team deployed by Tyndale House Publishers, Incorporated have meant that "the way

of the Christian faith is very different than the way of the Torah,” then they would be right. But “can *that* ‘way of faith’ be right?” is the multi-billion soul question. Can Paul’s thesis, his faith, his religion, be “very different from the way” delineated by God in the Torah and still reconcile fallen man into a relationship with that same God? Has God endorsed a revised plan which is counter to the one He originally authored? And if He did such a thing, wouldn’t it make Him untrustworthy and unreliable?

Irrespective of the fact that Yahowah has provided the answer, at least the battle lines have been drawn. According to the most popular modern translation, it is now the Torah vs. Christianity. So let the Great Galatians Debate begin: are we to trust Yahowah’s Torah or put our faith in *Sha’uwl* / Paulos / Paul?

Amplified, and with the words *Sha’uwl* selected on display, the man God just told us to question, wrote:

“But (*de*) the Towrah (*nomou* – the allotment which is parceled out, the inheritance which is given, the nourishment which is bestowed to be used to grow, the precepts which are apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and the prescription to become an heir) **exists (*eimi* – is) **not** (*ouk*) **out of** (*ek*) **faith or belief** (*pistis*), **but to the contrary** (*alla* –making an emphatic contrast with an adversarial implication), **‘The one having done** (*o poieomai* – the one having made and performed as such becoming) **them** (*autos*) **will live** (*zao*) **with** (*en* – in and by) **them** (*autos*).”** (Galatians 3:12)

Recognizing that Paul did not express this thought very well, principally because the Towrah passage he cited didn’t fit his presupposition, we are led to believe that *Sha’uwl* was suggesting that if an individual were to choose the Towrah over faith, that he would have to live with the consequence. He is implying that the only way to live with the Towrah would be to do everything it requires.

So since he tried to usurp God's credibility to prove his point, we must turn to the passage he referenced to ascertain whether or not Yahowah's Towrah actually said what Sha'uwl was asserting.

Opening Yahowah's Torah to *Qara'* / Called Out / Leviticus, we find God imparting guidance, whereby we are advised to avoid the kinds of religious myths and practices which comprise Christianity:

“Speak (*dabar* – communicate using words) to (*'el*) the Children of Yisra'el (*beny Yisra'el* – children who engage and endure with God), and (*wa*) say (*'amar* – affirm) to them (*'el*), **I am (*'anky*) Yahowah (יהוה), your God (*'elohym*). (18:1-2)**

With regard to things which could be considered similar to (*ka* – as with and like) the practices (*ma'aseh* – the pattern of behavior, the work, the things done, undertakings, and pursuits) of the realm (*'erets* – land) of the Crucibles of Egypt (*Mitsraym* – of religious, political, military, and economic oppression) where (*'asher*) you dwelt (*yashab*), you should not engage in or act upon (*lo' 'asah* – you should not celebrate or profit from) similar (*ka*) pursuits (*ma'aseh* – patterns of behavior, things done, undertakings, and practices) in the land (*ba 'erets*) of Kana'any (*Kana'any* – Zealousness which subdues and subjugates; commonly transliterated Canaan) which is where as a result of the relationship (*'asher*), I am (*'anky*) bringing you (*bow' 'esh*).

There (*sham*), you should not act upon or engage in (*lo' 'asah*) their decrees or customs (*chuqah* – their prescriptions for living and their traditions and statutes), never walking in or following their ways (*lo' halak* – never patterning your life after them). (18:3)

With (*'eth*) My means to exercise good judgment regarding the resolution of disputes (*mishpat* – My means to decide regarding justice and judgment), you

should continually engage and genuinely act ('*asah*).

With ('*eth*) My prescriptions for living (*chuqah* – My inscribed recommendations which cut you into the relationship), you should consistently examine and carefully consider (*shamar* – you should make a habit of consistently and actually observing) for the purpose of approaching by (*la*) walking in them (*halak ba*).

**I am ('*anky*) Yahowah, your God ('*elohym*).'”
(*Qara* / Called Out / Leviticus 18:4)**

This admonition against religion, politics, and societal customs was followed by the statement Paul sought to usurp to justify his inverted proposition. It reads:

“And so (*wa*) you should choose of your own volition to actually observe (*shamar* – under the auspices of freewill, you should consider choosing to carefully and completely examine (qal perfect consecutive)), accordingly ('*eth*), My prescriptions for living (*chuqah* – My inscribed (and thus written) instructions which cut you into a relationship (and thus into the Covenant) with Me) and also (*wa*) My means to resolve disputes (*mishpat* – My means to exercise good judgment regarding redemption (thereby directing our attention to His seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet)).

Whoever ('*asher* – relationally and beneficially) consistently acts upon and engages ('*asah* – endeavors to genuinely celebrate and continually benefit (qal imperfect)) with them ('*eth*), that man (*ha 'adam* – that individual and person), indeed (*wa* – emphasizing this), is actually restored to life as a result of this desire and his decision, living (*wa chayah* – he is literally revived, perfectly renewed, actually nurtured, completely spared, and kept alive into perpetuity through this exercise of freewill, raised, preserved, and allowed to flourish (qal perfect consecutive)) through them (*ba* – with and by them).

I am (‘any) Yahowah (אֲנִי יְהוָה).” (*Qara* / Called Out / Leviticus 18:5)

Yahowah is telling all who would listen that, if people want to live, they should pay attention to what He has to say and then act upon His advice. And at this point, everything He had to say, everything He had to offer, was contained in the very book in which this appeal was recorded: Yahowah’s Towrah!

Therefore, Paul has once again deliberately abbreviated and misappropriated a passage which was inconsistent with his message. He was hoping that, by pilfering some common words, his errant citation would be sufficient to convince his audience that God supported his contrarian position.

But in the actual citation, God absolutely and unequivocally did not say that the “law is very different than faith,” that “through faith a person has life,” or even “through obeying the law a person has life,” or anything remotely similar to these propositions. Paul was, therefore, being disingenuous to put it politely.

Surprising to many, there isn’t a Hebrew word for “obey.” To “*shamar* – observe” is to “examine and consider,” not “keep.” And to “*asah* – to act and engage” is to respond to what one has learned – a concept light-years removed from “obedience.” Moreover, neither “*chuqah* – prescriptions for living” nor “*mishpat* – means offered to resolve disputes by exercising good judgment” could be considered “laws.” Instead, Yahowah stated that by observing, which is to closely examine and carefully consider His written instructions, we are able to make reasoned decisions regarding the restoration of our lives. Therefore, God “*chayah* – restores and renews the lives” of those who are Towrah observant when they act upon what they have read. This is, of course, the antithesis of the Christian position.

While we are making such distinctions, it is grotesquely inappropriate to refer to Yahowah's Torah as "law," as Paul does throughout his letters. The Hebrew word *towrah* is derived from *yarah* and means "source from which teaching, instruction, direction, and guidance flow." His presentation is educational. His witness is enlightening. He is offering guidance which we are free to embrace or reject, so He is not controlling. Moreover, His way is not restrictive but instead liberating.

Rabbis, like Paul (who was dismissed from Pharisee school), deliberately perverted Yah's testimony to validate their own set of laws – a set of religious arguments recorded principally in the *Talmud*. By referring to the *Towrah* as *nomos* within contexts which imply "law," Paul, who was educated in Hebrew, demonstrated that he should not be trusted.

Those who would argue that Yahowsha' refers to the *Towrah* as "*nomos*" in his Teaching on the Mount would be inaccurate. Yahowsha' spoke Hebrew and occasionally Aramaic, never Greek. And the Disciple Levi, who was an eyewitness to Yahowsha's initial and longest public declaration, wrote this portion of his biographical account in Hebrew. Someone writing under the pseudonym "Matthew," no earlier than 80 or 90 CE, combined that eyewitness account into a much longer and less accurate Greek manuscript. Moreover, as we shall soon discover, the etymological history of *nomos* is somewhat harmonious with the Covenant's purpose as it is presented in the *Towrah*, which is "to parcel out an allotment and to bestow an inheritance, providing prescriptions regarding how to become an heir."

Paul, however, cannot be afforded any excuse. And that is because all of Paul's letters, including Galatians, were originally written in Greek, and there is no mistaking the fact that he was mischaracterizing the *Towrah*, presenting it as a punitive set of "laws." Further, he did so

in accord with Rabbinic Judaism – a religious proposition Yahowsha’ thoroughly rebuked.

These things known, there is much more to *nomos* than meets the eye of the casual observer. The word is based upon “*nemo* – to provide, assign, and distribute an inheritance and to nourish heirs.” It is “an allotment which is bestowed and parceled out to feed hungry sheep.” Metaphorically then, a *nomos* is a prescription for living which is given to us by God so that we might live with Him as His children, be fed and grow, inheriting all that is His to give. In this regard, properly defined, *nomos* actually provides a fitting depiction of Yahowah’s “*Towrah* – teaching, guidance, direction, and instruction” on how to participate in His Covenant Family.

However, since Paul consistently casts the *nomos* in a negative light, it is certain that he was not trying to reflect any of these positive attributes. This analysis also suggests that religious Bible translators, following Paul’s bad example, have knowingly and deliberately mistranslated both *nomos* and *Towrah* as “Law.” Recognizing this, lexicons published by Christian institutions claim that *nomos* describes “anything established as a custom, a law or command, any law whatsoever, a rule or injunction, even Mosaic law and the *Pentateuch*.”

Moving on to the next statement as it is presented in the *Nestle-Aland*, *King James Version*, and *New Living Translation*, we find: NA: “Christ us brought out from the curse of the law having become on behalf of us a curse because it has been written, ‘curse on all the one having hung on wood.’” KJV: “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:” (3:13)

Once again, if either the *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear* or the *King James Version* has accurately reflected Paul’s thought then, according to Sha’uwl, the

Torah is a curse. For this interpretation of Paul's statement to be correct, rather than fulfilling the Torah, Yahowsha' liberated us from its clutches. It also means that Yahowsha', rather than being the perfect Passover Lamb as a result of observing the Towrah, embodied all of the Torah's negativity. Even worse, according to Paul, his "Christ" was burdened by the Towrah rather than our sins.

To suggest that his position is irrational would be too kind. It means, at least according to Paul, that the only actual sinner in this story is God – the Author of the Towrah. To believe Paul, the Christian "Christ" died to remove Yahowah's curse. And if that were not sufficiently insane to make you walk away, shaking your head in disbelief, Paul is quoting this same errant and troublesome God to support his agenda. He even claims that this sinful and inept God inspired this condemnation of His testimony. So how is it that 2.5 billion people believe *Sha'awl* | Paul, relying upon the illogical notion that he is right and God is wrong?

Attempting to absolve Paul of the untenable position he has been placed in by his own testimony, as reflected in the *Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear* and the *King James Version*, the *New Living Translation* twists the text to convey a different perspective: "But Christ has rescued us from the curse pronounced by the law. When he was hung on the cross, he took upon himself the curse for our wrongdoing. For it is written in the Scriptures, 'Cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree.'" (3:13)

To the *New Living Translation's* shame, there is no reference to a "cross" anywhere in the Greek texts, much less in this passage. To *Sha'awl's* | Paul's shame, the Torah's position should not have been abridged, misappropriated, nor misquoted. While the Torah's prediction is profoundly accurate, and stunningly prophetic, its merit was mitigated by the way Paul truncated it.

But first things first: here is how the Greek text of Sha'uw1's letter reads:

“**Christos** (XPΣ – divine placeholder [written by Paul or added by a scribe]) **us** (*ego*) **bought back** (*exagorazomai* – worked to atone and purchase; from *ek*, out of, and *agorazo*, doing business in the marketplace where (*agora*) people assemble for a public debate, to buy, sell, and vote) **from** (*ek*) **the curse** (*katara* – from the evil, hateful, abhorrent, loathsome, maligning, and malicious influence) **of the** (*tov*) **Towrah** (*nomou* – the means to being nourished by that which is bestowed to become heirs, precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to proper and be approved, and prescriptions for an inheritance; from *nemo* – that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to heirs to nourish them (singular genitive, and thus a specific characterization)), **having become** (*ginomai* – having existed as) **for our sake** (*hyper ego*) **a curse** (*katara* – a repugnant prayer, invoking the power to harm others by wishing evil upon them, maligning and malicious), **because** (*hoti*) **it has been written** (*grapho* – inscribed): ‘**A curse on** (*epikataratos* – being exposed to divine slander and vengeance) **all** (*pas*) **the one** (*o*) **having hung** (*kremamai* – suspended) **on** (*epi*) **wood** (*xylon*).’” (Galatians 3:13)

According to the founder of the Christian religion, Yahowah's “Torah is an abhorrent and detestable curse which promotes evil.” From Sha'uw1's perspective, God's Word is “malicious and repugnant.” Moreover, instead of Yahowsha' observing the Towrah, affirming and fulfilling it as he, himself, attests in the 5th and 7th chapters of Matthew, according to Paul, God opted to engage in a business transaction whereby He has ransomed us, not from sin, but instead from the Torah.

It is difficult to imagine the darkness which would have to come over a person to prompt them to promote such a demonic deception. But perhaps one thing is becoming

clear, Sha'awl may well have told the truth when he admitted to being goaded and possessed by one of Satan's demons. But even then, why would so many Christians blindly swallow this poison?

I suppose it is because, like all spellbinding deceivers before and after him, Paul continues to weave a few credible threads through his evil tapestry. By citing God (actually misquoting Him), Sha'awl's lies appear plausible.

In reality, the redemption of the Covenant's children is predicated upon Yahowah, Yahowsha' (errantly called "Jesus"), and the Set-Apart Spirit honoring the Towrah's promises through the *Migra'ey* | Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God. Yahowah's and Yahowsha's sacrifices on Pesach and Matsah, apart from the Towrah, are meaningless. There would have been no reason for these Feasts to exist, nor any benefit to be derived from the Passover Lamb's inadvertent misfortune. Unless the Pesach 'Ayil's sacrifice served a purpose, such as fulfilling the promise of eternal life associated with Passover in harmony with the Towrah's instructions, Yahowsha's life was irrelevant. In fact, if the Towrah did not depict Yahowah's enduring plan of salvation, then Yahowsha' would have been an egregious liar who should not have been trusted, because he said and performed otherwise.

And that is what is so odd about all of this. Sha'awl is attempting to demean and dismiss the Towrah while pretending to speak on behalf of its Author. There is no rational way to position God in opposition to His own teaching, especially since He not only talked the talk, He walked the walk.

The statement *Sha'awl* | Paul misquoted also comes from the Towrah, this time from *Dabarym* / Words 21:23. The passage reads:

“Indeed when (*wa ky*) it comes to pass over time

(*hayah*) **that by association** (*ba*) **an individual** (*'ysh* – a Man) **is judged to be guilty, to resolve disputes** (*chata' mishpat* – it is decided, determined, and thought that he is liable for sin in order to resolve disputes) **worthy of death** (*maweth*), **and he chooses to be dispatched to the realm of the dead** (*wa muwth* – he passively allows himself to be slain so as to be absent from life, completely fulfilling the penalty (hophal stem perfect conjugation consecutive mood)), **then** (*wa*) **you decide to completely and literally suspend Him** (*talach 'eth* – you want to hang Him by fastening Him (qal perfect consecutive)) **on** (*'al*) **a wooden timber** (*'ets* – an upright pillar of wood or tree), **his corpse shall not remain overnight** (*lo' lyn nabelah* – his body must not endure the night, staying there after sunset) **on the upright pillar of wood** (*'al ha 'ets* – near the wooden post or tree).

Rather instead (*ky* – truthfully and certainly), **you should prepare and entomb his body** (*qabar qabar* – it is essential that you place his body in a sepulcher) **on this same day** (*ba ha yowm ha huw'*).

Indeed because (*ky*), **the One being suspended** (*talach* – the one being hanged) **is the cursed and abated of** (*qalalah* – the maligned who fades away as a result of an oath and is diminished, slighted, and decreased (in the construct form, the abated and diminished is being associated with and is connected with and bound to)) **God Almighty** (*'elohym*).

So you should not defile (*wa lo' tame'* – you should not cause to be unclean), **accordingly** (*'eth*), **your soil** (*'adamah* – your land, realm, and world; from *'adam* – mankind and human nature), **which relationally and beneficially** (*'asher*) **Yahowah** (יהוה), **your God** (*'elohym*), **gave** (*nathan* – produced, offered, and bestowed) **to you** (*la* – for you to approach) **as an inheritance** (*nachalah* – to become an heir).” (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 21:22-23*)

This is a prophetic picture of the Pesach ‘Ayil’s fulfillment of the Towrah’s presentation of Passover. Yahowah’s testimony reveals that Yahowsha’ would be considered guilty of sins worthy of death, that he would be suspended from a wooden timber, that his body would be removed from the upright pole before the sun set, that his carcass would be prepared and placed in a sepulcher as opposed to being buried in the ground, and that, as a result of having our sins associated with him, the soul would become separated from God in *She’owl* | Hell on Matsah. It also tells us that his body, in keeping with Yahowah’s instructions regarding Passover, would cease to exist that night.

Yahowah uses prophecies like this one, and a thousand more like it, to prove that He inspired His Towrah and Prophets. He did this so that we would be able to trust everything else He has to say. Only God can get every prophecy right, every time, without fail.

In Roger Miller’s song, *King of the Road*, where the refrain repeats “I’m a man of means by no means,” Paul’s methodology is easily exposed. By simply separating clauses, he is creating a false impression. Using this example, while the country artist sang “I am a man of means,” when that statement is disassociated from “by no means,” without the negation, the initial phrase isn’t just misleading, it’s wrong. Similarly, “by no means” independent of “I’m a man of means” could be deployed by an unscrupulous individual to negate anything in the song. But the technique is disingenuous.

Since Paul is not misrepresenting the sentiments of a country song, but instead misappropriating the Word of God, by falsely conveying the impression that God is affirming the disillusion of His own lyrics, *Sha’uwl* | Paul is disrespecting both God and his audience. God was not amused and has put us on notice that such tactics are deceitful, deadly, and damning, condemning Sha’uwl by

name for using them. But what about his audience, what about the billions upon billions of Christians? Now that you know, what are you going to do?

Thus far we have learned that Paul cannot be trusted. We now know that the *King James Version* is unreliable and inaccurate, and that the *New Living Translation* is not a translation of the Greek text; it is not even a faithful paraphrase, but is instead a novelized account, whereby its authors became storytellers. To its credit, the NLT reads smoothly, and it tickles the ears of the evangelical Christian audience, which is why I suppose it has become so popular. But as a study tool, other than to affirm Christian interpretations of Pauline Doctrine, it is of no practical use and is potentially harmful.

We have learned that Paul has misapplied and misquoted the Towrah and Prophets with the intent to mislead, which is troubling. All four citations were cleverly abridged. They were deliberately taken out of context and then purposefully altered to make it appear as if Paul's proposition and God's testimony were in sync. One time would have been inexcusable, but removing clauses from conversations will become a bad habit. Paul's propensity to be disingenuous has become epidemic – a plague which many Christians have come to emulate to justify their religious views. It is also curious, indeed telling, that, when considered as a whole, each of the four statements *Sha'uwil* | Paul cited, resolutely affirmed the Towrah's enduring promise to resolve the conflicts which separate us from Yahowah. Every one of God's declarations undermined Pauline Doctrine and thus the Christian religion.

And that means Paulos had no respect whatsoever for his audience. He played Christians for fools because he believed they would be easy to fool.

I do not say this to insult you if you are a Christian, but to get you to realize that what I am sharing is true. *Sha'uwil*

was so confident that his audience would not question him, that he flaunted his association with Satan, admitting that he was not only demon-possessed, but that he had been goaded into hyperbole, into overstated exaggeration, by the Adversary's emissary. Are you surprised? Did this catch you unaware?

It should not have. After all, there have been thousands of sermons questioning the nature of Paul's "thorn in the flesh." And yet nary a one of Paul's advocates conveys the specific and unabashed answer Paulos, himself, scribed in his second of two letters to Corinth, when he infamously wrote:

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

For then (*gar* – because) **I will say** (*ero*) **I am presently abstaining** (*pheidomai* – I am currently refraining). **But** (*de*) **someone** (*tis*) **not approaching me** (*un eis eme* – of lesser stature, worth, or merit) **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 exaggerated** (*hyperbole ton* – preeminence and exceedingly great, transcendent, magnificent, and awe-inspiring 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 animals, featuring a poisonous scorpion’s stinger) **in the body** (*te sarx* – incorporated into the flesh and as an aspect of 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 nor excessively exalted or lifted up, overdoing it, so as to be insolent and audacious (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 revealing 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)

As bad as this is, and this is as bad as bad ever gets, especially if you are a Christian and have entrusted your soul to the credibility of this man’s testimony, it may be even worse when considered from the perspective of Sha’uwl’s “conversion experience.” On the road to Damascus, he initially claims to have heard the “flashing light” speak to him. In a desperate attempt to prove his

qualification, and thus justify his exaggerated “revelations,” under oath, Paulos testified...

“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 kick against (*laktizo* – to resist, 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 may be surprising, even this gets worse in context, because the line “It is hard to resist the goad” was plagiarized from a line attributed to the Greek god, Dionysus – the pagan deity whose doctrine became part and parcel of Christianity. It is the most memorable line of Euripedes’ *Bacchae*, dating to 405 BCE. Dionysus’ line reads: “I would sacrifice to the god rather than kick against his goad in anger, a mortal against a god.”

Also, at this time, and by his own admission, Sha’uwl was doing this very thing. He was striking anyone who admitted that Yahowsha’ was the Passover Lamb. And now he was that “mortal against God.”

There is no way to discount this testimony, to reject Paul's admission of guilt. His confession to the Corinthians is duly recorded in Papyrus 46, a late 1st or early 2nd century codex. If that witness is not reliable, the entire "Christian *New Testament*" becomes untenable, because there are no older or more credible codices than P46.

If you are a Christian, you must either deal with this by rejecting all of Paul's letters as being demonically inspired, and then the whole of the "*New Testament*" as being similarly unreliable. Or, of course, you could put your head in the sand, and be religious which is now akin to being irrational. At this point, you can no longer claim ignorance – nor should you.

It should now be obvious that Paul was as *Yahowsha*' | "Jesus" described him – a wolf in sheep's clothing. He deliberately lied with the intent to deceive. And while that was relatively common then as it is today, it is frankly unbelievable that this man's fraudulent propositions are considered the Word of God.

If you are a Christian, are you going to remain a victim? You have the option to reject Paul, but that will mean rejecting Christianity. So what are you going to do? Are you open to knowing the truth? Can you handle the truth? Do you want the truth?

Before we move on, let's pause a moment and consider the options at our disposal regarding Paul's strategy – that of misappropriating, mistranslating, and misquoting Yahowah's *Towrah* and Prophets to promote his agenda. You can ignore his malfeasance if you believe that I have misrepresented Paul's or Yahowah's statements. But this approach is easily resolved. Flip forward to the "*Towrah – Teaching and Guidance*" chapter of *Questioning Paul* where every Hebrew and Greek word delineated in these statements is presented so that you can do your own due diligence and verify the text and the translations for

yourself. Or simpler yet, just compare standard English translations of these passages and Sha'uwil's quotations and note the differences.

Since the first option to dismiss this problem is a nonstarter, you can accept the fact that the citations are different, but attribute their divergence to an inadvertent mistake on Paul's part. But if you do, you must also abandon the notion that Paul's letters are "Scripture" – the inerrant Word of God. And with that realization, the foundation of Christianity crumbles.

You can admit that there is a pattern of malfeasance with regard to all of Paul's Towrah citations, and recognize that they are misquoted and then twisted to support his agenda, which means that he intended to misrepresent them. But if you take this path, you will be compelled to label Paul a false witness. And at that point, Christianity becomes false – yet the most popular and broad path that leads to destruction.

Since these options are devastating, you could blame the mistakes on scribal error, suggesting that Paul's quotations from the Torah and Prophets were correct initially, but that over time copyists inadvertently misrepresented his words, creating a false impression. But this is a slippery slope. The oldest meaningful codex of the Christian "*New Testament*" is Papyrus 46, which is dated between 85 and 125 CE, thirty-five to seventy-five years after this epistle was scribed. The codex contains a complete copy of almost all of Paul's letters. If it is not reliable, then nothing in the so-called "Christian *New Testament*" is reliable. There is only one other 2nd century witness, Papyrus 75, which covers Luke and John, and it was scribed nearly one hundred years thereafter. Therefore, if scribes significantly altered Paul's letters during this relatively short period of time, the list of appropriately supported and reliable "*New Testament*" books would shrink to two: portions of Luke and John. The rest, based

as they are on far less reliable and far more recent manuscripts, would be too suspect to believe. And of course, that would mean that the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms would still stand unchallenged.

Or you can take the quietly popular, albeit seldom articulated, Christian position regarding these misquotes – one derived from Marcion in the early 2nd century. He concurred with Paul and concluded that the God who inspired the Torah was mean-spirited, and no longer relevant. It is a position which many Christians hold, even if they are too timid to voice it. As such, Marcion attempted to nullify the Torah by encapsulating it within a collection which he, following Paul’s lead, labeled the “Old Testament,” and thus suggested that it was the will of a now deceased, or at least irrelevant, deity.

Marcion promoted the myth that Paul was the only true Apostle, and that he alone spoke for the new and improved god of his “*New Testament*.” Paul’s letters were canonized as a result – a collection that included his epistles and edited portions of Luke and Acts. Thereby, Sha’uwl of Tarsus, now Paulos of Rome, was positioned and purported to correct the errors that the old God had made. As a result, Paul’s new faith forever separated believers from Yahowah, from His Invitations to be Called Out and Meet, from the Chosen People, from the Promised Land, from the Covenant, and from Yahowah’s Towrah – His Teaching and Guidance.



Grapho / It is Written

Invalidate or Fulfill?...

The truth is as obvious as the lie is apparent. Forming a relationship with God is predicated upon our response to Yahowah's testimony, not Paul's.

On the fourth chapter of what is erroneously referred to as the "Christian *New Testament*," the first time Yahowsha's testimony is recorded, he settles this issue for us, removing any doubt that *Sha'awl* / Paulos / Paul lied when he maligned the Torah. Listen...

"But then (*de* – providing a contrast), **the One** (*o*) **having become the answer** (*apokrinomai* – the One who revealed the means to separate fact from fiction, to distinguish between truth and deceit; from *apo* – to separate and *krino* – to separate again), **said** (*lego* – clarified, providing meaning using words), **'It has been written** (*grapho* – it has been inscribed on a document, engraved in writing, and recorded using letters and words), **"Not upon** (*ouk ep*) **bread** (*artos* – a baked loaf of bread with yeast which aerates, food in general, that which raises up from the ground, is elevated, or lifted up; from *airo* – to rise up from the ground, to take upon oneself, carry away, and carry off, removing that which had once been associated) **alone, by itself, without help** (*monos* – only by himself, forsaken, merely, and destitute of help), **will man live** (*zao o anthropos* – will this one man reliably conduct his life in a particular manner to actually restore

life (future middle indicative)), **but** (*alla* – certainly, making an emphatic contrast) **upon** (*epi*) **every** (*pas* – the whole and complete) **spoken statement** (*rhema* – verbal declaration) **departing** (*ekporeuomai* – going forth and proceeding, leading and guiding the path of life) **through** (*dia*) **the mouth** (*stoma* – the spoken communication) **of Yahowah** (ΘY – a Divine Placeholder for Yahowah).”” (Matthew 4:4)

Yahowsha’ was debating Satan, Sha’uwl’s inspiration. The Devil, as he had with Adam and Chawah in the Garden of Eden, was tempting Yahowsha’. Using the same ploy he had originally tested in the Garden, the same strategy now on display throughout Galatians, the Adversary inverted the intent of God’s testimony by removing it from its context and twisting it to convey the wrong impression. Playing off of a similar circumstance, when the Children of Yisra’el were hungry in the wilderness, Satan recognized that Yahowah miraculously fed them with *mana*, considered to be the bread of heaven. Now after forty days in the wilderness, he realized that Yahowsha’ was hungry, so why not turn a stone into bread and take a bite?

But this was ordinary bread, *artos*, bread puffed up by carbon dioxide, which is the residue of fermenting yeast. This fungus is equated to religious and political corruption by Yahowsha’.

“Come on,” you can almost hear Satan pleading as he had exactly 4000 years before, “take a bite. What’s it going to hurt to ingest a little corruption?” Well, what it would have hurt was our salvation by corrupting Yahowsha’, causing him to be less than the perfect Passover Lamb. There was a lot at stake.

But, unlike Chawah six millennia ago, Yahowsha’ knew the Word of God, and he cited it accurately to forestall any temptation. It is the example we should follow. The Towrah is the antidote for Satan’s poison. But of course, to wield it, we must know it.

Yahowsha' cited a passage from *Dabarym* / Deuteronomy. It was applicable to this situation, just as it is ideally suited to resolve the question of whether Paulos spoke for Yahowah when he denounced the Towrah, having claimed that God's testimony was a lifeless and enslaving curse with the power to condemn but not save. Yahowsha' disagreed, and siding with Yahowah against Sha'awl, he said: **“Not upon bread alone, by itself, without help, will this man live, but upon every spoken statement departing through the mouth of Yahowah.”**

Life, therefore, is a byproduct of Yahowah's testimony. What's more, Yahowah speaks in first person in His Towrah and throughout His prophets. So not only did Yahowah's Torah, His Prophets and Psalms represent the entire reservoir of Godly proclamations at the time Yahowsha' provided this answer, and not only was this specific citation from the Towrah, Paul's first letter wouldn't be written for another twenty years, excluding it from consideration.

One of the many differences between God's Word and Paul's epistles is that Yahowah speaks for Himself in His Torah and Prophets, but it is Paul, not God, who is found continually speaking in first person throughout his epistles. And this is relevant because Yahowsha' specifically correlated life with the words which had flowed from Yahowah's mouth.

This realization is the antithesis of the Pauline style. Therefore, there would be no possibility of an informed and rational person interpreting Yahowsha's statement to include anything Paul would subsequently say or write to undermine this reality.

Yahowsha' **“became the answer.”** He *“apokrinomai* – revealed the means to separate fact from fiction, to distinguish between truth and deceit.” *Apokrinomai* is from *apo* – to separate and *krino* – to separate again. More specifically, *krino* means “to separate in the sense of

distinguishing between fact and fiction, discriminating between right and wrong, choosing between good and evil.” To *krino* is “to examine and consider evidence to determine what is reliable and proper.” To *krino* is “to exercise good judgment by separating that which can be trusted from that which cannot. It is about “discretion.”

This requires us to use our brains to filter out the foolishness of Paul. Yahowsha’ was the living embodiment of the Towrah, the Word of God in the flesh. By observing the Towrah, by acting upon the Towrah’s Guidance, and by engaging in accordance with Yahowah’s Instructions, Yahowsha’ affirmed that the Towrah is the means to know Yahowah, to participate in a relationship with Yahowah, to life and to salvation. So Christians, since this was Yahowsha’s first recorded statement, he is leaving you without excuse.

Now that we know the Towrah is the antidote for Pauline Doctrine, let’s consider the passage Yahowsha’ cited. Here, Moseh is talking with the Children of Yisra’el after they had spent forty years in the wilderness...

“You benefited from His response (*wa ‘anah* – He answered you in a way which you could choose to take advantage of on an ongoing basis (in the piel stem we are the beneficiaries of God’s answer, in the imperfect conjugation the response provides ongoing benefits, and in the consecutive mood, we can choose to respond)) **which is why** (*wa*) **He wanted you to be hungry** (*ra’eb* – He decided you would benefit if He developed your appetite (in the hifil stem God brought about their longing for nutrition, in the imperfect He caused it to be ongoing, and in the consecutive mood it was God’s will)).

Then He could feed you (*wa ‘akal* – so He might fulfill His desire to provide your ongoing substance, continuously nourishing you (hifil imperfect consecutive)) **with** (*‘eth*) **the** (*ha*) **mana** (*man* – a nourishing and sweet-tasting nectar from God considered to be the bread of life; from

mah – an interrogative asking what is this and what does it mean) **which** (*‘asher*) **you did not know** (*lo’ yada’* – you were actually and completely unaware of (qal stem denotes reality and the perfect conjugation indicates that which is complete)) **and also** (*wa*) **your fathers** (*‘ab* – your forefathers or ancestors) **could not have known** (*lo’ yada’*) **in order** (*ma’an* – for the express purpose and intent) **to make known to you** (*yada’* – to enable you to know and to become known (the hifil stem reveals that God facilitated our ability to learn, know, and understand, and the infinitive construct has the characteristics of a verb and noun, thereby making those who seek known to God)) **that, indeed** (*ky* – truly and surely), **not upon** (*lo’ al*) **bread** (*ha lechem* – a baked loaf of bread with yeast and food in general; from *lechem* – that which can be adversarial) **alone** (*la bad* – by itself, separated or isolated) **shall man continually live and actually be restored to life** (*chayah ha ‘adam* – shall the or this man, humankind and mankind, have life consistently and genuinely preserved, being continually spared, nurtured, and restored (the qal stem speaks of that which is actual and genuine, while the imperfect conjugation affirms the continuance of life)), **but** (*ky* – indeed rather) **upon** (*‘al*) **everything** (*kol*) **which flows out of** (*mowtsa’* – which travels forth, leading and guiding every incremental stage of a journey demonstrating the proper path through life; from *yatsa’* – to go forth, leading us out by way of) **the mouth** (*peh* – the communication and spoken word) **of Yahowah** (𐤏𐤃𐤅𐤃𐤁𐤄 – the pronunciation of *YaHoWaH* as guided by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **shall man continually live and actually be restored to life** (*chayah ha ‘adam* – shall this man, humankind, have life consistently and genuinely preserved, being continually spared, nurtured, and restored (the qal stem speaks of that which is actual and genuine, while the imperfect conjugation affirms the continuance of life)).” (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 8:3*)

Unlike Paul, Yahowsha' not only cited the complete statement from the Towrah, but he also pulled it from a discussion which was perfectly suited to affirm God's guidance. His citation answered the specific question being posed. He made the correlation between life and God's testimony – the very path through life he, himself, lived.

Since this is an important contrast between Yahowsha' and Sha'uwl, and since their approaches to the Word of God are considerably different, let's examine *Dabarym* / Words 8:3 in context. Moseh, the man Yahowah asked to scribe His Towrah, was reminiscing about what the Children of Yisra'el had heard, observed, learned, and experienced together over the past forty years...

“All of (*kol*) the terms and conditions (*mitswah* – the insights pondered regarding the instructions of the relationship, the directions associated with the covenant) which beneficially (*'asher* – for the sake of the relationship and to show the way) I (*'anky*) have instructed (*tsawah* – have provided by way of directions and guidance) this day (*ha yowm*) are for you to genuinely choose to observe (*shamar* – for you to want to closely examine and always carefully consider, electing to consistently and literally focus upon (the qal stem encourages us to literally and actually focus, the imperfect conjugation reveals that our observations should be ongoing and continual, and the paragogic nun ending makes our examination volitional and thus subject to freewill)) for the purpose of approaching (*la*) by actually responding and engaging (*'asah* – through acting upon, profiting from, and celebrating what you learn) so that (*ma'an* – for the intent and purpose of) you elect to continuously live (*chayah* – you capitalize upon freewill and are actually restored, your life always preserved (the qal stem reveals that our response to what we observe literally restores our life, the imperfect conjugation reveals that our nourishment, growth, and

preservation will be ongoing and continual, and the paragogic nun ending makes eternal life volitional and thus subject to freewill)).

And in addition (*wa*) **you can choose to be great, actually increasing in every possible way** (*rabah* – you can elect to have every aspect of your nature multiplied (the qal stem affirms that this promise to make us greater than we are is reliable, the perfect conjugation tells us that the transformation will be complete, and the consecutive mood reveals that we are empowered as a result of our choice to observe and respond)) **so that you will be pleased when you arrive** (*wa bow*’ – you will come to and be thrilled to be completely included in (qal perfect consecutive)) **and also so that** (*wa*) **you will become an heir** (*yarash* – you will be given a complete inheritance as a child choosing to receive all that is his or her father’s to provide (qal perfect consecutive)) **within** (*’eth* – in accord with) **the realm** (*ha ’erets*) **which beneficially** (*’asher* – as a result of the relationship) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – a transliteration of יהוה, our *’elowah* – God as directed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **promised in a sworn oath** (*shaba*’ – affirmed truthfully and reliably in association with the promise inherent in seven) **to** (*la*) **your fathers** (*’ab* – your ancestors and forefathers). (*Dabarym* / Deuteronomy 8:1)

Also (*wa*), **you should choose to remember** (*zakar* – you should actually want to recall every aspect of (qal stem perfect conjunction consecutive mood)) **everything associated with** (*kol* – the entirety of and every aspect of) **the beneficial way to the relationship** (*ha derek ’asher* – the specific and proper path to get the most out of life) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of YaHoWaH, our *’elowah* – God as directed in His *ToWRaH* – teaching regarding His *HaYaH* – existence and our *ShaLoWM* – restoration), **your God** (*’elohym*), **walked with you** (*halak* – traveled, leading you so that you could

follow Him (in the hifil perfect God is enabling our walk which He considers complete and perfect)) **these** (*zeh*) **forty** (*'arba'iyim* – a multiple of *'arba'* – four, from *raba'* – to be square, and thus to correct, right, out of debt, and in compliance) **years** (*shanah* – time of renewal and of a complete cycle of life) **in the wilderness** (*ba ha midbar* – in the desert).

This is in order for (*ma'an* – it is because and the intent was for) **you to respond** (*'anah* – you to answer), **to approach** (*la*) **by exerting yourself through the process of learning and understanding** (*nasah* – by testing and evaluating what you had observed and experienced), **coming to know and to become known** (*la' yada'* – to recognize and realize, to acknowledge and understand) **regarding** (*'eth*) **the benefits of the relationship** (*'asher*) **by deciding in your heart** (*ba leb* – through exercising good judgment and reflecting it in your attitude, motivations, and response) **whether** (*ha* – as an interrogative) **you will consistently and genuinely observe, closely examining and carefully considering** (*ha shamar* – you would actually and continually focus upon, scrutinize, evaluate, and prioritize) **the terms and conditions of His agreement** (*mitswah* – the authorized directions regarding His Covenant, the written stipulations and provisions of the mutually binding contract) **or not** (*'im lo'*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 8:2)

The statement Yahowsha' cited regarding bread in His defense against Satan followed what we have just read, making it an ideal choice. The Towrah, as it consistently does, reinforces the path to life. If you want to capitalize upon what God is offering, listen to what God has to say. And the only way to do that is to “*shamar* – closely examine and carefully consider, i.e., observe,” His Towrah. This would not be the only time Yahowsha' would affirm this obvious reality.

Since our goal is to learn as much from God as is

possible, before we thumb a couple of pages ahead in this story and ponder Yahowsha's most declarative statement regarding the Towrah, let's pause here in the Towrah a moment longer. Next we find Moseh saying...

“Your clothing did not wear out on you and your feet, they did not swell these forty years so that you would know, recognizing and acknowledging (*yada*’ – you would be aware and understand) by exercising good judgment (*im leb* – by deciding in your core being), that, indeed (*ky*), in the manner (*ka*) which beneficially (*asher* – for the sake of the relationship) a man (*iysh* – an individual) instructs and corrects (*yasar* – teaches and admonishes, providing guidance regarding that which is potentially harmful, revealing the consequences of bad choices and behaviors influencing) his children (*beny* – his sons), Yahowah (*Yahowah* – written as directed by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), your God (*elohym*), teaches and admonishes you, providing guidance regarding that which is potentially harmful while revealing the consequences (*yasar* – instructs and corrects you so that you don't go astray and make those mistakes).” (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 8:4-5*)

That is a summation of the Towrah's purpose. It is our Heavenly Father's advice to His children. It consists of the same kind of instruction we as parents ought to give to our sons and daughters. The Towrah, therefore, not only provides us with reliable guidance, it exposes us to that which is potentially harmful, revealing the consequences of ignoring our Heavenly Father's advice.

Since Yahowsha', the very first time he speaks to us, directs us to this place in Yahowah's Towrah, let's take one more step in Yahowah's direction.

“And so (*wa*) you should genuinely choose of your own volition to thoroughly and completely observe (*shamar* – you ought to want to actually examine, literally

consider, and totally focus upon (qal perfect consecutive)) **Yahowah's** (*YaHoWaH* – an accurate presentation of the name of 'elawah – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God's** (*'elohym* – the Almighty's), **stipulations and provisions** (*mitswah* – terms and conditions regarding the relationship agreement) **to approach** (*la*) **by walking** (*halak* – journeying through life) **in** (*ba*) **His ways** (*derek* – His paths and steps through life), **and** (*wa*) **for the purpose of coming to** (*la*) **revere and respect** (*yare'* – highly valuing) **being with Him** (*'eth*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 8:6)

These would be Yahowah's provisions, not Paul's propositions. They are stipulations rather than leaps of faith. Collectively they enable us to approach God and to enjoy His company. And these terms and conditions regarding the Covenant are being presented in Yahowah's *Towrah* – a document we are being encouraged to examine and consider so that we can benefit from God's guidance.

In short order, we will return to this encounter between Yahowsha' and Satan. Our purpose will be to demonstrate the strategy the Adversary typically deploys so that we are attuned to this preferred tactic as we make our way through the corpus of Paul's letters, and especially Galatians, the Magna Carta of Christianity. And secondarily, by considering Yahowsha's response, we will learn how we should react to similar deceptions.

But for now, let's rejoin the chronology presented by the Disciple. The very next time we hear Yahowsha' speak is in the fifth chapter of the book now called, "Matthew." This time, rather than negating Satan's influence by debating a singular fallen spirit, Yahowsha' is instead setting the stage by providing the proper perspective from which to evaluate everything he would say and do over the course of three years. This speech to the "multitudes" is known as the "Sermon on the Mount." It is a tribute to

Yahowah and His Towrah.

Yahowsha's presentation is especially germane considering Paul's claim to have been authorized by him to assault and annul the Towrah. Therefore, to determine whether such a mandate were possible, let's examine Yahowsha's statements regarding the enduring authority of the Towrah during his Instruction on the Mount.

Translated from Hebrew to Greek and then to English, Yahowsha' said...

“You should not think or assume (*me nomizomai* – you should not consider, expect, or suppose at any time even the possibility of the commonly held or popularly established presumption, never accepting the prevailing precept or justification (negative particle, aorist active subjunctive verb)) **that** (*hoti* – namely) **I actually came** (*erchomai* – I in fact appeared then, now, or in the future (aorist active indicative)) **to tear down, invalidate, put an end to, or discard** (*kataluo* – to dissolve, destroy, disunite, subvert, overthrow, abrogate, weaken, dismantle, or abolish, releasing or dismissing any of the implications, force, influence, or validity of) **the Towrah** (*ton nomon* – that which has been assigned to nourish and provide an inheritance) **or the Prophets** (*e tous prophetes* – those who are inspired to speak and write based upon divine inspiration, making God's thoughts and plans known even before they happen).

I actually came not (*ouk erchomai*) **to dismiss, to invalidate, or to discard** (*kataluo* – to tear down, to dissolve, to destroy, or to disunite, subverting by creating an artificial division, and thereby overthrow, abrogate, weaken, dismantle, or abolish, dismissing any implication or its influence), **but instead** (*alla* – to the contrary, emphatically contrasting that to the certainty), **to completely fulfill** (*pleroo* – to proclaim and complete, conveying the true meaning and thinking, to liberally supply, carrying out, accomplishing, and rendering it

totally and perfectly). (5:17)

Because (*gar* – for this reason then so that you understand) **in deed and in truth** (*amen* – truly and reliably), **I say to you** (*lego sy*), **until** (*hoes* – up to the point that) **with absolute certainty** (*an*) **the heaven and the earth** (*o ouranos e ge* – the universe and the surface of the planet) **cease to exist** (*parerchomai* – pass away, disappearing), **not ever under any circumstance shall** (*ou me* – there is no way whatsoever, not even so much as a possibility that) **one aspect of the smallest letter** (*eis iota* – shall a single Yowd, the first letter in Yahowah’s name and the smallest character in the Hebrew alphabet) **nor** (*e*) **a single stroke of the pen** (*mia keraia* – one of the smallest lines distinguishing any aspect of any Hebrew letter) **cease to be relevant** (*parerchomai* – be averted or neglected, have any chance of being ignored or disregarded, being passed over or omitted, perishing) **from** (*apo* – being disassociated, separated, or severed from) **the Towrah** (*tou nomou* – that which has been assigned to nourish and to provide an inheritance) **until with absolute certainty** (*hoes an*) **everything** (*pas* – every last aspect, all and the totality of it) **takes place** (*ginomai* – happens and occurs, becoming a reality). (5:18)

Therefore (*oun* – indeed and as a result), **whoever may at any time** (*hos ean* – if at any moment anyone introduces a contingency or condition whereby individuals) **dismiss or attempt to do away with** (*luo* – may seek to toss aside, invalidate, or abolish, tearing away or put asunder) **one of the** (*mian ton*) **smallest and least important of these** (*houtos ton elachistos*) **prescriptions and instructions which are enjoined** (*entole* – rules, regulations, and authorized directions, precepts, and teachings), **and** (*kai*) **he instructs or indoctrinates** (*didasko* – he might teach, delivering moralizing discourses while conceiving and instilling doctrine, expounding or explaining so as to enjoin) **people**

(*anthropos* – humanity or mankind) **in this manner** (*houto* – thusly and likewise), **he will actually be provided the name and will be judicially and legally summoned as** (*kaleo* – he will be referred to and called by the proper name, literally and passively summoned, called to task and designated) **Lowly and Little** (*elachistos* – Paulos in Latin, meaning: small and inadequate, insignificant and insufficient, irrelevant and unimportant, immaterial and inconsequential (*Paulos*, the Latin name Sha’uwl adopted as his own means “*elachistos* – little and lowly)) **by the kingdom of heaven** (*en te basileia ton ouranos* – by, within, among, and with regard to the reign and royal authority of the heavens).

And then (*de* – but by contrast), **whosoever** (*hos an*) **might act upon it** (*poieomai*– may engage through [the Towrah], making the most of it, attempting to carry out its assigned tasks (aorist active subjunctive)), **and** (*kai*) **teach it** (*didasko* – try to provide and share [the Towrah’s] instructions, expounding upon it), **he** (*houtos* – these things) **will properly be referred to and named** (*kaleo* – it will be judiciously and appropriately called and designated) **great and important** (*me gas* – astonishingly valuable, splendid and sensible, albeit surprisingly uncommon) **among those who reign within the heavens** (*en te basileia ton ouranos* – by and with regard to the kingdom and royal authority of the heavens).” (Matthew 5:19)

That was unequivocal. It was also in complete opposition to the Christian traditions Paulos contrived. To discount or discard any aspect of the Torah, an individual such as Paulos has to contradict Yahowsha’. And it is irrational for anyone to claim to have been granted authorization to speak on behalf of an individual when his message is contradictory to them.

If Yahowsha’ told the truth, the notion of a “*New Testament*” is torn asunder because Yahowah’s original

testimony is still valid. And based upon this statement, Paul's letters which seek to invalidate the Towrah must be discarded.

But if Yahowsha' cannot be trusted, then neither can Paul, because he would be speaking on behalf of a liar. In fact, if Yahowsha' cannot be trusted, then the whole "*New Testament*" has to be rejected, because it claims to chronicle Yahowsha's words and deeds.

Neither option is acceptable if you are a Christian. With regard to the religion's veracity, it actually does not matter if this statement from Yahowsha's most famous and well-attended public pronouncement is valid or invalid, properly recorded or misrepresented. If *Yahowsha's* | "Jesus" uncompromising declaration before the largest audience he would ever address, a speech originally chronicled by his most literate Disciple, isn't reliably conveyed, then nothing the Greek manuscripts claim to document can be considered credible. And if Yahowsha's words were accurately translated into Greek and then responsibly retained, there is no possibility whatsoever that the Christian religion is valid, because it is in complete and irreconcilable conflict with the letters which comprise the words of the Towrah.

As a Christian, you cannot discount this statement without discounting Yahowsha's testimony. And the moment that is done, everything crumbles. But on the other hand, to believe him, you have to reject Christianity.

Equally telling, especially since the Prophets were included in Yahowsha's affirmation, the majority of Yahowah's prophecies, including His return and His ultimate renewal and restoration of the Covenant with Yisra'el and Yahuwdah, have not yet happened, and the heavens and earth remain. Therefore, the Towrah still stands. Now that is something for Christians to think about, especially considering the subject and speaker. Therefore, as a Christian reading this, since you are no longer ignorant

of this proclamation, your only options are to reject Christianity or remain irrational. And what do you suppose the merits might be of believing in something which is illogical?

Since we are now undeniably aware of Yahowsha's assessment of those who attempt to dismiss and discard any portion of the Torah, and that he referred to such attempts as "Paulos," how can we consider Paulos' attempt to demean and devalue the Towrah favorably? In this light, how is it that Paul convinced the world that God had authorized him to do precisely what Yahowsha' just testified should not and could not, be done? Said another way, is there any chance whatsoever that God inspired, even condoned and endorsed, the writings of a man who invalidated His Towrah in view of this statement by Yahowsha'? Do Christians honestly believe that Paul can contradict God and still be trusted?

I realize that we have just begun our investigation, and that apart from the four derogatory statements we have thus far considered, where Paul referred to the Towrah as a curse, something abhorrent, repugnant, and malicious, and where he claimed that absolutely no one could be saved by the Towrah, I have not yet validated the assertion that Paul claimed to have destroyed and discarded the Towrah after dissolving and dismantling it.

Therefore, while we will cover all of this in great detail, until then here is a literal rendering of Paul's proposition. With so much at stake, readability will suffer to achieve absolute accuracy...

"Having come to realize without investigation or evidence that by no means whatsoever is made righteous or vindicated, man out of acting upon the Towrah if not by faith in Iesou Christou.

And we to Christon Iesoun, ourselves, believed in order for us to be acquitted out of faith in Christou, and

not out of acting upon the Towrah. Because out of works of the Towrah not any flesh will be acquitted, vindicated, nor be made righteous.” (Galatians 2:16)

“Because if that which I have actually torn down, dissolved, and dismantled, invalidated and abolished, negated, abrogated, and discarded, completely destroying, by this on the other hand, I strengthen and promote this edifice which I myself, bring into existence and have recommend. (Galatians 2:18)

I then, because of the Towrah, actually died and was separated in order that to God I might currently live. In Christo I have actually been crucified together with.” (Galatians 2:19)

“O ignorant and irrational, dimwitted and unreasonable, Galatians. Who bewitched and deceived you? (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 affected and you were vexed and annoyed without result or a plan. If indeed also thoughtlessly and for nothing without reason or cause. (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 Torah or out of hearing faith?” (Galatians 3:5)

“Indeed, consequently, the Torah accordingly is against and contrary to the promise of the god. Not may it be (It might be, although I don’t want it to be). For if,

perchance, had been given the Torah the power and ability, the capacity and resources, to impart life, certainly in the Torah would be the righteous and vindicated. (Galatians 3:21)

To the contrary, emphatically and certainly, written scripture imposed restrictions, completely shutting the door on heaven, imprisoning everything under error and evil in order that the promise out of the faith of Iesou Christou might be given to believers. (Galatians 3:22)

But before they to come of the faith, under the control of the Towrah, we were actually being held in custody as prisoners, restricted and trapped like fish in a net, to the bringing about of faith was revealed. (Galatians 3:23)

As a result, the Towrah has come to exist as our disciplinarian, a pedagogue which instructs in a particularly pedantic and dogmatic manner using strict, old-fashioned methods with an overbearing demeanor by smiting and stinging those it enslaves, extending until Christon in order that by means of the faith, or a belief system, we might, at some point in time, while doing nothing ourselves, be justified, with the possibility of someday being vindicated as a result of being influenced. (Galatians 3:24)

But now having come the faith-based system of belief, no longer do we exist under an old fashioned and strict disciplinarian whose methods are antiquated and overbearing, even harsh.” (Galatians 3:25)

This resolutely accurate and literal translation is word for word as the text of Galatians actually reads in Greek, something that will be conclusively demonstrated in due time. It sounds coarse and disjointed because it was poorly written. But if you look beyond the sorry prose and consider the intent of the words, there is no mistaking the

fact that Paul is claiming that he has invalidated and destroyed the Towrah because he views God’s testimony as inept and incompetent, even antiquated, mean-spirited, and overbearing. He is also claiming to have replaced the arcane and impotent Towrah with his edifice: “the faith of Iesou Christou” which is now wholly suspect due to the testimony of said individual.

To someone who knows and loves Yahowah, for someone who has been enriched and empowered by His *Beryth* | Covenant, as someone who has been perfected and adopted into His Family through His *Miqra’ey* | Invitations to be Called Out and Meet, and for someone who has been liberated and enlightened by the brilliance of His *Towrah* | Teaching, Paul’s rhetoric is nauseating. Even without my affinity for Yahowah, for any rational, informed, and moral individual, Paul’s claims are condescending, illogical, and obnoxious.

Such an illiterate and ignorant individual ought not have fooled anyone – much less billions. The fact that he has is a testament to the fallen state of man.

Returning to Yahowsha’s declaration, indirectly, he incriminated Sha’uwl, a man who not only dismissed the Towrah, but who also claimed to be a rabbi and Pharisee, in addition to being a religious expert, scholar, orator, and writer. Please consider what Yahowsha’ said next...

“For indeed (*gar* – because then), **I say to you all** (*lego umin* – I actually affirm and personally explain to you all (present active indicative)), **that unless** (*hoti ean* – because if) **your** (*umon*) **righteousness, integrity, and standing in the relationship** (*dikaioisyne* – acceptability of your thinking and state of approval, upright nature, accuracy of your understanding) **is abundantly superior and eminently more appropriate than** (*perisseuo polys* – could be considered vastly more abounding and greatly in excess of) **the religious teachers, experts, scribes, and scholars** (*ton Grammateus* – government officials,

politicians, public servants, reporters, writers, clerks, lawyers, and judges), **as well as the Pharisees** (*Pharisaiois* – members of a fundamentalist political and religious party comprised of hypocritical Jews who coveted authority, were overtly religious, set rules which others had to abide by, established religious rituals and traditions, and interpreted the Towrah to their liking), **you will absolutely never move into nor experience** (*ou me eiserchomai eis* – there is no chance whatsoever that at any time you might ever do something which may cause you to enter into (aorist active subjunctive)) **the realm of the heavens** (*ten basileia ton ouranos* – the sovereignty of the kingdom of the abode of God).” (Matthew 5:20)

Since we are still in the infancy of our study, notwithstanding the foregoing, for some it may still seem a bit presumptuous to conclude that Paul’s overall intent was to foreclose the Torah in order to promote his new faith. And yet the translations of the Galatians passages we considered suggest that Christian theologians believe they are justified in their interpretation of Paul’s message when they cite this letter as “evidence” that the Torah was an outdated and restrictive burden which had to be replaced with a much simpler and accommodating approach. But why is it that not one Christian scholar has the character, courage, or intellectual integrity to admit that Paul’s position, if Christians have interpreted it correctly, is diametrically opposed to Yahowsha’s testimony on life and the Towrah, as well as in direct conflict with God’s Word?

Speaking to those who are willing to invest the time required to actually know Yahowah, to those who actively seek to learn the truth, to those willing to engage in the process which leads to admission into God’s home, Yahowsha’ provided a set of instructions which completely undermines the ignorance of blind faith...

“You should ask (*aiteo* – at the present time it is desirable for everyone to act on his own initiative to

earnestly request information, knowledge, and answers (present active imperative second-person plural) **and** (*kai* – as a logical connective conjunction relates the flow of thought from one thing to another while expressing the logical relationship between them) **it will be given** (*didomi* – in the future this will reliably produce the desired result (future passive indicative third person)) **to you** (*umin* – two or more of you or you all).

You should seek (*zeteo* – at the present time it is desirable for everyone to act on his own initiative to attempt to find information, searching for knowledge and answers (present active imperative second-person plural)) **and** (*kai* – expressing the logical relationship) **you will actually receive the discovery** (*heuriskomai* – you will receive an education, you will be the beneficiary of finding reliable learning, facilitated and aided in the process attaining the information (future passive indicative third person)).

You should knock (*krouo* – at the present time it is desirable for everyone to act on his own initiative to physically demonstrate and announce their presence at the door desiring acceptance and admittance (present active imperative second-person plural)) **and** (*kai* – expressing a logical relationship) **it will be opened** (*anoigo* – entry into the midst will be provided (future passive indicative third person)) **to you** (*umin*). (Matthew 7:7)

For then (*gar* – because and for this reason) **universally the one asking** (*pas o aiteo* – without exception, the individual actively engaging is transformed and (present active participle nominative)) **receives** (*lambano* – he is selected and is grasped by the hand (present active indicative)), (*kai*) **the one seeking** (*zeteo* – earnestly trying to obtain information though personal interaction so as to learn (present active participle nominative)) **actually finds** (*heuriskomai* – genuinely participates in the discovery and receives an education

from the information (present active indicative)), **and** (*kai*) **the one knocking** (*krouo* – the one demonstrating and announcing his presence at the door desiring acceptance will be given and granted what he seeks so (present active participle dative)), **it will be opened** (*anoigo* – access to understanding and entry into the midst will be provided (future passive indicative third person)). (Matthew 7:8)

Yahowsha's declaration is consistent with Yahowah's Towrah guidance. God constantly encourages us to observe, which is to closely examine and carefully consider, His instructions, especially the provisions associated with the Covenant. He asks us to listen to His prescriptions for living, so that we can act upon what we discover. This, however, is the antithesis of Paul's proposition, which is salvation through faith. God's method requires us to seek, to learn, and then engage. But with faith, both the process and response are unnecessary and counterproductive.

Yahowsha's next statement is also hostile to Paul's proposition because he is directing our attention not to himself, but instead to Yahowah, to our Heavenly Father, and to the Father's gift, which is found in the Towrah. But beyond this, by juxtaposing these thoughts, Yahowsha' is also revealing where we should look to find the door to seek acceptance. He is even contrasting the merits of Yahowah's testimony, His offer and promises, against the statements and assurances of a man. He is saying this expecting that we will act upon Yahowah's offer instead of one promoted by someone who is clearly Paul.

“Should you be considering an alternative (*e* – by comparison (scribed as a logical disjunctive, a conjunction which provides a logical contrast between opposites)), **what** (*tis*) **man** (*anthropos*) **currently exists** (*estin* – is now actively becoming (present tense nominative singular masculine)) **from among you** (*ek umon*) **who** (*hos*), **when his son** (*o huios autos*) **asks for** (*aiteo* – will request

sometime in the future (future active indicative)) **a loaf of bread** (*artos* – aerated and thus yeasted bread), (*me* – forming a question) **will he give him** (*epididomi autos* – will he hand to him) **a stone** (*lithos* – a rock used for sealing graves or making millstones)? (Matthew 7:9)

Or should you be considering an alternative (*kai e* – by comparison (scribed as a logical disjunctive, a conjunction which provides a logical contrast between opposites)), **when he asks for** (*aiteo* – he actually will request (future active indicative)) **a fish** (*ichthys*), (*me* – forming a question) **will hand him** (*epididomi autos* – will he give to him) **a snake** (*ophis* – a serpent which is symbolic of Satan)? (Matthew 7:10)

If (*ei* – introducing a condition which must occur or be met before the resulting event can be manifest), **therefore** (*oun*), **you all** (*umeis*) **presently and actively being** (*ontes* – currently existing and in the process of being (present active participle)) **troublesome and morally corrupt** (*poneros* – seriously flawed, evil and annoying, blind and diseased) **have in the past been familiar with and have actually known how** (*oida* – have perceived and have shown that you are genuinely aware of, having recognized how (perfect (a completed action in the past) active indicative)) **to give** (*didomi* – to provide) **good and beneficial** (*agathos* – moral, generous, and useful) **gifts** (*doma* – presents) **to your children** (*tois umon teknon* – to your descendants and offspring), **how much more by contrast will** (*posos mallon*) **your Father** (*o umon pater*), **the One in the Heavens** (*o en tois ouranos*), **actually give** (*didomi* – personally respond to reliably produce, grant, and bestow (future active indicative)) **something good, moral, generous, and beneficial** (*agathos* – that which is upright and worthy, capable and substantial, valuable and kind) **to those asking this of Him** (*tois aiteo auton* – actively responding to Him, making a request of Him (present active participle))?” (Matthew 7:11)

Therefore, if Paulos is offering the gift of faith, and Yahowah is offering the gift of the Covenant, which offer do you suppose might be more beneficial and capable, more generous and substantial? And since this follows a presentation on asking and seeking, do you suspect that Yahowsha' is indicating where we ought to look to find something which is reliably good, valuable, and kind? Further, since the answers to these questions are obvious, why do Christians, who claim that their religion is based upon Yahowsha' | "Jesus," ignore this and turn to Paul instead? In light of this, how did Sha'uwl manage to convince them that the Towrah was anything but good, generous, capable, or beneficial?

“Anything (*pas* – everything), **therefore** (*oun* – then), **to whatever to the degree or extent** (*ean hosos* – whenever and as far as) **you might want or may enjoy** (*thelo* – you might decide or presently desire, you may propose or be of the opinion or currently think something might be so, perhaps personally being fond of or taking pleasure in your will, your intent and your purpose (present active subjunctive)) **as a result of** (*hina* – that) **men being human** (*oi anthropos* – individuals representing mankind and humankind (nominative plural)) **doing for yourself** (*poieo umin* – actively attempting to perpetrate this, fashioning and assigning these things with regard to yourself (present active subjunctive dative)), **also** (*kai*) **in this way** (*houto* – likewise in this manner, thusly), **you** (*umeis*) **should choose to actively do for them** (*poieomai autois* – you may elect to perform and behave unto them (present active imperative)).

This (*houtos*) **then** (*gar* – for this reason) **actually and presently is** (*estin* – exists as) **the Torah** (*o nomos* – becomes the means to being nourished by that which is bestowed to become heirs, existing as the precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to prosper and to be approved, and prescriptions for an

inheritance; from *nemo* – that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to heirs to nourish them (nominative)) **and the Prophets** (*kai oi prophetes*).” (Matthew 7:12)

The moral here is that, since we do not want a millstone, a premature burial, a poisonous snake, or a serpent representing Satan given to us by men or by their institutions, and would be vastly better served with Yahowah’s good, generous, and beneficial gift, we ought to offer our fellow man access to God’s gift, starting with our children – providing them with the valuable and kind offer found in our Heavenly Father’s Towrah presentation of His *Beryth* | Covenant Family.

Since context is the mother’s milk of understanding, remember that Yahowsha’ has been encouraging us to knock at a certain door, seeking admission, and he has spoken of our Heavenly Father’s gift being especially valuable. He has deliberately and decisively associated this especially good and generous gift with Yahowah’s Towrah and Prophets.

Yahowsha’ is introducing the narrow doorway which leads to life. He is speaking of Passover, something he, as the Passover Lamb, ought to know a great deal about...

“Under the auspices of freewill, you all should choose at some point in time to enter, personally engaging by moving (*eiserchomai* – at a moment in time you ought to want to personally act by electing to go in, beginning the journey by choosing to experience (aorist active imperative)) **through** (*dia* – by way of and on account of) **the narrow, specific, seldom-tread, and exacting door** (*tes stenos pule* – the doorway with strict requirements which is highly restrictive, the passageway which is unpopular and seldom walked, an infrequently-trodden gateway whereby a stand will be taken to enable others to stand, to be firmly established, and to be upheld (note: *stenos* is based upon *histemi* which provides the concluding insights)) **because** (*hoti* – for the reason that

namely) **broad, manmade, and crafted to be wide open** (*platys* – molded, malleable, plastic, and easily crafted and plied, a wide and artificial thoroughfare; from *plasso* – formed and molded by man, serving as the basis of plastic) **is the door** (*pule* – is the gate), **and spacious and accommodating** (*eurychoros* – as encompassing as nations, widely regional, and broadly societal; sharing a base with *eusebeia* – especially religious, speaking of belief systems and their devout and pious practices) **is the way** (*e hodos* – is the path and journey, the popular way through life, the well-traveled road and route, the common course of conduct) **which misleads and separates** (*e apago* – that takes away, leading through deception; from *ago* – directs, leads, and guides to *apo* – separation) **into** (*eis*) **utter destruction** (*apoleia* – needlessly squandering and ruining the valuable resource of one’s existence, causing it to perish; from *apollumi* – to be put entirely out of the way, to be rendered useless and to be abolished, coming to an end and ceasing to exist), **and a great many** (*kai polys* – the vast preponderance, an enormous number, and to a very great degree, serving as a superlative of great, many, much, and a large number) **are those** (*eisin* – are actually the ones (present active indicative)) **who are influenced into moving while suffering the consequences of entering** (*oi eiserchomai* – who as a result of being acted upon are affected by taking the first step toward and then going in, manipulated in the process of beginning a journey while experiencing the effect of going out (present middle passive participle nominative)) **through it** (*dia autos* – by way of it). (Matthew 7:13)

Certainly (*tis* – it is certain that), **the specific doorway has strict requirements, it is narrow, seldom-tread, and it is an exacting passageway** (*e stenos pule* – the doorway is highly restrictive, the passageway is unpopular and infrequently walked whereby a stand is taken to enable others to stand, to be firmly established, and to be upheld).

Additionally, it goes against the crowd to the point of persecution (*kai thlibomai* – it is so totally unpopular the past act influences the future to the point of hardship and harassment, even to oppression and affliction (perfect passive participle nominative)), **this one way** (*e e hodos* – this specific journey through life, the singular route and the path) **which leads, separating those guided** (*apago*) **unto** (*eis*) **life** (*zoe* – vigorous and flourishing living, the fullness of a restored and active existence), **but** (*kai*) **very few** (*oligos* – an extremely small quantity over a very short time) **are those** (*eisin o* – exist the ones) **finding it** (*heuriskomai autos* – presently learning and actively discovering the location of it, themselves experiencing it).” (Matthew 7:14)

This may be the single most devastating declaration ever made against religion. The one thing religions like Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and mankind’s newfound favorite, Socialist Secular Humanism, have in common is that they are very popular. A great many people have placed their faith in them, ranging from tens of millions to many billions. But Yahowsha’ just said that the popular ways are not only artificial and manmade, they lead to destruction, needlessly squandering countless souls.

While this statement is catastrophic to Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Islam, and Socialist Secular Humanism when Yahowsha’s divine credentials are known, it obliterates any support for Christianity – the most popular religion in the history of the world. Based upon this declaration alone in the midst of Yahowsha’s Sermon on the Mount, the moment Constantine made Christianity acceptable in Rome, and Theodosius declared it the official faith of the Empire, there was no longer any hope that it could be the path to life. It must, therefore, be one of the many ways which lead to destruction.

Now, do not misunderstand. Yahowsha’ did not say

that Christianity was destructive because it's popular, but only that the path to life is unpopular. Christianity is deadly because it is based upon Sha'awl's delusions.

I am not trying to rub salt into an open wound if you are still a Christian, but I would be remiss if I did not remind you that Yahowah specifically revealed that there would be a "broad path," a duplicitous and improper way, associated with Sha'awl. As a result, Christianity is "the plague of death" being predicted in these words...

"Pay attention, he will be puffed up with false pride. His soul, it is not right nor straightforward in him. So, through trust and reliance, by being firmly established and upheld by that which is dependable and truthful, those who are correct, and thus vindicated, live.

Moreover, because the intoxicating and inebriating spirit of the man of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal is a high-minded moral failure, and his is an arrogant and meritless presumption, he will not rest, find peace, nor live, whoever is open to the broad path, the duplicitous and improper way, associated with Sha'awl.

He and his soul are like the plague of death. And so those who are brought together by him, accepting him, will never be satisfied. All of the Gentiles will gather together unto him, all of the people from different races and nations in different places.

But they do not ask questions, any of them, about him. Terse references to the word they lift up as taunts to ridicule, with implied associations that mock through comparison and counterfeit, along with elusive sayings with derisive words arrogantly conveyed.

There are hard and perplexing questions which need to be asked of him, and double-dealings to be known regarding him.

So they should say, 'Woe to the one who claims to

be great so as to increase his offspring, acting like a rabbi, when neither apply to him. For how long will they make pledges based upon his significance, becoming burdened by his testimony?” (*Chabaquwq / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:4-6*)

In context, Yahowsha’ has identified the Torah as God’s gift, saying that it is the lone and unpopular path to life. He said that all other ways lead to destruction, “needlessly squandering a person’s existence.” So there is no getting around the fact that this means popular paths – and there are none more popular than Christianity – lead to the death and destruction of those who follow their edicts. This is a profoundly important truth few Christians consider. And yet it is the reason, the only reason, we are examining Paul and his letter to the Galatians.

As an interesting aside, Yahowsha’s instructions regarding eternal life tell us to “begin by entering through a specific doorway.” And that is because the first of seven steps to Camping Out with Yahowah begins by answering His invitation to walk through the doorway labeled “Passover.” This portal, featuring the blood of the Passover Lamb, initiated the exodus from the crucible of Egypt, engendering the liberation of God’s Chosen People from their enslavement by oppressive human political and religious schemes. It represents the doorway to God’s home. And Yahowsha’, as the Passover Lamb, is the living embodiment of this, the entrance to Heaven.

Also relevant, the reason that there are strict requirements associated with this specific doorway is because it is only available to the Children of the Covenant. And to participate in this family relationship with our Heavenly Father, we engage by accepting five very specific conditions. For God to make Heaven enjoyable for the few who are included, He must exclude the many who would tarnish the experience. Pauline Christianity is nauseating, a plague of death, and would make everyone

sick.

Yahowsha' was not yet finished warning Christians about the consequence of disregarding the Towrah. With these words, he would tell everyone willing to listen to him not to trust Paul:

“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* – you all should choose to beware, presently paying especially close attention, actively and attentively watching out for and guarding yourself against so as to separate yourself from (present active imperative)) **the false prophets** (*ton pseudoprophetes* – those pretending to be divinely inspired spokesmen, from *pseudo*– deliberately false, lying, deceitful, and deceptive and *prophetes* – one who speaks of hidden things, declaring what he claims to have received from God) **who** (*hostis*) **come to you, currently appearing before you** (*erchomai pros umas* – who approach you, moving toward or up to you, making public appearances or statements against you (the present tense reveals that the false prophet is currently in their midst, the middle voice indicates that he is self-motivated, that his statements are affecting him, and that the more assertive he becomes the more he is influenced by his aggressiveness and claims (i.e., one lie leads to another), while the indicative mood affirms that this is actually occurring)) **from within** (*esothen* – as an insider and thus from the same race, place, or group) **by** (*en*) **dressing up in sheep’s clothing** (*endyma probaton* – cloaked in the outer garments of sheep (note: the root of *probaton* is *probaino* – to go beyond, to go farther and forward, to go on and on, overstepping one’s bounds)).

And yet (*de* – but), **they actually are** (*eisin* – they correspond to, represent, are similar to, and exist without contingency as (present active indicative)) **self-promoting, self-serving swindlers** (*harpax* – vicious,

robbing, extorting, and destructive thieves, ferocious, rapacious, and snatching con men, extracting and compelling under duress; from *harpazo* – to violently, forcibly, and eagerly claim and then seize for oneself so as to pluck and carry away) **wolves** (*lykos* – fierce individuals under dangerous pretenses who are vicious, cruel, greedy, destructive, overreaching, voracious, avaricious, acquisitive, and insatiable men impersonating beasts of prey).” (Matthew 7:15)

The first word in this statement, *prosechete*, is a compound of “*pros* – to one’s advantage with respect to or toward someone or something” and “*echo* – that which is accepted, grasped unto, held, possessed, considered, or regarded.” It is used to describe “large groups, organizations, or institutions a person might join, attend, participate in, or congregate amongst.” Therefore, by juxtaposing “*prosechete* – a cautionary and guarded examination and consideration” of “*pseudoprophetes* – false prophets” and the “*prosechete* – institutions they would have you embrace and join.” With “*apo* – disassociation and separation,” Yahowsha’ told us to walk away from religious organizations like churches.

Further implicating Paulos, while he got his lone prediction wrong when he misrepresented the *Taruw’ah* Harvest and claimed in his first letter to the Thessalonians that the “*harpazo* – snatching away, or rapture” would occur during his lifetime (1 Thessalonians 4:17), thereby making him a false prophet by any standard, *pseudoprophetes* is less about errantly predicting the future than it is indicative of “someone who deliberately deceives by falsely claiming to have been inspired by God.” Therefore, because Sha’uwl’s message is consistently deceitful, it is overwhelmingly obvious that he lied about his inspiration.

Also, this admonition was recorded in the present tense, which is to say that the *pseudoprophetes* was present,

currently lurking in their midst. That is relevant because, according to Sha'awl, he was in this very place at this time, learning to be religious at a school for rabbis. And since the only false prophet of any significance during this time and in this place is also the most significant false prophet of all time, there is no mistaking *Sha'awl* | Paul as the wolf in sheep's clothing.

That is not to say that there weren't other Jews who led people astray in the name of religion. Rabbi Akiba shaped Judaism into the religion which is practiced today. But he never claimed to be a prophet and he lived a full century later. Maimonides, the man who codified Judaism's thirteen pillars, wasn't a prophet either, and he wrote over one millennia later in Islamic Egypt, not Yisra'el. Constantine, the gateway to Roman Catholicism in the early 4th century, could never be mistaken for a lamb. He was not a prophet, and he was neither a Christian nor a Jew, so he too would be disqualified for many reasons. Therefore, who else other than Paulos and his associates meet these criteria?

But there is more. By Yahowah's definition, Sha'awl, as a Benjamite, qualified as a wolf. Paulos claimed to be from the tribe of Benjamin in Romans 11:1, saying: **“For indeed, I am an Israelite, from the seed of Abraham, from the tribe of Benjamin** (*Beniamin* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *Benyamyn*).”

And then this heads up from God: **“Benjamin is a wolf viciously tearing apart, continually mangling and actually killing, plucking the life out of his victims, in the early part of the day, consistently devouring his prey, and during the dark of night at the end of the day. He divides and destroys, apportioning and distributing that which has been spoiled.”** (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 49:27)

While there were many Benjamites, there is only one man known to have publicly announced that he was from

the tribe of Benjamin present in Yaruwshalaim during the time Yahowsha' delivered His Instruction on the Mount. Beyond this, Sha'awl admitted to masking his true identity, which is the very essence of a wolf in sheep's clothing. Proof of Paul's willingness to change his outward appearance to take advantage of an unsuspecting audience is found in this confession...

“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*) with those under (*tous hypo*) Towrah (*nomon*) I might make a profit by procuring an advantage over (*kerdaino*). (1C9:20)

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

I came to exist (*ginomai*) to the (*tois*) incapable 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)

Even Machiavelli, the man who postured the immoral notion that the end justifies the means, was not this belligerent. And you will notice, Paulos is asserting that he is the savior, able to save anyone and everyone. This, of course, would be in direct conflict with God, in tactics, capability, and numbers.

While the combination of God's warnings and Paul's admissions are devastating, leaving Sha'uwl and his associates as the only viable and known potential culprits, there was a subtlety in Yahowsha's depiction of the wolf. He described the predator using a derivative of the same term Paulos selected to present his "*harpazo* – rapture." It was such an odd choice for Paul, especially considering its negative connotations. But since he did, and God knew he would, he gave us yet another clue regarding the identity of this wolf in sheep's clothing.

I don't suppose that Yahowsha' could have made his message any clearer for us. He told us we could rely upon the Towrah and then he told us whom we should not trust, revealing that a self-serving insider would feign an alliance with him so that he could more easily snatch souls away from God. He, of course, was speaking about Paul – and those who have allied themselves with him.

This is especially poignant, because on another occasion Yahowsha' spoke of the comparative influence he would have versus Paulos. God's statement is one of the reasons that I consider Paul to be the most influential (albeit not in a positive way) man who ever lived. Yahowsha' revealed:

"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 whenever) **another** (*allos* – completely different individual and entity) **comes** (*erchomai* – might appear, showing himself, and coming forth, presenting himself) **in his own name** (*en to onoma to idio* – with his own individual, unique, and distinctive, private, and personal name [like Sha’uwl choosing to be Paulos]), **that individual** (*ekeinos* – that lone and specific man, him, then and there (the demonstrative singles out the individual, the accusative associates this man and name, while the singular masculine limits this to a single male individual)) **you all will actually accept** (*lambano* – you will all receive, choose, and prefer).” (*Yahowchanan* / Yah is Merciful / John 5:43)

Considering how often the founder of the Christian religion wrote: “but I Paul say...”, it is a wonder more people don’t recognize him as the one who not only came in his own name, one that he actually chose for himself, but also as the one so many would prefer. Paulos even said “imitate me.” He wrote: “if someone teaches in opposition to what I say let him be accursed.” He was not only fixated on himself, he claimed the entire world for himself. And today, the vast preponderance of Christian Bible studies, sermons, and quotations are based upon Paul’s letters rather than Yahowsha’s pronouncements – and almost never upon His Sermon on the Mount.

But for those looking for it, second only to Yahowah’s Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, Yahowsha’s testimony is true. He went on to say...

“From (*apo*) their (*autos*) fruit (*karpos* – that which they produce), 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* – by closely examining and carefully considering, and by processing and evaluating everything logically, every one of you will be able to actually learn, completely understand, and without reservation recognize and acknowledge; *epiginosko* is to know for certain and to understand to the point of being completely convinced as a result of diligent observation and thoughtful comprehension (translated in the future tense revealing that while the wolf was currently among them, he had not yet revealed his fruit, which is to say some time would pass before Sha’uwl became Paulos and he and his followers wrote their letters, then in the middle voice we learn that those who are observant and circumspect will benefit from what they discover regarding these evil men, and finally in the indicative mood, Yahowsha’ is telling us that while the example is metaphorical, such deceivers are very real)) them (*autos*).

Is it even rationally possible (*meti* – introducing a rhetorical question where the answer is always no) to collect (*syllego* – to pick) a bunch of grapes (*staphyle*) from (*apo*) a thorn (*akantha* – something sharp and pointed often found on a thorny bramble or brier), or from (*e apo*) a thistle (*tribolos* – a three-pronged thorny and prickly invasive wild plant that is injurious to other plants), figs (*suka*)?” (Matthew 7:16)

Just as we can delight in the subtlety of Yahowsha’s use of a “*harpazo* – rapture” derivative to direct our attention to Paul’s false prophecy, *akantha*, translated “thorn” in verse 16, is from *akmen*, which means “point.” God is thereby directing our attention to two of Paul’s most incriminating statements.

“And of the superiority of the exaggerated,

magnificent, and awe-inspiring aspects of the overstated revelations, therefore, it should be self-evident, in order to not become overly proud, exalting myself beyond what would be justified, there was given to me a sharp goad (*skolops* – a troubling thorn at the end of a pointed stick used to control dumb animals) in the body, a messenger of Satan, in order to strike and restrain me.” (2 Corinthians 12:7)

And then Satan addressed him and said...

“I heard a voice saying to me in the Hebrew language, ‘Sha’uwl, Sha’uwl, Why are you actually pursuing me, following me, and really striving with such intense effort to reach me? It’s hard, demanding, difficult, and intolerable for you to resist against the goad (*kentron* – a pointed sharp stick used to prick and prod and thus control animals, making resistance vain or perilous).” (Acts 26:14)

Having come to know Yahowah, and thus Yahowsha’, I have come to recognize that, while religious deception is something God abhors, He has a sense of humor.

The *tribolos suka* comparison is also delightful. *Tribolos* is from *treis*, meaning “three” and *belos*, which speaks of “darts being thrown.” Interestingly, *belos* is derived from *ballo*, “to thrust aside and toss away, to scatter, giving over to the care of another with an uncertain result.”

That got me to thinking. What are Paul’s most lethal prongs? And I thought, perhaps: 1) His claim that he was an apostle speaking for God beguiling people into believing that his letters should be considered the Word of God. 2) His claim that the Towrah was an incompetent curse and that it had been annulled in favor of salvation through faith in the gospel of grace. And 3) His claim that his new covenant replaced the enslaving old covenant, when there is only one Covenant and it represents the lone

means to engage in a relationship with God.

And then, of course, there is the even more infamous trio, the Christian Trinity, the Babylonian myth which was incorporated into Christianity. It was the result of Paul's moronic "the fullness of the godhead resided upon him bodily."

But there is more. You see, a *tribolos*, as a thorny and prickly wild plant, is injurious to other plants. And in this example, the plant the thorny, prickly, invasive, and insidious Sha'awl would injure was the fig tree which, like the grapevine, is Yahowah's symbol for Yisra'el. Largely as a result of Paulos' rampant anti-Semitism first expressed in Galatians, and then elevated to a reprehensible rant in Thessalonians, Jews would become the enemies of Christians, who would ultimately claim what they renamed "Palestine" and the "Holy Land" as their own.

For God's Chosen People, it would be 1800 years from exile to return, a prophecy Yahowsha' pronounced by referencing the fig tree. It was a parable God designed to reveal that Yisra'el would blossom again, with Yahuwdym causing the Land to grow after centuries of neglect. And their return would occur less than a generation prior to His return.

"So then from the fig tree (*suke*) be instructed and learn from this symbolic illustration. No matter how long it takes, when a young and tender shoot is ready to sprout and its leaves grow, producing foliage, you know that summer is near.

And in this way, whenever you may see all of this, you should understand that it is near, at the door. Truly I say to you that there is no chance whatsoever that this generation will perish before all of these things come to exist." (Matthew 24:32-34) The pervasive influence of Paul's letters continues to be a thorn in Yisra'el's side.

Also interesting, in the accusative plural neuter, "*sukon*

– fig” is pronounced *suka*, which is a transliteration of *Sukah*, the seventh and final Invitation to be Called Out and Meet with God. So while this statement was not delivered in Greek, the transliteration of the Hebrew term may be relevant because it is symbolic of camping out with God in the Promised Land – a place and time devoid of thistles.

If Yahowsha’s next statement is true, a comprehensive examination of Paul’s words should be sufficient to determine whether his message is “*kalos* – genuine, approved, and commendable” or “*sapros* – corrupt, rotten, and harmful,” even “*poneros* – seriously flawed, annoying, and worthless.”

“In this way (*houto* – thusly, it follows, in like manner), **every** (*pas*) **good and useful** (*agathos* – valuable, beneficial, and generous, appropriate, and pleasant) **fruit tree** (*dendron*) **produces** (*poieomai* – creates, makes, and furnishes) **exceptionally suitable and commendable** (*kalos* – genuine, approved, magnificent, admirable, advantageous, superior, attractive, fitting, valuable, highly beneficial, and proper) **fruit** (*karpos* – production and results).

But (*de*) **a tree** (*dendron*) **which is corrupt, rotten, and harmful** (*sapros* – bad, decayed, putrefied, unfit, unprofitable, unsuitable, unusable, and destructive) **bears** (*poieomai* – produces, creates, makes and provides) **diseased and worthless** (*poneros* – seriously flawed and faulty, annoying and perilous, malicious, troubling, and painful) **fruit** (*karpos* – production and results).” (Matthew 7:17)

With the test so simple, with the evidence so plentiful, with the stakes so high, why do you suppose so few people have deployed these criteria to evaluate the fruit of Paul’s pen? Equally troubling, with God being so definitive, expressly saying that cherry picking snippets from a rotten source is not acceptable, why are so many Christians willing to exonerate Paul because they rather like some of

what he has to say?

“It is not possible (*ou dynamai* – it is never within its capability nor capacity) **for a good and useful** (*agathos* – for a valuable, beneficial, and appropriate) **fruit tree** (*dendron*) **to produce** (*poieomai* – to create, make, provide, or furnish) **seriously flawed or disadvantageous** (*poneros* – diseased, faulty, annoying, perilous, troubling, counterproductive, or evil) **fruit** (*karpos* – production and results), **nor** (*oude*) **a tree** (*dendron*) **which is corrupt, rotten, and harmful** (*sapros* – bad, decayed, putrefied, unfit, unprofitable, unsuitable, unusable, and destructive) **to make** (*poieomai* – to create, produce, or provide) **suitable or commendable** (*kalos* – genuine, approved, admirable, advantageous, fitting, valuable, beneficial, or proper) **fruit** (*karpos* – production and results).” (Matthew 7:18)

God is not talking about fruit trees. He is not trying to get you to show a preference for apricots over apples or pears over plums. A bad tree can on occasion produce something edible. But such is not the case with a rotten prophet.

The moral of the story is that, if a person is speaking for Yahowah, everything he writes and says is beneficial and reliable. With His prophets, because He is directing them, there are no mistakes and no misleading statements. But if there is a single error, one putrid statement, the smallest corruption, in someone’s testimony who claims his words have been nurtured by God, we must reject that source entirely. So now we have a bushel of reasons to uproot Paul from our lives.

Any one of the statements we have considered thus far from Paul individually is sufficient to reject his letters – designating them as harmful. And that is because, according to God, truth never produces something which is wrong and the product of evil is always poisonous. So even that which may appear appropriate in an inappropriate

source must be rejected, because that appearance only serves to make the venom more enticing to ingest. It is all or nothing.

When it comes to providing the proper perspective, there are few insights more important than recognizing that Satan and his messengers make their nauseating fruit appear delectable by coloring it with strokes from God's brush. These resulting counterfeits fool the unsuspecting, the unobservant, and the indiscriminate into believing that a message crafted by the Adversary will lead them to paradise.

Just as a counterfeit bill is completely worthless even when ninety-nine percent of its strokes are genuine, the more a false prophet says which is true, the more deadly he becomes. And that is because, by making his words appear Godly, they become more seductive and beguiling. Credibility is Yahowah's strong suit, which is why deceivers like Paul misappropriate it to make their lies appear credible. Paul has fooled billions of souls deploying this strategy. And Satan, with the assistance of Paul, Akiba, Muhammad, and Maimonides has deceived billions more, beginning long ago with Adam and Chawah.

“Any and every (*pas*) tree (*dendron*) not (*me*) producing (*poieomai* – creating or providing) suitable, fitting, and genuine, approved, commendable, and advantageous (*kalos* – valuable, beneficial, and proper) fruit (*karpos* – production and results) shall actually be cut off and done away with (*ekkopto* – shall find themselves reliably cut down, removed, and eliminated (present passive indicative)) and toward (*kai eis*) the fire (*pyr* – a metaphor for judgment), it will be thrown (*ballo* – he shall find himself moved, propelled, and cast, being nudged he will fall (present passive indicative)).”
(Matthew 7:19)

Fire is symbolic of divine judgment, where Yah's light and energy are used to refine and separate good while

devouring that which is bad. Fire is not, however, found in She'owl, because the Judge is never present in the place of separation. Moreover, without Yahowah, *She'owl* | Hell is a dark and lightless place, precluding the existence of fire.

It is therefore instructive to know that sources which are not “*kalos* – valuable, beneficial, and proper, suitable, fitting, and genuine,” are “*ekkopto* – cut off,” which means “removed” from Yahowah. Moreover, they are “*ekkopto* – done away with and tossed aside” following judgment.

Judgment is something rotten sources of information regarding God endure. Yah's Covenant children will witness trials for clerics and kings in addition to spectacular tribunals for the likes of Paul, Akiba, Muhammad, and Maimonides, Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao. God's children, however, as a result of the Towrah's provisions, will not be judged. Therefore, the sole purpose of judgment is to determine which souls will spend eternity separated from God, as opposed to those souls which will simply cease to exist. The former is a penalty, justly earned for leading others away from God. The latter is a consequence of being misled.

“So then indeed (*ara ge* – as a result and in reality), by (*apo*) their (*autos*) fruit (*karpos* – production), you will be able, through careful observation and studious contemplation, to actually know and understand them (*epiginosko autos* – by conducting a careful, thorough, and competent inquiry in the future you all will be able to use evidence and reason to genuinely comprehend them, by closely examining and carefully considering, and by processing and evaluating everything logically, every one of you will be able to actually learn, completely understand, and without reservation recognize and acknowledge them; (translated in the future tense revealing that, since the rotten fruit had not yet been produced, diagnosing the disease would have to wait, and in the middle voice we learn that those who are observant and

circumspect will benefit from what they discover regarding the illegitimate tree and its deadly fruit, and finally in the indicative mood, Yahowsha' is telling us that, while trees and fruit serve as metaphors, deceivers actually exist and the consequence is real))." (Matthew 7:20)

Since *epiginosko* speaks of that which can be known for certain based upon a close examination and careful evaluation of the available evidence, this concept is being presented as the antithesis of, and thus as the alternative to, faith. Therefore, to the degree that Yahowsha's statement was accurately translated, this is especially relevant. And that is because faith is Paul's lone alternative to observing the Towrah.

It is surprising, but nonetheless true, that God and man differ dramatically on the concept which has become synonymous with religion. God, rather than asking us to blindly believe Him, wants us to read His testimony so that we come to know Him. That is why the Towrah and Prophets were written and given to us. And this voyage of discovery which leads to knowing Yahowah is vastly superior to believing that He exists. Similarly, actually engaging in His Covenant is better than believing that you have a relationship with God.

The reason this particular instruction from God is being shared in the opening chapters of this book, one devoted to examining and evaluating the merits of Paul's letters, is because we are doing exactly what Yahowsha' asked of us. So if you are a Christian, you now have a trio of choices. You can continue reading *Questioning Paul*, you can dedicate the time to do a similar study on your own, or you can continue to live a lie, pretending to follow someone whose words you are prone to ignore.

And speaking of ignoring, if you are an agnostic, you would be better served to set this book aside temporarily and read *Yada Yahowah* or *Observations*. And that is because you are fortunate. Unlike those whose religious

beliefs are crafted to repel everything that is averse to their faith, and especially God's own testimony, being an agnostic, your mind isn't a house of cards which must be brought down before something sensible can be established in its place. For you, there is no clutter to clear away, no religious mythology which has to be rejected or defended. Nothing has to be exorcised prior to considering Yahowah's testimony.

As an agnostic, your mind is already open. You are keenly aware of the merits of evidence and reason. So you are prepared to consider God's testimony on its own merits. For you, it is just a matter of wielding evidence and applying reason in a different venue, and perhaps for the first time observing the Creator rather than His creation. But then once you have come to know Yahowah as He revealed Himself, once you understand what He is offering, once you respond to Him rationally and engage in His Covenant, you will want to return to this book. And that is because once you have come to know Yah, you will want to share what you have learned with Christians who have been misled.

That said, if you are a secular Jew, I'd recommend beginning with *Coming Home*. You'll meet *Dowd* | David, and come to enjoy his brilliant lyrics as he waxes poetic about his relationship with God. In him you will find your Messiah and King, even meet the Son of God. And the time is right, because soon he will be returning to lead the world of survivors.

That is not to say, however, that this book won't appeal to agnostics, Jewish or otherwise. By reading *Questioning Paul*, you will find comfort in the wisdom of rejecting the Christian religion. By coming to understand where and how Christians were misled, you will discover that your aversion to religion is something God shares.

This would also hold true for the many agnostic Yahuwdym. Three of the earliest beneficiaries of the initial

edition of *Questioning Paul* were Jews: a computer engineer, a pulmonary surgeon, and a leader in the Messianic movement. By seeing Yahowsha' stripped of his Hellenistic and Pauline, thus Christian garb, and with the foolishness of religion no longer associated with him, the Passover Lamb suddenly becomes credible.

Now returning to his Instruction on the Mount, from the beginning Yahowsha' has been resolute and precise. There has been no equivocation whatsoever. For example, we were told that not so much as a single one of the smallest strokes of the individual letters comprising any of the words of the Towrah would be negated or annulled. Equally uncompromising, He has said that a rotten tree never produces good fruit and similarly that a sound tree is always beneficial.

With this in mind, as we approach his next statement where he begins: “**not** (*ou* – absolutely never under any circumstances shall) **any** (*pas* – anyone),” to be consistent, the negation provided by *ou* when applied to *pas* must be rendered “not any” rather than “not all.” The former is absolute and the latter is equivocal. Beyond this, with *pas* scribed in the singular rather than plural, “any,” is a far better fit than “all.” Also, in the nominative form and negated, “not any” serves as the subject of the verb, “saying,” written *legon*, the present, active, and singular form of *lego*.

The reason this is important is because a criterion is being established which is excluding either “some” or “all” who refer to God as “Lord” from heaven. Seeking some wiggle room, Bibles published by Christian organizations prefer “not all,” but there is no reason to suspect that God is changing course and is being the least bit uncertain here, making “not any” a far better fit in this presentation.

Since context is essential to understanding, and consistency is God's hallmark, one cannot responsibly translate Yahowsha's testimony by taking him out of

character or context. Therefore, we should recognize Yahowah's overt animosity toward being called "Lord," not only since it is the derogatory title He uses to describe Satan, but also since as our "Heavenly Father" He cannot be our Lord. Further, knowing His name is essential to our salvation. As a result, we have to either translate the singular *pas* as "any or anyone" or change God's nature, plan, and testimony.

In this light, you should know that Yahowsha' delivered his Instruction on the Mount in Hebrew, not Greek. There is no evidence that he ever spoke Greek. Moreover, every report we have from this time regarding *Lowy* | *Levi* (the disciple's actual name (see: Mark 2:14 and Luke 5:27)), we know that he presented his eyewitness testimony in Hebrew. So at the very least, the text we are evaluating was translated out of Hebrew and into Greek fifty years or more removed from this time and one thousand miles away from where this was spoken.

Then adding yet another layer of concern, not only were the scribes who copied these manuscripts in Egypt less than meticulous, they were actually encouraged to harmonize texts so that the result would better mesh with the proclivities of those paying the bills – typically a religious institution. This free hand explains why there are over three hundred thousand known discrepancies between ancient and modern manuscripts. Therefore, when conveying the proper meaning of any word Yahowsha' may have spoken, which was then translated, the best rendering is one which is consistent with the Hebrew thought he was conveying.

That is what I have done here. But since *pas* is more often rendered "all" than it is "any" or "anyone," and because it is a translation of the Hebrew "*lo' kol* – not anyone," the selection of other than a primary definition isn't one I am comfortable making without full disclosure – without you knowing why – especially since so much is

riding upon presenting these words correctly.

“**Not** (*ou* – absolutely never under any circumstances shall) **any** (*pas* – anyone (scribed as an adjective in the nominative case in the singular masculine)) **one saying** (*legon* – one speaking, calling, or implying (scribed in the present tense active voice participle form in the singular nominative masculine)) **to me** (*moi*), ‘**Lord, Lord** (*kyrie kyrie* – master, owner, one who rules over, controls, or enslaves),’ **will actually as a result enter into** (*eiserchomai eis* – will in the future, and based upon how this influences the speaker, move inside or genuinely experience (scribed in the future tense, middle voice which signifies that those calling Yahowsha’ “Lord” are affected by this decision, and in the indicative mood which means that this statement is describing reality, and in the third-person singular)) **the kingdom of the heavens** (*ten basileian ton ouranon* – the spiritual realm and abode of God), **but by contrast** (*alla* – rather certainly and emphatically) **the one presently acting upon** (*o poieomai* – the one currently and actively engaging in (scribed in the present active participle singular nominative masculine)) **the purpose and desire** (*thelema* – the will and mindset, the design and determination, the resolve and intent) **of** (*tou*) **my** (*mou*) **Father** (*patros*), **the One** (*tou*) **in the heavens** (*en tois ouranois* – in the spiritual realm).” (Matthew 7:21)

If you do not know Yahowsha’s name, you do not know him – nor do you know the Father who sent him. His name defines who he is, from whom and why he came. When it is changed, the result is no longer accurate. And when the object of one’s belief ceases to be credible, his faith is in vain.

Similarly, if you do not know Yahowah’s name, you do not know God. If you do not know God, He does not know you. If He does not know you, you can neither be in a relationship with Him nor be saved by Him. This is why

those who call Yahowah and Yahowsha' "Lord" are excluded from heaven.

If you are still among those referring to God by Satan's title, "the Lord," then you are unaware of Yahowah's will – which is to serve His Covenant children as their Father. Lord and father are mutually exclusive concepts. God cannot be your Father if He is your Lord.

The only reason Yahowah created the universe, conceived life, engaged in our lives, and provided His guidance was so that we would be able to choose to engage in His family-oriented Covenant relationship. By mischaracterizing God's nature and purpose in this way, those who refer to God as "the Lord" are negating our Heavenly Father's most earnest desire. This then bars entry into heaven. And that is because salvation is a byproduct or benefit of the Covenant. It is yet another thing Christians have reversed.

Few things are as revealing in this regard as the misrepresentation of Yahowah's nature from Father to Lord. It is why referring to God as "Lord" was used as a litmus test to identify those who would be excluded from heaven. And it is why Yahowsha' spoke of the purpose and desire of "My Father" in heaven. The contrast is between man's view where their god is a "Lord," and God's view where He is our "Father." This is the very essence of the Covenant and thus of the Towrah. It is why Yahowah chose to rename the first child of the Covenant "*Abraham* – Merciful and Enriching Father."

And should you be clinging to the myth that God is referred to as "the Lord" throughout the "Bible," the truth is just the opposite. God spoke or wrote His name, Yahowah, exactly 7000 times in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. Religious institutions then copyedited God, substituting "Lord" for His name.

Equally instructive, if one must act upon the purpose

and desire of our Heavenly Father to enter heaven, then salvation does not come by way of faith as Paul asserts. To respond to God's will, His intent, we must first come to know what He is offering and what He is asking in return. And that brings us right back to the Towrah, to the one place Yahowah introduces His purpose and plan.

Since this may come as a shock to those lost in religion, as believers almost universally refer to their god as "Lord," especially Christians, Yahowsha' completely destroyed their illusion.

"Many (*polys* – a very great number and the preponderance of people) **will say** (*erousin* – will in the future actually and actively communicate (*lego* scribed in the future active indicative third-person plural)) **to me** (*moi*) **in that specific day** (*en ekeinos te hemera* – in this relatively distant period of time), **'Lord, Lord** (*kyrie kyrie* – master, owner, one who rules over, controls, or enslaves), **was it not** (*ou*) **in your** (*to so*) **name** (*onoma* – persona and reputation), **we actively spoke genuinely inspired utterances** (*propheteuo* – we prophesied, at some point in time actually making your thoughts known beforehand (aorist active indicative first-person plural)), **and** (*kai*) **in your** (*to so*) **name** (*onoma* – persona and reputation), **we drove out** (*ekballo* – we sent and threw out, we expelled and sent forth (aorist active indicative first-person plural)) **demons** (*daimonion* – evil spirits and devils, or inferior gods, minor divinities, and pagan goddesses), **and** (*kai*) **in your** (*to so*) **name** (*onoma* – persona and reputation), **many mighty and miraculous things** (*pollas dynamis* – with great supernatural power, extensive political and religious institutions), **we made and did** (*poieomai* – we engaged in, performed, worked, and profited from (aorist active indicative first-person plural))?" (Matthew 7:22)

While it requires a considerable reorganization of the Greek, thereby moving the negation of *ou* past the dative article, "the," past the possessive pronoun, "Your," and

past the dative noun, “name,” since the third definition of *ou* depicts a question in which the speaker expects a resounding “yes” to be the answer, one might assume that Christians, having not listened to what Yahowsha’ just said, might ask:

“Lord, Lord, didn’t we speak inspired utterances in Your name, cast out demons in Your name, and establish mighty political and religious institutions in Your name?”

But the answer to that question is a resounding “no!” Not one Christian in a million knows or uses Yahowsha’s name. In fact, once a person comes to know his name and understand what it means, he or she can no longer be a Christian. And that is because Yahowsha’s name means “Yahowah Frees and Saves.” As a result, the means to salvation is found in the Towrah rather than in the “*New Testament*.”

Yahowsha’s name means that Paul was wrong – about everything! Yahowsha’ is not God, Yahowah is God. Yahowsha’ is not our Savior, Yahowah holds that distinction. Yahowsha’ is not the one we should be asking to help us, enlighten us, lead us, save us, liberate us, or inspire us. It is Yahowah. The truth is found in Yahowah’s *Towrah, Naby’, wa Mizmowr* | the Teaching, Prophets, and Psalms – not in a *New Testament* replete with Paul’s poison pen.

The entirety of the Christian experience is wrongly focused. It is why those who refer to Yahowsha’ as “the Lord” are excluded from Heaven. This is not God’s doing; it is their fault. Christians do not know Yahowah, and as a result, they do not know God. They do not appreciate what Yahowah is offering and have no interest in even knowing what He is asking in return. They have no interest in the Towrah where these things are found.

To the Christian, Yahowah’s interests are immaterial.

And that is the reason they are universally excluded from the Covenant. Yahowsha' just explained why man's most popular way leads to the death and destruction of souls.

But then again, why would a Christian want to trust Yahowsha', even Yahowah, when they can cuddle up to Paul and believe him instead?

You will not find a church in which the sermon is delivered in Yahowah's name, not even in Yahowsha's name. Christians speak on behalf of Paul and his mythical "Jesus Christ." They are inspired by Paul's pathetic and patronizing pathogens. They prefer Sha'awl's convoluted and contradictory epistles to the brilliance of Yahowah's Towrah. With Hebrew and Greek stitched into one book, they read the story backward through a warped and occluded lens which perverts and inverts everything they see.

As bad as that may sound, it is actually far worse. Most Christians dislike everything about the so-called "God of the Old Testament," His name, Yahowah, His place and people, Yisra'el and Yahuw'dym, His Towrah, Beryth, and Miqra'ey.

In all of their many books, in all of their vast libraries, in all of their Bible studies, in all of their radio and television programs, and in all of their religious institutions, they never speak or write in the name of God. Most do not even know it. And therefore, Yahowsha' was correct when he said that their claim to have spoken inspired utterances in his name was untrue.

As for driving out demons, the moment you come to understand that Christian clerics, because of Paul, are indirectly inspired by Satan, it is easy to see why they would be able to exorcise demons. The Adversary controls them. So casting out demonic spirits becomes the perfect ruse – a spectacle to stupefy those seeking miracles rather than enlightenment.

Easily confused by this sleight of hand, Christians have made this claim to validate their godly credentials. And yet, Yahowsha' is translated suggesting that they will have professed to throwing out "*daimonion* – inferior gods and pagan deities." What is funny about this possibility is that Paul's strategy was to replace Yahowah and Yahowsha' with his Iesou Christou, thereby, demoting the "inferior and impotent god of the obsolete and arcane Old Testament" with the "all accepting, always nice, graceful god of his superior *New Testament*." But in actuality, the only real God was replaced by faith in the Gospel of Grace – the evil spells of pagan goddesses.

Equally stimulating is *pollas dynamis* which, while I translated "many mighty and miraculous things," could just as accurately have been rendered "extensive political and religious institutions." Paul's minions do both, but are better at establishing the latter. It will come as a tremendous shock to the systems of Christians when they learn that their institutions, their churches, nations, and denominations were not established in the name of God – not a single one of them.

Further, "mighty deeds and miracles" are so often claimed by those inspired by the Adversary that Yahowah tells us that when we see them we ought to be especially wary. Yahowah is not a showoff but Satan is. God does not have to prove His status or power, but Satan tries. Moreover, Christians almost universally claim that their lives or those that they love have been miraculously transformed, something they errantly attribute to God. So Yahowsha' is telling them that these things are neither provable nor valid, neither good nor appropriate.

In an informed and rational world, Yahowsha's conclusion would have scuttled Pauline Doctrine and destroyed the religion of Christianity with it. And so it is ironic Christians believe that their religion was inspired by the individual who castrated it before it was born.

“And then (*kai tote* – so at that time) I will profess to them (*homologeō autois* – I will admit, assert, and declare to them (future active indicative)) that, because (*oti*) I never at any time knew you (*oudepote ginōsko umas* – at no time was I acquainted with you, not even once or for a moment did I acknowledge you or understand you), you all must depart from me (*apochoreō apo emou* – you are now ordered to leave, going away and separating yourselves from me (present active imperative)) those (*oi*) of you involved in (*ergazomai ten* – you all actively engaging in (present middle participle plural)) Towrahlessness (*anomia* – who are in opposition to and have attempted to negate the Towrah, thereby those of you without the Towrah, who demonstrate a contempt for the Towrah and are thereby in violation of the allotment which provides an inheritance).” (Matthew 7:23)

There are two reasons the multitudes will be sent away, both of which are related, either of which results in being rejected by God. Initially, Yahowsha’ said that he “never knew them,” which means that Christians do not know him either. If they are involved in a relationship with god, their god is not real.

When God says “at no time was I acquainted with you,” it means that these individuals have all failed to capitalize on the Covenant. No matter what they may have felt or believed, they have not been in a relationship with Yahowah.

Beyond this, when Yahowsha’ says that “not even once for a moment did I acknowledge you or understand you,” it means that he never heard any of their prayers and that their opinions, even conclusions, regarding him and their religion were incomprehensible. Beyond Yahowsha’ being the wrong individual to pray to, Yahowah wants us to approach Him by listening, not pleading. Paul was, therefore, wrong yet again when he told the world to “pray without ceasing.” (1 Timothy 5:17)

Collectively, Yahowsha's response to the religious who have been duped by the Wolf in Sheep's Clothing is to pronounce the obvious: they are Towrahless – and thus estranged from God. Every argument Christians pose to justify their opposition toward Yahowah's name, toward observing His Towrah, or toward engaging in the Covenant has been negated. God is not interested in their names, scriptures, rhetoric, institutions, or pleas.

The point Yahowsha' is making here is one that took me a very long time to fully assimilate. But God's position is both simple and reasonable, even necessary. Salvation is only afforded to the children of the Covenant. It is facilitated by way of the *Miqra'ey* | Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God. His approach begins with immortality as a result of *Pesach* | Passover, becoming perfected on *Matsah* | UnYeasted Bread, being adopted during *Bikuwrym* | Firstborn Children, so as to be enriched and empowered on *Shabuw'ah* | the Promise of the Shabat. These are the benefits of the Covenant.

It would be senseless, even irritating, for God to save those who do not know Him – those who hold contrarian views toward Him. After all, God has to live with those who are saved for eternity.

As a result of this, Christians would be wrong believing that God's intent is to save everyone, or even that salvation is His priority. Yahowah is receptive to a relationship, something which is worthless unless both parties participate and benefit. For this reason alone, salvation cannot be the byproduct of faith. A person has to engage with God in accordance with the conditions of His Covenant in order to receive its benefits.

When Yahowsha' said "*anomia* – Towrahless," it was a wholesale denunciation of Paul, the *New Testament*, and Christianity. If a person is without the Towrah, he is estranged from its Covenant. And if he is not a participant in the Covenant, he cannot enter God's home in heaven

because he is neither God's child nor saved.

Beyond this, Yahowsha' has just delineated the issue which will define our debate. According to Yahowsha', to reject the Towrah is to be rejected by God. This is a point Yahowah makes abundantly clear through the prophet *Howsha'* | Hosea. But according to Paul, the inverse is true. He writes that a person must reject the Towrah to be accepted by God.

So who do you suppose is right? Is salvation, as Yahowsha' just declared, a product of the Covenant relationship and Yahowah's Towrah Instructions or is it as Paul professes: a result of faith?

But since Paul claims to speak on behalf of the individual his letters contradict, how could he be right? Said another way, based upon Yahowsha's statement regarding admission into heaven, why would anyone in his right mind believe that Paul was telling the truth?

With your soul hanging in the balance, thoughtfully reflect upon everything Yahowsha' stated prior to considering the conclusion to His Instruction on the Mount...

“Everyone (*pas*), therefore (*oun*), who (*ostis*) presently and actively listens to (*akouo* – who currently pays attention and really seeks to hear and understand (present active indicative)) these (*toutous*) statements (*logos* – treatise, testimony, and words, discourse, teaching, and instruction) of mine (*mou*), and (*kai*) he or she genuinely acts upon them (*poieomai autous* – he or she actively and actually engages as a result of them (present active indicative third-person singular)), will be likened to (*homoioo* – will become like, compared to, and be considered similar to, resembling) a wise (*phronimos* – an intelligent and astute, a prudent and sensible, a thoughtful and judicious) individual (*andros* – a person) who (*ostis*) edifies and strengthens (*oikodomeo* – builds

and constructs, restores and repairs, establishes and erects) **his or her** (*autos*) **house** (*oikia* – home, family, household, and relationship) **upon the** (*epi ten*) **rock** (*petra* – bedrock).” (Matthew 7:24)

Christians seem somehow unaware that Yahowah and Yahowsha’ spoke with the same voice. And while Christians will acknowledge *Yahowchanan’s* | John’s assertion that Yahowsha’ is the Word of God, there is a disconnect in their minds between that statement and the realization that Yahowsha’ was therefore the living embodiment of the Torah and Prophets.

To understand Yahowsha’, you will have to read the Towrah and Prophets. After all, that is why he began this instruction affirming the validity, value, and enduring nature of the Towrah and Prophets.

In this regard, Yahowsha’s statement mirrors Yahowah’s constant recommendation throughout His Towrah, whereby God encourages us to “*shama*’ – listen to” His Guidance. But more than this, Yahowsha’s statement also reflects Yahowah’s consistent counsel, whereby God instructs us to “*asah* – act upon” His advice. Therefore, for us to participate in a relationship with God, we must first come to know Him, understand what He is offering, and then respond by choosing to engage in the Covenant in accordance with our Heavenly Father’s terms and provisions.

Emphasizing the benefits of listening to and observing the Word of God, Yahowsha’ is translated as “likening” such individuals with *phronimos*, being “intelligent and astute, prudent and sensible, especially thoughtful and judicious.” And then speaking of what flows from this understanding, Yahowsha’ makes a connection between the “*beryth* – family-oriented Covenant relationship,” which is from “*beyth* – family and home,” when his testimony was translated into Greek using “*oikia* – household and family.” So you’ll note, a “family and

home” is being edified and established, not a church or religious institution. God is still pointing thoughtful individuals toward His Covenant family and Heavenly home.

Also relevant, Yahowsha’ is translated using *petra* to convey “bedrock.” He is speaking of the role the Towrah plays in establishing a firm foundation for the Covenant. This is illuminating because it undermines the basis of Roman Catholicism and thus Christianity. The Church claims that “Peter,” which is a transliteration of *petros*, meaning “stone,” is the “rock” upon which their “church” was built. It is why they claim that their pope “sits on the seat of Saint Peter.” But it is obvious when we read Yahowsha’s exchange with Shim’own (He Listens) Kephas (Hebrew and Aramaic for “Rock”), that the “Rock” upon which God’s Called Out are established and edified is the Disciple’s realization that Yahowsha’ is fulfilling Pesach, the first of the Miqra’ey. As such, he is serving as the Rock of our Salvation.

Members of the Covenant are not immune from challenges, which provides the opportunity to shine brightly when storms come our way because we have the wherewithal to survive them.

“And even when (*kai*) the rain (*e broche* – a besprinkling (akin to a baptism)) descends (*katabaino* – falls down), (*kai*) the rivers (*oi potamos* – a torrent or floods; from *pino* – libations) come (*erchomai* – appear moving people from one place to another), and the rapidly shifting winds (*anemos* – violent, agitated, and tempestuous (emotional, stormy, passionate, uncontrolled, and even hysterical) changes in doctrine) blow (*pneo*), descending upon (*prospipto* – rushing upon and striking against, bowing and battering) this specific (*te ekeine*) home and household (*te oikia* – the family), then (*kai*) it shall not fail (*ouk pipto* – it will not fall, will not be bowed, it will not be destroyed, it will not become inadequate)

because (*gar*) **the foundation was previously established and is enduring** (*themelioo* – the foundation was firmly laid in the past and is now providing ongoing benefits (pluperfect passive indicative)) **upon** (*epi*) **bedrock** (*petra* – solid rock).” (Matthew 7:25)

While Christians will tell you that Paul won the argument over whether the Towrah is the foundation of our relationship with God or the Gospel of Grace, methinks Yahowah disagrees. He recognizes that His *Towrah* | Guidance provides the most effective protection against the torrents of rapidly shifting sentiments others may bring against us. As long as we are grounded in the Towrah, our family is secure.

This is where the journey begins.

אֱלֹהֵינוּ

Questioning Paul
V1: Liars Lie
...*Contradicting God*

4

Tsadaq / Being Right

Comparative Analysis...

Let's lay out some ground rules before we consider Paul's opening comments in Galatians. Calling the Christian "*New Testament*" "Scripture," so as to imply that its contents were inspired by God, has no sanction of any kind in the Towrah or Prophets. It is a religious decree without Divine sanction or support. Neither Yahowah, Yahowsha', nor any of the Disciples, ever referred to anything beyond the Hebrew Torah, Prophets, and Psalms as inspired by God.

According to Yahowah and Yahowsha', the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms comprise the totality of God's revelation to mankind. Therefore, the only aspects of the Greek eyewitness accounts which should be considered credible would be the words and deeds of Yahowsha' as recorded by the Disciple *Lowy* | Levi in what is now called "Matthew" (see: Mark 2:14, Luke 5:27 and compare Matthew 9:9) as the original disciple chronicled the Sermon on the Mount and Olivet Discourse. To this we can add the verifiable and unaltered portions of *Yahowchanan* / John. Then, to the degree it was properly recorded, translated, retained, and substantiated, some of Revelation. Mark is entirely hearsay, and this unverifiable source serves as the basis of Matthew and Luke – neither of whom were eyewitnesses.

Sha'uw'l's epistles, on the other hand, contain only one

citation from Yahowsha' (which he got wrong), and no accurate quotations from Yahowah's Towrah or Prophets. This realization serves as an admission that his letters contain his opinions. Therefore, our mission will be to determine whether his opinions were ever accurate.

In this light, you may have noticed that in the four Galatian passages already cited, Sha'uwl's thoughts were poorly conveyed, opening the door to a wide variety of interpretations. His citations were all misquoted, taken out of context, and then twisted to convey the opposite of God's intent. Sha'uwl's reasoning was flawed and much of what he said was historically inaccurate. Frankly, it is insulting to suggest that God inspired anything he wrote.

To be fair to God, and even Paul, to understand any message, we must consider it in context. The practice of citing isolated comments to make a point is often misleading and is usually invalid. It is how the church justifies religious doctrines which are contrary to the Torah. And they get by with their sleight of hand because most Christians are unwilling to compare clerical pontifications to the statements from God which oppose them. Most are not even willing to check to see if the context of the discussion from which the snippets were removed altered their intended meaning. And ironically, since Paul deployed this tactic with reckless abandon, subconsciously Christians may now believe that this strategy is appropriate.

According to Yahowah and Yahowsha', there is nothing man can say or do that has the authority to alter or negate, to replace or abolish, any aspect of the Torah – and most especially its provisions regarding God's identity, His relationship with us, His plans, people, family, meetings, and place. Any proposition to the contrary is contrary to God.

Therefore, the Christian myth that Grace has replaced

the Torah is invalid. The Towrah, itself, is merciful. Similarly, the Christian belief that that they live under a “*New Testament*” based upon a “New Covenant,” replacing an “Old Testament” and its Covenant, is a nonstarter with Yahowah and torn asunder by Yahowsha’s Instructions on the Mount. God’s testimony and covenant have neither been changed nor replaced. What was, is. What is, will be.

First among the many reasons behind the Christian confusion regarding the relationship between the Torah and the Covenant is derived from Paul’s letters, and most especially his notion that there are “two covenants” – with a “new” one established as a result of his explanations. This polarization was based upon an outright lie, with Paul claiming that the Torah’s Covenant was made with Hagar, not through Sarah’s son, Yitschaq, and thus was enslaving. (Galatians 4:21-25)

While we have only reviewed four of the many contrarian propositions presented in Galatians, it would not be reasonable to conclude that these citations intended to begin a debate between “observing the Torah” and “faith.” Even from the most favorable vantage point, the best that could be said of Paul is that his words imply that believing him rather than knowledge or actions lead to God. But if that is what he wanted to convey, there would have been no reason to misappropriate and misquote the Towrah or to demean it.

According to the Towrah, to engage in the Covenant we must first come to know Yahowah, understand the conditions of the relationship, agree to those terms, and then act upon them. Those who do as Yahowah requests receive the Covenant’s benefits, a by-product of which is salvation. And while that is simple enough, to show how Paul upended God’s approach, we will methodically turn over every card in his hand one after another.

Second, the Christian perspective of God and salvation

is backward. It is from the end, rather than from the beginning. It is salvation before relationship – God saving those He does not know. Worse, it would mean that God would be committing to spend an eternity with people who had no interest in listening to Him and who were part of a religion which demeaned and demoted Him.

Third, Christians confuse “observing the Torah” with Judaism, as if these things were related. But they are not. Religious Jews manage their lives in accordance with the *Talmud*, which is based upon their oral traditions and religious rules. The *Talmud*, in fact, is written very similarly to Paul’s letters, in that the *Talmud* is comprised of rabbinic arguments which elevate man’s opinions above God’s. While perhaps not as egregious as Christianity, Orthodox Judaism’s departure from the Torah has irked Yahowah sufficiently that the Prophets are filled with His rebuke of His people.

Fourth, the Torah is not comprised of laws. Guidance and teaching are entirely different concepts. The misappropriation of the Towrah’s purpose is one of religion’s most sinister ploys.

The Torah’s stories, examples, and dialog represent facets on a marvelous jewel. They provide insights and a perspective from which to enjoy and benefit from Yahowah’s brilliant Light. The Torah is both literal and metaphorical, realistic and symbolic, painting word pictures to help us know Yahowah, understand His plan of reconciliation, and rely on His provisions.

In this light, it is better to understand the relevance of Passover and UnYeasted Bread, and to capitalize upon these gifts, than it is to simply do what is delineated on the right date. Understanding leads to trust, trust leads to reliance, and reliance leads to salvation. Our works, beliefs, and faith lead nowhere.

Fifth, the Torah and Yahowsha’ are inseparable.

According to Yahowah, the Torah is the Word of God and Yahowsha' is the Word made flesh. So the very notion that we must choose between the Torah *or* God's favor is an attempt to divide the indivisible.

Those familiar with one of the Towrah's great scenes may recall the moment Moseh was inspired by Yahowah to depict Yahowsha's mission:

“Yahowah, your God, will raise up for you a prophet like me from your midst, from your brothers.

Listen to Him. This is according to all that you desired of Yahowah, your God, in Choreb, in the day of the assembly, saying, ‘Let us not continuously hear the voice of Yahowah, our God, nor see this great fire, lest we die.’

And Yahowah said to me, ‘Well spoken. I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brothers.

I will put My words in his mouth and he will speak as I direct him.

The one who will not listen intelligently to My words which he shall speak in My Name, I shall investigate.” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 18:15-19)

Thereby, Yahowah encouraged us to listen to the words Yahowsha' would speak and now has spoken. And yet Christians chose to reject most of what Yahowah said and ignore most of what Yahowsha' proclaimed, while at the same time listening to a man who never cited either accurately – which is why the last line of this prophecy seems to be directed at *Sha'awl* | Paul.

Sixth, the Torah exists to convey who God is, what He is offering, and what He expects in return. As Yahowsha' told the men on the road to Emmaus immediately after fulfilling Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children, if you want to understand what he did, you have

to change your perspective and your thinking to that of the Torah and Prophets. The Torah is the source of the healing and beneficial message that the religious term “Gospel” corrupts.

Seventh, perhaps the biggest issue of all is reflected in a discussion Yahowsha’ had with his disciples. When they failed to understand that the yeast which was being removed from our souls on UnYeasted Bread was none other than religious and political corruption, Yahowsha’ explained:

“How is it that you did not think so as to understand (*noeo* – use your mind to comprehend) that I was not speaking about a loaf of bread when I said, ‘Be alerted to and turn away from (*prosecho apo* – beware of, guard against, and distance yourself from) the yeast (*zyme* – leavening fungus) of the Pharisees (the overtly religious leaders) and Sadducees (the worldly-minded, liberal political leaders)?” (Matthew 16:11)

Religion is designed to replace thinking with believing. The faithful are typically opposed to evidence and reason, especially when these things invalidate what they have been led to believe. And the few who are open-minded are usually handicapped by corrupted data in the form of horribly errant translations.

Beyond these issues, while believers will protest that the “Old Testament” contains the “inerrant” Word of God, when God’s words are deployed against their religion, they are summarily rejected. For example, we have already considered more than enough of Yahowah’s testimony to scuttle the religion of Christianity many times over, and yet Christians are more likely to go down with the ship than use it to bail themselves out.

✠

In that He has proven His existence and the legitimacy

of His testimony through prophecy, we will be using Yahowah's testimony as the only unassailable source of information regarding God's nature and plan. It will be the standard to which we will hold Paul accountable. It is only fair.

Therefore, let's conclude this, the final introductory chapter, by giving our God, our Father, our Creator, Yahowah, the last word...

This is some of what God revealed through His prophet, *Yasha'yah* | Freedom and Salvation are from Yah:

“Woe (*howy*), the people from different races and places (*gowy*) bear blame and are guilty for having wandered away (*chata'*).

The people's (*'am*) distortions and their propensity to alter, twist, and pervert (*'awon*) are numerous and burdensome, even troubling (*kabed*).

They are descendants (*zera'*) of those who have done wrong, harming themselves (*ra'a'*). They are children (*benym*) of those who corrupt and destroy (*shahat*).

They have rejected and abandoned (*'azab*) Yahowah (𐤃𐤏𐤃𐤏). They have spurned and belittled, maligned and disparaged (*na'as*) the Set-Apart One (*qadowsh 'eth*) of Yisra'el (*Yisra'el*).

They are strangers who have gone astray (*zuwr*), having turned their backs (*'achowr*).” (*Yasha'yah* / Salvation and Freedom are from Yahowah / Isaiah 1:4)

“I am (*'any*) Yahowah (𐤃𐤏𐤃𐤏). This is My name (*huw' shem*). And (*wa*) the manifestation of My power (*kabowd*) I will not give (*lo' nathan*) to (*la*) another (*'acher*), nor (*wa*) My renown and reputation (*tahilah*) to (*la*) religious imagery (*pasyll*).” (*Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 42:8)

“Yahowah (יְהוָה) was willing, even desirous (*chaphets*), for the sake of (*ma'an*) His sense of honesty and fairness, and His commitment to doing what is right regarding your vindication (*tsedeq*), to reveal His empowering, enriching, and enabling (*gadal*) Towrah, His Teaching and Instruction, His Guidance and Direction (*Towrah*), and to prove its worth (*wa'adar*).” (*Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 42:21)

“Listen and pay attention to Me, so that you can respond appropriately to Me (*qashap 'el*), My family (*'am*) and (*wa*) My people (*le'om*).

To Me (*'el*), listen, considering and evaluating what you hear, and then respond (*'azan*) because indeed (*ky*), the Towrah, the Source of Teaching and Guidance (*Towrah*) from Me (*min 'eth*) shall be brought forth and shall be disseminated (*yatsa'*).

And (*wa*) My means to justifiably resolve disputes (*mishpat*) will (*la*) shine upon and enlighten (*'owr*) the family (*'am*).” (*Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 51:4)

“Then (*wa*) he shall reveal (*galah*) the glorious presence and manifestation of the power (*kabowd*) of Yahowah (יְהוָה). And all (*kol*) living creatures (*basar*) will see (*ra'ah*) Yahdow – the Unity of Yah (*Yahdow*). Indeed (*ky*), he is the Word (*ha dabar*), the verbal spokesman and mouth (*peh*) of Yahowah (יְהוָה).” (*Yasha'yah* / Isaiah 40:5)

“Look and see, pay attention and behold (*hineh*), Yahowah (יְהוָה), our Upright One and Foundation (*'edownay*), arrives (*bow'*) with the blast of a trumpet (*ba chazaq*).

He is the Sacrificial Lamb (*zarowa'*). He is the proverb and the parable, a picture of the Word which is vivid and easy to see (*la mashal*). Behold (*hineh*) him, our recompense and fare for the passage, our ransom

(sakar) is associated with him ('ethow).

He does the work to pay our debt (pa'ulah) to clear the way to appear before His presence (la paneh).

As a Shepherd (ka ra'ah) leads, protects, and feeds his flock (ra'ah 'eder), the Protective Shepherd (zarowa') will gather (qabas) his sheep (tala'ym).

And in His chest (ba cheyq), He will lift them up (nasa'), nursing, nurturing ('uwl), and guiding them (nahal)." (Yasha'yah / Isaiah 40:10-11)

This is a taste of what Yahowah revealed through Moseh in His Towrah:

"Pertaining to ('achar) these ('el-leh) conversations (dabarym), the Word (dabar) of Yahowah (יְהוָה) came to exist with (hayah 'el) 'Abram ('abram) in the form of (ba) a personal, visual, and illuminating manifestation which could be seen and experienced (machazeh) to say ('amar): 'Do not be awed or intimidated (yare' 'al) 'Abram. I am ('anoky) your protector, defending you from harm (magen la), your exceedingly (ma'od) great (rabah) reward (sakar)." (Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 15:1)

"And (wa) God ('elohym) conveyed (dabar) all of (kol) these words (dabar), providing perspective ('eleh) in our presence ('eth), saying ('amar): 'I am ('anky) Yahowah (יְהוָה), your God ('elohym), who beneficially ('asher) descended to serve, bringing you out of and delivering you (yatsa') from the realm (min 'erets) of the crucibles of oppression (mitsraym), out of the house (min beyth) of slavery and servitude ('ebed). You will not exist with (lo' hayah la) other ('aher) gods ('elohym) in relation to ('al) My presence (paneh)." (Shemowth / Names / Exodus 20:1-3)

"You should observe, closely examining and carefully considering (shamar) this word and its

message (*dabar*) as a clearly communicated and engraved prescription of what you should do to live (*choq*) and (*wa*) as an enduring and restoring witness (*'ed*) to your children (*beny*) forever (*'owlam*).” (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 12:24)

“You should not ever add to (*lo' yasap 'al*) the Word (*ha dabar*) which, as a blessing (*'asher*), I (*'anky*) am instructing and guiding you all (*tsawah 'eth*).

And you should never subtract (*wa lo' gara'*) from it (*min*) if you are to properly observe (*la shamar*) the terms of the covenant (*mitswah*) of Yahowah (יהוה), your God (*'elohym*) which, as a favor (*'asher*) I am (*'anky*) instructing you (*tsawah 'eth*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 4:2)

“Exclusively without exception (*raq*) be observant (*shamar*) as your goal. And pay very close attention to (*ma'od shamar*) your soul (*nepesh*) lest you forget or overlook (*sakah*) the words (*dabarym*) which you have seen with your eyes (*ra'ah 'ayn*). And lest they are removed from your heart and thinking (*min leb*). All of the days of your life (*wa kol yowmym chay 'atah*), you shall make them known (*yada'*) to your children and to your children’s children (*ben 'atah wa ben ben 'atah*).

The day which you were present, standing (*ha yowm 'amad*) before (*paneh*) Yahowah, your God (*Yahowah 'elohym 'atah*), in Choreb, in which Yahowah (יהוה) said to me to summon and assemble (*qahal*) the family (*'am*) so that I might have them hear (*shama'*) the words (*dabar*) which will cause them to learn (*lamad*) to revere, to respect (*yare'*), and to approach Me all of the days which as a result of the relationship they shall live (*la 'any kol ha yowmym chay*) on the earth (*'adamah*), and so that they might teach (*lamad*) their children (*ben hem*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 4:9-10)

And Yahowah (יְהוָה) spoke the word (*dabar*) as God to you (*'el*) from the midst of the fire (*'esh*), words (*dabarym*) the sound of which (*qowl*) you heard (*shama'*).

But a visual form (*tamuwnah*), you did not see – but only (*zuwlah*) heard the sound (*shama' qowl*). He told you all about (*nagad la*) His Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship (*beryth*) with you. Which, as a result of the relationship (*'asher*), He instructed and directed (*tsawah*) you to act upon (*'asah la*) the Ten Statements (*dabar*), writing them (*kathab*) on two tablets of stone.

And Yahowah (יְהוָה) instructed and guided (*tsawah*) me at this time (*'eth*) that She (the Set-Apart Spirit) (*hy'*) would teach (*lamad*) you regarding the clearly communicated prescriptions for living (*choq*) and the means used to resolve disputes, even to exercise good judgment (*mishpat*), so that you might act upon them, celebrating and profiting from them (*'asah*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 4:12-14)

“During the time of adversity and distress (*tsar*), all of these words (*ha dabar*) will find you, especially those in the last (*'acharyth*) of days.

And then you will return and you will be restored (*shuwb*) forever and eternally (*'owlam*) to Yahowah (יְהוָה), your God (*'elohym*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 4:30)

“From the heavens He has individually and deliberately prepared you to listen to (*shama'*) His voice (*qowl*) for the explicit purpose of instructing you (*la yasar*).

And upon the Almighty’s earth, He enabled you to see and witness (*ra'ah*) His magnificent light (*gadowl 'esh*) and His words (*dabar*) which you heard (*shama'*) from the midst of the fire (*'esh*).

And truthfully, underlying this is His love (*'ahab*) for your fathers, He has chosen to favor (*bahar*) their descendants after them. He has descended to serve, leading you (*yatsa'*) into His presence with His power (*gadawl*), away from (*min*) the crucibles of human oppression (*Mitsraym*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 4:36-37)

“You should recognize and acknowledge (*yada'*) this day, returning your heart and thinking (*ha yowm shuwb leb 'atah*) to God (*'elohym*), because, indeed (*ky*), **Yahowah** (אֲדֹנָי), He is Almighty God (*huw' ha 'elohym*) in the heavens (*ha shamaym*) above and on the earth (*ha 'erets*) below. There is no other. You should observe, closely examining and carefully considering (*shamar*) His clearly communicated and inscribed prescriptions of what we should do to live (*choq*), along with the terms and conditions of His binding contract (*mitswah*), which relationally I have instructed and guided you (*tsawah*) this day.

Because, as a result of the relationship (*'asher*), He is good to you and beneficial for you (*yatab la*), and also for your children after you (*wa gam ben 'atah 'achar 'atah*), for the express purpose of elongating your days.” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 4:39-40)

“This is (*ze'th*) the Towrah, the Teaching (*ha Towrah*), which beneficially He placed before Moseh (*Mosheh*) and the *Beny Yisra'el* | Children who Engage and Endure with God (*beny Yisra'el*).

This is the Enduring Witness and Restoring Testimony (*'ed*), the clearly communicated prescriptions (*choq*), the means used to think clearly and resolve disputes (*mishpat*), which God (*'elohym*) spoke to (*dabar*) Moseh (*Mosheh*) and to the Children of Yisra'el (*beny Yisra'el*) when He led them (*yasta'*) away from the crucibles of oppression (*mitsraym*).” (*Dabarym*

/ Words / Deuteronomy 4:44-45)

“These are (*wa ze’th*) the terms and the conditions of the relationship agreement (*mitswah*), the clearly communicated prescriptions of what we should do in life to live (*choq*), and the means to exercise good judgment and resolve disputes (*mishpat*) which, beneficially (*‘asher*), Yahowah (יהוה), your God (*‘elohym*), instructed and guided (*tsawah*) you to (*la*) learn and teach (*lamad*) what should be done (*la ‘asah*) in the realm into which (*ba ha ‘erets ‘asher*) you all (*‘atem*) are going to pass over into (*‘abar sham*) as an inheritance (*la yarash*).

The intent and purpose is so that (*ma’an*) you come to revere and respect (*yare’*) Yahowah (יהוה), your God (*‘elohym*), by observing (*shamar*) all of (*kol*) His clearly communicated prescriptions of what we should do in life to live (*chuwqah*) and (*wa*) His terms and conditions (*mitswah*), which (*‘asher*) I (*‘anky*) have instructed and directed (*tsawah*) you individually (*‘atah*), your children (*wa ben ‘atah*), and your children’s children (*wa ben ben ‘atah*) all (*kol*) of the days (*yowmym*) of your lives (*chayym*).

It is for the purpose of (*ma’an*) elongating (*‘arak*) your days (*yowmym*), and so that (*wa*) you listen (*shama’*), Yisra’el (*Yisra’el*), and so that (*wa*) you are focused and observant (*shamar*), thereby (*la*) acting upon (*‘asah*) that which relationally (*‘asher*) is good and beneficial for you (*yatab la*), and which beneficially (*wa ‘asher*) will cause you to substantially increase, grow dramatically, and become exceedingly great and powerful (*rabah ma’od*), consistent with (*ka*) that which (*‘asher*) Yahowah (יהוה), your God (*‘elohym*), promised and affirmed to (*dabar*) your fathers (*‘ab*) on your behalf (*la ‘atah*).

Yisra’el | Individuals who Engage and Endure with

God (*Yisra'el*), **listen to and hear** (*shama'*) **Yahowah** (יהוה), **your God** (*'elohym*). **Yahowah** (יהוה) **is one** (*'echad*).

You should choose to truly love (*wa 'ahab 'eth*) **Yahowah** (יהוה), **your God** (*'elohym*), **with** (*ba*) **all** (*kol*) **your heart** (*leb*), **and with all** (*wa ba kol*) **your soul** (*nepesh*), **and with all** (*wa ba kol*) **your capacity and capability** (*ma'od*).

These (*'eleh*) **words** (*dabar*) **which** (*'asher*) **I am** (*'anky*) **guiding you with** (*tsawah*) **this day** (*ha yowm*), **they should come to exist and always be** (*wa hayah*) **part of your thinking** (*'al leb*).

Your goal should be to choose to teach them by reciting them to (*wa la sanan*) **your children** (*ben 'atah*). **And you should consistently speak about them** (*wa dabar ba*) **during your life** (*ba yashab*), **and inside your home and with your family** (*wa ba beyth 'atah*), **and as you walk, traveling through life** (*ba halak*), **and along the path** (*ba derek*), **and when you lie down to rest** (*wa ba sakab*), **and when you stand up** (*wa quwm*).

And you should choose to fasten them (*wa qasar*) **as a sign** (*la 'owth*) **upon your hand, influencing your actions** (*'al yad*), **and they should come to exist** (*wa hayah*) **between your eyes, influencing your perspective** (*bayn 'ayn*).

And (*wa*) **you should write them** (*katab*) **upon the doorframes** (*'al mazuwzah*) **of your home** (*beyth*), **and upon your gates** (*wa ba sa'ar*).” (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 6:1-9*)

“Indeed (*ky*), **you should listen to** (*shama' ba*) **the voice and invitation** (*qowl*), **of Yahowah** (יהוה), **your God** (*'elohym*), **for the purpose of approaching by examining and considering** (*la shamar*) **the terms and conditions of His relationship agreement** (*mitswah*) **and**

His clearly communicated prescriptions and inscribed recommendations of what we should do in this life to live (*wa chuwqah*), which are inscribed and permanently memorialized (*ha kathab*) in (*ba*) the written scroll (*ha sepher*) of this (*ze'th*), the Towrah (*ha Towrah*).

And that is because (*ky*) you will return and be restored (*shuwb*) to ('*el*) Yahowah (𐤅𐤃𐤁𐤀), your God ('*elohym*), with all (*ba kol*) your heart (*leb*) and with all (*wa ba kol*) your soul (*nepesh*).” (*Dabarym* 30:10)

“For indeed (*ky*), the empowering and enriching (*ma'od*) Word (*dabar*) of your God ('*el*) facilitates your approach and brings you near (*qarowb*), when ingrained in your speech (*ba peh*) and in your heart (*wa ba leb*) to engage with Him (*la 'asah*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 30:14)

“And (*wa*) it came to be (*hayah*) just when (*ka*) Moseh finished (*kalah*) writing (*kathab*) the words (*dabar*) of the Towrah (*ha Towrah*) upon this, the Almighty's (*ha ze'th 'al*) written scroll (*sepher*), successfully completing (*tamam*) the Eternal Witness and Restoring Testimony ('*ed*), Moseh instructed (*tsawah*) the Lowy (*ha lowy*) lifting up and carrying (*nasa'*) Yahowah's (𐤅𐤃𐤁𐤀) Ark ('*arown*) of the Family-Oriented Covenant (*beryth*), saying ('*amar*), ‘Accept and grasp hold of (*laqach*) the written scroll (*sepher*) of the Towrah (*ha Towrah*) and place (*sym*) this (*zeh*) alongside ('*eth min sad*) Yahowah's (𐤅𐤃𐤁𐤀) Ark ('*arown*) of the Covenant Relationship (*beryth*).

Your God ('*elohym*), He will always exist (*hayah*) there (*sham*) for you (*la*) in (*ba*) the Enduring Witness and Restoring Testimony ('*ed*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 31:24-26)

In His next book, one scribed by Yahowsha', Yahowah introduced the living embodiment of His Towrah

by name:

“Later (‘*achar*), therefore (*ken*), Yahowsha’ recited and proclaimed (*qara*) all of (*kol*) the words (*dabar*) of the Towrah (*ha Towrah*), the blessings of peace and prosperity (*ha barakah*) and also the slights and denunciations (*ha qalalah*), just as (*ka*) all of these things (*kol*) were written (*kathab*) in (*ba*) the written scroll (*sepher*) of the Towrah | Teaching and Guidance (*ha Towrah*).

There did not exist (*lo’ hayah*) a Word (*dabar*) from (*min*) all (*kol*) that which beneficially (‘*asher*) Moseh (*Mosheh*) had instructed and directed (*tsawah*) which to reveal the way to get the most out of the relationship (‘*asher*) Yahowsha’ (*Yahowsha*) did not (*lo*) read, recite, or proclaim (*qara*) in a straightforward manner in the presence of (*neged*) the entire (*kol*) assembled community (*qahal*) of *Yisra’el* | Individuals who Engage and Endure with God (*Yisra’el*), including the women (*ha ‘ishah*) and the little children (*tap*), as well as (*wa*) the foreigners from other races and places (*ger*) who were walking (*halak*) among them (*ba qereb*).” (*Yahowsha* / Yahowah Saves / Joshua 8:34-35)

And then Yahowsha’ (*Yahowsha*) wrote (*kathab*) these (‘*eleh*) words (*dabar*) in (*ba*) God’s (‘*elohym*) Towrah (*Towrah*).” (*Yahowsha* / Yahowah Saves / Joshua 24:26)

Now that we have heard from Yahowah through His prophet Yasha’yah, His coworker Moseh, and His namesake Yahowsha’, let’s consider what God inspired Dowd, the man errantly known as “David,” to reveal to us in song. This is especially poignant because Dowd is Yahowah’s Messiah, His Shepherd and King, His son, and the man who will be returning with Him...

“On behalf of (*la*) the eternal Leader (*ha natsach*), a song (*mizmowr*) of (*la*) Dowd | the Beloved (*dowd*): The

heavens (*shamaym*) quantify the unit of measure, exactly and accurately of (*saphar*) the manifestation of the power (*kabowd*) of God (*'el*).

Its spreading out and expanse (*raqya*) makes conspicuous (*nagad*) His handiwork (*yad ma'aseh*). Day unto day (*yowm la yowm*) pours out (*naba'*) answers (*'emer*), and night unto night reveals (*hawah*) knowledge which leads to understanding (*da'ath*).

Nothing exists without (*'ayn*) the Word (*'emer*). Nothing exists when and where (*wa 'ayn*) the spoken and written message (*dabarym*) of the voice which calls out (*qowl*) is corrupted or is negated, ceasing (*bely*) to be heard (*shama'*).” (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 19:1-3)

“His (*huw'*) going forth is (*mowtsa'*) from (*min*) the uttermost part of (*qatseh*) the spiritual realm (*shamaym*).

His arrivals (*taquwphah*) are unto the distant end of time (*qatsah*). And nothing (*wa 'ayn*) is hidden (*satar*) from (*min*) His light (*chamah*).

Yahowah's (𐤅𐤃𐤅𐤃𐤁) Towrah (*Towrah*) is complete and entirely perfect (*tamym*), returning, restoring, and transforming (*shuwb*) the soul (*nepesh*).

Yahowah's (𐤅𐤃𐤅𐤃𐤁) enduring testimony and restoring witness (*'eduwth*) is trustworthy and reliable, verifiable and dependable (*'aman*), making understanding (*hakam*) simple for the open-minded (*pethy*).

Yahowah's (𐤅𐤃𐤅𐤃𐤁) directions (*piquwdym*) are right (*yashar*), causing the heart to rejoice (*leb shamah*).

Yahowah's (𐤅𐤃𐤅𐤃𐤁) terms and conditions (*mitswah*) are moral and are purifying (*bar*), shining a light toward understanding (*'owr 'ayn*).

Revering and respecting (*yir'ah*) Yahowah (𐤅𐤃𐤅𐤃𐤁)

is cleansing and restoring (*tahowr*), sustaining and establishing us (*'amad*) forever (*'ad*).

The means to exercise good judgment and to resolve disputes (*mishpat*) of Yahowah (יְהוָה) are trustworthy and reliable (*'emeth*). They are wholly (*yahdaw*) vindicating and correct (*tsadaq*).” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:6-9*)

“This which (*'asher*) we have heard (*shama'*) and we have known (*yada'*), our fathers (*'ab*) communicated to us in writing (*la chaphar*).

These things were not concealed (*lo' kachad*) from (*min*) their children (*ben*) from one generation to (*dowr la*) the next or to the last (*'acharown*).

They recounted and recorded (*chaphar*) Yahowah's (יְהוָה) glorious love songs (*tahilah*), His power and influence (*'azuwz*), and the wonderful and astounding things (*pala'*) which as a result of the relationship (*'asher*) He has done and will do (*'asah*).

He took a stand to establish (*quwm*) an enduring witness to this restoring testimony (*'eduwth*) with (*ba*) Ya'aqob (*Ya'aqob*), bringing about (*suwm*) the Towrah (*Towrah*) with (*ba*) Yisra'el (*Yisra'el*) which to benefit the relationship (*'asher*) He instructed and directed (*tsawah*) our fathers (*'ab*) to make it known (*la yada'*) to their children (*la ben*).

He did so for the express purpose (*ma'an*) that the next, as well as the last (*'acharown*), generation (*dowr*) would come to know and understand (*yada'*).

These children (*benym*) will have children (*yalad*) who rise up and take a stand (*quwm*). They will proclaim this (*saphar*) to (*la*) their children (*benym*).

And they will place (*wa sym*) in them (*ba*) the trust and reliance upon (*kesel*) God (*'elohym*).

They will neither forget nor improperly respond to (*wa lo' shakach*) God's ('el) work (*ma'alal*). And so the terms and conditions of His relationship agreement (*mitswah*) will save them (*natsar*).

They will not be (*wa lo' hayah*) like (*ka*) their fathers ('*ab*), a generation (*dowr*) too stubborn to change (*sarar*), and a generation (*wa dowr*) who was defiantly rebellious and embittered (*marah*), whose hearts (*leb*) were not prepared (*lo kuwn*), and which were not nurtured by (*wa lo' aman 'eth*) God's ('el) Spirit (*ruwach*).

The children (*beny*) of the Northern Kingdom ('*Ephraym*) submitted, and they yielded to (*nashaq*) those who betrayed them (*ramah*). And they were overthrown and destroyed (*chapak*) in the day (*ba yowm*) the battle was waged (*qarab*).

They did not observe (*lo' shamar*) the Covenant Relationship (*beryth*) with God ('*elohym*).

And with regard to His *Towrah* | Teaching (*wa ba Towrah*), they resisted and refused (*ma'an*) to (*la*) walk (*halak*).” (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 78:3-10)

“Yahowah (יהוה), make known to me (*yada'*) Your ways (*derek*). Teach me (*lamad*) Your path ('*orah*).

Direct me to walk (*darak*) by (*ba*) trusting and relying upon You ('*emeth*). Teach me (*lamad*), because indeed (*ky*), You are ('*atah*) the God ('*elohym*) of my salvation (*yasha'*). With You ('*eth*), I confidently anticipate deliverance (*qawah*) every day (*kol yowm*).

Yahowah (יהוה), remember and invoke (*zakar*) Your mercy (*racham*) and Your steadfast love, even Your unfailing kindness (*chesed*). For indeed (*ky*) they (*hem*) are from (*min*) time immemorial ('*owlam*).

The sins (*chata'ah*) of my youth (*na'uwrym*) and rebellion (*pesha'*) do not remember (*lo' zakar*) as (*ka*)

Your love for me is remembered (*chesed zakar la 'atah*) **on account of** (*ma'an*) **Your goodness** (*towb*), **Yahowah** (יהוה).

Yahowah (יהוה), **Almighty** (*'al*), **is good, beneficial, and generous** (*towb*) **and always right** (*yashar*), **therefore** (*ken*), **He is the source of teaching and instruction, and He guides and directs** (*arah*) **sinner** (*hata'*) **along the way** (*ba ha derek*).

He enables the way of (*derek*) **the unpretentious and sincere who respond and answer His call** (*'anaw*) **with His means to make rational decisions and resolve disputes** (*ba ha mishpat*).

He provides the information to teach (*lamad*) **those who appropriately respond to** (*'anaw*) **His way** (*derek*).

All (*kol*) **of the mannerisms and conduct** (*'orah*) **of Yahowah** (יהוה) **are merciful and beyond reproach** (*chesed*), **and they are trustworthy and reliable** (*'emeth*) **for** (*la*) **those who are preserved by** (*natsar*) **His Covenant Relationship** (*beryth*) **and by His enduring Witness** (*'edah*).

As a result (*ma'an*) **of Your name** (*shem*), **Yahowah** (יהוה), **You will choose to forgive** (*wa salah*) **my sin** (*la 'awon*), **because indeed** (*ky*), **He** (*huw'*) **is great** (*rab*).

Hence (*zeh*), **whatever** (*my*) **individual** (*'ysh*) **respects and reveres** (*yare'*) **Yahowah** (יהוה), **He will teach him** (*arah*) **in** (*ba*) **the way** (*derek*) **he should choose** (*bachar*).

His soul (*nepesh*) **in** (*ba*) **the most favorable, pleasing, and festive circumstances** (*towb*) **will dwell and endure** (*lyn*), **and his descendants** (*zera'*) **will inherit** (*yarash*) **the realm** (*'erets*).

A very close and intimate fellowship with (*sowd*) **Yahowah** (יהוה) **is certain for** (*la*) **those who respect and revere Him** (*yare'*), **because His Family-Oriented**

Covenant Relationship (*beryth*), He makes known to him (*yada*’).

My eyes (‘*ayn*) will continually be (*tamyd*) upon (‘*el*) **Yahowah** (𐤅𐤓𐤏𐤃), because indeed (*ky*), **He** (*huw*’), **Himself**, will come (*yatsa*’) removing the restraints from (*min resheth*) **my feet** (*regel*), turning me around and preparing me (*panah*) to have mercy on me (‘*el chanan*) as a unique child (*ky yahyd*) and I am (*wa* ‘*any*) humbled (‘*any*).” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 25:4-16*)

“As a result of (*min*) **Yahowah** (𐤅𐤓𐤏𐤃), the steps (*mits’ad*) of each individual (*geber*) are prepared and firmly established (*kuwn*). And (*wa*) **His way** (*derek*) is a pleasurable experience (*chaphets*).

Indeed, though (*ky*) he falls (*naphal*), he is not cast down (*lo’ tuwl*). **Indeed** (*ky*), **Yahowah** (𐤅𐤓𐤏𐤃) is sustaining, upholding him in His hand (*samak yad*).

Every day (*kol yowm*) **He is merciful and compassionate** (*chanan*), accompanying (*lawah*) **His children** (*zera*’), kneeling down in love to bless them (*la barakah*).

And so (*wa*) **I encourage you to consider, to act upon and engage in** (‘*asah*) that which is good, beneficial and agreeable, productive and pleasing (*towb*) and as a result (*wa*) live (*sakan*) forever (*la owlam*).

For indeed (*ky*), **Yahowah** (𐤅𐤓𐤏𐤃) loves (‘*ahab*) good judgment, the process of evaluating evidence so as to render a just and fair verdict which resolves disputes (*mishpat*).

So (*wa*) **He will not abandon** (*lo’ azab*) those who steadfastly seek His protection (*chasyd*).

Throughout eternity (*la owlam*), they shall be watched over and cared for (*shamar*), but (*wa*) the offspring (*zera*’) of the wicked (*rasa*’) will be cut off

(*karat*).

The upright who are correct, and thus vindicated (*tsadyq*), shall inherit (*yarash*) the realm ('*erets*), and they shall live (*wa sakan*) forever (*la 'ad*) within it ('*al*).

The mouths (*peh*) of those who are right (*tsadyq*) passionately and boldly proclaim (*hagah*) wisdom, providing the capacity to understand (*hakamah*), and their tongue (*lasown*) speaks the Word (*dabar*) of good judgment and of justly resolving disputes (*mishpat*).

The Towrah Teaching (*Towrah*) of his God ('*elohym*) is in his heart (*ba leb*), so his steps ('*ashur*) will never waver (*ma'ad*).” (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 37:23-31)

That was beautiful. So now returning to His Towrah, we discover...

“There is one ('*echad*) engraved prescription for living (*chuqah*) for all of you to approach (*la*), for the assembled community (*qahal*) and for (*wa la*) those from different races and places (*ha ger*).

The clearly communicated and inscribed prescription (*chuqah*) for living together (*guwr*) is everlasting and eternal ('*owlam*) and for (*la*) all of your generations (*dowr*).

It is exactly the same for you as for (*ka ka*) the foreigner and newcomer (*ger*). This was, this is, and this will always exist (*hayah*) as the means to approach (*la*) the presence (*paneh*) of Yahowah (יהוה).

One ('*echad*) Towrah (*Towrah*) and (*wa*) one ('*echad*) means to think clearly and resolve disputes (*mishpat*) shall continually exist (*hayah*) for you to approach (*la*) and for newcomers from different races and places to approach (*wa la ha ger*), with you all ('*eth*) living together (*guwr*).” (*Bamidbar* / In the Wilderness / Numbers 15:15-16)

Since Yahowah has clarified how we are to approach Him, the only thing which remains is to question what Sha'awl had to say regarding the means God has provided. I do not suspect they are similar.

☩

Poneros / Worthless

Tossing Out the Trash...

The author of the letter to the Galatians began his landscape-altering treatise by changing his name and then boldly announcing...

“**Paulos** (*Paulos* – of Latin origin, meaning lowly and little), **an apostle** (*apostolos* – a messenger who is set forth, a prepared delegate who is dispatched; from *stello*, one who is set, placed, and prepared, and *apo*, to be separate), **not** (*ouk*) **from** (*apo* – separating) **men** (*anthropon*), **not even** (*oude*) **by the means of** (*dia* – through, by, or on behalf of) **man** (*anthropou*), **but to the contrary** (*alla* – certainly and emphatically) **on behalf of** (*dia* – through, by, and by means of) **Iesou Christou** (INY XPY – Divine Placeholders used by early Christian scribes for *Iesou Christou* or *Chrestou*) **and** (*kai*) **God** (ΘY – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God), **Father** (IPA – Divine Placeholder for *Patera* | Father) **of the** (*tou*) **one having roused and awakened** (*egeiromai* – having caused to stand, raising; from *agora* – to assemble people for a public debate, to vote, or to conduct business with) **him** (*autos*) **out of** (*ek* – from) **a lifeless corpse** (*nekros* – death, a useless, futile, and vain carcass, an ineffective, powerless, and deceased cadaver, a dead body having breathed its last breath; from *nekus* – a corpse, carcass, or cadaver),...”
(Galatians 1:1)

It is interesting, indeed telling, that this man born

Sha'awl would choose to rename himself, disgorging his Hebrew heritage in the process. The language of God's revelation was rejected to select a Latin *nom de plume*. Sha'awl, now Paulos, was thereby estranging himself from Yahowah's testimony while reflecting his allegiance to Rome – to mankind's most powerful kingdom. There was no place on earth more overtly religious, more aggressively political, more savagely militaristic, or more covetous than Rome. At this moment, no other nation was as morally bankrupt or ruthlessly oppressive. And it would be Rome that would forever earn Yahowah's wrath for destroying His Temple in 70 CE, and His city in 133 CE. This change in identity and shifting allegiance should have been sufficient to motivate readers to "*sha'awl* – question him."

The opening line affirms that Paulos, as he now chose to be known, wanted his audience to believe that he was "an Apostle," and thus was on the same footing with Yahowsha's disciples. He said that he had been "*apostolos* – prepared and placed as a delegate and messenger" of "Iesou Christou." It is also telling that the translators of this statement correctly transliterated Paulos and Apostolos and yet could not accurately render Yahowsha'.

It is interesting, of course, that Yahowsha' said no such thing. The title "Apostle" was not given to *Sha'awl* | Paulos by Yahowah either. In fact, rather than speaking for God, God said that *Sha'awl* | Paulos spoke presumptuously and deceitfully for himself. This is proof. Sha'awl sought status he did not deserve or earn.

Paulos' claim that his message was unrelated to any man or men is untrue. He, by his own admission, was trained to be a rabbi. And this, like every letter Paul wrote, reads like the *Talmud*, which is a collection of rabbinical arguments regarding the Torah which are designed to empower men above God.

It should also be noted that, if he had written "*ha*

Mashyach Yahowsha” rather than “*Iesou Christou*,” even that would have been wrong. Yahowsha’ was the *Pesach* ‘*Ayil* | Passover Lamb, not *ha Mashyach* | the Messiah. That title belongs to *Dowd* | David, along with *Melek* | King, *Ra’ah* | Shepherd, and *Ben ‘Elohyim* | Son of God. Yahowah’s testimony in this regard is comprehensive, consistent, and incontrovertible. Yahowsha’ assuredly knew and supported what Yahowah had said, and he would never have misappropriated a title that had been given by God to His Beloved. It is why Yahowsha’ is never recorded referring to himself as the Messiah or Son of God – repeatedly and exclusively calling himself instead: “the son of man.”

This is not to slight Yahowsha’. The truth is never offensive to God. Furthermore, the name *Yahowsha*’ | Yahowah Saves and Liberates is a far more impressive moniker than either title! There would have been no Christianity had it been retained.

Please pause a moment and consider the gravity of this realization. Had Christians respected his proper designation, rather than recasting and misrepresenting him – they might have actually understood who he was and what he was doing.

There were two names changed in Sha’uwl’s opening salvo, both away from Hebrew, with one becoming Roman and the other Greek. With the first stroke of his pen, Paul has revealed his *magnum opus*: Replacement Theology. All things Yahowah had promised to Abraham, Yitschaq, and Ya’aqob, to Dowd, and to Yisra’el and Yahuwadm throughout His Towrah and Naby’ were snatched away from them and awarded to the edifice Paul was creating: the Christian Church.

When we cast both men under their given names, the story is clear. Sha’uwl was trying to hide from the prophecies Yahowah had spoken to condemn him, and

Yahowsha's name was obscured so that Yahowah's name could be abolished along with His role as God and Savior. This is the disingenuous foundation of Christendom – a religion whose very name is predicated upon an obvious fraud. It is right there in the first line of his first letter and it is obvious.

Truth was the initial casualty. Life was the second. Had Yahowsha' not fulfilled his role as *ha Pesach 'Ayil* | the Passover Lamb, death would be the end of life for all of us. There is no other means to immortality. This is what Paul obfuscated, damning Christians.

Yahowsha' knew who he was and what he was doing. It is Christians who have misidentified and miscast him to promote their religion rather than the relationship he sacrificed himself to achieve. It is their loss.

Whether you concur with Yahowah and Yahowsha' on this matter at this juncture is your choice. My job is to tell you the truth, to lay all of the words God revealed face up on the table and explain what they mean.

If properly identifying the characters in Yahowah's story, beginning with God, Himself, and coming to appreciate the roles each play, is important to you, then mark this page and set this book down for the moment. Open Volume One of *Coming Home, A Voice Calls Out*, and begin reading until you are satisfied. Then, if you are still curious as to the nature of the ploy Paul is presenting, return to *Questioning Paul* for the sake of the billions still beguiled by his deceit.

Other than the Instruction on the Mount and perhaps the Olivet Discourse, we know very little of what Yahowsha' actually said. We do not have a single word recorded in the language he spoke retained by an eyewitness. The closest we have is what the Disciple *Lowy* | Levi is known to have recorded in Hebrew. His recollections of what was conveyed on the two

aforementioned occasions was incorporated into the “Gospel of Matthew” which was written in Greek by an anti-Semitic imposter around 90 CE by plagiarizing Levi and the hearsay accounts of Paul’s apprentices, Mark and Luke. Those are the facts, whether you like them or not.

There is a reason we have the words of Yahowah’s prophets accurately preserved, in the language God and they spoke, and essentially nothing from Yahowsha’ similarly maintained. Yahowah told His prophets, beginning with Moseh, to write every word down so that His testimony would be accurately preserved for future generations. We are the beneficiaries of Yahowah’s relentless insistence on recording everything He said in writing.

And yet, Yahowsha’ (errantly called “Jesus” by those who do not know him), unlike the great liberator, *Moseh* | Moses, the articulate judge, *Shamuw’el* | Samuel, the brilliant lyricist *Dowd* | David, or any of the prophets such as *Yasha’yah* | Isaiah, *Yirma’yah* | Jerimiah, and *Zakaryah* | Zachariah, did not scribe a single word. He did not even ask his disciples to commit anything he said to writing. Two of them appear to have done so on their own initiative, with one all but lost to the ravages of religious malfeasance and the other altered to the point it is hardly recognizable.

We can bemoan this reality, but we cannot deny it. So perhaps we should seek to understand it. And in this regard, the answer is staring us in the face. Yahowah inspired His prophets to speak to us and Yahowsha’ to act on our behalf. Yahowah’s words led to Yahowsha’s deeds.

Yahowsha’ was not here to provide additional prophecy or commentary, but instead to fulfill what had already been written. We will find everything we need to know about the role and result of the Passover Lamb scribed in the *Towrah*, *Naby’*, *wa Mizmowr* – notably in *Qara’* / Called Out / Leviticus and *Yasha’yah* / Yahowah

Liberates and Saves / Isaiah, along with the only eyewitness account: Dowd's 22nd and 88th *Mizmowr* / Song / Psalms.

While that is a lot to digest, I would like to move on to other, albeit related, matters. Yahowsha' did not speak for himself. He spoke for Yahowah. And since Yahowah's words are available to us in the language He conveyed them, we already know what Yahowsha' said. Further, for *Sha'awl* | Paul to have claimed to have spoken for Yahowsha' is preposterous. He only cited a snippet of one statement Yahowsha' made, which was about his role as the Passover Lamb and its association with the Covenant. And even at that, Paul got it wrong. It wasn't an accident, because what Yahowsha' revealed, regarding the connection between Passover and the Covenant, obliterated Paul's entire proposition.

To claim to speak for someone, to assert to have been chosen to represent him, and to never accurately quote anything that individual had to say is completely inappropriate and disingenuous. Simply stated: the self-proclaimed and wholly unsubstantiated assertion that *Sha'awl* | Paul was chosen to speak for Yahowsha' or Yahowah is a lie. It is as obvious and simple as that. To deny this reality is to be either ignorant or irrational – or both. But I suppose that is why it takes “faith.”

I wonder if Christians have ever considered why Paul's new name appeared first in his letter and Yahowah's name was not even mentioned. Paul would have known it. And he would have known that everyone, without exception, inspired by Yahowah used it. But *Sha'awl* | Paul did not. Then he went one step further and removed Yahowah's name from Yahowsha'.

By doing so, Paul conclusively demonstrated, for anyone familiar with the Towrah's test, one Yahowah provided for us to use to ascertain whether someone was

inspired by God or acting on his own initiative (presented in the concluding chapter of *Questioning Paul, Metaneo* | Change Your Perspective), that he was not a prophet and did not speak for Yahowah. The penalty is death. Let me explain...

“But the person who claims to speak for God, who presumes to speak a word under My reputation which I have not instructed or directed him to speak, or that speaks in the name of other gods, then that person acting like a prophet shall die. (Dabarym 18:20) And if you say, using your best judgment, ‘How shall we know the Word Yahowah has spoken?’ (Dabarym 18:20) When someone claiming to speak in the name and reputation of Yahowah, if the narrative did not happen or if the prediction does not occur, then those are the words that Yahowah has not spoken. This false prophet, who has spoken it presumptuously, you should neither respect him nor fear him.” (Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 18:22)

It is almost as if this was written explicitly to warn the world, especially Yisra’el, about *Sha’uwl* | Paul. Unlike Paul, neither Akiba nor Maimonides ventured into historical narratives or prophecy. And while Muhammad did both, he spoke of “Allah,” not the God of the Towrah. Moreover, he was so pathetic, we don’t need any help rejecting him.

In addition, by excluding Yahowah’s name from his letters and speeches, *Sha’uwl* | Paul committed the lone unforgivable crime against God and man. Recorded in the Third Statement on the First Tablet, the negation of Yahowah’s name is unforgivable – a crime for which there is no redemption. Having renounced it, and doing this so publicly and egregiously, we can be assured that *Sha’uwl* | Paul is in *She’owl* | Hell with *ha Satan* | the Adversary who inspired him.

While it is small barley compared to all that we have just considered, had Paulos been correct about Yahowsha' being *ha Mashyach* in his letter, the pseudonym and title are reversed. And this is no "*paulos* – small" mistake. With "*Iesou Christou*," the errant name and erroneous title are reversed, giving the false impression that the individual's name was "Jesus Christ." More on this in a moment.

Turning to the final mistake of Paul's initial sentence, God did not die. God cannot die. Yahowsha' did not fall asleep. And with absolute certainty we know that Yahowsha's corpse was not resurrected. So all of this is a lie in that it is wholly inconsistent with Yahowah's teaching and prophecy on the subject of the Passover Lamb.

Yahowsha's represented the perfect Pesach 'Ayil. Moments before His physical body was sacrificed on our behalf as the *Pesach* lamb, Yahowah's Spirit left Him. Yahowsha' confirmed as much when he cried out, "My God, my God, why have You forsaken me?"

The reason he made this declarative statement was twofold. First, he wanted to direct our attention to the lyrics of *Dowd's* | David's 22nd *Mizmowr* | Psalm so that we might understand what was occurring. Yahowsha' recognized that Dowd had already written the lone eyewitness account of the fulfillment of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children. He was a prophet after all.

The second reason that Yahowsha' made this declaration is because it completely undermines the religion that would mischaracterize him and misconstrue his sacrifice. Based upon Yahowsha's final declaration, God did not die for anyone's sins. Further, "Jesus Christ" could not have been God. With Yahowsha's parting statement, there is nothing left of Christianity.

In his own words, or more correctly in Yahowah's as they were pronounced one thousand years in advance by

the Messiah and Son of God, God had left him there to die as the Passover Lamb. Please pause once again to consider the implications.

The Passover Lamb died to nurture the family and promote eternal life. Had the Pesach 'Ayil not been sacrificed on this occasion in concert with the Towrah's instructions, we would have been deprived of the opportunity to live. Yahowah wanted him to sacrifice his life to accomplish this result. He had made this promise to Abraham when He was affirming the Covenant, saying that He would provide the 'Ayil | Lamb.

This, of course, negates the foundation of Replacement Theology. According to Paul, Jews were condemned by his god because "they killed Jesus." And while it was Rome, not Jews, who slew Yahowsha', had the Jews been responsible for leading the Passover Lamb to the sacrifice, the world should be applauding them not hounding them. They did what Yahowah intended.

Therefore, we can be assured that the Christian mythology underlying Replacement Theology is invalid. God could not be angry with His people for doing what He intended. Just because men are capricious and unreliable, does not mean that God turned away from Yisra'el, withdrawing every promise He had made on their behalf. He did not transfer these sworn oaths to the people who murdered the Lamb of God either: the Romans who became the Roman Catholic Church. The case for Christendom has quickly unraveled.

In accordance with the Towrah, the physical body of the Passover Lamb was sacrificed so that we might live. His soul, however, did not die. It descended into *She'owl*, the place of separation from God, on the *Miqra'* of *Matsah*, known as UnYeasted Bread, to remove the fungus of religious and political infidelity from our souls. It was the most horrid experience imaginable, and thus hardly a

snooze.

The consequence of ignoring Pesach and Matsah, which is precisely what Paul did in his opening declaration, is life and death. Without Passover, we remain mortal. Without Matsah, we retain our faults. So while *Bikuwrym* | Firstborn Children warrants our attention, without Pesach and Matsah, there isn't anything to celebrate.

Should you credit Paul with an indirect mention of the Passover Lamb, in that he acknowledged there was a "corpse," there is something far worse than failing to capitalize on Pesach. It is why Pesach and Matsah are one contiguous event, one inseparable from the other. To benefit from Passover while ignoring UnYeasted Bread is to become eternally separated from God. He calls this outcome *She'owl* | Hell. It is synonymous with *Sha'uwl* | Paul because he has directed more souls there than any other.

There are deceptions big and small woven into the deceiver's claim that **"God, Father of the one having roused and awakened him out of a lifeless corpse** (*nekros* – death, a useless, futile, and vain carcass, an ineffective, powerless, and deceased cadaver, a dead body having breathed its last breath; from *nekus* – a corpse, carcass, or cadaver)."

God did not "rouse" Yahowsha'. The Passover Lamb never comes back to life. The Pesach 'Ayil restores our lives, not his own. There would have been no purpose to the sacrifice if Yahowsha's body had been reanimated, rising from the dead.

Assuring that the observant individual would never make this mistake, Yahowah told us to incinerate the inedible portions of the Pesach 'Ayil after being nourished by the meal. Therefore, the same evening Yahowsha's body served as the Lamb, his body was destroyed, incinerated by Yahowah's light. (*Shemowth* / Names /

Exodus 12:10) There could not have been a bodily resurrection because there was no longer a body.

For those who may protest, saying that the disciples saw him, let's keep it real. His mother and the women in his life mistook him for a gardener at the dawning of *Bikuwrym* (John 20:15). The fellows on the road to Emmaus, who had been in *Yaruwshalaim* as these events were transpiring, were clueless as to who he was when he approached them later that day (Luke 24:13-18). And the same evening with his disciples, he not only passed through a wall – something a physical body cannot accomplish – even they did not recognize him. (John 20:19)

Yahowsha' was no longer using the tortured body. He was doing as the Covenant's children will one day do, transferring a small amount of his spiritual energy into matter as a result of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children. And that is a whole lot better than returning in the body the Romans had mutilated and distorted when they tortured him. It is why I am so disgusted, as is God, by the Christian propensity to worship "Jesus Christ" as a dead god on a stick and then claim that his ravaged body was resurrected.

Physical bodies are burdensome and limiting. They degrade over time. With a body, we cannot leave this solar system, much less explore the universe or enter heaven. Bodily resurrection is counterproductive. The miracle is a result of *Matsah*, whereby the perfected become Yahowah's children, empowered, enriched, and enlightened.

During those three days, Yahowsha's body died as the Passover Lamb, and his body was incinerated, ceasing to exist, in harmony with the *Towrah's* instructions. His soul entered *She'owl* on *Matsah* to unleaven souls. Then on the *Miqra'* of *Bikuwrym*, known as Firstborn Children, Yahowsha's / Yahowah's soul was reunited with the Set-

Apart Spirit, becoming the firstborn of the Covenant. Thereby, the Towrah's promise to make us immortal, to perfect and adopt us, was fulfilled.

Then as proof that Yahowsha's corpse was not reanimated or resurrected as Paul has written, the only common denominator amongst the three eyewitness accounts that day was that no one recognized him.

In his opening statement, Paul got everything wrong: his name, his title, his status, his sponsor, his inspiration, Yahowsha's name and title, Yahowah's name, the relationship between Yahowah and Yahowsha', all while promoting the myth that God died, fell asleep on the job, and was bodily resurrected from a corpse. It was not an auspicious beginning.

God, Himself, proves that each of the explanations I have laid before you is valid. In due time, we will consider Yahowah's position on them because, without sharing God's view, this book fails to live up to its potential. My goal is not to leave Christians floundering, but instead to replace the lies Paul has sown with the truth. I will take away nothing that is worthwhile, but for those who are receptive, I will provide you with a clear and correct path to God.

In this regard, *Sha'uwI* | Paul did not say, at least in his opening line, that he was speaking for "God, the Father." That subtlety is lost on most Christians who have replaced Yahowah with their "Lord Jesus Christ," in effect focusing on the implement as opposed to the One wielding it.

This issue isn't insignificant. While Yahowsha' spoke for Yahowah, and represented Him, they are not equivalent. Yahowsha' cannot equal Yahowah because Yahowsha', by His own admission, and by necessity, is at the very most an extremely diminished manifestation of Yahowah. All of God cannot fit into a human form, and the undiminished presence of God would consume our planet.

This concept was affirmed by Yahowsha' when he acknowledged: **“The Father is greater than I am.”** (*Yahowchanan* / Yahowah is Merciful / John 14:28) There is no prophet who claims Yahowsha', instead of Yahowah, inspired him or her.

This possibility of a diminished manifestation, if that is the nature of Yahowsha', is explained by Einstein's famous equation $E=mc^2$. Since Yahowah is Spirit and describes Himself as Light, He is energy. Yahowsha' as a man was corporeal, and thus matter. Einstein's formula reveals that energy and matter are exactly the same thing, but they are not equivalent. He proved that matter is a substantially diminished form of energy.

If Yahowsha' was the equivalent of Yahowah, what's known as the “Lord's” prayer (Matthew 6:9) is nonsensical, as it would become Yahowsha' saying: *“Pray to Me who is not in heaven, set apart is My name, My kingdom come, My will be done in earth as in heaven...”* Recognizing that they were not the same, it is curious that Paul saw himself representing the representative.

The Greek word that we transliterate “Apostle,” *apostollos*, when used correctly is important. It means “to be set apart, prepared, and equipped.” While Paulos was the furthest thing from this, even today far too many individuals go off pretending to be witnesses without first studying the Torah and Prophets. As a result, those who are inadequately and improperly enlightened do more harm than good.

By changing his name and then misappropriating the title, the opening line of Sha'uwl's first letter became inaccurate in multiple ways. Those who knew Yahowah, and thus Yahowsha', recognized that Sha'uwl was not an Apostle, and that there would never be a Roman in this role. Every one of Yahowah's prophets, as direct descendants of Abraham, were introduced to us using their Hebrew names.

Further, Sha'uwI did not walk in Yahowsha's footsteps, nor personally witness his fulfillment of Passover, nor understand the intent of UnYeasted Bread, Firstborn Children, or Seven Shabats. Nor was he there in the upper room when the Set-Apart Spirit descended upon the disciples during the *Miqra' of Shabuw'ah*.

Paul was clearly missing from the most important event recorded in Acts, the fulfillment of the fourth Invitation to be Called Out of Seven Shabats (what Christians have errantly named "*Pentecost* | Fifty"), during which time Yahowsha's disciples were filled with the *Ruwach Qodesh* | Set-Apart Spirit. (Acts 2:1-4) As a consequence, the disciples were "*apostollo* – set apart, equipped, and prepared, fit for use" and *Sha'uwI* | Paulos was not. Shim'own, Yahowchanan, and Ya'aqob were enlightened and empowered and Paul remained as he had defined himself, a presumptuous pervert. (Romans 7)

There were twelve Apostles by this definition, all chosen by Yahowsha'. All twelve lived with him and witnessed his every word and deed. And that is why he referred to them as "disciples," meaning "those who learn." But from this introduction, as well as from the introductions Paulos wrote to the Corinthians, Romans, Colossians, and Ephesians, we know that *Sha'uwI* | Paul was too full of himself to be a "learner," so he passed on the "Disciple" moniker altogether. It was beneath his ego. He would instead be the Teacher.

Still, Paul coveted the title the actual Apostles were unwilling to give him. So in his craving to be seen as important and credible, he arrogantly and presumptuously overstepped his bounds, applying a title to himself he did not deserve. Moreover, he knew that every word of what he had written was a lie – one he would repeat many times.

One of the reasons we know that Paulos intended to convey "Apostle" as a title, rather than use *apostolos* as a

descriptive term, is that, in his letters to Rome and Corinth, he writes “Paulos, called an Apostle.” The men and women he fooled called him by the title he craved.

Since Paul claimed to speak for God, it is our responsibility to consider his statements in light of the *Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 13 and 18 tests established by God to evaluate the legitimacy and consequence of such assertions. While we will delve into both in future chapters, suffice it to say for now, in the first of these criteria Yahowah reveals that the best way to recognize who is or isn't speaking for Him is to realize what He, Himself, has conveyed. To accomplish this, we must closely examine and carefully consider His Towrah – which is the approach we have used thus far.

Yahowah is clear, revealing that no one is authorized to add to or subtract from His Towrah. So if we witness the Towrah's role in our lives being diminished by anyone, or if we find a writer adding something new, like a new covenant, we should be careful because such a person isn't speaking for God.

In *Dabarym* 13, Yahowah reveals that if the prophet stands up and establishes *himself*, as Paulos has done, he is a false prophet. If he claims to have performed miracles, as Paulos will do, he is a false prophet. If he encourages his audience to go after other gods by other names, like the Roman Gratia or Greek Charis, whom Paulos sponsored, he is a false prophet. If he promotes religious worship, which is the result of Paulos' letters, he is a false prophet. If his writings fail to affirm his love and respect for Yahowah, then he does not know Him. And that is a problem for Paulos because he implies that Yahowah is incompetent, impotent, and worse.

In addition, a man is a false prophet if he encourages anyone to disregard the terms and conditions of the Beryth or Miqra'ey, which comprise Yahowah's Way. And of

such false prophets, God says that they are in opposition to Him, both ruinous and deadly, so we should completely remove their disagreeable, displeasing, and evil corruptions from our midst.

Then in Dabarym 18, Yahowah delineated the six signs of false prophets: they claim to speak for Him, they are arrogant, overstepping their bounds, their words are inconsistent with the Torah's instructions, they recite the names of foreign gods, their historical presentations are inaccurate, and their prophetic promises fail to materialize. *Sha'uwI* | Paul failed every codicil of this test too.

In his opening salvo, Paul claimed that he did not represent any man or any human institution, and that would of course include the *ekklesia*, the Greek term which has been co-opted to represent the Christian Church. And that would have made *Sha'uwI* a freelance operator and an independent contractor had he not contradicted himself and referred to the *ekklesia* as his own.

The flip side of this admission is also problematic. If *Sha'uwI* | Paul did not write on behalf of what he learned from religious teachers in rabbinical school, then his ubiquitous references to the “*nomos*” must denote the *Towrah* as opposed to the *Talmud*. This being the case, the principal methodology used by those who are Torah observant, to reconcile Paul's epistles with Yahowah's Word, was torn asunder by his opening statement. The facts are evident and undeniable. There is no getting around the realization that the “*nomos*” is an object of scorn and ridicule in this epistle. And at no time does *Sha'uwI* associate the “*nomos*” with Rabbinic Law by citing Talmudic sources. Not once – ever. To the contrary, his examples and citations are all from the Torah, clearly identifying the document he is assailing.

Also convicting, if Paulos was speaking for Yahowsha', why didn't he quote him? If he was

Yahowah's messenger, why is Yahowah's Word discounted and never cited accurately? Why, if Paul was speaking for God, is his most repeated line, "But I Paulos say...." If Sha'uwl was Yahowsha's or Yahowah's apostle, why do his letters contradict God?

Sha'uwl / Paulos / Paul proved that he was out of touch with the truth, and therefore incongruent with Yahowah and Yahowsha', by his insistence that the *Towrah* | Teaching and Guidance was a set of binding laws and strict rules. This was the position held by the religious rulers of the day – the Pharisees – whom Yahowsha' routinely refuted and rebuked. So whether he was referring to the Oral Laws of the rabbis or to the Torah, itself, his conclusions were all wrong – especially since he has told us that he isn't speaking based upon what he learned while training to be a rabbi.

Based upon his opening stanza, Paul has positioned himself as an authority on God, as someone who spoke for God, but not ostensibly as the founder of a religion – albeit that is what he has become. His greeting displays neither religious qualifications nor an overt religious agenda. In fact, Sha'uwl only used the word religion twice, and both times it was called "the Jews' religion." (Galatians 1:13-14) That is a sobering thought if you are a "Christian."

Paul would, however, contradict himself and establish all of the trappings for a new religion, replete with a paid and empowered clergy and a plethora of personal edicts – all of which he said had to be obeyed. Ironic for a man so steadfast against what he claimed were God's rules. And he perverted the *Towrah* and Prophets to make his assertions appear both reasonable and divine. (Read 1 Timothy 5:17-18, 1 Corinthians 9:1-11, and then 16:1-3 for evidence of this.)

I am aware that Christians have been led to believe that "Jesus Christ was the founder of the religion of

Christianity,” and that “Paul spoke for him,” but those conclusions aren’t supportable. The institution of Christianity is founded on Paul’s writings, not Yahowsha’s words or deeds. After all, Yahowsha’ was Torah observant. Every minute aspect of his life and his teachings were derived from and inspired by the Torah. Therefore, to follow Him, the devotee would have to become Towrah observant. And in so doing, he or she would cease to be a Christian.

To his credit, or shame, Sha’uwl was telling the truth up to a point. He wasn’t entirely inspired by men. In his second letter to the Corinthians, as we have already read, he claimed to be demon-possessed, guided and controlled by one of Satan’s messengers.

But that is not to say that everything Paulos wrote was inaccurate. He correctly referred to God as the Father. But this statement of fact in a sea of lies only serves to make his deceptions appear credible.

For example, far too many people have been beguiled into believing that everything Satan says is a lie. They even believe that in a satanic religion, Satan is worshiped as himself. But this is not how he or his associates deceive and this is not what he wants. Satan usurps Yahowah’s credibility to fool the unsuspecting to worship him, not as the Adversary, but as if he were God. Satan wants to be known by the title Yahowah gave him: “Lord.” It elicits bowing, control, servitude, ownership, and worship.

Our Heavenly Father is the one who enabled the fulfillment of *Bikuwrym* by reuniting His soul with His Spirit. And while it may not mean much to many, since *nekros* is based upon *nekus*, meaning “corpse,” the end of the verse actually reads as I have rendered it: **“and God, Father of the one having roused and awakened, raising him out of being a lifeless corpse (*nekros* – death, a useless, futile, and vain carcass, an ineffective, powerless,**

and deceased cadaver, a dead body having breathed its last breath).”

So while “raising Him from the dead” sounds familiar to Christian ears, such was not the case. Only Yahowsha’s physical body suffered the indignity of death, not the soul nor the Set-Apart Spirit. Further, He was not asleep and his corpse had been destroyed and thus did not rise.

This isn’t a small technical point. Passover is the lone means to eternal life. UnYeasted Bread alone perfects us. Firstborn Children is the only way to be adopted into our Heavenly Father’s Covenant family. If Yahowsha’ didn’t enable these promises, if he slept on the job, if he was ineffective, or worse dead, then we all die estranged from God.

And while Passover is essential, UnYeasted Bread is vastly more important. That is why suggesting that nothing happened on *Matsah*, and that Yahowsha’ slept through the Shabat, or was dead at the time, completely negates Yahowah’s plan of salvation.

Moreover, Firstborn Children is symbolic of our souls being reborn Spiritually into our Heavenly Father’s Family. And as I’ve previously mentioned, the Torah says the following regarding the body of the Passover Lamb: **“And do not leave it until morning, and what remains of it before morning, you are to burn with fire.”** (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 12:10)

Moving on to the deployment of the Divine Placeholders, they are often overlooked. Not one Christian in a million knows of their existence. And yet four of the most common names and titles in Christendom were used in this greeting. INY represents “*Iesou*,” which became “Jesus” in the 17th century after the invention of the letter “J,” not “*Yahowsha*’ | Yahowah Frees and Saves.” XPY was used to convey either “*Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement,” not “*ha Mashyach* | the Messiah.” ©Y

was used by early Christian scribes to write “*Theos* | God,” not “‘*el* or ‘*elohym* | the Almighty,” in Hebrew. And Yahowah’s favorite title, “‘*ab* | Father,” based upon the first word comprised of the first two letters in the Hebrew lexicon and alphabet, was misrepresented by ΠΠΑ, written *Patera* in Greek. *Patera* transliterated as *Papa* in Latin, then became *Pope*, with men attempting to usurp Yahowah’s favorite title.

Examples of placeholders not used in this particular statement, but ubiquitous throughout the rest of the Greek texts, and universally found in every 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and early 4th century manuscript, direct us to the Greek interpretations of “spirit,” “lord,” “mother” and “son,” when used in reference to God.

While codices dating to the first three centuries differ considerably among themselves, and differ substantially from those composed after the influence of General Constantine, the use of Divine Placeholders is the lone exception to scribal variation among the early manuscripts. These Greek symbols for the Christian deification of “Jesus Christ,” the “Lord God,” and “Son” are universally found on every page of every extant codex written within 300 years of Yahowsha’s mission, and without exception. But, nonetheless, they are universally ignored by Christian translators, writers, and preachers. By including them here in the text, it is incumbent upon us to expose and condemn 1,700 years of religious tampering and corruption.

The very fact that these placeholders are found on all of the more than one hundred manuscripts unearthed prior to the mid-4th century tells us that it wasn’t a regional or scribal choice. Instead, they convey something so profoundly important that they were purposefully inscribed throughout the oldest manuscripts. And the best explanation for them is the Christian attempt to deify “Jesus Christ,” the “Lord God,” and “Son.”

And so while these manuscripts all differ from one another with regard to their wording, the only constant is the one thing every translator has ignored. There isn't even a footnote in any of the English translations indicating that these Divine Placeholders were universally depicted in all of the oldest manuscripts, including the codices, *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*. As a result, Christians do not know that these symbols existed, much less that they were later replaced by translators substituting the very names and titles which would have been written out by the original authors had they been intended. (For those interested in a comprehensive presentation and analysis of the use and significance of the Divine Placeholders, study the "His Name" Volume of *An Introduction to God*.)

Kappa Sigma and Kappa Upsilon, in capital letters with a line over them, were used in place of Yahowah's name when citing a Towrah text in which it was included. This divine placeholder was also used with regard to the Christian "Jesus." Both uses are problematic because the placeholders were based upon *Kurios* or *Kyrios*, the Greek word for "Lord" which, according to God, is Satan's title.

This obvious conclusion has been reaffirmed recently by the publication of early *Septuagint* manuscripts. In them we find a transition from writing Yahowah's name in paleo-Hebrew, in the midst of the Greek text throughout the 1st and 2nd centuries, to using the symbolism of Kappa Sigma to represent Yahowah's name beginning in the 3rd century – after the emergence of Christianity. It is, therefore, likely that the Divine Placeholders KΣ and KY were initially used to designate Yahowah's name in a language whose alphabet could not replicate its pronunciation.

Also, by finding "Yahowah" written in paleo-Hebrew in the oldest Greek translations of the Hebrew Towrah and Prophets, especially in those dating to the 1st and 2nd centuries BCE and into the first two centuries CE, we have

an interesting affirmation that my initial rationale regarding the Divine Placeholders was accurate. Yahowah's name cannot be accurately transliterated using the Greek alphabet. So to avoid a mispronunciation, the Hebrew alphabet was used. Then after Hebrew became less familiar, due in large part to the Romans murdering, enslaving, and exiling most Jews, Greek symbolism was substituted.

Moving on, the placeholders Iota Epsilon (IE), Iota Nu (IN), Iota Sigma (ΙΣ), and Iota Upsilon (IY) were used to convey the religion's intent to deify *Iesou*, *Iesous*, or *Iesoun*, which became "Jesus" with the invention of the letter "J" in the early 17th century CE. Rather than attempting to transliterate Yahowsha' in Greek, they changed his name to suit Greek sensibilities and grammar.

And that means there is very little basis for the 17th century corruption written as "Jesus." Beyond the fact that there was no "J" sound or letter in English prior to the 17th century, and never in the Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, or Latin languages, "Jesus" is not an accurate transliteration of *Iesou*, *Iesous*, or *Iesoun* – which were conceived as a result of Greek gender and grammar rules. But most importantly, none of these names was ever written in the original Greek texts – not once, not ever. It is therefore inappropriate to transliterate something (to reproduce the pronunciation in the alphabet of a different language) which is not actually present. So the name "Jesus" is a fraud purposely promoted by religious leaders desirous of separating Yahowsha' from Yahowah and to deify their creation.

The title "*ha Mashyach* | the Messiah" cannot be found on Yahowsha's lips. He never referred to himself as such. It is a title Yahowah ascribed to *Dowd* | David, by pronouncing and orchestrating his anointing on three occasions. By contrast, Yahowsha' was never anointed.

Therefore, the Divine Placeholders represented by Chi

Rho (XP), Chi Rho Sigma (XPΣ), Chi Sigma (XΣ), Chi Upsilon (XY), Chi Rho Upsilon (XPY), Chi Omega (XΩ), Chi Rho Omega (XPΩ), and Chi Nu (XN) were used to ascribe a Divine character to the Greek concepts of *Christos* | to administer drugs or *Chrestos* | depicting a useful implement with integrity. More on these Divine Placeholders in a moment.

The Hebrew *‘el* and *‘elohym*, meaning “Almighty,” but most often translated “God,” were replaced using the Greek concept of “*Theos* – God” by using the placeholders Theta Sigma (ΘΣ), Theta Upsilon (ΘΥ), Theta Omega (ΘΩ), and Theta Nu (ΘΝ). And while God’s name and title are not interchangeable, there are times when these placeholders represent “Yahowah” instead of His title, “God,” in cited Hebrew texts.

Ruwach is the feminine Hebrew noun for “Spirit.” Without exception, references to the “*Ruwach Qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit” are rendered under the Greek concept of “*penuma* – moving air, wind, breath, or breeze” using the placeholders Pi Nu Alpha (IINA), Pi Nu Sigma (IINΣ), and Pi Nu Iota (IINI).

In addition to these two names and three titles, the noun and verb forms of “upright pole,” and “to affix to an upright pillar,” later changed to “*crux* – cross,” were rendered Sigma Rho Omega Sigma or Sigma Rho Omega followed by Mu Alpha Iota to indicate the verbal form – both with a line over them to signify divinity. Making sure that we wouldn’t miss the Divine connotation of the Christian “cross,” *stauros* was never written out in the Greek text. The placeholder was changed from “*stauros* – upright pole” to the Latin “*crux*,” and then became “cross” in English. This is how the image of a pagan “cross” was deified, becoming the symbol of the religion.

The cross was a common religious symbol used throughout antiquity in Babylon, Egypt, Greece, and Rome

to signify the intersection of the constellation Taurus (the Bull which represented their god) with the sun during the Vernal Equinox. The closest “Sun”-day to this event was called Easter by these pagans who believed that the Sun impregnated Mother Earth on this day, giving birth nine months later on the Winter Solstice (then December 25th) to the Son of the Sun. Solar worship, known as *Sol Invictus* (the Unconquerable Son) was thereby incorporated into Constantine’s new religion – where it remains to this day. This process began with his vision of a flaming cross superimposed on the sun, which was his god, along with the edict: “In this sign conquer.”

Now, returning to “Christ,” and the improper title’s appearance in English translations of the Galatians 1:1 passage, it turns out that the overscored Greek symbols Chi Rho (XP), Chi Rho Sigma (XPΣ), Chi Sigma (XΣ), Chi Upsilon (XY), Chi Rho Upsilon (XPY), Chi Omega (XΩ), Chi Rho Omega (XPΩ), and Chi Nu (XN), weren’t initially based upon *Christos*, *Christou*, *Christo*, or *Christon*, but instead upon *Chrestos* – an entirely different word.

Christos means “drugged.” As I have demonstrated, the one time its defining verbal root was written out in the Greek text, it was used to say that the Laodicean assembly should apply a manmade drug, an ointment in this case, to their eyes. *Chrestus* (which is related to *chrestos*) on the other hand means “useful implement,” even “upright servant,” as well as “merciful one.” It was used to “depict the good and beneficial work of a moral servant.” This is quite similar to the implications of the Hebrew, *Ma’aseyah*, which is the Implement Doing the Work of Yahowah. As such, it is useful for you to know that “*ha Mashyach* – the Messiah” was never written as a title in conjunction with *Yahowsha’*.

While the 9:25-6 passage was not found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, Daniel is cited using *mashyach* as an adjective, not a title, to convey the realization that

Yahowah's representative would "be prepared and set apart to serve" as a messenger. While the adjective modifying messenger is there for all to see in the *Masoretic Text*, that has not precluded Bible publishers from giving their readers "the Messiah" they identify with in this passage.

Also interesting, "*Ma'aseyah*" was written over twenty times in the Hebrew Prophets. It was perhaps indicative of the idea that Yahowsha' would be the "Implement Doing the Work of Yahowah."

In this regard, it is not likely that Yahowah would miss this opportunity to associate His Work with His name. Therefore, as a result of this evidence I am on reasonable footing extrapolating the use of "*Chrestus*" as "*Ma'aseyah* – Implement Doing the Work of Yahowah."

The realization that the earliest witnesses may have selected *Chrestus*, not *Christos*, as the closest Greek allegory to *Ma'aseyah*, can't be distinguished from the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or early 4th century Greek placeholders because Chi Rho, Chi Rho Sigma, and Chi Sigma represent both words equally well. But, that isn't to say that there isn't a textual affirmation for *Chrestus*; there is. In all three depictions of the epithet used to describe the first followers of The Way, in Acts 11:26, 26:28, and in *Shim'own* | 1 Peter 4:16, the *Codex Sinaiticus* reveals that *Crestuaneos* was penned initially, not *Christianous*. The same is true with the *Codex Vaticanus*. Then, after Constantine in the 4th century, *Crestuaneos*, meaning "useful tools and upright servants," was replaced by *Christianous*, transliterated as "Christian" today, but literally meaning "those who are drugged." If you are a Christian reading this, please take the time to not only verify the accuracy of this realization but, also, to consider its implications.

But there is more. The *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament*, 27th Edition reveals that *Chrestus* (χρηστὸς)

was scribed in *Shim'own* | 1 Peter 2:3, not *Christos*. Their references for this include Papyrus 72 and the *Codex Sinaiticus*, the oldest extant witnesses of *Shim'own Kephass'* | Peter's letter.

In *Shim'own* | 1 Peter, which was attested by both manuscripts, Yahowsha's disciple tells us: "**As a newborn child, true to our real nature** (*logikos* – be genuine, reasonable, rational, and sensible), **earnestly desire and lovingly pursue** (*epipotheo* – long for and crave, showing great affection while yearning for) **the pure and unadulterated** (*adolos* – that which is completely devoid of dishonest intent, deceit, or deception) **milk in order to grow in respect to salvation, since we have experienced** (*geuomai* – partaken and tasted, have been nourished by and perceived) **Yahowah (ΚΣ) as the Useful Implement and Upright Servant** (*Chrestus* – the Upright One who is a superior, merciful, gracious, kind, and good tool)." (*Shim'own* / He Listens / 1 Peter 2:2-3)

With the realization that *Chrestus* was written in the *Codex Sinaiticus*, and the placeholder XPΣ written in P72 in the same place in this passage, we have an early affirmation that the Divine Placeholder was based upon the Greek *Chrestus* and may have thus conveyed the meaning behind *Ma'aseyah*.

The related Greek term, *chrestos*, means: "kind," "good," "useful," "benevolent," "virtuous," and "moral," as in the sense of "being upright." Words directly related to *chrestos* and *chrestus* speak of "integrity" in the sense of being trustworthy and reliable, "receiving the benefit of a payment," as in providing recompense and restitution, of "fulfilling one's duty," as in being a loyal servant, "doing what is beneficial" in the sense of healing us, "transacting business," as in fulfilling one's mission, "providing a Divine message and response," "being fit for use," as in being Yahowah's Implement, and "conveying a beneficial and trustworthy message which produces a good result,"

which is synonymous with “*euangelizo*—which is to convey the healing and beneficial message” of Yahowah.

Writing about the great fire of Rome circa 64 CE, the accredited Roman historian, Tacitus (the classical world’s most authoritative voice regarding this time and place), in *Annals* 15.44.2-8, wrote: “All human efforts...and propitiations of the gods, did not banish the sinister belief that the fire was the result of an order [from Nero]. Consequently, to get rid of the report, Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called *Chrestuaneos* by the populace. *Chrestus*, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilate.”

Also, the Roman historian, Suetonius (69 to 122 CE), makes reference to Chrestus in his *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*. A statement in *Divus Claudius* 25 reads: “He expelled from Rome the *Iudaeos* / *Yahuwdym* / Jews constantly making disturbances at the instigation of *Chrestus*.” And then in summary, he wrote: “Since the *Iudaeos* constantly made disturbances at the instigation of *Chrestus*, he expelled them from Rome.” This event is dated by Suetonius to 49 CE. The historian also wrote in *Nero 16*: “Nero issued a public order calling for the punishment of *Chrestuaneos* in the year of the Great Fire of Rome due to the superstition associated with *Chrestus*.”

These two credible secular sources, in addition to Pliny, who used the same spelling, providing additional and convincing evidence in favor of *Chrestus* over *Christos*, of “the Useful and Merciful Servant,” over “the Drugged One,” and *Chrestuaneos* over *Christianios*, “those who are useful and merciful servants,” over “those who are drugged.”

The placeholders are errantly called “*nomina sacra*” by theologians, which is Latin for “sacred names.” This

moniker is wrong on three accounts. First, only two of the ten placeholders designate a name, while seven convey titles. One represents a thing, in this case Passover's "upright pole," and the other speaks of how the Upright Pillar became the Doorway to Haven.

Second, there is nothing "sacred" in the Towrah, only individuals and things which are set apart. The human term "sacred" is religious (meaning "devoted to the worship of a deity in a religious service and worthy of religious veneration"), while the divine designation "set apart" is relational. It explains the association between Yahowah and the Set-Apart Spirit, for example.

Third, the Greek text is already a translation of Hebrew conversations as well as Hebrew citations from the Towrah and Prophets. Therefore, adding the Latin *nomina sacra* designation is another step in the wrong direction.

Christian scholars use the same hypocritical sleight of hand to explain the universal presence of the placeholders in the Greek texts that Rabbis have deployed to justify their removal of Yahowah's and Yahowsha's name from the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. They suggest that the "names were considered too sacred to write." But if that were true, if the earliest scribes thought that these ten names and titles were "too sacred to write," then why are they written today? If it was wrong then, it cannot be right now.

Anyone who has spent fifteen minutes reading any portion of the Torah and Prophets from any one of the hundreds of Qumran manuscripts recognizes that the "too sacred to write" notion is in complete discord with Yahowah's approach to every name and title in the Towrah and Prophets including His own. Moreover, God, in the midst of criticizing and rebuking religious clerics, said:

"Their plan is for (*ha hasab* – considering everything, their thinking, calculation, decision, devise, and account reveals that they are determined for) **My**

people (*'am* – My family) **to overlook, to forget, and to cease to properly value** (*sakah* – to ignore, to be unmindful of, to lose sight of the significance of, and to no longer respond to) **My personal and proper name** (*shem*) **by way of** (*ba*) **the revelations and communications** (*ha halowm* – the claims to inspired insights) **which** (*'asher*) **they recount to** (*saphar* – they proclaim, record, and write to) **mankind** (*'iysh*), **to their fellow countrymen and associates** (*la rea'* – to others in their race and company), **just as when in a relationship with** (*ka 'asher 'eth ba* – similarly as when engaged in the same relationship with) **the Lord** (*ha Ba'al*), **their fathers** (*'ab* – their forefathers and ancestors) **overlooked, ignored, and forgot** (*sakah* – were not mindful of and ceased to appreciate the significance of) **My personal and proper name** (*shem*).” (*Yirmayahuw* / Yah Lifts Up / Jeremiah 23:27)

We know that these clerical copyedits began much earlier because Yahowah is recorded in His Towrah warning that the crime of diminishing the use of His name was punishable by death and separation (in *Qara'* / Called Out / Leviticus 24:9-16). The rabbis, however, took the opposite approach and said that the use of Yahowah’s name was a crime punishable by death. It is why religious Jews replaced Yahowah’s name with “*adony* – my Lord,” under the guise that it was “too sacred to say.” Affirming this, the publishers in the preface of most every popular English Bible translation openly admit that they replaced God’s name with “the LORD” because of religious traditions. Surely they are not suggesting that rabbinical instigation provided a license to deceive.

If this same rabbinical mindset was shared by the disciples, we would have proof that their writing style was influenced by religion, and was not inspired by the same God who conveyed the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. And that would mean that nothing in the Christian “*New Testament*” could be considered inspired, and thus to be

“Scripture” by modern interpretations.

It is curious, of course, that not one in a thousand pastors, priests, religious teachers, or scholars ever mentions the universal application of the ten placeholders found on every page of every manuscript written within three centuries of Yahowsha’s life. And yet, if any portion of the Greek text was to be considered inspired by God, then these ten placeholders would have been designated by God. It is as simple as that. Ignoring them would then be in direct opposition to God’s will if He intended them, and proof that He did not inspire the text if they were subject to our interpretation.

I am convinced that there is only one rational reason for Yahowah to write out His name 7,000 times in the Hebrew Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. He wants us to know Him by name. Yahowah’s name, Yahowsha’s name, and all of God’s titles convey essential truths in Hebrew which are lost in translation.

The most positive spin that can be placed upon the “*nomina sacra*” is that the sounds produced by the 22 Hebrew letters differ from the sounds represented by the 24 letters in the Greek alphabet. Of particular interest, there is no Y, W, soft H, or SH in Greek, the letters which comprise Yahowah’s and Yahowsha’s name. And since names don’t change from one language to another, and always sound the same, there was simply no way to transliterate Yahowah or Yahowsha’ using the Greek alphabet. So rather than change His name, or misrepresent it, the translators of the *Septuagint* began the tradition of using placeholders. *New Testament* scribes simply followed suit.

I am not the first to recognize this predicament, or the first to deal with it. As I mentioned a moment ago, every extant 1st and 2nd century BCE and 1st and 2nd century CE copy of the *Septuagint*, the Greek translation of the Hebrew

Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, inserts Yahowah's and Yahowsha's name into the Greek text using paleo- and Babylonian Hebrew letters. It was only after the scribes were no longer conversant in Hebrew that the Greek placeholders were used to convey God's name.

A prominent early manuscript scholar offered a different, albeit uninformed, comparison between the Greek placeholders and the presentation of God's name found in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, of which you should be aware. He claimed that the Hebrew letters YHWH represented a contraction similar to what is found in the early Greek texts. But if that was true, every single word in the Hebrew text would be a contraction. Said another way, Yahowah's name isn't written differently than any other Hebrew word or name used in the Torah and Prophets or throughout Yisra'el. And the reason that this isn't a problem is that the letters which comprise Yahowah's name represent three of the five Hebrew vowels – with the Aleph and Ayin representing the other two. Using these vowels, every Hebrew name, title, and word is pronounceable.

The inclusion of these Divine Placeholders tells a story, one completely undermined, however, when Greek words, titles, and errant transliterations were substituted for them. If you were to read the *Textus Receptus* or the more modern *Nestle-Aland*, you wouldn't even know that these symbols ever existed. The same is true with every popular English translation. A stunning amount of crucial information pertinent to our salvation was discarded in the process.

Therefore, to the Christian, Yahowah's name became "Lord," Yahowsha's name became "Jesus," the Ma'aseyah was changed to "Christ," and the feminine *Ruwach*, became the gender-neutral *pneuma*, which was rendered "Spirit." It is also how Upright Pillar migrated over time to "cross." Yet if any of these words, titles, names, or symbols

were appropriate, the disciples would have simply written them in their Greek manuscripts – but they didn't, ever.

The truth is: “Lord” is Satan’s title. That is because the concept of lord represents the Adversary’s agenda and ambition. At best, “Jesus” is meaningless, and at worst, it is the name of the savior of the Druid religion (Gesus), where the Horned One is god. Recognizing that Constantine’s initial share of the Empire consisted of Britain, Gaul, and Spain, where the Druid religion flourished, the selection of Gesus could well have been politically expedient, as was incorporating most every pagan holiday into the new religion.

Worse still, as I have previously mentioned, “*christos*” means “drugged” in Greek. In fact, it is from the rubbing on of medicinal ointments that the anointed connotation of *christos* was actually derived. The Rx or Rho Chi symbolism associated with today’s drug stores is a legacy of the first two letters in *christos*.

And most intriguing of all is that the placeholder for Useful Implement, XΣ, was based upon *Chrestus*, not *Christos* – an entirely different word. And that is why all of the earliest manuscripts say that the first followers of “The Way” were called “*Crestuaneos*,” not “Christians.” They, like the one who had led the way to their salvation, were “useful tools and upright servants.”

All of this known, and it is important, after dedicating more than a year of my life to Sha’uwl’s letters, I do not think the amanuenses he employed used the placeholders that are now found in the oldest manuscripts – all of which were scribed in Egypt. It would have been awkward in dictation and would have served no purpose. And if he did use them, it would have been because these same placeholders are used throughout the *Septuagint*. He would have wanted his epistles to look like “Scripture.” But the thing he did not want was for Yahowsha’ to be “Yahowah

Saving Us.” Yahowsha’ could not be the Ma’aseyah, the Work of Yahowah, without completely undermining the entirety of Sha’uwl’s thesis. So, just as Sha’uwl changed his own name, jettisoning its Hebrew meaning, he most assuredly discarded the message conveyed by the most important Hebrew title and name.

Therefore, while it is essential that you know that Yahowah, Himself, saved us by working on our behalf, which is what the Ma’aseyah Yahowsha’ means, Sha’uwl, now Paulos, did not want anyone to realize this. As proof, he never once explains the meaning behind God’s title or name to his Greek and Roman audiences. As a result, in every translation of Galatians, I am going to make the most reasonable and informed assumption: that a scribe in Egypt harmonized Paulos’ epistles with copies of the *Septuagint*, thereby adding the placeholders which were never intended by Paulos. Moreover, as a former rabbi, he would have been duty bound to avoid all things “Yah.”

The longer I have contemplated their intent, I have become convinced that the function of the placeholders evolved to the point that, once they had served their function, they were eliminated. Originally, Hebrew letters written within Greek translations of the Towrah were designed to properly attest to the fact that every name and title associated with Yahowah and His people were Hebrew, not Greek. But then when Greek proxies were substituted from the Hebrew letters, the “*nomina sacra*” took on Divine connotations within the Greek nomenclature. And it was this sense of divinity that the early Christian authorities employing the first scribes wanted to associate with their Iesou, with their Christos, their Kurios and Theos, even their Crux. So the *nomina sacra* were deployed to give the new religion a Godly veneration.

Speaking of religious malfeasance, since Galatians is the principal text used to undermine the Towrah’s

foundation, and since it is cited to negate Yahowsha's repeated affirmations that he did not come to annul the Torah, but instead to fulfill it, it's important that we consider the troubadour of the Christian justification: the *King James Bible*, as well as the Latin *Vulgate* upon which this revision was ultimately based. Therefore, recognizing that the Greek text reads, "Paulos, an apostle or delegate, not separating men, not even by the means of man, but to the contrary and emphatically on behalf of Iesou Christou and God, Father of the one having roused and awakened him for public debate, raising Him out of a dead corpse...", here is the KJV rendition of Galatians 1:1:

"Paul, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead;)"

It reflects its source, the Latin *Vulgate*: "Paulus, Apostolus, not from men and not through man, but through Iesum Christum, and Deum the Father, who raised him from the dead."

In that credulity is important, here is how the most highly respected text, that of the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*, reads: "Paul delegate not from men but not through man but through Jesus Christ and God father of the one having raised him from the dead..."

Sadly, the most recent rendition of Paulos' letter simply reiterated all of the same mistakes. Consider the *New Living Translation's* regurgitation of prior prose: "This letter is from Paul, an apostle. I was not appointed by any group of people or any human authority, but by Jesus Christ himself and by God the Father, who raised Jesus from the dead."

What is particularly regrettable is that the *New Living Translation's* "New Testament" coordinator was none other than Philip Comfort. And yet every book Professor

Comfort has published on the extant early Greek manuscripts acknowledges the consistent presence of the Divine Placeholders. He is not ignorant of them, and therefore, he is without excuse.

Before we move on, please notice that all three translations transliterated *apostolos*, rather than translate its meaning. They all ignored the four placeholders found in the Greek manuscripts, and then improperly conveyed Yahowsha's name, Yahowsha's title, and Yahowah's title. Further, *egeiromai*, meaning "to awaken, rouse from sleep, and get out of bed" was translated based upon a tertiary definition in all three cases, as was *nekros*.



It is a natural, albeit annoying tendency in spoken communication to use dependent clauses. But in the written word there is no excuse for run-on sentences, some of which comprise a paragraph or more.

Paulos' first sentence of his first letter began, "**Paulos, an apostle or delegate, not separating men, not even by the means of man, but to the contrary and emphatically on behalf of Iesou Christou and Theos | God, Patera | Father of the one having roused and awakened him for public debate, raising him out of a dead corpse,...**" and then continued: "**...and (kai) all (pas) the (oi) brothers (adelphos) with (sym) me (emoi) to the (tais) called out (ekklisia – out called; from ek – out of or from and kaleo – to call) of the (tes) Galatias (Galatias – the Roman province of Galatia in Asia Minor, bounded on the north by Bithynia and Paphlagonia, on the east by Pontus, on the south by Cappadocia and Lycaonia, and on the west by Phrygia)...**" (Galatians 1:2)

First, Paul had a posse. Like all religious founders, he

sought followers.

Second, there is no basis for anything remotely related to a “church” in the Greek texts. *Ekklesia* is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew *Miqra’ey* because those who are Called Out are able to separate themselves from human institutions and join Yahowah’s Covenant family by responding to the Towrah’s “*Miqra’ey* – Invitations to be Called Out and Meet” with God. Second only to the religious corruption of Yahowah’s and Yahowsha’s names through the deployment and later avoidance of the Divine Placeholders, the replacement of *ekklesia* with “church” is the most lethal copyedit found in the so-called “Christian *New Testament*.”

Third, the “book” of Galatians is actually an open letter, or epistle. Paulos was responding to a myriad of opponents who had criticized his preaching in Galatia. We are witnesses, however, to only one side of this debate – in similar fashion to the never-ending argument which permeates Muhammad’s *Qur’an*. And in our quest for accuracy, the proper pronunciation of the name ascribed to this audience is *Gal-at-ee-ah*.

Unlike what we find in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, where Yahowah is seen dictating His message to a prophet or scribe who then writes down what he has heard in his native Hebrew tongue, Sha’uwl’s letters are the result of dictating a stream of consciousness to one of his devotees, to someone who was not a professional scribe, in Greek, a language foreign to him, rather than his native Hebrew, Aramaic, or Latin. Further, Paulos’ continued focus upon himself and his repetitive use of “but I say,” where “I” represents Paul, not Yahowah, differentiates this self-proclaimed Apostle’s epistles from God’s Word. It also positions Paulos as the lead candidate for the wolf in sheep’s clothing who would come in his own name and still be popularly received.

As a result of this stylistic choice, Sha’uwl’s letters contain some of the most difficult passages to translate. There are many missing words, and Paul’s epistles are famous for their run-on sentences. Moreover, in Galatians, Sha’uwl is being attacked, and he is clearly on the defensive, trying to justify his persona, authority, and teachings, especially those in conflict with the Torah of the God he is supposedly representing. His claim of being an “Apostle” was being questioned, because he was not a witness to Yahowsha’s words or deeds.

Galatia, itself, was a Roman province in Asia Minor which extended to the Black Sea. The Galatians were originally Gauls who moved down the Rhine to mingle with Greeks and Jews. They were known for their quick temper, prompt action, inconsistency, and malleability. Sha’uwl knew them well, as he grew up south of them and later traveled throughout their land in the pursuit of his mission.

Now as we will do throughout this review of Galatians, here are the *Nestle-Aland*, the Latin *Vulgate*, and the *King James* renditions of the second verse. The NA reveals: “and the with me all brothers to the assemblies of the Galatia.” Next, the LV conveys: “and all the brothers who are with me: to the *ecclesiis Galatiæ*.” Of which, the KJV published: “And all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia:” In this case, the most egregious error cannot be blamed on the Latin *Vulgate*.

It is worth restating that few things in Christendom have been as harmful as changing the *ekklesia*, which means “called out,” to “church.” It created the impression that “Jesus Christ” had conceived a new Christian institution to replace the Chosen People, and that this religious construct was somehow unrelated to Yahowah’s seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with Him, or even the Sabbath. And that led to the notion that the Feasts were nothing more than quaint “Jewish holidays.” But

now, at least you know who to blame for this devastating corruption of the text. The Rosicrucian Francis Bacon, serving the political interests of King *Iames* | James, was the first to perpetrate this grievous and damning corruption. His predecessors, such as John Wycliffe, either transliterated *ekkllesia* or wrote “assembly.”

In their desire to be politically correct, the revisionary paraphrase known as the NLT suggested: “All the brothers and sisters here join me in sending this letter to the churches of Galatia.” There is no Greek textual basis for “and sisters,” “here,” “join me,” “in sending,” or “this letter.” And *ekkllesia* means “called out,” not “churches.” Equally misleading, the NLT created a new sentence, replete with a verb, to make it appear as if Paulos wasn’t engaged in a long-winded diatribe.

Also worth noting, of Sha’uwl’s first five letters, only Galatians went out under his name alone. First and Second Thessalonians were sent from “Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy.” First Corinthians was from Paul and Sosthenes, while the immensely troublesome, indeed demonic, epistle of 2nd Corinthians bears Timothy’s name in addition to Paul’s. In today’s vernacular, Sha’uwl wrote Galatians before his posse was popular.

The evidence suggests that this letter was dictated in haste immediately after the Yaruwshalaim Summit, immediately before Paul befriended Timothy. Equally telling is that while Sha’uwl will acknowledge Barnabas in this epistle, since the two severed their relationship in the immediate aftermath of the Yaruwshalaym Summit, he was excluded from the greeting and demeaned in the midst of a rather mean-spirited rant.

This next dependent clause is a great example of why it is so difficult to determine what Paulos was trying to say, and for us to ascertain why he chose to be so provocative. At issue here: there is no verb, and *Charis* (Greek) and

Gratia (Latin) serve as the name of the popular trio of pagan goddesses.

“...**Grace** (*charis* – the name of the lovely and lascivious Greek goddesses of merriment, known to the Romans as the *Gratia*, from which “Grace” is derived) **to you** (*humeis*) **and** (*kai*) **peace** (*eirene* – harmony and tranquility, freedom from worry) **from** (*apo*) **God** (ΘΥ – a placeholder for *Theos* | God), **Father** (*pater*) **of us** (*emon*), **and** (*kai*) **Lord** (KY – a placeholder used to convey *kurios*, giving the Greek word for lord and master a Divine sheen), **Iesou** (IHY – a Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Iesou* which became “Jesus” in the 17th century after the invention of the letter “J”) **Christou** (XPY – a placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement)...” (Galatians 1:3)

Thankfully, *charis* is not found in the earliest book, which is Mark or even in Matthew, which was based upon it. The Christian fixation on *Charis*, and its Roman manifestation, *Gratia*, is therefore a direct result of Paul. *Charis* appears 107 times in the self-proclaimed Apostle’s letters, and another 14 times in Acts, a book written mostly about Paul and for Paul.

The only other mentions of *charis* in the Greek texts appear after the publication of Paul’s epistles. We find *charis* used in just one conversation in *Yahowchanan* / John (1:14-17). It is found four times in Luke, a book written from Paul’s perspective (of which there is no 1st, 2nd, or 3rd century manuscript to verify these inclusions). Of the remaining 16 occurrences, we find all but two sprinkled in the poorest attested books. Ten are found in *Shim’own’s* | Peter’s letters (of which there are no reliable 1st, 2nd, or 3rd century manuscripts (the late 3rd century Papyrus 72 is extremely free (meaning imprecise and subject to substantial alterations), which suggests that it was heavily influenced by Marcion)). *Charis* appears twice

in *Ya'aqob* | James (of which there is no pre-Constantine manuscript of the 4:6 passage in which it appears), once in 2nd *Yahowchanan* / John (of which there is no pre-Constantine manuscript), and once in Jude (but P78 does not include *Charis* in the 4th verse indicating that it was added later by a scribe whose agenda was other than accuracy).

The first use of *charis* in Revelation (1:4) is attested only by a fragment too small to validate. It was written by an untrained and unprofessional scribe (as determined by his penmanship) in the early 4th century on Papyrus 18, and is thus unreliable. The second purported inclusion of *charis* is found in Revelation 22:21, but no pre-Constantine manuscript covers anything past the beginning of the 17th chapter, so it cannot be validated. Therefore, apart from the one poorly attested inclusion, there is no verification that *charis* was used by anyone other than Paul prior to the early 4th century.

The reason that this is an issue is because *Charis* is the name of the three Greek Graces, known as the Charities (*Charites*). The English word “charity” is a transliteration of their name. These pagan goddesses of charm, splendor, and beauty were often depicted in mythology celebrating nature and fertility. They were overtly erotic. Collectively they make four appearances in Homer’s *Iliad* and three in *The Odyssey*. In the order of their appearances, they are depicted offering bedroom attire to Aphrodite, participating in a ruse to trick Zeus, and serving to lure Hypnos astray with promises of sex such that he would mislead the father of the gods. They are seen as objects of beauty when splattered with blood, as the source of feminine attractiveness for handmaidens, as those who pampered Aphrodite after she was caught being unfaithful to her husband, and finally as a means to enchant through erotic dancing. And in the case of Aphrodite, the Graces “bathed her, anointed her with ambrosial oil, and dressed

her in delightful apparel so that she might resume her loving duties” after having been caught in “the loving embrace of Ares,” the God of War. As such, Homer used the enchanting lure of the Graces to depict what he called, “the beauty of war.”

Some accounts attest that the Graces were the daughters of Zeus. Others claim that *Charis* were the daughters of Dionysus and Aphrodite. And that is particularly troubling because Paul claims to hear one of Dionysus’ most famous quotes during his conversion experience on the road to Damascus. And as it would transpire, Paul’s faith came to mirror the Dionysus cult (Bacchus in Roman mythology), which is one of the reasons why so many aspects of Pauline Christianity are pagan. (These troubling associations are detailed for your consideration in the “*Kataginosko – Convicted*” chapter of *Questioning Paul*.)

The Graces were associated with the underworld and with the Eleusinian Mysteries. Their naked form stands at the entrance of the Acropolis in Athens. Naked frescoes of the *Charites* adorn homes in Pompeii, Italy which means that they transcended the Greek religion and influenced Rome where they became known as the *Gratia*. Their appeal, beyond their beauty, gaiety, and sensual form, is that they held mysteries known only to religious initiates. Francis Bacon, as the founder of the Rosicrucians, would have loved them.

At issue here, and the reason that I bring this to your attention, is that Yahowah tells us in the Torah that the names of pagan gods and goddesses should not be memorialized in this way. **“Do not bring to mind (*zakar* – remember or recall so as to memorialize) the name of other (‘*acher* – or different) gods (‘*elohym*); neither let them be heard coming out of your mouth.”** (*Shemowth / Names / Exodus 23:13*)

And: **“I will remove and reject the names of the Lords and false gods (*ba’alym*) out of your mouth, and they shall not be brought to mind and memorialized (*lo’ zakar* – remembered, recalled, and mentioned) by their name any more (*’owd shem*).”** (*Howsha’* / Salvation / Hosea 2:16-17)

And yet the name of the Greek goddesses, *Charis*, is the operative term of Galatians – one which puts *Sha’uwl* | Paul in opposition to the very *Towrah* | Teaching and to God which condemns the use of their names. Simply stated: the “Gospel of Grace” is pagan. It is literally “*Gott’s* spell of *Gratia*.”

In ancient languages, it’s often difficult to determine if the name of a god or goddess became a word, or if an existing descriptive term later became a name. But we know that Greek goddesses, like those in Babylon, Assyria, Egypt, and Rome, bore names which described their mythological natures and ambitions. Such is the case with the *Charites*. They came to embody many of the things the word, *charis*, has come to represent: “rejoicing, pleasure, loveliness, charming speech, and delightful experiences,” in addition to “licentiousness, sensuality, hedonism, merriment, and eroticism,” although the latter are typically censored from religious lexicons as unchristian. So while we can’t be certain if the name, *Charis*, was based on the verb, *chairo*, or whether the verb was based upon the name, we know that it conveys all of these things, both good and bad.

There is a Hebrew equivalent to positive aspects of this term – one used in its collective forms 193 times in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. It is *chen*, from the verb, *chanan*. As a noun, it means “favor and acceptance by way of an unearned gift,” which is why it is often mistranslated “grace” in English Bibles. To be *chanan* is “to be merciful, demonstrating unmerited favor,” and as such *chanan* is errantly rendered “to be gracious.” The author of the

eyewitness account of Yahowsha's life, whom we know as "John," was actually Yahowchanan, meaning "Yahowah is Merciful."

For the second time in a row, Paulos has reversed the proper order of title and name, and I suspect to imply that "*Iesou's* last name was "*Christou*," a ruse Christians have swallowed as if the poison was laced with Kool-Aid. But this is like writing "Francis Pope" rather than "Pope Francis." It is akin to saying "George King" instead of "King George." So even if the title "Christou" was accurate, and it is not, even if he was the Messiah and Greek, and He was not, writing *Iesou Christou* is wrong on every account.

Worse, now that Satan's title, "Lord," has been associated with *Iesou Christou*, those who are cognizant of the Adversary's agenda see his demonic influence on this letter. Satan could not dissuade Yahowsha' from fulfilling his role as the Passover Lamb, so *ha Satan* did the next worse thing: he inspired Sha'uwl to contravene his purpose such that the Christian Christ could be used to advance the Lord's agenda.

Beyond this, absolutely no attempt was made in any English Bible to translate or transliterate the Hebrew basis of Yahowsha's name, or even the title they were trying to ascribe to him. And yet, the Greek *charis*, which is used as if it were a title in the phrase "Gospel of Grace" throughout Paul's letters, was neither translated nor transliterated from the Greek, but instead was conveyed by replicating the name of the Roman version of the Greek goddesses' names, and therefore as "Grace." Inconsistencies like this are troubling, because they prove that the translators cannot be trusted.

While it is a smaller distinction, Yahowah and Yahowsha' convey "*shalown*," which speaks of "reconciliation." It is used to describe the "restoration of a

relationship.” Paulos, on the other hand, speaks of “*eirene* – peace,” which is the absence of war. They aren’t the same.

Continuing our review of the sources of Christian corruption, the NA reads: “**favor to you and peace from God father of us and Master Jesus Christ.**” Next, the KJV begins verse 1:3 by offering the pagan goddesses to the Galatians: “**Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ.**” This time, their inspiration was the Latin *Vulgate*, which reads: “*Gratia and peace to you from the Father, our Domino, Iesu Christo.*”

I am always interested in knowing how pagan terms enter into the religious vernacular. In this case, we just learned that “Grace” comes to us by way of the *Roman Catholic Vulgate*. *Gratia* was the Latin name for the Greek *Charis*. And that is why they are known as the “Graces” in English.

In Pagan Rome, the three *Gratia*, or Graces, served as clever counterfeits for *euangelion* – Yahowsha’s healing and beneficial message. So all Christendom has done is transliterate the Roman name into English, and then base a religious mantra, “the Gospel of Grace,” upon the name of these pagan deities.

This is deeply troubling. It is a scar upon the credibility of the texts. It is a mortal wound to Paul’s epistles, and it is an irresolvable deathblow to Christendom.

In the NLT, rather than Paulos offering the Galatians “Grace,” the Father and Son are depicted doing so. “**May God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ give you grace and peace.**”

All three translations got one name right, that of the pagan goddesses, “Grace.” The other name and titles, they got wrong – and those belonged to God. In fact, throughout

this review, you will find that all of the most important names and titles – Yahowah, Mashyach or Ma’aseyah, Yahowsha’, Towrah, and ‘Edown | Upright One – are always rendered errantly while all of the made-up or less meaningful names and titles are transliterated accurately in most every English Bible translation. And that is incriminating.

Sha’uwl’s rambling introductory sentence continues with:

“...**the one** (*tou*) **having given** (*didomi* – having produced and allowed) **himself** (*heautou*) **on account of** (*peri* – concerning and regarding) **the** (*ton*) **sins** (*hamartia* – wrong doings, wanderings away, and errors) **of us** (*emon*), **so that** (*hopos* – somehow, as a marker of indefinite means) **he might possibly gouge or tear out** (*exaireo* – he might choose to pick, pluck, root, or take out (in the aorist tense this depicts a moment in time, in the middle voice, he, not we, is affected by his actions, and in the subjunctive mood, this is a mere possibility)) **us** (*emas*) **from** (*ek*) **the** (*tou*) **past inflexible and unrelenting circumstances of the old system** (*aionos* – the previous era, the long period of time in history operating as a universal or worldly system, something that was existent in the earliest or prior times that continued over a long period of time; from *aei* – circumstances which are incessant, unremitting, relentless, invariable, and inflexible) **which** (*tou*) **had been in place** (*enistamai* – had occurred in the past but was influencing the present circumstances in which we had been placed, depicting from where we had come, and now found ourselves, presently threatened by a previous edit (in the perfect tense this is being used to describe a completed action in the past which still influences the present state of affairs, in the active voice the subject is performing the action, and as a participle in the genitive, the circumstance into which we have been placed is being presented as a verbal adjective which is

being described by the following)) **which is disadvantageous and harmful** (*poneros* – which is wicked and worthless, evil and faulty, immoral and corrupt, annoying and mischievous, laborious and criminal, unprofitable and useless, unserviceable and malicious, malevolent and malignant (in the genitive, this adjective is modifying the previous genitive participle)) **in opposition to and against** (*kata* – extending downward from, with regard to, and opposed to) **the desire and will** (*to thelema* – the wish, inclination, intent, choice, pleasure, and decision) **of the** (*tou*) **God** (ΘΥ – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God) **and** (*kai*) **Father** (ΠΡΣ – Divine Placeholder for *Paters* | Father which became the basis of Pope) **of us** (*ego*)...” (Galatians 1:4)

While it is a fairly small copyedit, modern Greek texts use *hyper* between “giving himself,” and “us missing the mark,” but on Papyrus 46, we find *peri*, instead. While these words convey similar thoughts, *hyper*, meaning “for the sake of and in place of,” makes a stronger case, which is why scribes may have replaced *peri* with it.

This known, there are some insights to be gleaned from this declaration – all of which are horrendous. First, once we come to understand that Yahowsha’ was not the Messiah and that Yahowsha’ means “Yahowah Frees and Saves,” we realize that Yahowah is the one who personally gave of Himself to save us. However, when these clauses are joined, we find Paulos claiming that the “Lord Iesou Christou,” was “the one having given himself.” This is not a small distinction. It defies the very purpose and nature of God. This error in perception is akin to calling our Father “Lord,” and thus Satanic.

Paul expressly denounces this connection with *hopos*, which is a “marker of indefinite means.” By including it, this introductory statement implies that Paul said that the methods deployed by God to save us were “not planned,” they “did not unfold on a fixed or appointed schedule,” and

that His “means were unclear, vague, and imprecise.” Since this is all untrue, it’s instructive for you to know that Yahowah provided the Passover Lamb. In this way, Yahowsha’s body served as the sacrifice while Yahowah’s soul, once associated with our mistakes, was placed in She’owl on the Shabat to honor the promise to perfect us on UnYeasted Bread.

But none of this occurred according to Paul. His Lord slept through it all – or was dead at the time. And he must have awakened in a horrible mood, at least based upon the angry and violent verb this “apostle” ascribed to him – *exaireo*: He might gouge, tear, and pluck out.

Or perhaps, the transformation from Sha’uwl, the murderous wannabe rabbi, to Paulos, the Lord’s Apostle, was a bit overstated. By any standard, and most especially in this context, *exaireo* was a poor choice of words. It literally speaks of “gouging and tearing out,” in addition to “plucking and rooting out.” Yes, *exaireo* can also convey “to rescue, to remove, and to take out,” but when these softer approaches are connected with what the “Lord Iesou Christou” is allegedly delivering us from, it only gets worse.

In the *Complete Word Study Dictionary*, the primary definition of *exaireo* is “to pluck out” an eye. They provided this example because both times Yahowsha’ is translated using the verb, it is to depict the plucking out of an offensive eye to keep one’s whole body from being cast into Hades. While it is probable that he said no such thing, there is no missing the fact that the Greek word is traumatic and violent.

The only time *exaireo* is used by other than Paul, the mythical creation who has become known as “Stephen” is presented in Acts 7 telling the High Priest that Yowseph was “*exaireo* – delivered from” his afflictions. Reflecting this usage, the secondary definition in the *Complete Word*

Study Dictionary is “to take out of affliction.” So in a moment we’ll consider the source of affliction from which this Lord is supposedly “rescuing” believers.

The *Dictionary of Biblical Languages* concurs with its peers, reporting that *exaireo* principally means: “take out, gouge out, and tear out.” Secondly, they attest that it can convey “to rescue and set free.” Then they point us to its root and reveal that *exaireo* also means “to choose.” But this too is a problem. While Yahowah has every right to choose whomever He wants, for the most part, the option is ours. We were given freewill so that we might choose to engage in a relationship with God.

Moving on, the *Exegetical Dictionary* lists “pluck it out” as its favored definition. This is supported by *Strong’s Lexicon* which presents “to pluck out” as the most accurate depiction of *exaireo*. This is not a loving embrace.

Nonetheless, Paulos deployed *exaireo* in the aorist tense, which depicts an isolated moment in time without any respect to a process. As such, the sacrifices made by Paul’s Lord were random events, neither promised nor part of a plan. They didn’t even occur on a prescribed schedule – all of which is untrue. In the middle voice, his Lord is being affected by his own actions, which could only be valid if the Lord is Satan, not Yahowsha’. With regard to Yahowsha’s sacrifices, it is Yahowah’s Covenant children who benefited from them. But if Paul’s Lord is Satan, then it is the Adversary who is most favorably affected by this inversion of the truth. And last but not least, by using the subjunctive mood, faith becomes operative, because it presents a mere possibility.

This has been a horrendous beginning, with the rejection of his Hebrew name, the selection of a Roman moniker, the unfounded boast of being named an apostle, denying his rabbinical training and its influence, inverting the order of Yahowsha’s name and the title he errantly

afforded him, not once but twice, then implying that God slept through the most vital aspect of His mission. Pagan Graces are now operative agents in Pauline Doctrine, and Paul has revealed that his god was the Lord. He conveyed that there had been no plan and that God's schedule and timing were irrelevant. Then he protests that his Lord was now plucking us away from something. But from what do you suppose was Paulos' Lord tearing us away?

To answer that question we have to isolate the specific "*aionos* – prolonged circumstance, old system, or era" Paul is labeling "corrupt and worthless" with the adjective "*poneros* – annoying harassment, toilsome labor, burdensome hardships, and bad-natured." And fortunately, our first hint comes from "*enistamai* – the threatening system in which we had been placed" by the inclination of God. With the verb scribed in the completed variation of the past tense where there is a lingering effect, we can be fairly certain that the subject this verb and adjective is addressing with *aionos* is a "previous or old system" under which people, at least according to Paul, were still being adversely influenced. So while the identity of this entity should be obvious, since knowing for certain is vital to our understanding of Sha'awl's intent, please bear with me a while longer as we uncover something which is, well, disturbing.

Aionos can be used to address something which has been present from the beginning. It speaks of prolonged periods of time, even of so many lifetimes that these epochs might seem to last forever. It reflects eons and ages, which is why it is often translated "forever" or "into perpetuity." *Aionos* is used to describe "worldly systems" and "universal circumstances." But not every condition can be conveyed using *aionos* because it is based upon "*aei* – circumstances which are incessant, unremitting, relentless, invariable, and inflexible." This is telling because this is similar to how Sha'awl describes Yahowah's Towrah.

Paul uses *aionos* as if it were synonymous with the “world as it presently exists” in 1 Corinthians 8:13. It is used to mislead people into believing that there is an “order of” Melchisedec in Hebrews 5:6. Then in Ephesians 3:9, Paulos again deploys *aionos* to speak of a mystery which has been hidden by God from the “beginning of the world.”

But it is his selection of *aionos* in Colossians 1:26 which is especially telling. Once again, in association with “*mysterion* – religious secrets which are mysterious, remaining a mystery and not to be understood, confided only to the initiated and not to mere mortals” and also “*apokrypto* – deliberately hidden and concealed by those keeping secrets,” we find *aionos* depicting “past ages,” especially with regard to previous generations.

So let’s turn to that letter and examine what Paulos had to say about the mysterious and hidden *aionos*. This discussion begins with the self-proclaimed apostle arrogantly and erroneously presenting himself as the “co-savior” and “co-author” of his new religion in Colossians 1:24-25:

“**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 misfortunate 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), **and** (*kai* – also) **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’uwl or the afflictions is performing this, and with the indicative mood, the writer is portraying his fulfillment of the sufferings as being actual, and thus real, even though he may not believe it himself)) **that which is deficient and lacking** (*hysterema* – that

which is needed, missing, wanted, and absent from, addressing the deficiencies associated with that which is left to be done due to prior failures and inferior performances) **of the** (*ton*) **afflictions** (*thlipsis* – pressing troubles, anguishing distresses, burdensome tribulations, oppressive pressures, straits, and persecutions) **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, exists 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 and arrangement** (*oikonomia* – the management, task, job, oversight, dispensation, or plan) **of this** (*tou* – the) **god** ($\Theta\Omega$), **the** (*ten*) **appointment having been produced and granted** (*didomi* – one caused, assigned, entrusted, committed, and given for his advantage (in the aorist participle this one time appointment was in antecedent time, in the passive this god was influenced and acted upon, and in the accusative singular this appointment was solely granted)) **to me** (*moi* – to and for myself (in the dative, Sha’uwl is saying that this belongs to him)) **to** (*eis* – for and into) **you all** (*umas*) **to complete and fulfill** (*pleroo* – to fully provide, completely enable, and finish, bringing an end to) **the** (*ton*) **word** (*logon* – statement, speech, and account) **of the** (*tou*) **god** ($\Theta\Omega$).” (Colossians 1:24-25)

In addition to calling himself the “co-savior,” Paulos would have us believe that he is the “co-author” of God’s Word. If we are to believe him, God personally granted

Paulos the authority to complete His testimony and Plan of Salvation. It all sounds a bit Muhammadan, doesn't it? On a one to ten scale of presumptuousness and ego, of intoxicating and deadly deceit, this would be off the scale.

So now after revealing that he is both “co-savior” and “co-author,” God’s means to make up for His own deficiencies, Paulos turns to mythology. His enormous contributions and this marvelous accommodations had been unknown to the Jews, to the descendants of Abraham and the Covenant, because they were blinded by the old system. He writes:

“The mystery and mythology (*to mysterion* – the sacred secrets, used as a technical religious term in the pagan cults of Greece and Rome to depict a secret rite or esoteric knowledge confided only to the initiated and not spoken to mere mortals) **of the one having been hidden and concealed** (*to apokrypto* – the one kept a secret) **from those of (apo) the past age** (*ton aionos* – the old system), **and from (kia apo) their generations** (*genea* – those fathered, the descendants who were related, successive members of the same ethnicity, thus speaking of the offspring of the old system who were Abraham’s descendants, a.k.a., Yahuwdym), **but right now at this exact moment** (*de nyn* – however presently at this time as part of this current discourse) **it is being revealed** (*phaneroo* – it is being disclosed and displayed) **to (tois) his (autou) holy and pure ones** (*hagios* – dedicated, consecrated, sacred, and set-apart saints).” (Colossians 1:26)

Since this has been all about Paul’s contributions, it would be reasonable to assume that he was implying that God wanted him to become known to the world in this way – by Paul’s own hand. But that is not why we turned to the Colossians letter. We were seeking to define *aionos* which, now having been linked to the “*genea* – descendants,” can be none other than the Towrah and its Covenant. In Paul’s

mind, that was the “old system.” It is known today as the “Old Testament” as a result of Paul’s malfeasance.

And speaking of Paul’s state of mind, his affinity with the rabbinical community may be showing. Orthodox Jews view the most devout as “holy and pure ones.”

Returning to Galatians 1:4, as I mentioned before, with “*enistamai* – had been placed in” scribed in the perfect tense, thereby describing something that had been completed in the past but with a legacy influence, we have yet another affirmation that *aionos* was being deployed to depict an “old, or previously existing, system.” And then when these circumstances are presented in context to “*to thelema* – the intent, determination, and decision” of God, the *aionos* is most assuredly the Torah.

That is a problem for a number of reasons. First, Paulos is describing God’s “old system,” His Towrah, saying that it is: “*poneros* – disadvantageous and harmful,” when Yahowah’s perspective on His Towrah is the opposite. Just imagine having the gall to call God’s teaching and guidance “wicked and worthless, evil and faulty, immoral and corrupt, annoying and mischievous, laborious and criminal, unprofitable and useless, unserviceable and malicious, malevolent and malignant.” No. Sorry. Not even remotely. Just the opposite.

Second, Paulos is introducing the myth which would forever haunt Christendom: that of an “Old Testament” being replaced by a “*New Testament*.” And yet God only has one testimony. His message has not changed. Likewise, Yahowah only has one Covenant, and it has yet to be renewed. Yahowah and Yahowsha’ emphatically affirm that the Towrah is forever. Nothing can be added to it or taken away from it. And yet here, it is being discarded as trash – literally as “*poneros* – porn.”

Third, why would anyone in his right mind believe that God authorized someone to be His Apostle so that he could

malign and discredit Him? Associating *poneros* with His system, with His Way, is about as slanderous as words allow.

And fourth, if God's original system was so worthless and immoral, why would anyone suspect that His revision would somehow be worthy? How is it that the Author of such a disadvantageous and harmful scheme could ever be credible? Moreover, if this is God's history, if what He has revealed and promised through His previous prophets is so awful, so counterproductive, why believe this "impostle?" "

And as mind-bendingly atrocious as all of this is, and it is as bad as bad ever gets, there is yet another implication so rotten, so insidious, once I saw it, I had to put my response off for a day just to cool down. Paul is saying that his "*Kurios Iesou Christou*" is "tearing us away from" the Torah. It is the unspoken undercurrent of Christianity.

While Yahowsha' bluntly and boldly declared to all who would listen that he came to fulfill and affirm the Towrah, and that no one should think that he came to discredit or discard it, Paulos is refuting and upending all of this. He is literally turning everything Yahowsha' represents upside down. After demeaning the Word of God, he is tossing it away as if it were "*poneros* – trash."

To believe Paul, Yahowah's entire plan has been torn asunder. Yahowsha's mission is now for naught. The Covenant is meaningless. The Invitations to Meet with God will go unanswered. The Torah is public enemy number one. And yet by writing in a counterfeit of God's name, by claiming God's authorization and sponsorship, Paulos, with the stroke of a pen, has handed billions of unsuspecting souls over to Satan.

We are witnessing the creation of Christianity. Paul's religion would be based upon the lie that the "Lord Jesus Christ came to save us from the evils of the Torah and from its mean and incompetent God." In Christendom, rather

than Yahowsha' being the Passover Lamb saving us by affirming and fulfilling the Torah's promises, the "Lord Jesus Christ" would be "*kata* – in opposition to" the "*thelema*" will and intent" of God, "*exaireo* – ripping us away from" His "*poneros* – disadvantageous and harmful" "*aionos* – Old System."

I am reminded of what Yahowah said of this man some 2,500 years ago:

"Pay attention, he will be puffed up with false pride. His soul, it is not right nor straightforward in him. So, 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. (2:4)

Moreover, because the intoxicating and inebriating spirit of the man of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal is a high-minded moral failure with his meritless presumptions, 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, will never be satisfied. All of the Gentiles will gather together unto him, all of the people from different races and nations in different places. (2:5)

But they do not ask questions, any of them, about him. Terse references to the word they lift up as taunts to ridicule, with implied associations that mock, controlling through comparison and counterfeit, along with allusive sayings with derisive words arrogantly conveyed.

There are hard and perplexing questions which need to be asked of him, and duplicitous dealings to be known regarding him. So they should say, 'Woe to the

one who claims to be great so as to increase his offspring, acting like a rabbi, when neither apply to him. For how long will they make pledges based upon his significance, becoming burdened by his testimony?” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:6)

While it is a painful reminder, in his opening line, Paulos actually wrote:

“...the one having produced and given himself on account of the sins and errors of us, so that somehow, through indefinite means, he might possibly gouge or tear out, pluck and uproot us from the past circumstances and old system which had been in place which is disadvantageous and harmful, corrupt and worthless, malicious and malignant, and in opposition to the desire and will, the inclination and intent, of God and Father of us...” (Galatians 1:4)

Reflecting some, but not all of this, the *McReynolds* translators, who provided the *Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear*, opted to ignore the caustic and confrontational nature of Paulos' greeting when they offered: **“the one having given himself on behalf of the sins of us so that he might pick out us from the age the present evil by the want of the God and father of us.”** And not surprisingly, the dark side of the message laden within the Greek text was also ignored in the version of Galatians 1:4 found in the KJV: **“Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father,”** Other than **“present wicked age,”** the *Vulgate* is identical.

The NLT, however, decided to be more creative: **“Jesus gave his life for our sins, just as God our Father planned, in order to rescue us from this evil world in which we live.”** While the inclusion of a subject is required, **“Jesus”** name isn't part of this clause. Further, arbitrarily

adding a subject to the clause artificially elevates the writing quality, giving the false impression that this could have been inspired by a rational being. Furthermore, there is no basis for “his life” in the Greek text.

The first run-on sentence within the most wretched document ever penned began with these words...

“Paulos (*Paulos*), an apostle (*apostolos*), not (*ouk*) from (*apo*) men (*anthropon*), not even (*oude*) by the means of (*dia*) man (*anthropou*), but to the contrary (*alla*) on behalf of (*dia*) Iesou Christou (INY XPY) and (*kai*) *Theos* | God (ΘY), *Patera* | Father (ΠPA) of the (*tou*) one having roused and awakened (*egeiromai*) him (*autos*) out of (*ek*) a lifeless corpse (*nekros*), (Galatians 1:1) and (*kai*) all (*pas*) the (*oi*) brothers (*adelphos*) with (*sym*) me (*emoi*) to the (*tais*) called out (*ekklesia*) of the (*tes*) Galatias (*Galatias*), (Galatians 1:2) *Charis* | Grace (*charis*) to you (*humeis*) and (*kai*) peace (*eirene*) from (*apo*) *Theos* | God (ΘY), Father (*pater*) of us (*emon*) and (*kai*) *Kurios* | Lord (KY), Iesou (IHY) Christou (XPY), (Galatians 1:3) the one (*tou*) having given (*didomi*) himself (*heautou*) on account of (*peri*) the (*ton*) sins (*hamartia*) of us (*emon*), so that (*hopos*) he might possibly gouge or tear out (*exaireo*) us (*emas*) from (*ek*) the (*tou*) past inflexible and unrelenting circumstances of the old system (*aionos*) which (*tou*) had been in place (*enistamai*) which is disadvantageous and harmful trash, indeed pornography (*poneros*) in opposition to (*kata*) the desire and will (*to thelema*) of the (*tou*) *Theos* | God (ΘY) and (*kai*) *Paters* | Father (ΠPΣ) of us (*ego*),...” (Galatians 1:4)

If you believe that this man was speaking for the God he was excoriating, please give this book to someone else.

✠✠✠✠

Questioning Paul
V1: Liars Lie
...*Contradicting God*

6

Thanatoo Nomo / Killing the Torah

Really?...

Although the words Paulos selected, taken on their own merits, provide convincing proof that the scheme he was proposing was nefarious, since the accusation that I have leveled against him, if true, would make him the most revolting man in human history, I would like to share something germane from this same man's sixth letter, the one he wrote to the Romans.

This particular discussion begins in clever fashion, albeit in an arrogant and condescending manner. It deploys the logical fallacy known as the straw man. Before I share it, it is important that you know that the Towrah provides very few instructions regarding marriage. It reveals that men and women become one in marriage and that adultery is highly inadvisable – not in the sense of having more than one wife, but instead, God does not want us to be unreliable. It speaks against incest, homosexuality, and bestiality.

There is some guidance regarding a woman's menstrual period and on showing compassion to enslaved women. And as for divorce, it is as simple as having the man hand his estranged wife a certificate and asking her to leave. The lone rule regarding divorce says that if the woman remarries and divorces again, the first husband cannot have her back. Beyond this, there is a non-binding recommendation on how a man can assist his brother's

widow in the case of a childless marriage.

Against this backdrop, *Sha'uwl* | Paul opined...

“Or alternatively (*e*), are you presently ignorant (*agnoeo*) brothers (*adelphos*)? Knowing and understanding (*ginosko*) then (*gar*) the Torah (*nomon*), I say (*laleo*) that (*hoti*) the Torah (*nomos*) is like a lord and master, ruling over (*kyrieuo*) the man (*anthropos*) for (*epi*) however long and to whatever degree that (*hosos chronos*) he lives (*zao*).” (Romans 7:1)

The Romans were hardly ignorant, but since they knew very little about the Torah, they were susceptible to what may be one of the most twisted and disingenuous arguments ever perpetrated. Here, Paul is claiming that he is an expert on the Torah, telling the Romans that he “knows and understands it.” But rather than revealing what it actually says, Paul speaks of the Torah being akin to a “Lord and Master.”

His straw man, however, bears no correlation with the truth. There is no correlation between Yahowah’s *Towrah* | Teaching and Guidance and the mannerisms of Satan, who is the Lord. Moreover, the *Towrah* emancipates the Children of the Covenant from slavery, from being oppressed by human religious and political institutions. And as a liberating document from our Heavenly Father, it does not function as a “lord.” Therefore, Paul’s premise is invalid. Any conclusion drawn from a false premise is worthless. Had this been a debate, Paul has already lost.

Undaunted by the truth, *Sha'uwl* | Paul continued to reveal why Yahowah called him “the Plague of Death.”

“To explain (*gar*), under the male (*huphadros* – subject to a man’s authority), a woman (*gyne*) to (*to*) a living (*zao*) man (*andri*) is bound, restricted and imprisoned (*deo* – tied, compelled, and forced, under his authority) in the Torah (*nomo*).

But (de) if (ean) the man (o aner) should die (apothnesko), it provides release (katageomai – it makes inoperative, it abolishes and invalidates this, discharging her) from (apo) the Torah (tou nomou) of the (tou) man (andros).” (7:2)

Ironically, it is Paul’s letters which subject women to men. The Torah says no such thing. So this, the preamble of Paul’s argument, is not only untrue, he knows that it is invalid. Therefore, Paul was lying through his teeth when he set up this argument to explain how he claims we have been released from the “old written system” “of the Torah.” But by considering his overture, we are witnessing just how devious and convoluted a misguided man’s arguments can be.

“As a result then (ara), accordingly (oun) with the man living (zao tou andros), an adulteress (moichalis) she will be considered (chrematizo – based upon what God makes known and instructed) if (ean) she may come to be (ginomai) with another man (heteros andri).

But (de) if (ean) the man (o aner) might die (apothnesko), she is (estin) free (eleutheros – no longer a slave) from (apo) the Torah (tou nomou), her (auten) not being (me einai) an adulteress (moichalis) by being with (ginomai) another (etero) man (andri).” (7:3)

Here again, after mischaracterizing the Torah, Paul is negating reason. The woman’s relationship to the Torah is unchanged by her husband’s death. If I were to die, for example, while my wife would be free of me, she would not be released from the American judicial system. The Constitution of the United States is unaltered by my demise, as would be my widow’s rights under it.

The only reason that the widow would not be considered an adulteress for being with another man is that she is no longer married. Her changed status is irrespective of the Torah. Paul is being illogical.

He is also pandering to the Romans...

“So as a result (*hoste*), brothers (*adelphos*) of mine (*mou*), also (*kai*) you all (*umeis*) were put to death (*thanatoo* – you were all executed, made to die and deprived of life, even exterminated, ceasing to exist) in the (*to*) Torah (*nomo*) by way of (*dia* – through) the body (*tou soma* – the physical being) of the (*tou*) Christou (XPY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement) into (*eis*) you all (*umas*) become (*ginomai*) of another (*etero*), to the (*to*) dead (*nekros*) having been awakened and arising (*egeiromai* – being aroused and raised to life) in order to (*hina*) bear fruit (*karpophoreo*) of the (*to*) God (Θ'Ω – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God).” (7:4)

This is a leap out of irrational ignorance into mind-numbing stupidity. There is no correlation between the widow's husband dying and the Romans being put to death. And while Romans murdered hundreds of thousands of Torah-observant Jews, very few Romans were killed because of the Torah – and none in Paul's audience. Yahowsha's body, serving as the Passover Lamb, upheld and affirmed the Towrah so that we might live. Therefore, to suggest that the fulfillment of Passover equates to the death of the Torah is a non sequitur.

“For (*gar*) when (*ote*) we were (*emen*) in (*en*) the (*te*) flesh (*sarx*), the suffering and misfortune (*pathema* – the evil afflictions and uncontrollable impulses and sexual desires) of being evil, offensive, and errant (*hamartia* – of being misled and of being sinful, doing wrong) was a result of (*dia* – by, through, and on account of) the (*tou*) Torah (*nomou*) operating and functioning (*energeo* – bringing about and producing) in (*en*) our (*emon*) bodies (*melos* – members) to (*eis*) bear the fruit (*karpophoreo*) of (*to*) death (*thanatos* – the plague, pestilence, and pandemic disease associated with dying and punishment).” (7:5)

Paul equates Yahowah's *Towrah* | Teaching and Guidance to the "flesh" because he was overtly opposed to the sign of the Covenant which is circumcision. In addition, Sha'uwl was also appealing to the Roman affinity for all things Greek, especially Gnosticism, whereby the flesh is seen as inferior (unless it is Greek).

So by the "flesh," Paul means "evil" – something he admits by calling the Torah a source of "*pathema* – suffering, misfortune, and evil afflictions." He even goes so far as to say that as a result of the Torah, "*hamartia* – that which is evil, offensive, and errant" is brought about in us. In other words, according to Paul: the Torah is the source of all evil.

Forgetting for a moment that the opposite is true, where is the logic which connects the death of a woman's husband to this absurd mischaracterization of Yahowah's Torah? And how is it that God's teaching regarding what is good and bad, suddenly becomes the source for bringing about that which is bad? That is like saying that a documentary film on the hazards of using illicit drugs is responsible for drug abuse.

Moreover, if you think being Towrahless makes a person good, you might want to look around and check out the current state of man.

Lastly, since Yahowsha's body, representing the Passover Lamb, opened the doorway to life, something which was affirmed and celebrated during Firstborn Children, it ought not be equated with death.

"But (*de*) now at the present time (*nyni* – at this very moment), we have been released and removed from (*katageomai apo* – we have made inoperative, abolished, and invalidated, having been discharged from the uselessness of) the Torah (*tou nomou*), having died (*apothnesko*) in (*en*) that which (*o*) inappropriately hindered and restrained us, holding us down (*katecho* –

possessed and controlled us, holding us back) **in order to** (*hoste* – for the purpose and so as to) **enslave us** (*douleuo emas* – subjecting us to servitude, slavery, and forced obedience), **to** (*en* – in or with) **different and completely new** (*kainotes* – extraordinarily recent, unused, unprecedented, uncommon, and unheard) **of spirit** (*pneuma*) **and not** (*kai ou*) **the old, inferior, obsolete, and former age and way of** (*palaiotes* – the antiquated and arcane system, the ancient and worn out state of affairs of) **that which was written** (*gramma* – the written document).” (7:6)

This is so incongruous it staggers the mind to realize that billions of souls have been beguiled by Paul’s rubbish. There is absolutely no connection between the death of a woman’s husband and her being released from the Torah. And there is no correlation between that hypothetical death and either the Torah dying or us being released from it.

I would be surprised if there was a single individual in Paul’s audience who had chosen to be bound to the Torah, which means he could not be released from it – nor would he want to be. The choice to accept or reject the Torah, and its promises and provisions, is ours alone. Yahowah does not impose His Teaching and Guidance, or its benefits derived from it, upon us.

According to God, His Torah liberates us, freeing us from slavery, from death, and from judgment. But not according to Paul. His garbled and concocted version of the Torah hinders and enslaves.

Paul’s answer is to reject the “*palaiotes gramma* – the old and obsolete way which was written” with a “*kainotes pneuma* – a completely different and recent spirit.” But at least now we have come face to face with Paul admitting that my interpretation of his opening statement in Galatians was correct. The “Old System” that he was calling “*poneros* – corrupt and harmful” was none other than the

Torah.

Based upon his incessant use of Torah in this argument, we are left with no other viable alternative. Moreover, for those who would claim that Paul was assailing the Oral Law of the rabbis, the *Talmud*, think again. Paul's enemy was the "*gramma* – written" "*nomos* – Torah." And let's never lose sight of the fact that, in Galatians 3:10, a statement we considered in a previous chapter, Paul, himself, translates the Hebrew word "*towrah*" using the Greek term "*nomou*."

Of course, by calling the Torah a "*palaiotes* – an old, inferior, obsolete, antiquated, and arcane system of a previous age," Paul is once again projecting a message which is in complete and irreconcilable conflict with Yahowsha's testimony regarding Yahowah's Towrah. One is not speaking for the other. Sha'uwl is contradicting Yahowsha' on behalf of a "*kainotes pneuma* – a completely different and recent, unprecedented and unheard of spirit." And that means that the spirit Paul is advocating cannot be Yahowah's Spirit, the "*Ruwach Qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit" of the Towrah.

Therefore, what spirit do you suppose Paul is advocating? Do you know of a spirit adversarial to Yahowah who is also opposed to His Towrah? I know of him and I suspect you do as well. So all I can say is that I'm glad to have this wicked man and his demonic spirit out of my life. Christians, you can have them.

As ignorant and irrational as this argument has been thus far, it is about to get ludicrous – ridiculous to the point of comical.

“What (*ti*), therefore (*oun*), shall we say (*eroumen*)? The Torah (*o nomos*) is misleading, errant, and offensive (*hamartia* – is evil, sinful, and wrong)? If only it were not so (*me ginomai* – may it not be or I wish it was not true (in the aorist, this state exists without regard to any

process or plan, in the middle voice the subject, which would be Paul as the speaker, is acting on his own initiative, and with the optative mood, the implied subject is conveying his personal wishes and desires regarding a mere possibility)).

Nevertheless (*alla* – but however, making an emphatic and certain contrast), **I would not have actually known** (*ouk ginosko* – I would not be familiar with or recognize (aorist active indicative)) **that which is evil, sinful, and wrong** (*hamartia* – that which is misleading, errant, and offensive) **if not** (*ei me*) **through** (*dia* – by) **the Torah** (*nomou*).

For (*gar* – because) **also** (*te* – in addition to this), **lust and craving** (*epithymia* – strong impulses and desires), **I would not have been aware of** (*ouk oida* – I would not have been able to recognize (pluperfect active indicative)) **if not** (*ei me*) **for the** (*o*) **Torah** (*nomou*) **saying** (*lego*), **‘You will not have strong desires** (*ouk epithymeo* – you will not long, lust, or crave, you will not be sexually perverted or licentious (future active indicative)).” (7:7)

If this had not beguiled billions of souls, tearing them away from Yahowah and handing them over to worship Satan, I would be laughing, not vomiting. How is it that a notion so absurd became the foundation of a religion that influences so many?

Since Yahowah is the author of the Towrah, Paul is saying that God and His testimony are “*hamartia* – misleading, errant, and offensive.” And yet at the same time, he wants you to believe that this same God is not only speaking through him, but that He has authorized him to vilify Him. Beyond this, he wants us to believe what he has to say about the God who has deliberately misled everyone thus far. It is little wonder faith and religion are synonymous. This is }*@#)\$%^^{! | Bull Excrement!

The God Paul claims enslaved and killed everyone,

now under Paul's stewardship, is suddenly transformed as a new and different spirit providing freedom and life. And the means to Pauline salvation is by disassociating everyone from God's foundational thesis. Moreover, the book which discourages us from going astray and being evil is actually the source of evil. *Really?*

The basis of his argument is as follows: 1) you are ignorant, 2) Paul is brilliant, 3) he says the Torah acts like a Lord, 3) women are under men, 4) the Torah binds, restricts, and imprisons women to men, 5) when a man dies a woman is released from the inoperative Torah, 6) as a result, the woman is no longer an adulteress, 7) when the widow goes to be with another man she is no longer a slave to the Torah, 8) as a result, you were put to death by the Torah, 9) the body of Christou caused you and the Torah to die, 10) you came to another by dying, 11) by being awakened you bear the fruit of Paul's god, 12) for then in the flesh you suffer evil afflictions and uncontrollable urges, 13) you are evil, offensive and wrong because the Torah is operating within you producing the fruit of death, 14) but now, you have been released from the invalidated Torah, 15) so you have died, 16) you were inappropriately hindered and held down by the Torah, 17) so the Torah's purpose was to enslave you, 18) but you have been released into the care of a different and completely new spirit, 19) such that you have been freed from the old, obsolete, and inferior way which was written in the Torah, 20) therefore, we should say that the Torah is misleading, evil, and wrong, 21) even though we don't want to say this, 22) nonetheless, Paul would not have known that he was evil if it had not been for the Torah, 23) so therefore, the Torah is responsible for Paul's lustful cravings, coveting, and sexual perversions, 24) it also killed him, but he is not dead. *Got it?*

On what planet does any of this make sense? I do not suppose that with such sublime rhetoric anyone is going to

confuse Paul with Plato anytime soon.

“But now (*de*) the opportunity, excuse, and pretext (*aphorme* – the basis and starting point of the favorable environment and the opportune circumstance) to grasp hold of and experience (*lambano* – to select and be exploited by) that which is evil, sinful, and wrong (*hamartia* – that which is misleading, errant, and offensive) through (*dia*) the commandment (*entole* – the regulation) it was brought about thoroughly (*katergazomai* – it was performed, effected, committed, accomplished, and worked) in (*en*) me (*emoi*), including every and all (*pasan*) deep desire and longing (*epithymia* – lust and craving, uncontrollable urges, sexual perversion, and licentiousness).

For indeed (*gar* – because certainly), without (*choris* – apart from, by itself, or separately from) the Torah (*nomou*), that which is misleading, errant, and offensive (*hamartia* – that which is evil, sinful, and wrong, even guilt and the consequence of sin) is dead and no longer an issue (*nekros* – is lifeless and has departed, and thus is useless, futile, ineffective, and powerless).” (7:8)

Beyond the fact that there are no “Commandments,” but instead “Three Statements and Seven Instructions,” not one of them says: “You will not lust, crave, desire, long, or have uncontrollable urges.” There is none which speaks of restraining a person’s capacity to engage in “sexual perversions” or “licentiousness,” either. Apart from the fact that passion and promiscuity are not addressed, not one of the Ten Statements was written in the future tense. They were scribed in the imperfect conjugation, which speaks of ongoing and habitual behavior without reference to time. Additionally, reasonable people realize that a document which discourages harmful behaviors, does not facilitate them.

Also relevant, adultery, murder, lying, and stealing

don't go away by discarding the book which opposes these things. If anything, if everyone ignored the Torah, there would be more adverse behavior, not less. Moral individuals the world over have always known that adultery, murder, lying, and stealing are wrong.

However, since Paul has been fixated on his lustful urges, since he never married, and since the only person he admits to actually loving was a young man named Timothy, it's hard to ignore the possibility that he was a homosexual, especially now that he has said that his sexual urges were not only uncontrollable, but that he was motivated to do what the Torah disapproves. So I suspect that we are witnessing yet another confession. And as usual, rather than blaming himself for his licentiousness, Paul is blaming God. He is inferring that God made him a pervert.

As an interesting aside, Yahowah does not condemn homosexuality in His Towrah – only incest, pedophilia, rape, and bestiality. As we will discover in future books, the passages which infer otherwise are errantly translated. That is not to say that many homosexuals are not tormented by their sexual orientation and the effect it has on their lives and family. They are, as was Paul.

Speaking of Paul's obvious sexual conflict, a few chapters hence we will discover that through His prophetic warning against Sha'awl, Yahowah exposed Paul's fascination with male genitalia. It is almost as if God read Paul's letters before commenting upon them – and that He came to the same conclusion.

Mind you, so long as he was not a rapist, incestuous, or a pedophile, as was the case with Muhammad, Sha'awl's sexual orientation is irrelevant up to a point. It becomes fair game, however, when he denounces what he, himself, practices, whether that be homosexuality or promiscuity. Beyond this, since Paul is fast becoming a

model for the man known as the “Antichrist,” it is relevant to note that he, too, will be gay.

And on the subject of gaiety, what are we to make of the connection between Paul’s uncontrollable lusts and the Charities, known as the Gratia or Graces in Rome? After all, these naked beauties were the pagan embodiment of lasciviousness.

The indulgent and unrestrained one’s fixation on death continues, along with his animosity toward God’s Towrah...

“**So then** (*de* – therefore) **I** (*ego*) **was living** (*zao* – was alive) **apart from and without** (*choris* – disassociated from and independent of, separated from and devoid of any relationship with) **the Torah** (*nomou*). **But** (*de*) **once** (*pote* – at the point that) **having happened upon** (*erchomai* – come to) **the commandment** (*tes entole* – the regulation, injunction, and prescribed precept), **the evil sin** (*hamartia* – errant wrongdoing, being misleading and offensive) **sprung to life again** (*anazao* – became alive again, was revived, started anew, functioning and operating once more). (7:9)

They say that confession is good for the soul. But methinks this isn’t helping. Paul has again admitted that “evil and sin are all thriving within him, having sprung to life.” He is “operationally offensive and functionally errant.”

Now if we are to believe Paul, a mythical commandment, saying, “Thou wilt not be passionate, indulgent, lustful, or sexually perverted,” killed him.

“**So then** (*de* – therefore), **I** (*ego*) **died** (*apothnesko* – ceased to exist) **when** (*kai*) **was found** (*heuriskomai* – was discovered and experienced) **in me** (*moi*) **the commandment** (*e entole* – the regulation, injunction, and prescribed precept) **with reference to** (*e eis*) **living** (*zoe* –

how to live life), **this** (*aute*) **brought** (*eis*) **death** (*thanatos*). (7:10)

If only.

“**For indeed** (*gar*), **this evil sin** (*e hamartia* – this means to be mistaken and to mislead, this offensive wrongdoing, this moral consequence, and the guilt) **took hold of this opportunity** (*aphorme lambano* – ceased this pretext to grab hold of and exploit) **through** (*dia* – on account of) **the commandment** (*e entole* – the regulation, injunction, and prescribed precept) **to thoroughly deceive and completely beguile me** (*exapatao me* – to systematically entice and utterly delude me, unscrupulously and methodically cheating me), **and so** (*kai*) **through it** (*dia autes*), **it killed** (*apoktenno* – deprived me of life). (7:11)

Then proving that he was wholly beguiling and completely delusional, the unscrupulous and illogical one, after systematically attacking the enslaving and murderous Torah and its evil and deadly commandment, wrote...

“**So as a result** (*hoste*) **this** (*o*) **affirms** (*men* – shows and reveals) **the Torah** (*nomos*) **is holy** (*hagios* – sacred, dedicated, and consecrated) **and also** (*kai*) **the commandment** (*e entole* – the regulation, injunction, and prescribed precept) **is worthy of veneration** (*hagion* – sacred, holy, and sincere), **also** (*kai*) **good** (*agathos* – valuable and generous).” (Romans 7:1-12)

If nothing else, by praising what he has invested the previous 11 statements destroying, the religious can now assert with reckless abandon that Paul actually supports the Towrah. If that is not enough to make your head spin and stomach queasy, Paul, after contradicting God, is now contradicting himself.

Sadly, this all reminds me of the *Qur'an* where, after Allah tells us that there should be no compulsion in

religion, he orders Muslims to kill all non-Muslims in addition to any Muslim who rejects the Islamic religion.

But perhaps even in the swirling tornadic winds of circular reasoning, there is an explanation for Paul's conclusion, whereby he negated his own ridiculous rant. Maybe it was good from his perspective that the Torah killed him. That way he could present himself rising from the dead to serve as mankind's savior, especially now that the Torah had schooled him in all manner of unscrupulous methods and beguiling deceit. And of the latter, he was now lord and master.

There has always been an unspoken and ignoble aspect of Christianity that Romans 7 seems to foster. The old god, the god of the old system, died, which is why his witness was relegated to an Old Testament and why his words are no longer considered relevant. Laying the foundation for this myth, Paul has the husband, which is a metaphor Yahowah applies to Himself in relation to both Yisra'el and the Covenant, dying. This thereby frees believers from the deceased deity and his arcane methods. Christians will of course deny that their religion killed God, but there is no denying that they treat Him as if He were dead. From the Christian perspective, Yahowah was replaced by "Jesus Christ." And in the process, a real and rewarding relationship with God devolved into swimming in the cesspool of one man's perverted imagination.



Returning to Paul's initial diatribe, when last we were in Galatians, we found:

“Paulos (*Paulos*), an apostle (*apostolos*), not (*ouk*) from (*apo*) men (*anthropon*), not even (*oude*) by the means of (*dia*) man (*anthropou*), but to the contrary

(*alla*) on behalf of (*dia*) Iesou Christou (INY XPY) and (*kai*) *Theos* | God (ΘY), *Patera* | Father (ΠPA) of the (*tou*) one having roused and awakened (*egeiromai*) him (*autos*) out of (*ek*) a lifeless corpse (*nekros*), (Galatians 1:1) and (*kai*) all (*pas*) the (*oi*) brothers (*adelphos*) with (*sym*) me (*emoi*) to the (*tais*) called out (*ekklesia*) of the (*tes*) Galatias (*Galatias*), (Galatians 1:2) Grace (*charis*) to you (*humeis*) and (*kai*) peace (*eirene*) from (*apo*) *Theos* | God (ΘY), Father (*pater*) of us (*emon*) and (*kai*) *Kurios* | Lord (KY), Iesou (IHY) Christou (XPY), (Galatians 1:3) the one (*tou*) having given (*didomi*) himself (*heautou*) on account of (*peri*) the (*ton*) sins (*hamartia*) of us (*emon*), so that (*hopos*) he might possibly gouge or tear out (*exaireo*) us (*emas*) from (*ek*) the (*tou*) past inflexible and unrelenting circumstances of the old system (*aionos*) which (*tou*) had been in place (*enistamai*) which is disadvantageous and harmful trash, indeed pornography (*poneros*) in opposition to (*kata*) the desire and will (*to thelema*) of the (*tou*) *Theos* | God (ΘY) and (*kai*) *Paters* | Father (ΠPΣ) of us (*ego*),...” (Galatians 1:4)

Sha’uwl’s long and deeply troubling initial sentence concludes with the following clause:

“...to whom (*o*) the assessment of the brilliant **splendor** (*e doxa* – the opinion regarding the glorious radiance, the view or perspective on the appearance of the shining light, the estimation of amazing greatness, and as a characterization of a manifestation of god’s reputation, glorified and dignified) **by means of** (*eis* – to, on behalf of, and with reference to) **the old and the new systems** (*tous aionas ton aionon* – the past and present circumstances), **Amen, let it be so** (*amane* – verily and surely, this is indeed as it ought to be, also Amen, the name of the Egyptian sun god).” (Galatians 1:5)

This time with *aionos*, without a verb in sight, and now in the plural form, *tous aionas ton aionon* becomes “the old and the new systems.” We are witnessing the birth of the

“Old” and “*New Testaments*.”

It should be noted that Paul, in his second of three conflicting accounts on what he saw and heard on the road to Damascus, in Acts 22:11, used *doxa*, which was translated here as an “assessment of the brilliant splendor.” But since by comparing Acts 26:14 with 2 Corinthians 12:7 in a previous chapter, we know that the encounter was with Satan, we are compelled to consider *doxa*’s | glorified and dignified association with the Adversary.

Searching *Strong’s Lexicon* we learn that its primary connotation is “to express an opinion, to present one’s own view or estimate regarding someone or something.” It is from *dokeo*, meaning “to be of the opinion and to repute,” thereby saying: “it seems and is pleasing to me to question and to suppose.” The *Complete Word Study Dictionary* concurs, writing that *doxa* is “to think or suppose, to be of the opinion that something is so.”

It is, therefore, Paulos’ assessment that Satan is Lord. He sees him as brilliant, radiant, and beautiful. It is how the Adversary sees himself, so that is reassuring and convenient. While it is their self-assessment, and they would be wrong, it is instructive for us to be aware of it.

They were now a team, with one goading the other. The Master had his Apostle place him on the pedestal he craved. The Lord, in Paulos’ estimation was a manifestation of *Theos* | God. He was glorious. And it would be by transitioning from the Old System to the New System that Sha’uwl’s Lord would be empowered. He even concluded his opening statement with the name of the god of Egypt, Amen, saying: “Let it be so....”

Sha’uwl has undermined Yahowsha’ while equating His Lord, Satan, to a “messenger of light.” He would say the same thing of Satan in 2 Corinthians 11:14. Even his depictions of the “flashing light” he experienced on the road to Damascus, as chronicled in Acts 9, 22, and 26, are

identical to Yahowsha's depiction of Satan's fall from heaven as recorded in Luke 10:18-19 – passages which we will analyze and compare in due time.

The Greek word *amane* is a transliteration of the Hebrew *'aman*, meaning “trustworthy and reliable.” Capitalized as “Amen,” it becomes a transliteration of the name of the Egyptian sun god: Amen Ra. And as such, Amen is the name of the god to whom Christians pray when they say, “in god's name we pray, Amen.” So, based upon its position at the end of this clause, and its reemergence in Sha'awl's signoff at the end of this letter, there would be no justification for translating the meaning of the word, strongly suggesting that the inappropriate transliteration was intended.

It is interesting in this regard to note that among many of the obelisks around Rome, including one now at the center of the Vatican, their bases are inscribed with testimonials to the sun. In fact, one in front of St. John's Basilica still has the inscription “The Name of our God is Amen.” Such obelisks were then sanctified by Christian clerics and became church steeples replete with crosses.

Bringing this to a conclusion, the opening sentence of Paulos' first letter concludes as follows according to the *Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear*: “to whom the splendor into the ages of the ages amen.” And so as we probe the *King James* and *Vulgate*, it appears obvious that they wanted us to believe that the Egyptian sun god, Amen Ra, was eternal and glorious. The KJV reads: “To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.” The LV says: “To him is glory forever and ever. Amen.”

But they were not alone. The NLT conveys the same message: “All glory to God forever and ever! Amen.” The only difference between them is that the NLT arbitrarily added “God,” and thereby associated this title with “Amen.”

It didn't take Paulos very long to reveal whose side he was on. This was not an auspicious beginning.



What follows affirms that Paul's preaching had failed. The moment he had left town, the Galatians ignored what he had told them. Accentuating the problem, this is just the second sentence of his first letter.

“I marvel (*thaumazo* – I am amazed and astonished, wondering and surprised) **that** (*hoti* – namely) **in this way** (*houto* – in this manner) **quickly** (*tacheos* – suddenly in haste) **you change, desert, and depart, becoming disloyal apostates** (*metatithemai* – you are waylaid, abandoning your loyalty, you are transposed, transferred to another, becoming traitors (in the present tense this is the current condition, in the middle voice they have done this to themselves under their own volition, and in the indicative mood the writer is revealing that this was actually occurring)) **away from** (*apo*) **your** (*sou*) **calling in the name of** (*kaleo en* – summons in reference to the name) **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) **to** (*eis*) **a different** (*heteros* – another) **healing message and beneficial messenger** (*euangelion* – a compound of *eu* meaning beneficial, healing, and prosperous and *aggelos*, which is messenger and sometimes message),...” (Galatians 1:6)

It is hard to imagine this getting worse, but that may be the case. There are five serious problems associated with the opening portion of Paulos' second sentence.

First, God's spokesmen know, they do not “wonder.” God's prophets are aware of what is going to happen, they

are not “surprised.”

Second, the benefits of Yahowah’s teaching and guidance endure. Those exposed to His Towrah, those who understand the benefits of His Covenant, those who act upon Yahowah’s guidance do not go astray. They are transformed by His Instructions, and not for a moment, but forever.

Third, by selecting *metatithemai*, Paulos is speaking of a mutiny. He is criticizing the Galatians because they have all turned on him. This has become personal. The Galatians’ disdain was being directed at Paulos, himself. And because he saw himself as the founder of a new religion, he considered these traitors to be apostates.

Fourth, following *kaleo*, Paulos has now affirmed that he was using *Charis* as a name. And while these girls were alluring, they were mythological. God does not call us to false gods, even when they are cute.

And fifth, by saying that the Galatians had embraced a “different” healing message and messenger, what are we to make of Paul and his competition? Was he fighting against Yahowsha’, and was his foe the Torah?

Having studied Sha’uwl’s initial letters, I have come to the conclusion that he never provided his audience with a sufficient number of appropriate Towrah references for them to understand God’s plan of salvation. His style was to issue a wide range of unsupported opinions under the banner: “But I say....” So rather than deliver the information they would need to know Yahowah, and the reasons to trust Him, Sha’uwl asked the faithful “to believe him.” He even encouraged them to “imitate” him.

The other reason that Paul had so much trouble with his first three assemblies, the Galatians, Thessalonians, and Corinthians, is that his message was so radically different from Yahowah’s, Yahowsha’s, and the disciples. And

since the overwhelming preponderance of the first people to capitalize upon God's teaching were Yahuw'dym (more commonly known as Jews), they not only knew the Towrah, they had come to recognize Yahowsha' through the Towrah. And they realized that Sha'awl lacked the authorization to annul any part of it.

So it became an issue of credibility. They could trust Yahowah or believe Paul. And initially, based upon the evidence contained in the five epistles to the Galatians, Thessalonians, and Corinthians, the people who actually met with Paul, who listened to his preaching, overwhelmingly chose God over Paulos. In fact, considering Paul's desperate admission to Timothy, for a while all of Asia rejected Paul: **"You know this, that all those in Asia have turned away from me..."** (2 Timothy 1:15). What did they recognize that Christians are ignoring today?

Galatians 1:6 is enlightening in this regard. It states that there were two competing "*euangelion* – healing messengers and beneficial messages." Obviously, the messenger and message he was touting was himself and his preaching. And as we make our way through his initial letter, we will come to realize that he was not being received very well. But then who was or were his competitors?

Our options are Yahowah and His Towrah, Yahowsha' and that same Towrah, or one or more of the disciples, namely *Shim'own Kephaz* | Peter, *Yahowchanaan* | John, or *Ya'aqob* | James, but their message was the same as Yahowah's. And that leaves only one potential competitor: God. Perhaps that is why Paulos spoke of his preference, that of "their calling in the name of Grace," as being superior to being called in Yahowah's name. The *Gratia* were more attractive, at least from Paul's perspective.

One of the reasons our options are so constrained is because the challenger was said to be wielding a different “*euangelion* – healing messenger and beneficial message.” Therefore, Paulos’ foe could be neither Judaism nor Rome. At this place and time, Rome and the Rabbis were beginning a war with one another and were the antithesis of healing or beneficial. Furthermore, in his subsequent letters and in Acts, Paul will speak glowingly about both Judaism and Rome, eliminating them as adversarial candidates. Reinforcing this conclusion, Yahowsha’ denounced Judaism and was convicted and tortured by Rome, so they cannot be considered beneficial or healing from this perspective.

Even though the answer is obvious, the reason that it is not seen as such is because of Paul’s approach. By claiming to speak on behalf of the individual and message he is opposing and against the spirit he is promoting, to discover the truth, a person has to compare God’s testimony to Paul’s. But by disparaging Yahowah’s revelation and by ignoring Yahowsha’s testimony, those who are swayed by Paul are predisposed to discard this evidence against him. So long as the audience remains religious, operating in the realm of faith, Paul’s scheme prevails. To understand who is opposing whom, we have to be willing to examine the evidence and process it judgmentally.

In reality, Paul defined his foe in the first sentence of his first letter. He wrote that we were being plucked away from the counterproductive and laborious Old System, more accurately known as the Towrah. If it were not his enemy, *poneros* would not have been used to demean it. So now in the second sentence, Paulos is distinguishing his approach from God’s. And he is showing his bewilderment and frustration that those he spoke to in Galatia prefer that old God to his new plan.

Had it not been for two clever tricks, the obvious

answer would have become apparent to most everyone centuries ago. The first of these is that, by pretending to speak for God, by pretending to be a brother, Sha'uwl became the wolf in sheep's clothing. He was seen for other than what he was. He was accepted and viewed as being one with them, even while he was devouring them.

It is why Yahowah admonishes us for not questioning Sha'uwl. It is why Sha'uwl changed his name. It is why Yahowsha' warned us, telling us that a wolf in sheep's clothing, a man now named "Paulos – Lowly and Little," would seek to discredit and discard the Towrah.

The second ploy is found in the writing style, which blends circular reasoning and all manner of logical flaws with a myriad of inappropriate word choices. The opening sentence is a prime example. Due diligence is required as is thoughtful consideration to understand why a violent verb was deployed against a pornographic and arcane system. But those who have been conditioned by their political, religious, academic, and media institutions to avoid being judgmental, even critical, read right through Paul's confession and are left wondering.

Also with regard to Galatians 1:6, please note that Sha'uwl did not write "Gospel" at the end of his sentence. *Euangelion*, pronounced "yoo·ang·ghel·ee·on," is a compound of two common Greek words. It is not a name or a title. And if it were a name or title, it should have been transliterated, "Euangelion," which was done in Jerome's Latin *Vulgate*, but not in any modern English translation. For example, in the *King James*, *euangelion* was neither translated nor transliterated, but instead, the Greek word was replaced by the religious term "Gospel."

The *King James* conveys: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel." But here, now for the second time, we cannot blame Jerome for the mistake found in the KJV.

There is no “Gospel” in the Latin *Vulgate*: “I wonder that you have been so quickly transferred, from him who called you into the grace of Christi, over to another *evangelium*.” We can, however, blame Jerome for the inclusion of “Christi,” which is errant on every account. According to P46, the oldest witness to this letter, Paul did not include the misappropriated title in this sentence, neither by placeholder nor by having his amanuensis write it out.

This affirms two things. First, the *King James Version* is a translation of the Latin *Vulgate* not the Greek text – as are most subsequent translations. And second, Paul called his faithful to “*Charis / Gratia / Grace*,” not to the teaching and guidance of Yahowah’s Towrah, which was different in every imaginable way.

The Christian misnomer, “Gospel” was first deployed in *Tyndale* and *Geneva Bibles*, forerunners of the *King James Version*, which itself was published in the early 17th century. It cannot be found in John Wycliffe’s translation, the first made in the English language. Wycliffe used “*euangelie*,” not “Gospel,” in the late 14th century.

Let’s juxtapose the *New Living Translation* against Sha’uwl’s actual words so that you might fully appreciate the liberties they have taken: “I am shocked that you are turning away so soon from God, who called you to himself through the loving mercy of Christ. You are following a different way that pretends to be the Good News...” Compared to the NA: “I marvel that thusly quickly you change from the one having called you in favor of Christ into other good message.” And as a reference, this is literally what Paulos conveyed: “I marvel and am amazed, even astonished, that in this way how quickly and in haste you changed, deserting and becoming disloyal apostates and traitors away from your calling in the name of Charis to a different healing message and beneficial messenger,...” (1:6)

As a result of some religious tampering, whereby *euangelion* was replaced with “Gospel,” Christians now believe that Paul’s preaching was in harmony with the lone eyewitness and three hearsay accounts contained in what have become errantly known as the “Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.” But there are many problems with that theory. First, Sha’uwl never quoted a single line from any of them. He did not even reference them. And second, these accounts were not called “Gospels.”

At the time this letter to the Galatians was written in 50 CE, all of the contemporaneous and credible historical evidence affirms that *Lowy’s* | Levi’s eyewitness account was still in its original Hebrew. And while it was cherished in *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem, it was not widely distributed beyond *Yahuwdah* | Judea due to the fact it was written in Hebrew. So it would have been irrelevant to Sha’uwl.

Moving on to Mark, Eusebius wrote: “Markus, who had been Peter’s interpreter, wrote down carefully...all that he remembered of Yahowsha’s sayings and doings. For he had not heard Yahowsha’ or been one of his followers, but later, he was one of Peter’s followers.” I do not think that this is true. The only time Mark is mentioned, he is part of Paul’s posse.

Origen, Tertullian, and Clement concurred, writing at the end of the 2nd century that “Mark compiled his account from Peter’s speeches in Rome.” If so, Galatians predates Mark by a decade. Therefore, a connection between Mark’s hearsay account cannot be made. Also, we must be careful. While the historical evidence suggests that Markus compiled the book attributed to him in Rome, there is no credible evidence that suggests that his primary source, Shim’own, was ever in Rome. And that is the other reason I attribute Mark to Paul’s influence, as he famously died miserable and alone in Rome.

Lucas was yet unknown to Paulos and to Yahowsha’s

disciples at the time Galatians was scribed. Therefore, his hearsay portrayal in favor of Paul had not been written, making any association between it and Paulos' use of *euangelion* at this time in Galatians 1:6 ill-advised.

Based upon the enormous popularity of Yahowchanan's eyewitness account, as evidenced by the sheer quantity of extant pre-Constantine manuscripts, had his portrayal of Yahowsha's life been circulated by this time, Paul would have been compelled to reference it. But he did not. Not in this letter, and not in any of his subsequent letters. In all likelihood, it had not yet been composed.

So we know for certain that Paulos was not writing on behalf of nor promoting the portrayals and myth pursuant to Yahowsha's life found in Matthew, Markus, Lucas, or Yahowchanan. At the time the Galatians letter was written, Divine Writ was comprised solely of the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. It still is. Every statement Yahowsha' made affirms this reality, as do the disciples in their portrayals of his life.

Should you be wondering why in his subsequent letters Paulos never so much as even refers to the existence of a biographical portrayal of Yahowsha's life, the answer is twofold. First, his message was the antithesis of that which can be derived from Yahowsha's words and deeds. The caricature of "the Lord Iesou Christou" painted by Paulos differs so substantially in identity, nature, style, and substance from the actual Yahowsha' that they have precious little in common.

And second, Paul's ego got in the way. He was in competition with him and them. After all, he wanted us to believe that he was both "co-savior" and "co-author," the chosen one completing what God, Himself, could not accomplish without his assistance. Someone of his status would never cite a lesser individual.

The Old English moniker, “Gospel,” like the use of the Greek goddesses’ name, *Charis*, known by the Latinized “*Gratia* – Grace,” has caused millions to believe that the “Gospel of Grace” replaced the Torah, when instead the Torah is the source of “mercy.” To know the Towrah is to know “*chanan* – unearned favor” and the liberty it provides. So this bears repeating: there never was such a thing as a “Gospel.” There still isn’t.

No matter where you look, Christian apologists say that “Gospel means ‘good news.’” But if that is true, why not simply write “good news.” Or more to the point, since *euangelion* actually means “healing messenger and beneficial message,” why not translate the Greek term accurately?

Christian dictionaries go so far as to say that “gospel is from go(d) meaning ‘good,’ and spell meaning ‘news.’” But “god” was never an Old English word for “good.” Instead, “god” is a transliteration of the Germanic “Gott,” an epithet for Odin. The Old English word for “good” was “gud.” And the Middle English “spell” is from the Old English “spellian,” which means “to foretell, to portend, or to relate.” As such, “gospel” does not mean “good news,” and is therefore not a translation of *euangelion* as Christians protest.

Other dictionaries suggest that gospel was “derived from an Anglo-Saxon word which meant ‘the story concerning God,’” even though there is no etymological history of such a term in the annals of the Anglo-Saxons.

While we are on this subject, it is insightful to know that, according to *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*, the English word, “spell,” came to us “from Old English by way of Middle English.” And “circa 1623 (which would be around the time the KJV was being popularized) a spell 1) was a spoken word or form of words which were held to have magic power, 2) was a state of

enchantment, or 3) was used in the context of casting a spell.”

Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary says: “The word ‘god’ is common to the Teutonic tongues.... It was applied to heathen deities and later, when the Teutonic peoples were converted to Christianity, the word was elevated to the Christian sense.”

ommon to the Teutonic tongues.... It was applied to heathen deities and later, when the Teutonic peoples were converted to Christianity, the word was elevated to the Christian sense.”

Further affirming that “Gospel” conveyed being under “Gott’s spell,” *Merriam Webster* explains: “god is from Old English by way of Middle English and is akin to the Old High German *got*, which was derived before the 12th century CE.” Along these lines we learn that *gottin* is the Old High German word for “goddess.”

Digging a little deeper in our quest to understand the religious origins of “gospel,” circa 17th century Europe, when the religious connotation was conceived and initially promoted, the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says that “God is the common Teutonic word for a personal object of religious worship...applied to all superhuman beings of the heathen mythologies. The word god upon the conversion of the Teutonic races to Christianity was adopted as the name of the one Supreme Being.” Therefore, in the manner common to most every Christian corruption of Yahowah’s Word, the religious term is drenched in paganism.

By comparison, there is nothing particularly special about the Greek word, *euangelion*. The first recorded use was in the feminine, as *euaggelia*, as opposed to the neuter form most common to the Greek eyewitness and historical accounts. It was attributed to Augustus in 9 BCE in Priene where the Roman Caesar was hailed as the “Savior of the world for the ‘beneficial proclamation’ of

the Julian calendar.”

As I have mentioned, *euangelion* is a compound of two common Greek words. *Eu* means “beneficial, healing, and prosperous,” and *aggelos* is the Greek word for “messenger” and thereby “message.” So while Christians will protest that something which heals and is beneficial is by definition “good,” and that a message can be “news,” there is no reason to extrapolate when the primary meaning is readily apparent. Therefore, those who seek to know and share the truth are compelled to translate *euangelion* accurately so that others will understand its intended meaning.

Along these lines, if *aggelos* meant “news,” as opposed to “message,” the *aggelos*, or “spiritual messengers,” would be “newscasters,” instead of Yah’s spiritual envoys, representatives, and messengers. Moreover, while *eu* can be translated “good,” “beneficial and healing,” there are far more accurate and descriptive definitions of Yahowah’s plan. After all, if the intent was to communicate “good,” as in “Good News,” the preferred Greek words for “good” are *kalos* and *agathos*. And while the Hebrew is *towb*, Yahowah is far less interested in “good” than He is in being “right.” Further, Yahowsha’ is translated using the former in Matthew 5:16, saying: **“Thusly, let your light shine before men so that they might see within you the responses and endeavors which are good (*kalos*), thereby wonderfully attributing them to your Heavenly Father.”** And with the latter, Yahowsha’ says **“I am good (*agathos*),”** in Matthew 20:15.

But before I present Yahowah’s perspective on what is actually “*towb* – good,” I’d be remiss if I didn’t share the fact that the same light and endeavors Yahowsha’ spoke about in His Instruction on the Mount are equated to Yahowah and his Towrah in the 105th Psalm, which proclaims: **“Because they focus upon and observe,**

closely examining and carefully considering, His clearly communicated prescriptions of what we should do in life to live, and His Torah, His Source of Teaching and Instruction, they are saved, radiating Yah's light.” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 105:45*)

With this connection established, and especially now that Yahowah and His Towrah have become Sha'uw'l's enemy, let's take a moment more and consider the position articulated by the other side in this debate.

While I cited much more of what *Dowd* | David was inspired to write in the 19th Psalm concerning Yahowah's message, His Guidance and His Towrah in a previous chapter, please consider this reminder...

“Yahowah's Towrah (*Towrah*) is complete and entirely perfect, lacking nothing, helpful, healing, beneficial, and true (*tamym*), returning, restoring, and transforming (*shuwb*) the soul (*nepesh*). Yahowah's testimony (*'eduwth*) is trustworthy and reliable (*'aman*), making understanding and obtaining wisdom (*hakam*) simple for the open-minded (*pethy*).” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:7*)

In the following Proverb, this same Towrah is called “*towb* – good.” This means, according to God, the “good news” and His Towrah are synonymous, making Paul's claims ridiculous.

“Consistently listen (*shama'*) children (*ben*) to the correct and disciplined instruction (*muwsar*) of the Father (*'ab*) and (*wa*) pay attention (*qasab*) so as (*la*) to know and discover (*yada'*) understanding and discernment (*bynah*).

For indeed, such teaching and learning, instruction and direction (*laqah*) are good, beneficial, and helpful (*towb* – is proper, prosperous, favorable, pleasing, enjoyable, valuable, and healing). For this reason, I have

given you (*la natan*) My Towrah (*Towrah*). You should not forsake, neglect, or reject it (*'al 'azab*)." (*Mashal / Word Pictures / Proverb 4:1-2*)

Dowd's 119th Psalm is comprised of inspiring and beautiful lyrics. It is an ode to the Towrah. Let's turn to it next...

"You have actively engaged and accomplished (*'asah*) good, beneficial, and generous things (*towb*) with and through (*'im*) Your associate and coworker (*'ebed*), Yahowah (*Yahowah*), in accordance with (*ka*) Your Word (*dabar*).

The good and positive aspects associated with (*towb*) exercising good judgment, the whole process of informed, rational, decision-making (*ta'am*), leading to (*wa*) understanding based upon knowledge (*da'ath*) teaches me so that I will benefit by choosing to respond appropriately (*lamad*).

So indeed (*ky*), in (*ba*) the terms and conditions of Your binding covenant agreement (*mitswah*), I completely trust and totally rely because they are verifiable and enduring (*'aman*). (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 119:65*)

Prior to the time that I responded and answered this invitation, before I was thoughtful, spoke truthfully, and composed these songs, I was preoccupied and (*terem 'anah*) I (*'any*) unintentionally erred, I inadvertently wandered aimlessly without deliberation and sinned without meaning to do so because I was unwittingly deceived and therefore placed my faith in mistaken opinions (*shagag*).

But (*wa*) now, at this point in time (*'atah*), I literally keep my eyes totally focused upon, carefully and completely observing, closely examining, diligently exploring the totality of (*shamar*) Your Word, Your

Instruction, and Your Promise ('imrah). (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 119:66*)

You ('atah) are good (towb – generous and pleasing, enjoyable and festive, beautiful and pleasant to be around), Yahowah (Yahowah), and (wa) are doing what is good and beneficial by (yatab) helping me learn, becoming better acquainted, while teaching me how to properly respond to (lamad) Your clearly communicated prescriptions of what I should do to share life with You (choq). (*Mizmowr / Psalm 119:67*)

The self-important, self-motivated, and presumptuous (zed) lie, they mislead and deceive with their speeches promoting worthless beliefs (sheqer).

Smearing and slandering with misinformation, their scribes conceal what I have said on behalf of God by plastering over it with their official message ('al taphal). (*Mizmowr / Psalm 119:68*)

I will ('any), with all my heart, with all my intent and personal commitment, my sense of purpose (ba kol leb), engage my Savior by keeping close to and by observing (natsar) Your precepts, those instructions which You have entrusted to us, encouraging us to pay close attention to and examine for guidance so that we respond appropriately to You (piquwdym). (*Mizmowr / Psalm 119:69*)

Your Towrah (Towrah) is actively engaged in my life because I delight in it, something I find totally enjoyable (sha'a). (*Mizmowr / Psalm 119:70*)

It is good and beneficial for me (towb la) that indeed (ky) You responded, providing Your testimony ('anah) for the purpose of (ma'an) teaching me how to properly respond to (lamad) Your engraved and clearly communicated prescriptions of what I should do to be cut into this relationship (choq). (*Mizmowr / Psalm*

119:71)

The Towrah teaching, instruction, direction, and guidance (*towrah*) of Your mouth (*peh*) is better and more prosperous for me (*towb la*) than (*min*) thousands of ('*eleph*) gold and silver coins (*zahab wa keseph*).” (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 119:65-72)

In that *Dowd* | David is speaking to and on behalf of Yahowah and His Towrah, his insights and perspective regarding both are relevant to this discussion. It is little wonder Yahowah anointed him the *Mashyach* | Messiah and refers to him as His beloved “*ben – son*.”

In the 25th Psalm, we find him saying...

“The sins (*chata’ah*) of my youth (*na’uwrym*) and rebellion (*pesha’*) do not remember (*lo’ zakar*) as (*ka*) Your love and mercy for me is remembered (*chesed zakar la’atah*) on account of (*ma’an*) Your goodness (*towb – Your perfect nature*), **Yahowah (יְהוָה). (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 25:7)**

Yahowah (יְהוָה), the Most High ('*al*), is good (*towb – moral, perfect, beautiful, pleasing, joyful, cheerful, happy, favorable, beneficial, generous*) and always right, completely correct and consistently straightforward (*yashar*), therefore (*ken*), He is the Source of teaching and instruction, and He guides and directs (*yarah*) sinners (*chata’*) along the Way (*ba ha derek*). (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 25:8)

He enables the way of (*darak*) the unpretentious and sincere who respond and actively engage ('*anaw*) with this means to exercise good judgment and to achieve justice by resolving disputes (*ba ha mishpat*). He provides the information to teach (*lamad*) those who respond to His call and act upon ('*anaw*) His Way (*derek*). (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 25:9)

All (*kol*) the mannerisms and conduct ('*orah*) of

Yahowah (𐤆𐤃𐤅𐤍) are merciful and beyond reproach (*chesed*) and they are trustworthy and reliable (*'emeth*) for (*la*) those who are preserved by (*natsar*) His Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship (*beryth*) and His enduring Witness and restoring Testimony (*'edah*). (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 25:10*)

As a result (*ma'an*) of Your name (*shem*), Yahowah (𐤆𐤃𐤅𐤍), You will choose to genuinely and completely forgive (*wa salah*) my sin (*la 'awon*), which (*ky huw'*) is great (*rab*). (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 25:11*)

Hence (*zeh*), whatever (*my*) individual (*'ysh*) respects and reveres (*yare'*) Yahowah (𐤆𐤃𐤅𐤍), He will teach and guide him (*yarah*) in (*ba*) the Way (*derek*) he should choose (*bachar*). (*Mizmowr / Psalm 25:12*)

His soul (*nepesh*), in (*ba*) the most favorable, pleasing, and festive circumstances (*towb* – goodness, beauty, prosperity, and enjoyment), will dwell and endure (*lyn*), and his descendants (*zera'*) will inherit (*yaras*) the realm (*'erets*). (*Mizmowr / Psalm 25:13*)

A very close and intimate fellowship with (*sowd*) Yahowah (𐤆𐤃𐤅𐤍) is certain for (*la*) those who respect and revere Him (*yare'*). And His Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship (*beryth*), He makes known to him (*yada'*).” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 25:7-14*)

Speaking of “*towb* – good,” here is another insight from the man Yahowah said was “*tsadaq* – right”...

“And then (*wa*) I encourage you to consider acting upon and actively engaging in (*'asah*) that which is good, beneficial, moral, agreeable, generous, and pleasing (*towb* – that which is in accord with the standard, is valuable, prosperous, ethical, just, worthy, and worthwhile) and as a result (*wa*) live (*sakan*) forever (*la 'owlam*).” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 37:27*)

A bit more comprehensive illustration regarding the

enduring merits of Yahowah's Towrah is advanced in the 40th *Mizmowr* / Psalm. And once again, these lyrics were scribed by a man whose name means "Beloved." If you want God to view you similarly, this is good advice...

“At that time ('az) I shared ('amar), ‘Behold (hineh), I am coming (bow’) with (ba) the scroll (magilah) of the written document (sepher) which was dictated and scribed (kathab) on my behalf ('aly) regarding (la) the work You have done and will do to accept me, God ('asah ratsown 'elohy). I genuinely want and willingly accept this (chaphets). (Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 40:8)

Your Towrah – Your Instruction and Teaching, Your Guidance and Direction – is within the midst (tawek) of my inner nature (me'ah).

I have proclaimed the good news of (basher) vindication as a result of being right, fairly and accurately, responsively, honestly, and correctly (tsadaq) in (ba) the great assembly and esteemed community (rab qahal).

Behold (hineh), my lips (saphah) have not been restrained (lo' kala'), Yahowah (ﷲ). (Mizmowr / Psalm 40:9)

You ('atah), Yourself, know, You respect and acknowledge (yada') that I have not hidden nor concealed (lo' kasah) Your means to achieve righteousness through being correct (tsadaqah) in the nature of my thinking (ba tawek leb). (Mizmowr / Psalm 40:10)

I have spoken about ('amar) Your trustworthiness and reliable nature ('emuwnah) and (wa) Your salvation (yashuw'ah).

I have not hidden nor concealed (lo' kachad) Your mercy (chesed) or (wa) Your integrity, honesty, and

steadfast reliability (*'emeth*) **on behalf of** (*la*) **the esteemed community and great assembly** (*qahal rab*). (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 40:11*)

Yahowah (יְהוָה), **You** (*'atah*) **will not withhold** (*lo kala'*) **Your love and mercy** (*rachamym*) **from me** (*min*), **Your unfailing devotion, love, and unearned favor** (*chesed*).

Moreover (*wa*), **Your integrity, honesty, and trustworthiness** (*'emeth*) **continually** (*tamyd*) **protect me from harm and they spare my life** (*nasar*). **For indeed** (*ky*), **You are surrounding me, providing a covering for me, God** (*'aphaph 'al*). (*Mizmowr / Psalm 40:12*)

For the entire duration of time (*'ad*), **evil and wrongdoing will not be counted against me** (*ra'ah lo' ayn 'aown | 'awon*).

And (*wa*) **I will not** (*lo' yakol*) **witness them** (*la ra'ah*) **though they be more numerous** (*'atsam*) **than** (*min*) **the hairs on my head** (*sa'arah ro'sh*). (*Mizmowr / Psalm 40:13*)

So (*wa*) **my heart** (*leb*) **is restored** (*'azab*), **accepting and delighted with** (*rasah*) **Yahowah** (יְהוָה) **saving me** (*nasal*).

Yahowah (יְהוָה) **is prepared and ready, even excited about** (*chuwsh*), **helping and supporting me, influencing and assisting me** (*'ezrah*).” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 40:8-14*)

Like Yahowah, I would rather listen to Dowd than Sha'uwl. Nothing has changed in 3000 years.

Let's consider one last word of advice, some of which also appeared at the end of a previous chapter. This next morsel of guidance comes from the Towrah, itself. Moseh is summarizing what he has learned for our benefit.

“That which is undisclosed (*satar*) **is for Yahowah**

(*la* ʔʔʔ), **our God** (*'elohym*).

Those things which are revealed and made known (*galah*) **belong to us** (*la*), **and are for** (*la*) **our children** (*ben*) **eternally and forever** (*'ad 'owlam*), **to act upon and conduct ourselves in accordance with** (*'asah 'eth*) **all** (*kol*) **the words** (*dabar*) **of this** (*ze'th*), **the Towrah** (*ha Towrah* – the signed, written, and enduring way of treating people, giving us the means to explore, to seek, to find, and to choose the source from which instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction flow, that provides answers which facilitate our restoration and return, even our response and reply to that which is good, pleasing, beneficial, favorable, healing, and right, and that which causes us to be loved, to become acceptable, and to endure, purifying and cleansing us so as to provide an opportunity to change our thinking, attitude, and direction). (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 29:29)

Indeed, truly and surely (*ky*), **you should actually listen to** (*shama'ba*) **the voice and the call, the invitation and summons** (*qowl*), **of Yahowah** (ʔʔʔ), **your God** (*'elohym*), **for the purpose of observing, closely examining, and carefully considering** (*la shamar*) **the terms and conditions of His binding covenant contract** (*mitswah*) **and His clearly communicated prescriptions regarding life** (*wa chuwqah*) **which are inscribed** (*ha katab*) **in** (*ba*) **the written scroll** (*ha sepher*) **of this** (*ze'th*), **the Towrah – the Instruction and Teaching, the Guidance and Direction** (*ha Towrah*).

That is because (*ky*) **you will actually be transformed, be changed, be restored, and return** (*shuwb*) **to** (*'el*) **Yahowah** (ʔʔʔ), **your God** (*'elohym*), **with all** (*ba kol*) **your heart and thinking** (*leb*), **and with all** (*wa ba kol*) **your soul and consciousness** (*nepesh*). (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 30:10)

For (*ky*) **these** (*ze'th*) **terms and conditions of the**

agreement (*mitswah*) which beneficially (*'asher*), I am (*'anky*) instructing and guiding you (*tsawah*) this day (*ha yowm*), they are not too difficult for you. They are not a hardship (*huw' lo' pala'*) for you (*min*), nor are they beyond your reach (*wa lo' huw' rachowq*). (30:11)

For indeed (*ky*), the exceedingly powerful and great (*ma'od*) Word (*ha dabar*) of your God (*'el*) facilitates your approach and brings you near, enabling you to engage in a close and personal relationship (*qarowb*) – as part of your speech (*ba peh*), and in your heart, influencing your thinking (*wa ba leb*) – to engage with, capitalize upon, and celebrate Him (*la 'asah*). (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 30:14)

Open your eyes, establish this perspective, and become aware (*ra'ah*): I am offering (*nathan*) on your behalf and in your presence (*la paneh*) this day (*ha yowm*) an association with (*'eth*) the Life (*ha chay*) and (*wa*) an association with (*'eth*) that which is Good (*ha towb*). But also (*wa*) that which is associated with (*'eth*) death (*ha maweth*) and (*wa*) an association with (*'eth*) that which is bad, evil, wicked, harmful, and destructive (*ra'*). (*Dabarym* / Deuteronomy 30:15)

Because, that which (*'asher*) I am (*'anky*) instructing and guiding you (*tsawah*) this day (*ha yowm*) is for the purpose of (*la*) you really wanting to genuinely love, and you choosing to actually demonstrate your affection in a personal and familial relationship (*'ahab*) so as to be closely associated with (*'eth*) Yahowah (יהוה), your God (*'elohym*), and achieving this result by (*la*) actually walking (*halak*) in His Ways (*ba derek*).

It is also (*wa*) for the purpose of (*la*) actually observing, closely examining, and carefully considering (*shamar*) His terms and conditions as they pertain to His binding relationship agreement (*mitswah*), His clearly communicated and engraved prescriptions of what we

should do in life to live (*chuwqah*), and (*wa*) His means used to exercise good judgment and justly resolve disputes (*mishpat*), as well as (*wa*) to restore your life and keep you alive, renewing and preserving your life (*chayah*), (*wa*) to make you great, increasing you exponentially so that you grow in every possible way (*rabah*).

In addition (*wa*), Yahowah (יהוה), your God (*elohym*), will kneel down, diminishing Himself in love to greet, welcome, and bless you, invoking loving favors upon you (*barak*) in the realm (*ba ha 'erets*) where relationally (*'asher*) you (*'atah*) are going to, and will be included within (*bow' la*), this named place of renown (*sham / shem*), receiving it as an inheritance (*la yarash*). (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 30:16*)

But if (*wa 'im*) you turn your heart away from Him (*panah / paneh leb*), and if you do not listen (*wa lo' shama'*), and you are lured away (*wa nadah*), and you bow down in worship (*hawah*) to other gods (*la 'acher 'elohym*), and you actively engage with and serve them (*wa 'abad*), (30:17) I am reporting the following message, warning, and verdict (*nagad la*) this day (*ha yowm*) that indeed (*ky*) you will be utterly destroyed and completely annihilated, ceasing to exist, and thus (*'abad 'abad*) not elongating your days (*lo' 'arak yowmym*) upon (*'al*) the earth (*'adamah*). (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 30:18*)

I have testified repeatedly to restore and warn (*'uwd*) you in (*ba*) this day (*ha yowm*) with regard to (*'eth*) the spiritual realm (*ha shamaym*) and with regard to (*'eth*) the material world (*ha 'erets*), and about life (*wa ha chay*) and death (*wa ha maweth*).

I have freely offered (*nathan*) on your behalf and in your presence (*la paneh*) the blessing which restores the relationship (*barakah*) and also (*wa*) the curse of being

abated and seen as worthless (*qalalah*).

So (*wa*) you should actually choose in favor of (*bachar ba*) continued life and renewal, of nourishment and growth (*chay*), so that (*ma'am*) you (*'atah*) and your offspring (*zera'*) are restored to life, renewed, and are spared (*chayah*). (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 30:19*)

This is accomplished by (*la*) choosing to genuinely love and by closely associating with (*'ahab 'eth*) Yahowah (𐤃𐤇𐤅𐤃𐤇𐤁), your God (*'elohym*), by (*la*) really listening to (*shama'*) His voice and His call (*qowl*), and by (*wa la*) choosing to stay especially close to Him (*dabaq*).

For indeed (*ky*), He (*huw'*) is the source of your life, and of renewal (*chay*), and of lengthening (*wa 'orek*) your days (*yowm*), enabling you to dwell (*la yatsab*) in the realm (*'al 'adamah*) which (*'asher*) Yahowah (𐤃𐤇𐤅𐤃𐤇𐤁) promised (*saba'*) to your fathers (*la 'ab*), to Abraham (*la 'Abraham*), to Yitschaq (*la Yitschaq*), and to Ya'aqob (*wa la Ya'aqob*), to give it as a gift (*nathan*) to them (*la*).” (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 30:20*)

Yahowah's perspective, His *Towrah* | Guidance, is sufficiently clear to guide those who are seeking to know Him, who are seeking to understand what He is offering, and who are seeking to learn what He is asking in return.

And there is no correlation of any kind between Yahowah and Paul. They are life and death.

𐤃𐤇𐤅𐤃𐤇𐤁

Tarasso / Confusing

A Different Message...

We are in a better position to ascertain the differences between Paulos' Graced-based "*euangelion* – healing messenger and beneficial message" and the alternative, Yahowah and His Towrah. And in this light, if we are going to seriously consider the so-called "Christian *New Testament*," it is incumbent upon us to accurately relate the words contained therein so that they can be understood correctly.

If it is to be considered a Godly document, we are not at liberty to change it, at least without consequence. And if it is not Godly, by changing it, we obfuscate the evidence thoughtful people require to evaluate its veracity. Let's not change *euangelion* to "Gospel."

Having introduced his second thought with, "**I marvel and am astonished, even surprised (*thaumazo*) that (*hoti*) in this way (*houto*) quickly (*tacheos*) you changed, departing and becoming disloyal apostates, traitors (*metatithemai*), away from (*apo*) your (*sou*) calling in the name of (*kaleo en*) Charis (*Charis*) to (*eis*) a different (*heteros*) healing message and beneficial messenger (*euangelion*),...**" (Galatians 1:6)

Paulos continued by contradicting himself...

"...**which (*hos*) does not exist (*ou eimi*) differently (*allos* – as another, other, different, or contrasting), if not**

(*ei me* – conditionally or hypothetically negated because) **perhaps some** (*tis* – or things) **are** (*eimi*) **the ones** (*oi*) **stirring you up, confusing you** (*tarasso sou* – causing you to be troubled and distressed, causing commotion and agitating you), **and also** (*kai*) **wanting and proposing** (*thelo* – desiring and deciding, taking pleasure in and aiming, resolving and being of the opinion) **to change and pervert** (*metastrepho* – to turn one thing into another, overturn and reverse) **the beneficial messenger and healing message** (*to euangelion*) **of the** (*tou*) **Christou** (XPY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement to infer Divinity)...” (Galatians 1:7)

So that you know, this same clause was translated in the *Nestle-Aland, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear* as: “what not is other except [not applicable] some are the ones troubling you and wanting to turn across the good message of the Christ.”

Since the writing quality is poor, since Paul infrequently defines his terms, since it required the deployment of evidence and reason to ascertain the distinction between Paul’s position and God’s, I suspect that the Galatians were scratching their heads, wondering what Paulos was trying to say. Half a breath ago, he bemoaned that there were two distinctly different approaches. He was angry because so many had abandoned his mantra for the other proposition. Now he appears to be saying that these two messages are not different at all, but that they are only being made to appear to be in discord by some unknown agitators. But how can that be so when, in his previous sentence, he had his Lord snatching us away from the Old System.

In spite of this, our maestro of confusion is calling his rivals “*tarasso* – confusing.” The man responsible for the greatest upheaval in human history said that those who had challenged his upending of God’s message were guilty of

perversion. It is the tactic politicians deploy to demean their rivals, projecting their faults upon their opponents. When the party who is not actually guilty of the crime responds, the audience becomes sufficiently confused to question those inappropriately slandered, leaving the actual perpetrator of the crime unscathed, their biggest fault no longer considered. That is precisely what is occurring here. Paul could not have been more disingenuous if he tried.

In these words, we are also witnessing the insecurity of the man, the very trait which made him susceptible to Satan. Paul has thin skin. He cannot tolerate a rival. He pounces on every opponent, every threat to his authority, real or imagined. The liar calls others, perceived more worthy, liars in an attempt to cut them down so that he can rise above them.

And like most all insecure men, he is drawn to those who are confident, in this case Yahowsha' and His disciples, in hopes of filling the enormous void in his own life, only to turn against them as a result of his own flawed and corrupt character. It is a dance which has been performed thousands of times, and in every walk of life, but never with the stakes this high.

If you have never witnessed the destructive capacity of an insecure individual, you are fortunate. And if, as a result, you do not see this character flaw driving Paul's inappropriate and angry rant against the Galatians for not believing him, then at the very least I hope that you see his words as mean-spirited and disingenuous. This is a million miles from Towrah.

When this introductory statement is set into the context of Paul's life and writings as we know them, it becomes obvious that Paul's message was the only one which was completely different than everyone else's, including Yahowah's, Yahowsha's, and the disciples. And considering the qualifications of the others, Sha'uwl's was

hard to believe. The purpose of this epistle was to launch a defense of his authority through a series of counteroffensives.

Consistent with the preview presented in the opening chapter, Paul will continue to undermine, belittle, and besmirch the Torah, separating Yahowsha' from it so as to nullify his sacrifice. And before long, we will witness him discrediting Yahowsha's disciples, effectively nullifying what the Passover Lamb had taught them. These things done, *Sha'uwl* | Paul substituted his own rhetoric while claiming to have God's authorization.

You may be wondering why I am now so judgmental, tearing Paul to ribbons for mistakes big and small, especially since I admitted to being fooled by him for many years. The reasons are varied. As I have shared, my intent was not to expose and condemn the differences between Pauline Doctrine and the Torah, but instead to resolve them. I began doing what many have done before me. In fact, some have made a religion of it.

By blending Rabbinic Judaism with Pauline Doctrine, they call themselves Messianic. But then I reached a point where I just could not do it anymore. I could no longer find common ground. The chasm grew too large as the conflicts grew insurmountable. And the more I looked to Yahowah and Yahowsha' for help, the more I found them at odds with Paul.

Ultimately I had to take sides. I could either be with God or be with Paul. And while that was an easy choice, neither Yahowah nor Yahowsha' are ever easy on those who corrupt their message. Their approach is now mirrored in this book. God is informed, rational, relentless, uncompromising, and especially judgmental. Too much is at stake to take any other approach.

Also I suppose that I'm sympathetic to those who believe, as I once did, that Paul spoke for God. I appreciate

how enormously difficult it will be for many of you to process and accept the evidence which is being laid before you. While I make no apologies for being judgmental, I nonetheless appreciate the fact that this approach, along with the unpopular nature of this message, will turn many people away who might otherwise have been helped if this review were not so dismissive of Paul's commentary. And yet ultimately, every one of us will eventually take sides on this argument. I have made my choice.

Surprisingly, it was not especially hard for me to admit that I was wrong – even that I had been played for a fool. In fact, it was a relief, as I hope it is for you one day. There is something wonderfully liberating and reassuring when you come to terms with Paul and everything falls into place, where there is no longer a collection of odd-shaped pegs which must be wiggled and whittled to fit.

But the bottom line with all of this is that you should not trust me any more than you trust Paul. Yahowah alone is trustworthy. Do your own research. Compare their testimony. Then decide.

Speaking of perverting, the *King James Version* changed “if not” to “but.” They added “there,” and “that” without justification. They ignored *thelo*, and its meaning entirely, as if the verb was not in the text. “Turned around and changed” was rendered “pervert” and *euangelion* was replaced with “gospel.” Then to add insult to injury, the KJV replaced “XPY (Chi Rho Upsilon),” the Divine Placeholder with a transliteration of a derogatory Greek word which was not actually written in the text, and they wrote “Christ.” Besides all that, they did a pretty good job with: “but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.” The Latin *Vulgate* reads: “except that there are some persons who disturb you and who want to overturn the *euangelium* Christi.” To Jerome's credit, “overturn” is a literal translation of *metastrepho* and *euangelium* is an accurate transliteration of *euangelion*.

To help all of us retain our footing, the text reads: “...which does not exist differently, if not conditionally or hypothetically negated because perhaps some are the ones stirring you up, confusing you, and also wanting and proposing to change and pervert the beneficial messenger and healing message of the Christou,” (1:7)

Evidently feeling at liberty to write whatever they wanted, the *New Living Translation* completely ignored the presence of *euangelion* in their rendering: “You are being fooled by those who deliberately twist the truth concerning Christ.” Yet that was not their only liberty. *Tarasso* does not mean “you are being fooled.” There is no basis whatsoever for “by those who deliberately” or “the truth concerning.” And the XPY placeholder is based upon *Chrestus*, not *Christos*, and it represents the Useful Implement, not Christ.

By stating that the Galatians were “being fooled by those who were deliberately twisting the truth concerning Christ,” the NLT exonerates Sha’uwl while condemning Yahowah’s witnesses. Truth had been upended.

As you consider the third clause of the second sentence, keep in mind that there were two messengers who came out of heaven, one trustworthy, the other deceitful. Also note the switch from Paulos, as the ultimate individual, to “we.” I suspect that this is because he wanted his audience to believe that he was now speaking in conjunction with his god. This is something I am particularly attuned to because I have seen it in Muhammad, who also admitted being demon-possessed. He not only used “we” similarly throughout the *Qur’an*, he positioned himself as errantly and egotistically. At the very least, even if you aren’t yet ready to acknowledge the satanic influence, Paul is elevating himself to the place where he and his god are now speaking with the same voice. Furthermore, he is inferring that he is a messenger from heaven, while stating unequivocally that a person will

be cursed if they challenge him.

“...but (*kai*) to the contrary (*alla*), if (*ean*) we (*emeis* – first-person nominative plural) or (*e* – another comparable) a messenger (*aggelos* – a heavenly envoy and spiritual servant) out of (*ek* – from) heaven (*ouranos* – the abode of God (this was written in the singular even though Yahowah and Yahowsha’ consistently use the plural form)) might convey a healing messenger or beneficial message (*euangelizo* – may announce a helpful and prosperous communication or communicator) to you (*sou*) which is approximately the same or contrary to, even positioned alongside, what (*hos para* – which is near, beyond, greater than, associated with, less than, positioned along with, or is in the opinion of some in opposition to that which), we delivered as a beneficial messenger (*euangelizo* – we announced and told as a healing claim) to you (*sou*) then a curse (*anathema* – a dreadful consequence has been set up and) exists (*eimi*).” (Galatians 1:8)

This not only screams insecurity, which incidentally manifests itself as paranoia, with everyone else seen as a lesser form of life and as a potential foe, but also as delusional, with an insatiable need to be viewed as essential and right – no matter how useless or wrong. And this time Paul has gone so far as to say that he and his Lord are going to curse the opposition even if the competitor is a heavenly messenger.

From this point forward, and we are a mere two sentences into Paul’s first letter, Christians would invoke a curse on any and all who would question their faith. Any opposition to Pauline Doctrine would be demeaned as Satanic. And yet it was Satan, speaking through his Apostle, who was cursing humankind with these words.

In reality, Yahowah, Himself, sent “a Messenger out of heaven to convey his healing and beneficial message.”

His name explained His purpose: Yahowsha', meaning Yahowah Frees and Saves. His message was in perfect harmony with the Towrah, making it the opposite of that being conveyed by Sha'uwl. Therefore, a "dreadful consequence exists."

Satan was also "a messenger out of heaven," as are all of Yahowah's *mal'ak* – to cite the Hebrew term for "heavenly representative." His message even "approximates" Yahowah's witness, making it an effective counterfeit, something which appears genuine and yet is contrary to our interests.

Using Sha'uwl in this way, the Adversary has brought a curse upon himself and upon all who are in league with him. Yahowah announced this sentence in the Garden of Eden nearly six thousand years ago, telling us that the serpent would be cursed for having beguiled Chawah by corrupting His testimony. The curse that the Adversary brought upon himself has now found its way into Paulos' preamble.

By writing this, Paul's intent was to render any competitive message moot – especially Yahowah's, Yahowsha's, and the disciples. He wanted his audience to join him in condemning his foes, God and His spokesmen. This is akin to Islam where Allah warns Muslims to be ever ready to attack, even slander and kill, all who would besmirch the Islamic god's reputation by telling the truth. So while Allah is Satan, the wannabe god prevails by labeling his opponents "satanic," and thereby confusing the feeble-minded.

This duplicity confuses people because most cannot fathom why Satan would oppose Satan, as he appears to do in both Christianity and Islam. But the moment a person considers who Satan is and contemplates what he wants, the answer becomes obvious. Satan does not want to be known as "*ha Satan* – the Adversary," but instead as the

Lord. He wants to be worshiped as if he were God. Therefore, it is perfectly rational, even clever, for Satan to oppose his Adversarial title in texts which not only present the Lord as god, but which at the same time undermine the credibility of the real God, His nature and His Covenant.

When the verb *euangelizo* is changed to a proper noun and becomes “gospel,” as is the case with the KJV, we are left with nothing but the curse: “**But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.**”

In this verse, the authors of the *King James* changed *alla* to “but,” as if Sha’uwl selected *de* to begin the sentence. They ignored *kai*, which means “and,” and then mistranslated *ean* as “though,” as opposed to the preposition, “if.” They transliterated (replicated the pronunciation of) *aggelos* as “angel,” instead of translating (replicating the meaning of) it as “messenger.” They added “preach” when there is no basis for it in the Greek. They then included the words “any other” without a textual justification, and replaced the first *euangelizo*, a verb, with the noun “gospel.”

Then the KJV arbitrarily added “unto,” “than,” and “that,” all without textual support. They included a second “we,” rendered the second *euangelizo*, not as “gospel” this time, but as “have preached,” inadequately representing the word rather than replacing it. They added another “unto,” without textual support, and then included the pronoun “him” as if Sha’uwl had written it. Since there is very little association between what Sha’uwl said and what the *King James Version* published, it’s easy to see how people have been misled by their product.

So it is fresh in your mind, Paul actually wrote: “**...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 beneficial messenger and announced as a healing message to you then a curse with a dreadful consequence exists.”

If you have disposed of your *King James Version* for a *New American Standard Bible*, the “translation” which claims to present a literal rendering of the oldest Greek and Hebrew manuscripts, I am sorry to be the bearer of bad news: it is not much better. It is as incongruent as the KJV, and obviously little more than a revision of its more popular predecessor. “But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to what we have preached to you, he is to be accursed!”

Again, it was inappropriate to transliterate *aggelos*, “angel.” But the crux of the issue here is that the verb *euangelizo* was rendered “preach to you a Gospel” the first time it appears (which is wrong linguistically), and then the second time the exact same verb appears, it was simply rendered “preach,” as if *euangelizo* was one of many Greek words for “speak.”

Recognizing that the vaulted and acclaimed *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear* reads: “But even if we or messenger from heaven might tell good message to you from what good message we ourselves told to you, curse let there be,” the *New International Version* is equally distant from the Greek: “But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let him be eternally condemned.” The common dissimilarity from the words Paul actually penned, combined with their similarity to one another, affirms that these translations were actually revisions of one another.

The NLT, which we have learned is nothing more than a loose paraphrase under the slogan “The Truth Made Clear,” reads: “Let God’s curse fall on anyone, including

us or even an angel from heaven, who preaches a different kind of Good News than the one we preached to you.” While “preaches...Good News” would have been a slightly more accurate translation of the first occurrence of *euangelizo*, demonstrating that the words, themselves, are irrelevant to their presentation, they translated the second *euangelizo* differently, this time without any reference to “different kind” or “Good News,” even though the same exact word appeared twice.

Further, the sentence order in the NLT was reversed, and God’s title was added without textual support. In so doing, the passage now infers that God is the one cursing a specific individual, as opposed to the contrarian message existing as a curse.

Christian theologians are deliberately being inconsistent, because “Gospel” and “Good News” are central to their theology. Christendom is based upon these concepts. It is as critical and errant as the doctrine of the Trinity in this regard.

We find the following in Jerome’s blend of the Old Latin manuscripts: “But if anyone, even we ourselves or an angelus from Heaven, were to *evangelizet* other than the one that we *evangelizavimus* to you, let him be anathema.” Once again, we find evidence that Jerome wasn’t to blame for the corruption of *euangelizo*, but he was to blame for the subsequent treatment of Catholic heretics, due to his personalizing of the curse.

These translations all affirm that Paul wanted his rivals cursed. And by his definition, his opponents were those whose message was contrary to his own. As we will discover as we make our way through this letter, Sha’uwl’s rivals will come to include: Yahowah and His prophets and Yahowsha’ and his disciples. While they all spoke with one voice, their message was contrary to Sha’uwl’s. And that is the bottom line.

Repeating himself, but this time slipping from first-person plural to singular to underscore the fact that this Benjamite was a lone wolf among men, we are left to question the motivation for the duplication. And with Sha'awl so overly fixated on his rivals, do you suppose the reason he did not name them was because, had he done so, his credibility would have been destroyed?

The *Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear* reads: "As we have said before and now again I say, if some you tells good message from what you took along curse let be." The basis of their translation was as follows:

"As (*hos* – like) we have said before (*proepo* – we have said already), and even (*kai*) just now (*arti* – simultaneously or immediately thereafter) also (*palin* – again repetitively) I say (*lego* – I convey), if (*ei* – under the condition) someone (*tis*) delivers as a helpful messenger or communicates a useful message (*euangelizo*) to you (*sou*) similar or contrary to, in opposition with or just positioned alongside (*para* – close to, besides, approximately the same, near, beyond, or greater than in the opinion of some, even associated with) that which (*hos*) you received (*paralambano* – you brought in, associated with, or related to), it shall be (*eimi* – I wish or command that it shall exist as (the present tense means that this state currently exists and that it will continue for an undisclosed period, the active voice means that the subject, Paulos (who is the speaker), is actively engaged bringing about the curse, and the imperative mood serves as either a command or as an expression of the speaker's desire, or both)) a curse with a dreadful consequence (*anathema*)." (Galatians 1:9)

Paul is putting everyone on notice that he will not tolerate a rival. He would remain vengeful with dreadful results, cursing the Jews who challenged him. He would not prevail through evidence or reason, nor through logical and attested debate, by which he was sure to lose, but

instead by vilifying his perceived opponents. He would begin by damning Jews in general and then seek to condemn the three most important Jews on the planet at the time – none other than *Shim'own* | Peter, *Ya'aqob* | “James”, and *Yahowchanan* | John.

He had become an exceedingly dangerous and threatening man. He was, himself, the curse.

Since this is Paul's first letter, the “as we have said before” is little more than a reference to the previous sentence, something he makes clear by way of “*arti* – simultaneously and immediately thereafter.” As a result, since Paulos is writing exclusively under his own chosen name, we must consider what he was trying to accomplish by using “we,” and then ponder why then he felt it was necessary to transition back to “I.” Who were his partners and why at times did he exclude them?

It is telling, therefore, that Galatians 1:6 begins: “I am amazed” (first-person singular present tense), but then transitions to “we delivered” (first-person plural past tense) in Galatians 1:8. Paul's recent visit to Galatia was with Barnabas, according to Acts, perhaps accounting for the prior and plural message delivery. But in the short period between the Yaruwshalaim Summit and the time this letter was dictated, Barnabas and Sha'uwl had a heated argument and had gone their separate ways, accounting for the present singular perspective. At least that would be the case had Galatians 1:9 not included “we” and “I” in immediate succession. Also interesting, Sha'uwl will take a mean-spirited swipe at Barnabas before this letter is through.

As is the case with everything Paul writes, he never bothers to explain the nature of the argument. All this says is that “I'm always right and everyone else is always wrong.” As such, even if Sha'uwl's opinions were right, without a basis in fact, this would not be helpful. Thus far, and indeed throughout Paul's letters, we will be exposed to

Paul's opinions, and we will be apprised of his attitude, but nothing else.

Other than omitting the accusative "contrary or in opposition to," adding "preach" without justification, replacing the verb *euangelizo* with the noun "gospel," and adding a pronoun at the end of the verse, the KJV got most of this right: "As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Their inspiration was obviously Jerome's Latin *Vulgate*: "Just as we have said before, so now I say again: If anyone has *evangelizaverit* to you, other than that which you have received, let him be anathema." The NLT paraphrase reads: "I say again what we have said before: If anyone preaches any other Good News than the one you welcomed, let that person be cursed." All three versions were unable to translate *para*, meaning "close, but yet in opposition," appropriately when it was used in conjunction with their Gospel and Good News. But by changing *paralambano* to "welcomed," the NLT was, once again, the least accurate.

Before we move on, I want to underscore a deficiency associated with the previous statements – and indeed with all of Sha'awl's letters. For this to be an effective warning, for it to be instructive and useful, we must know what Paul told the Galatians, and also know how his preaching differed from those he was cursing. Without this information, speculation reigns supreme, and false interpretations are far too readily developed.

As it stands, all we have is that anyone who delivers a message which differs from Paul's should be cursed, all of which sounds hauntingly similar to the *Qur'an's* first eighty surahs chronologically. And while that was designed to censure debate, and while it has kept most critics at bay, by repeating this, Paul has tipped his hand. He has said that his skin and doctrine are so thin that neither can tolerate criticism. It is a sure sign of insecurity.

Those who cannot defend their message attack those who are critical of it. In politics, this strategy is known as “killing the messenger.”

Introductions aside, here is a quick review of Sha’uwl’s second and third sentences:

“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 healing message and beneficial messenger, (1:6) which does not exist differently, if not hypothetically negated because perhaps some are stirring you up, confusing you, and also proposing to change the healing messenger and pervert the beneficial message of the Christou, (1:7) but to the contrary, if we or a messenger out of heaven conveys a healing messenger or beneficial message to you which is approximately the same or contrary to, or even positioned alongside what we delivered as a beneficial messenger and announced as a healing message to you then a curse with a dreadful consequence exists. (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)

Are you confused or sickened, angry or cursed?

✠✠✠

Living life to its fullest in the loving embrace of the most wonderful woman I have ever met, sitting in my study in America's paradise overlooking the turquoise blue waters of Caribbean Sea and Virgin Islands, while translating Yahowah's Towrah and Prophets, including Dowd's Psalms, I am proof positive that the only thing Paul cursed was himself and those he beguiled.

As we move to the next statement, while the interrogative required to frame the questions presented in most English translations does not appear in the Greek text, it was implied because Paul is asking us to choose. These questions, however, are rather odd considering that Paul has pitted his message against God. Also, the first is advanced using a peculiar verb – one that runs the gambit from perplexing to inappropriate, from conceited to bewildering.

If I may, since the writing quality is so poor, let's begin with the *Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear*. "Now for men I persuade or the God. Or I seek men to please. If still men, I was pleasing of Christ slave not – I was."

That was clear as mud. So then amplified, we find:

“For (*gar* – because) **currently** (*arti* – or simultaneously, just now) [is it] **men** (*anthropos*) **I persuade** (*peitho* – I presently, actively, and actually use words to win the favor of, I seduce, mislead, coax, convince, appease, and placate, inducing someone through words to believe so that they strive to please me by tranquilizing them) **or** (*e* – alternatively) **the** (*ton*) **God** (ΘΝ)?

Or (*e* – alternatively by comparison or contrast) [do I] **I seek** (*zeto* – I attempt and desire) **to please and accommodate** (*aresko* – to oblige) **men** (*anthropos* – humans)?

Yet nevertheless (*eti* – in addition besides), **if** (*ei*)

men (*anthropos*), **I was pleasing and accommodating** (*aresko* – I was exciting the emotions of and lifting up) **slave** (*doulos*) **of Christou** (XPY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Christou* | Drugged or *Chrestou* | Useful Implement which was designed to imply Divinity), **certainly** (*an*) **not** (*ou*) **was me** (*eimi*).” (Galatians 1:10)

The initial verb, *peitho*, was written in the first-person singular, present active indicative, which not only means that Paulos is again operating on his own, but also that the opening sentence literally reads: “Because currently men ‘I presently, actively, and actually use words to win the favor of, I seduce, mislead, coax, appease, and placate, inducing belief through words pleasing to me while tranquilizing them (*peitho*)’ or the God?” So regardless of which option we choose, this question poses a series of serious problems.

First, the transition from “we” as the sources of the lone acceptable message and as the originators of the curse, to “I” in a question, where “men” and “God” represent the universe of potential answers, is curious. Rather than partnering with men, as “we” might imply, is Paul opposing men in some sort of grand debate? Or rather than partnering with God, as “we” might also suggest, is Paul actually arguing against Him?

And while Paul’s personal confessions, his positions and his approach, affirm that his partner is Satan, there is a hint of delusional arrogance here in this transition back to “I” because, no matter how we translate *peitho*, Paul is implying that his rhetoric and reason are sublime. It is as if he wants us to believe that he was so much smarter than everyone else, he could take on God and men single-handedly.

Second, “winning favor,” along with “persuade and convince,” is the best we can do with *peitho*. Every other connotation makes this question substantially worse,

because it would read: “I presently, actively, and actually seduce, mislead, coax, appease, and placate” men or God?

Third, in spite of what religious zealots have been led to believe, we are not called to “win the favor” of men, and we cannot “win the favor” of God. We are not called to “persuade or convince” men. And the notion of “persuading and convincing” God is nonsensical. It is God’s job to convince, not ours. And even then, Yahowah is not interested in “winning our favor” or in “persuading” us. He lays out the opportunity to form a relationship with Him, He proves that we can trust Him, and He invites us to get to know Him, but that is as far as God goes. Therefore, even if we render *peitho* as favorably as possible, if the answer to the question is “men,” Paul’s approach is unGodly. And if the answer is “God,” then Paul’s arrogance is in league with Satan.

That is the good news. When any of *peitho*’s alternative definitions are considered, Paul becomes the Lord of Deceit. The Devil “*peitho* – seduces, misleads, coaxes, appeases, and placates.” That is why Yahowah called Sha’uwl the Father of Lies.

As you might suspect, *peitho* is almost exclusively Pauline. It is used in Paul’s letters and attributed to him throughout Acts. One of the few times it is found in association with Yahowsha’, the Book of Matthew shows him translated using it to convey the religious mindset of the opposition by writing: “but the chief priests and elders *peitho* the multitude that they should ask for Barabbas and destroy Yahowsha.” Shortly thereafter, in 28:14, and now in a political setting, the imposter writing under the pseudonym, Matthew, is translated using *peitho* again to say: “and if this comes to the governor’s ears, we will *peitho* him.” Luke, who was Paul’s attaché, in his hearsay account, translates Yahowsha’ using *peitho* twice, but neither translation is credible in that Luke wasn’t an eyewitness and Yahowsha’ never spoke Greek.

Now I understand that religious individuals do not see any issue with men persuading other men on behalf of their god, but that is because they have been deceived into believing that it is God's will that we "win souls for Him." They see a "conversion" to their religion as a favorable event, as something that bolsters their faith. They not only send out evangelists to persuade people into believing as they do, the Church has used the threat of violence to convert the masses for centuries.

But not only is Paul's message opposed to God's message, winning souls is not God's style. Yahowah is only interested in people who are interested in Him. And all He wants from any of us is to understand who He is, what He is offering, and what He expects in return. That way we can choose of our own volition to get to know Him, to ignore Him, or to reject Him. With God, it is all about freewill.

These things known, there is no way to overemphasize the consequence of this question. No matter the answer, it proves that Paul did not speak for God. It also demonstrates that his use of "we" did not include God.

But it does not get better from here. After posing a question where both options have horrendous ramifications, indeed religious implications, Sha'uwl spins his question, posing it a different way. And yet, we ought not try to accommodate or please men. Yahowah does not. Yahowsha' didn't. In fact, God's approach is the opposite. He is resolutely intolerant. He does not accommodate the views of the vast preponderance of people. He is displeased with humanity. While it is Yahowah's desire for us to get to know Him, He only accommodates the few who do.

Also problematic, with the juxtaposition of the first and second "e – or," we cannot isolate Paul "seeking to please men" from the possibility that he is "attempting to accommodate" God. The first option is disingenuous and

pathetic while the second is ludicrous.

Not only were these questions left unanswered, which leaves one wondering why they were posed, they were followed by “*eti* – nevertheless” and “*ei* – if,” strongly suggesting that Paul actually wanted us to think that he was capable of sparring with God. Further, *aresko*, the next verb Paul deploys, is not a cerebral concept, but instead speaks of “exciting and enticing emotions.” And the object this time is “Christou,” indicating that God, rather than being predictable and dependable, can be swayed by an emotional appeal. While Yahowah has an emotional component to His nature, everything that we know about God affirms that He values an informed and rational response over misdirected feelings.

Paul routinely infers that he died to become “Christ,” which is what “of Christou, certainly not was me” conveys. However, if one sees Paul’s *Iesou Christou* as the new and mythological caricature upon which the Pauline religion was contrived, then the author of this letter is the living embodiment of the Christian “Jesus Christ.” Paul is to “Jesus Christ” as Muhammad is to Allah. They are one and the same. If you know one, you know the other. If you like one, you will like the other.

If we were to dispense with the dubious connections and evaluate Paul’s rhetoric as if this were a debate, he’d flunk that test too. Sha’uwl deployed a non sequitur. The initial question was not answered by his hypothetical. And there was no *quid pro quo* between “accommodating man” and “serving his Christou.” Moreover, how is it that Paul, who fashions himself as the one who liberated the faithful from bondage to the Torah, is now positioning himself as a slave? And not just anybody’s slave, he is now in servitude to the same Christou whose death supposedly freed everyone from slavery. So this has become a litany of contradictions.

And the fact remains, only an egomaniac would suggest that someone might wonder whether or not this man was “persuading God.” And that is especially troublesome since the opening stanza of this letter affirms that Paul was not effectively “persuading and convincing men.”

Beyond this, perhaps we can deduce that Paul’s intent was to convince his audience, by displaying hostility toward the Galatians at large, as well as against any other messenger or message, that he was demonstrating, even proving, that he was out to please God and not men. But nothing displeases God more than denouncing and discarding His testimony.

This is a serious problem for thinking Christians. When Paul was not focusing on himself, he was focused on presenting an errant characterization of Yahowsha’. Neither perspective has merit. Even Yahowsha’ told us that we should focus on the Father and not on him. But since Paul is opposed to Yahowah and His Torah, that is not possible.

I am keenly aware that there is a limit to the amount of criticism an audience will endure. And while we are called to love our enemies, we are encouraged to expose and condemn God’s foes, which is why questioning Paul is so essential. But to be appropriate, our criticisms need to be bolstered by evidence and reason, they need to be consistent with God’s testimony, and they should be focused on an individual, an institution, or on a specific message. However, in Paul’s case, his blanket dismissal of an entire province and nation is not appropriate, nor is criticism without justification, and Paul seldom if ever provides any. This letter opened similarly to the Romans 7 diatribe, with a universal condemnation.

While it is appropriate to constructively criticize religious documents and institutions, it is not appropriate

to rail against their victims en masse. And yet, Paul is lashing out at everyone, while undermining everyone, because he suspects everyone is his foe, from heaven to earth, and he feels compelled to cut them all down. In this regard, his tone will evolve from condescending to vicious – becoming stunningly uncivilized. And while never appropriate, since Paul posed the question, his wholly antagonistic attitude toward men reveals the answer to the questions he has posed. In his mind, he was debating God. Moreover, as the evidence will demonstrate, Paul’s rage was universally misplaced. Sha’uwl’s adversaries were leading the Galatians to Yahowah, while Sha’uwl was taking them for a ride in the opposite direction.

Apart from the errant title, “Christ,” my concern with the most influential translations is that neither were consistent with the actual text. They both added a plethora of words to artificially elevate the writing quality. While Paul wrote:

“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, even regardless, if men, I was obliging and accommodating, exciting them emotionally, a slave of Christou, certainly not was me,” the KJV published: **“For do I now persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.”** While Christians no doubt see this as a rhetorical question, the deeper we dig into Paul’s mantra and mindset, the more likely it becomes that Paul thought himself qualified to persuade God to change His plan of salvation. LV: **“For am I now persuading men, or God? Or, am I seeking to please men? If I still were pleasing men, then I would not be a servant of Christi.”**

Unlike the *King James* and *Vulgate*, the *New Living Translation* reads beautifully. It is a shame God didn't inspire Paul to write as eloquently. "Obviously, I'm not trying to win the approval of people, but of God. If pleasing people were my goal, I would not be Christ's servant." While there is an extremely remote possibility that this may have been what he meant to say, it absolutely was not what he wrote. And should they have magically captured Paul's intent, we are incapable of "winning the approval...of God." That is the reason God conceived a plan whereby He did all that was required to make us acceptable.

Next, we find Sha'uwl professing that the message he was revealing was his own. And Paulos wanted everyone the world over to recognize that the mantra which would become known as "the Gospel" was "*hypo ego* – by, under and through me, by reason and force of me, because of and controlled by me."

"But (*de* – therefore, however, and nevertheless) **I profess and reveal** (*gnorizo* – I perceive and tell, I provide the knowledge I've gained to make known, I recognize and declare) **to you** (*sou*) **brothers** (*adelphos*) **of the** (*to*) **beneficial messenger and healing message** (*euangelion* – the rewarding envoy and helpful communication) **which** (*to*) **having been communicated advantageously** (*euangelizo*) **by** (*hypo* – under and through, by reason and force of, because of and controlled by) **myself** (*ego*), **because** (*oti*) **it is not** (*ou eimi*) **in accord with** (*kata* – according to) **man** (*anthropos*)." (Galatians 1:11)

This, of course, means that Paul was solely responsible for his "gospel." He conceived it all by himself, and he, alone, was authorized to declare it. As such, Paul was solely responsible for the mythology which became Christianity. There is no one else to credit or to blame. If his personal and individual revelations are not true, the religion he conceived is wholly unreliable.

Christian clerics universally recognize and readily admit that Paul opposed Yahowsha's disciples. This statement merely explains why. His message was his own while theirs was Yahowsha's. And set into the context of debating God, this is an incriminating confession.

But even if you were unaware of Paul's underhanded slap at his adversaries, both human and divine, it was either egregiously presumptuous or an outrageous confession to write "*gnorizo* – I reveal and provide" the "*euangelion* – beneficial messenger and healing message" and I "*euangelizo* – communicate it advantageously" "*hypo ego* – by myself." If Paul were speaking for God, shouldn't he be touting His words and not his own? Said another way, someone who is speaking for God knows that it's His message which matters, not the one who delivers it.

Had this been anything more than Paul claiming the world as his own, he would have done what we are doing, which is to dissect the errant message, showing through evidence and reason where it is wrong. Sha'uwl should have delineated pertinent examples of the *euangelion* which differed from his own. But the only message Paulos has condemned is God's, discrediting and discarding His Torah.

The *McReynolds Interlinear* reveals that the *Nestle-Aland* text reads: "I make known for to you brothers the good message the having been told good message by me that not it is by man." In order to make those words appear credible, *euangelion* and *euangelizo* had to be rendered differently, even though their etymological basis is identical in the KJV: "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man." That was incriminating. The *King James Version* accurately asserted that Paul "certified" that "the gospel which was preached" was "of me." In a rational world, this would have been sufficient to bury him.

Jerome's blend of Old Latin texts was both less accurate and less convicting. LV: "For I would have you understand, brothers, that the *evangelium* which has been *evangelizatum* by me is not according to man." But ever in form, the NLT ignored six of the twelve Greek words, and they added ten English words of their own choosing. Still inadequate to support their theology, they grossly misrepresented, and inconsistently translated *euangelion*. "Dear brothers and sisters, I want you to understand that the gospel message I preach is not based on mere human reasoning." The use of "mere" implies that "human reasoning" was a contributing factor. And that suggests that Yahowah's message was incomplete or inadequate, and that He required the contribution of Sha'awl's considerable intellect.

When you combine Paul's arrogant and incriminating statements with the Christian interpretation of them, you have the crime and confession laid at your feet. So why have so few people held Paul accountable?

What follows is the other half of Sha'awl's defense. He is saying that he was not influenced by any human agenda or institution, while implying that those who oppose him are in opposition to God. The opposite, however, is true. Paul's approach and style are rabbinic, and it would be hard to find someone more opposed to God than him.

Now if only someone could have taught Paulos how to write. It is the one thing you would have thought they would have taught him at rabbi school. But perhaps this explains why he flunked out...

"But neither (*oude* – nor or not) **because** (*gar* – for the reason then) **I** (*ego*) **by** (*para* – among, from, or for) **man** (*anthropos*) **associating myself with** (*paralambano* – I received, learning and accepting) **it** (*autos*). **Nor** (*oute* – but neither) **was I taught** (*didasko* – was I instructed as a

disciple).

But to the contrary (*alla* – by contrast) **by way of** (*dia* – through) **a revelation** (*apokalypsis* – an appearance or disclosure, an uncovering or unveiling) **of Iesou** (IHY – Divine Placeholder used by early Christian scribes for *Iesou* which became “Jesus” in the 17th century after the invention of the letter “J”)) **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).” (Galatians 1:12)

Contradicting his previous statement, while at the same time contravening Yahowah’s and Yahowsha’s approach to teaching, Paulos would have us believe that he did not associate with men and that he was not taught. He is evidently not ready to disclose the fact that he has been in rabbinic school for many years.

According to Paulos, his message had been previously undisclosed, and he alone had the right to convey what was miraculously unveiled, appearing to him in a revelation attested by no one. So it raises the question: if this is so, why did Yahowah bother with His Towrah – Teaching? If this were so, why did Yahowsha’ bother with disciples. If this were so, why did Yahowsha’ bother to say or do anything? If this were so, why did Yahowsha’ direct those with questions to the Torah and Prophets for answers? If this were so, how could Paulos be speaking for Yahowsha’ when God’s attitude, approach, and affirmations were the antithesis of what is being written here?

Since it would be natural to assume that I am sabotaging Paul by making him appear illiterate, please note that the scholastic *Nestle-Aland* published: “But not for I from man took along it nor was I taught but through uncovering of Jesus Christ.”

Beyond the fact that I now understand the purpose of

Galatians was to separate Yahowsha' from the Torah, and thereby negate his sacrifice while nullifying the means to our salvation, to say that he "was not taught" his message is to say that he did not learn the truth in the same place Yahowah and Yahowsha' directed all of us to go for understanding: the Torah. Neither Sha'awl, you, nor I need private instruction regarding God's public disclosure. Proving this, the Disciple Yahowchanan recorded: **"Yahowsha' answered him, 'I have spoken openly to the world. I have always taught in synagogues and in the temple where all of the Yahuw'dym come together. And I spoke nothing in secret.'"** (*Yahowchanan* / Yah is Merciful / John 18:20) This, of course, would also mean that what Paul just wrote was a lie. Yahowsha's statement and Paul's cannot be reconciled.

This was not Paul's only claim to "secret" revelation. In the *New American Standard Bible's* rendition of Romans 16:25, we read: **"Now to him who is able to establish you according to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which has been kept secret for long ages past but is now manifested."** "According to my gospel" confirms the obvious, but nonetheless I appreciate the confession: this is the "Gospel of Paul" and not the "Gospel of 'Jesus Christ.'" But God does not keep secrets – at least not regarding anything vital to our relationship with Him. Mysteries form the sum and substance of the myths which permeate pagan religions. And since Paul never once cited Yahowsha's "preaching," in a rare moment of truth, calling the "gospel" he was preaching "his own" should have been sufficient for Christians to reject him and their religion. God does not have a "gospel," nor should you.

And speaking of revealing something important regarding Yahowsha', this is now the third time in three tries that Paulos has not only placed the inappropriate "title" after an erroneous rendition of his "name." The

backward approach gives the impression that “Iesou’s” last “name” was “Christou,” further distancing him from Yahowah.

Paul’s fixation on unverifiable secret revelations, on mystery and mythology, was further advanced in his letter to the Ephesians when, according to the *New American Standard Bible*, he wrote: “...if indeed you have heard of the stewardship of God’s grace which was given to me for you; that by revelation there was made known to me the mystery, as I wrote before in brief.

And by referring to this, when you read you can understand my insight into the mystery of Christ, which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men, as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit...of which I was made a minister...to preach to the Gentiles the unfathomable riches of Christ and to bring to light what is the administration of the mystery which for ages has been hidden in God who created all things.” (Ephesians 3:2-9)

Funny thing though, the prophets never spoke of mysteries, and to the contrary, Yahowah used them to dispel myths. The disciples never spoke of mysteries either, nor did Yahowsha’. For those who are open to Him, Yahowah is an open book. Open His Towrah and you will find Him there. In fact, the only reason that God authored His Torah was to reveal Himself to us so that we might come to know Him.

King Dowd (more commonly known as David) was inspired to share the following insight into the nature, purpose, and effect of the Torah:

“Yahowah’s (יְהוָה) Towrah (*towrah* – source from which teaching, instructions, guidance and directions flow) **is complete and entirely perfect** (*tamym* – without defect, lacking nothing, correct, right, helpful, beneficial, and

true), **returning, restoring, and transforming** (*shuwb* – turning around and bringing back) **the soul** (*nepesh* – consciousness).

Yahowah's (אֱלֹהֵינוּ) **eternal testimony** (*'eduwth* – and restoring witness) **is trustworthy and reliable** (*'aman* – verifiable, confirming, supportive, and establishing), **making understanding and obtaining wisdom** (*hakam* – educating and enlightening oneself to the point of comprehension) **simple for the open-minded** (*pethy*).” (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 19:7)

Few things so essential to life are this succinct. And that is why you have seen this verse before and will see it again.

But let's assume, for the sake of argument, that the murderer who had been Sha'awl, who by his account was forced to become an apostle during a rather nasty encounter with a prodding and debilitating spirit on the road to Damascus, was a special case, that he was too remarkable an individual to learn about God the way the rest of us mere mortals have done – by observing the Torah as God suggested. It is certainly God's prerogative to teach someone individually if He so desires.

The disciples had some group instruction, most of which they made public. And their subsequent message, unlike Sha'awl's, was wholly consistent with everything Yahowah and Yahowsha' proclaimed publicly. If God had a private meeting with Paul, why was there no prophetic affirmation of it, and why was everything they allegedly discussed the opposite of what had been conveyed so many times before? And why do you suppose, if this revelation occurred as Paul professes, that there isn't a single quote from Yahowsha' in the entirety of Paul's letters?

Rather than write, “Yahowsha' said, “...,” Paul wrote: “But I say...” Beyond not citing anything from their mythical private meeting, the self-proclaimed Apostle only

quoted one snippet of something Yahowsha' said publicly, and in his lone citation, Sha'awl bungled the quote. As such, Paul's entire premise is ludicrous – particularly since, in the citation Sha'awl misappropriated and misquoted, Yahowsha' was explaining how his role as the Passover Lamb would enable the Covenant's promises.

And most revealing and incriminating of all is the realization that Paul's message is the antithesis of everyone else's, including Yahowah, who just happens to be God, all of Yahowah's prophets, Yahowsha', and Yahowsha's disciples. It was one man against the Word and world. Everything Yahowsha' did and said affirmed the importance of the Torah. And yet the primary thrust of Sha'awl's testimony is to belittle and demean the Torah. His claim to a secret revelation from God for which he alone has a license to promote is not only rationally impossible, it is preposterous.

While I am admittedly flogging a dead pig, since so many seem oblivious to the obvious, if Sha'awl spent time one-on-one with Yahowsha', as he claims, why didn't he tell us anything about his encounter? Why, unlike everything else God has revealed, wasn't there a single prophecy which could be used to validate the inspiration?

The Torah, by contrast, is set into the context of history. It details Moseh's meetings with Yahowah, in addition to their interactions with the Egyptians and the Children of Yisra'el over the course of time. There are not only thousands of witnesses, the Towrah is filled with historical and prophetic insights which serve to verify its validity. Moreover, its primary purpose was to explain the purpose of God. And that means that Yahowsha' was not only included, but was also explained and predicted in this very same plan. And now we are to believe that all of those promises and predictions were for naught, and there was no reason for any of it.

Also relevant, since most of the Torah consists of Yahowah speaking in first person through Moseh, which is the same format used throughout the Prophets, why is Galatians written in Paul's voice? The Prophets Zakaryah, Yasha'yah, Yirma'yah, and Mal'aky, to name a few, routinely get out of the way and allow Yahowah to speak through them. Their personalities, their styles, their messages, and their reputations are never an issue. But the same cannot be said of Paul.

There are seven signs, all along the same path, all pointed in the same direction, all conveying the same message, all from the same God, and then there is *Sha'awl* | Paul. And his sign is on a distinctly different path, it points in the opposite direction, and it conveys an entirely different message. And yet for each individual choosing to follow the path laid out by the seven in concert with God, hundreds of thousands prefer Paul's instead.

Other than misrepresenting the second most important name and title in the universe, the KJV and LV handled the rest of the words appropriately enough. The *King James* reads: "For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." LV: "And I did not receive it from man, nor did I learn it, except through the revelation of Iesu Christi."

Unable to restrain themselves, the NLT felt compelled to add their own personal embellishments to an otherwise simple statement. "I received my message from no human source, and no one taught me. Instead, I received it by direct revelation from Jesus Christ."

Incidentally, and forgetting about the Divine Placeholders for a moment, just because the Greek reads: "Iesou Christou," that does not automatically mean that it is always appropriate to order the name and descriptive title this way in English. In Greek, like Hebrew and Latin, in fact in many languages, adjectives follow the nouns they

are modifying. But in English the opposite is true. For example, the Hebrew reads “*Ruwach Qodesh*,” but in English, it is written “Set-Apart Spirit.” So then the issue is whether the intent of Christou was an adjective or a title, and if it is a title, why is the definite article routinely omitted? Also, since Paul has already deployed Satan’s title, “the Lord,” writing “the Lord Iesou Christou,” why is the improper title in the proper place but the proper title is not?

You can be the judge as to whether this was incriminating, or affirming:

“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, even regardless, if men, I was obliging and accommodating, exciting them emotionally, a slave of Christou, certainly not was me. (1:10)

So therefore, I profess and reveal to you brothers of the beneficial message which having been communicated advantageously by and through myself, because it is not according to or in accord with man. (1:11)

But neither because I by man associating myself with it. Nor was I taught (like a disciple). But to the contrary, by way of a revelation, an appearance serving to uncover and unveil Iesou Christou.” (1:12)

Perhaps a little education, and learning to write, may have done him some good. Nah, don’t think so...

Sha’uwl’s animosity toward the Torah began before his conversion. As a rabbinical student, he had been trained to argue against God. So Paulos was not so much reflecting his former association with Judaism, but instead revealing the mindset which permeated his writings.

Initially, at least before I discovered that each of the hundreds of times that “*towrah*” was written in Yahowah’s Word as a proper noun that it was translated using *nomos* throughout every extant copy of the *Septuagint*, I was hopeful that by confessing his affinity for Judaism and the religion’s oral traditions, Paul would associate his use of *nomos* with the *Talmud* instead of the *Towrah*. But that did not happen and it is not possible. While he knew the *Talmud’s* Oral Laws like the back of his hand, Sha’uwl never made any connection to Rabbinic Law. And he routinely associated the “*nomos*” he was assailing with Yahowah’s Torah. Moreover, the notion of rendering *nomos* as anything other than “Torah” is torn asunder by Paul’s own translation in Galatians 3:10. So now, listen carefully to what he says:

“**For** (*gar* – because indeed) **you heard of** (*akouo ten* – you received news of) **my** (*emos*) **unruly behavior** (*anastrophe* – wayward conduct and upside-down way of life) **at a time and place** (*pote* – whenever, speaking of an undisclosed point in the past or future; from *pou* – where, addressing a place and *te* – not only and both) **during the practice of Judaism** (*en to Ioudaismos* – in association with the Jewish religion), **namely that because** (*hoti* – since) **regarding** (*kata* – coming down from and regarding this) **showing superiority, surpassing any measure of restraint** (*hyperbole* – to an extraordinary degree, preeminently, excessively, beyond measure, and better than anyone else) **I was aggressively and intensely**

pursuing (*dioko* – I was hastily striving toward, systematically running after, persecuting, oppressing, and harassing) **the** (*ten*) **Called Out** (*ekklesia* – from *ek* – out and *kaleo* – call) **of** (*tou* – the) **God** (ΘΥ – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God), **and** (*kai*) **I was and am devastating her, continuing to annihilate her** (*portheo autos* – I was and am attacking and overthrowing her, I was and am undermining and ravaging her, continuing to destroy her; from *pertho* – sacking (in the imperfect tense, this ongoing action began in the past but there is no indication when it might cease if ever, in the active voice, Paulos was and is personally engaged ravaging and destroying, and in the indicative, these attacks are being presented as actually occurring)).” (Galatians 1:13)

The *Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear* presents this same revolting pallet of words using a slightly sparser array of colors: “You heard for the my behavior then in the Judaism that by excess I was pursuing the assembly of the God and was ravaging her.”

The *King James Version* helped fan the flames of anti-Semitism by combining “Jews’ religion” and “beyond measure I persecuted the church of God.” “For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews’ religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it:” What’s interesting here is that there is actually no basis for or indication of a “conversion” in Paul’s letter.

And the British translators cannot blame the Roman apologist for Christianity’s deadly opposition to Judaism. The Latin *Vulgate* rendering was somewhat more accurate. Jerome’s Latin translation reads: “For you have heard of my former behavior within *Iudaismo*: that, beyond measure, I persecuted the *ecclesiam Dei* and fought against Her.” But here again, while “former” is a superior rendering of *pote* than is “conversion,” it isn’t accurate. It speaks of “any place and time, of some place and time, of

an undisclosed point in the past, present, or future” and is, therefore, by no means limited to a “former” time.

This is not a minor point, because Paulos specifically used the imperfect tense in association with *portheo* to say that he had and was continuing to ravage and destroy” those who have chosen to be with God. He never stopped attacking.

The *New Living Translation* turned back the clock even further on truth by completely ignoring *pote*, by rendering *ekklesia* “church,” and by failing to communicate the ongoing nature of the final imperfect verb. “You know what I was like when I followed the Jewish religion—how I violently persecuted God’s church. I did my best to destroy it.” God has a lot of things, but “church” is not among them.

In this passage, Sha’uwl was not putting himself in opposition to Judaism, nor suggesting that he was no longer practicing the religion, but instead was stating that the Jewish religion was in opposition to God’s people. In fact, later in Acts, before a Jewish assembly, Paul will speak of Judaism as if it remained the love of his life. And yet throughout this letter, and in others, his comments are decidedly anti-Semitic, fueling the animosity Christians would harbor against Jews. This duplicity is an enigma unless perceived from the perspective that Paul wanted to be seen as both in league with and in opposition to everyone and everything.

And there is no question that Sha’uwl was and continued to be religious. It is therefore instructive to know that *Ioudaismos* is based upon *Ioudaizo*, which in turn is defined as “the adoption of Jewish customs, traditions and religious rites, even the observation of the ritual law.” Thereby *Ioudaismos* describes: “Rabbinic Judaism.”

Being a fundamentalist practitioner of Judaism made Sha’uwl opposed to a redeeming Mashyach, to a suffering

servant, as opposed to a conquering warrior, but that still does not explain his unbridled animosity toward those who quietly elected to follow him. Judaism, unlike Islam, indeed even unlike Christianity, has never inspired rage. From the religion's fledgling beginnings circa 200 BCE to the present day, Jews have fought six defensive campaigns, the first three of which failed, all hoping to liberate their homeland from invaders: the Greeks once, the Romans twice, and more recently on three occasions against Muslims. The religion is not sufficiently aggressive or violent to inspire the kind of rage Sha'awl expressed. Nor is there any evidence to suggest that Sha'awl was anything more than a lone wolf – singularly vicious and out of control.

This is the second time Paul has revealed that his cravings were insatiable. First it was libertine lusts, sexual perversions, which he blamed on the Torah. And now he is attributing his unrestrained annihilation of passive and peaceful people on his religion. And yet, lost in his arrogance, he wants us to believe that he alone was selected by God to slander Him and undermine His Torah.

But I know someone similarly perverted and violent – Muhammad. His bloodlust and appetite for sexual abuse were hallmarks of his life where terrorism was used to supply an endless stream of booty and babes. His religion grew out of his lust. Paul's may have as well.

As we consider Paulos' claim, I would be surprised if more than a handful of people, most of whom would have been relatives of his victims, would have heard of him. I suspect that Sha'awl was a legend in his own mind.

And the evidence indicates that Judaism was not responsible for his actions. There is no historical evidence to suggest that others were operating similarly. There is no record of such orders in any rabbinic archive, and you would be hard-pressed to find any group more committed

to documenting their aims and arguments.

That may be one of many reasons that Paulos provided no specificity with regard to time or place. And if you are wondering why he would admit these awful things, especially if they were exaggerated, it is because he thought that the comparison between the old Sha'awl and new Paulos would serve to demonstrate the relative merits of the Old System compared to his *New Testament*. The same strategy is deployed in Islam which is why I recognize the ploy.

And while these are all serious and deeply troubling issues, they don't measure up to juxtaposing "*hyperbole* – showing superiority surpassing any measure of restraint," "*dioko* – aggressively and intensely pursuing," and "*portheo* – devastating and annihilating," especially when scribed in the imperfect and directed at God's children. Had Paulos wanted to say that he had been conceited, that he had been out of control and intensely aggressive in the past while annihilating, which is to murder in mass, God's Covenant children, he would have used the perfect tense, which describes actions which were completed in the past which led to the present state of affairs. The fact he did not, not only confirms that his assault on the Covenant was ongoing, indeed never-ending, but also that he had no respect for his audience, believing that they were so inferior to his intellect that they would never figure it out no matter how obvious he made it for them.

We do not know many of the details of Sha'awl's life. He told us that he went to school to be a rabbi, but not if he ever became one. As a young man, he claims to have studied under the famed Gamaliel, which would have put him in Jerusalem while Yahowsha' was there. But an undisclosed time thereafter he claims to have been making tents back in his hometown of Tarsus, in what is now southwestern Turkey. Since there was no shortage of rabbis in Yaruwshalaim to harass the followers of The Way,

should that have been their unofficial mission, why recruit a vicious and egotistical unbridled libertine?

That makes no sense, unless, of course, Sha'uwl was so immoral, myopic, and uniquely savage that he became an ideal candidate for all the wrong reasons. But even then, how depraved would an individual have to be to engage in a mission where the goal was to mercilessly bludgeon your own people, ripping innocent families apart who had broken no laws, only because you disagreed with their conclusions? A moral and rational individual could never have done such a thing. Since Sha'uwl has confessed to all of these acts and attributes, and since the attitude required to actually have done these horrendous things permeates this letter, it is incumbent upon us to consider the character flaws which motivated him.

Returning to the passage itself, the *ekklesia*, describing those who were “called out” of the world and unto God, is a translation of the Hebrew *qara'* – itself the basis of *Miqra'*, the title of Yahowah's seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with Him. It is telling that the *ekklesia* is feminine. This is because it represents Yahowah's “*beryth* – Covenant,” also feminine, and because inclusion in it is facilitated by the “*ruwach qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit, the feminine manifestation of God's nature.”

Beyond this, *Yisra'el*, like *beryth*, *ekklesia*, and *ruwach*, is feminine, with the first two representing Yahowah's bride – at least symbolically. Before the divorce decree was announced through the prophet *Howsha' / Hosea*, based upon *Yisra'el's* infidelity, the Familial Covenant Relationship was a marriage between Yahowah and His Chosen People. But when God's bride chose to cavort with *Ba'al* (the “Lord” in Hebrew), Yahowah announced the divorce, a split which He has promised to resolve on the Day of Reconciliations two thousand years after He healed the rift with *Yahowsha's* and the Set-Apart Spirit's fulfillment of the first four

Miqra'ey. In so doing, Yahowah honored each of the five promises He had made to His Covenant children, with our Spiritual Mother enriching and empowering the “*ekklesia* – called out” on “*Shabuw'ah* – Seven Sabbaths.”

It had been on this *Miqra'*, after tangibly demonstrating the purpose of Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children on the way out of Egypt, that the Towrah was revealed to God's children. It is another connection Christians seldom acknowledge.

Sir Francis Bacon was the occultist that King James, as he was then known, hired to shepherd his self-serving translation. Along with the politically savvy theologians who served with him, he must have felt that since the opening verb of Galatians 1:13 was “you heard,” they had liberty to change “wayward behavior” to “conversation.” After all, they could be pretty sure Paulos wasn't going to object. I suspect it sounded more racist to say “the Jews' religion,” rather than “Judaism,” which explains that decision as well. But no matter what their justification may have been for copyediting Sha'awl, as a consequence of replacing “*ekklesia* – called out” with “church,” the lone aspect of the message which had any merit was lost, and a devastating misnomer was born.

While I have attempted to hold Sha'awl, himself, accountable for the severe character flaws required to perpetrate savagery on innocent kin, he must also bear the burden of his legacy. His positioning of Judaism as a ruthless enemy of God's “church” has fanned the flames of racial hatred and caused horrible and needless suffering. Translators exacerbated the problem to be sure, but it was Paul who presented Judaism as the enemy of his faith: Christianity. The foreseeable and inevitable consequence was to rally Christians to persecute Jews out of a misguided sense of divine retribution.

This is a glaring red flag, a dire warning signal, a dead

canary in the coal mine, which most have missed. Satan's religions engender a hatred for Yahowah's Chosen People. In the Torah we read: **“For you are a set-apart people unto Yahowah, your God. Yahowah, your God, has chosen you to be a people for Himself, a treasured possession above all of the peoples on the face of the earth.”** (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 7:6) God's love for His people is unmistakable and unshakable. But so is Sha'awl's animosity.

The Babylonians and Assyrians, as the first practitioners of Satanic sun-god religious schemes, were especially savage toward Jews (or correctly, Yahuwdym, meaning Related to Yahowah and Beloved of Yah), plundering their towns and hauling the people off into slavery. The Egyptians, who practiced the same religion under different names, held the Yisra'elites captive for four centuries.

Practicing the same religion, the Seleucid Grecian Empire, which was created as a result of Alexander's conquests, ruthlessly sacked Yaruwshalaim under Antiochus IV Epiphanes (“the Manifestation of God”), as is described in the books of Maccabees. The Romans, who worshiped the same gods, but also under different names, were even more barbaric in their treatment of Jews than were the Babylonians and Assyrians. They razed Yahowah's Home, salted the land so that nothing would grow, and then renamed the Promised Land “Philistina,” solely because the Torah presents the Philistines as Yisra'el's most annoying enemy, from whence we get the myth of a “Palestinian people.”

Constantine's Christians, governed as they were by Pauline Doctrine, were so anti-Jewish, observing any aspect of Yahowah's Torah became a crime punishable by death. Then came Islam, a religion born out of plundering, enslaving, raping, and murdering Jews en masse. But they were not alone. Such discrimination and lack of moral

judgment lingered throughout the reign of Catholicism in Europe, facilitating the horrid treatment of Yahowah's Chosen People under the dominion of the first Socialist Secular Humanist regimes: Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia.

The common denominator in each of these religions, including the faith conceived by Sha'awl, is a ruthless animosity directed at God's Covenant Children, especially those who were naturally born: Yisra'el and Yahuwdym. It is Satan's trademark. It is why Yahowah predicted that the Serpent would "bruise the heel of man." Ya'aqob, who was named Yisra'el by Yahowah, is based upon the Hebrew word for "heel." Therefore, Sha'awl's animosity toward God's chosen people should have been seen as a red flag of monumental proportions.

Displaying the kind of arrogance that is the hallmark of the most grossly insecure individuals, Sha'awl continued to brag. But rather than isolate his next statement from his previous one, let's join them because one flows out of the other. And as you read these words, please note that the selection of the imperfect tense, which made Paul's last statement so indicting and devastating, is used again in his follow-on comments, thereby, conveying two things: First, Paul is suggesting that Judaism was the cause of his bloody rampage; second, he is saying that he is still progressing in the religion.

"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 an extraordinary degree better than anyone else, I was aggressively and intensely, even systematically pursuing it by persecuting, oppressing, and attacking the Called Out of God as I was and am devastating her, continuing to undermine, overthrow, and annihilate her." (1:13)

“And so (*kai*) I was and continue to progress (*eprokopto* – I was accomplishing a great deal, and I persist moving forward, advancing; a compound of *pro* – before and *kopto* – cutting, striking, and smiting (scribed in the imperfect, where the writer is portraying the action as an ongoing process which, while initiated in the past, is continuing to occur with no assessment of when if ever it will end, in the active voice, which signifies that the subject, Paulos, is performing the action, and in the indicative mood, whereby the writer is saying that his assessments are genuine and his accomplishments are real)) **in (*en*) the practice of Judaism** (*Ioudaismos* – the Jewish religion), **over and beyond** (*hyper* – to a greater degree and for the sake of) **many** (*polys* – the preponderance of) **contemporaries** (*synelikiotēs* – people of similar age) **among (*en*) my (*ego*) race** (*genos* – progeny, descendants, ethnic group, kin, or nationality), **excessively** (*perissoteros* – abundantly and to a much greater degree) **enthusiastic** (*zelotes* – zealous, jealous, and excited, devoted, emotional, and burning with passion, vehemently adherent; from *zeloo* – to burn with zeal, heated, envious, and angry, boiling over) **to belong to** (*hyparcho* – to be identical to, to exist with and possess, to be equivalent to and yield to, and to be present with and assimilate (in the present tense Paulos, at this very moment and moving on into the future, is currently striving to embrace Judaism and to incorporate its Oral Law, in the active voice, Paulos is doing whatever it takes to achieve this state, and as a participle, and thus as a verbal adjective, his desire to belong is influencing him with regard to)) **the traditions and teachings handed down by** (*paradosis* – to being given over to the word of mouth which has been passed on by) **my (*ego*) forefathers** (*patrikos* – ancestors).” (Galatians 1:14)

First things first. By successively deploying the imperfect tense, Paulos has left no doubt that his unrestrained and depraved behavior and his participation in

this degenerate religion were not limited to the past experiences but was an ongoing devotion. He was and would continue to be a religiously inspired assassin. And indeed, Paul morphed many of the worst characteristics of Judaism into Christianity, thereby spreading its devastating consequences from a few to many, from Yahuwdym to Gowym.

This confession means that there was no conversion experience on the road to Damascus. Paulos is what Sha'awl was. Nothing changed. He did not progress from attacking God's Covenant children to nurturing them, from rabbinical traditions to the Christian religion.

If, as Yahowah asserts, it was Satan, under the guise and moniker of the Lord, who had influenced the Yisra'elites to oppose His Towrah and to reject His Covenant in favor of their oral traditions, then as Sha'awl will later admit, it was the same spirit who appealed to the founder of the Christian religion on the road to Damascus. In his opposition to God, Paulos would display the same attitude and approach now extant throughout the *Talmud*. And he was just like the authors of Jewish traditions who, while claiming to speak for God, did the opposite.

Likewise, and in the manner of the rabbis, Sha'awl's characterization of Yahowsha' would bear no resemblance to most of the promises made about the Passover Lamb in the Torah or Prophets. The Christian Christ, like the Rabbinic Mashyach, would be estranged from Yahowah. And most penalizing of all, there would be no connection between the Lamb and his fulfillment of the Miqra'ey in the *Talmud* or these Epistles.

Also, as was the case with the rabbis, Paulos would deploy arguments which made his testimony, at least in the eyes of his adherents, more relevant than, even vastly superior to, God's. To this day, religious Jews hold their *Talmud* over the *Towrah*, just as every religious Christian

values their “*New Testament*,” comprised chiefly of Paul’s letters, over the Word of God – and most especially over His Towrah. Nothing changed except the audience.

In these words, Sha’uwl has conveyed and indeed embraced the rabbinical mindset, defining what it means to be an adherent of Judaism. The religion was conceived to zealously indoctrinate the descendants of Ya’aqob so that every religious Jew would have their lives defined and governed by these oral traditions. Christianity has had a remarkably similar influence on Gentiles, with nations, communities, and cultures for vast swaths of time often being indistinguishable from the religion.

While we should not have been surprised, the Greek word designating the religious teaching and traditions of Sha’uwl’s elders, *paradosis*, also means “to surrender, to give up, and to deliver oneself into the hands of others.” It is based upon *paradidomai*, whose tertiary definition after “surrender” and “to be delivered into custody,” is “to be judged, condemned, punished, put to death, and be anguished because of treachery.”

The fourth connotation conveys “to be taught in such a way as to be molded as a result of verbal reports.” In the realm of etymology, this is especially revealing because it exposes the cause and consequence of religious traditions and teachings. Paul loved his religion. He just hated his people. They would not honor him the way Gentiles have done.

Regarding Sha’uwl’s affinity for Judaism, please consider this confession. Having climbed some stairs to rise above his audience, motioning for them to be silent, and then speaking in Hebrew, Sha’uwl proclaimed: “**Men, brothers and fathers** (*andros adelphos kai pater*), **you must listen to me** (*akou mou* – now I command you to hear me (aorist active imperative)), **to this regarding and against you** (*tes pros umas* – with this advantageously),

the current and present (*nuni* – this moment’s) **defense and justification** (*apologia* – answer and retort). (Acts 22:1)

As is the case throughout Paul’s letters, he is defending and justifying his credentials and message, not Yahowah’s or Yahowsha’s. It is a broken record figuratively and literally. Rather than encouraging us to listen to God, Sha’uwl is demanding that we listen to him.

Then rather than tell the uplifting story of Yahowsha’, the troubled troubadour continued to tout Sha’uwl from Tarsus...

And then (*de*) **having heard** (*akouo*) **that the Hebrew language** (*oti te Ebraida dialektos*) **he had been and was continuing to use to address them** (*prosponeo autois* – he was summoning them, calling them to him by speaking to them (imperfect active indicative)), **the more** (*mallon*) **they continued to be** (*parecho*) **quiet** (*hesychia* – still and silent). **And he declares** (*kai phemi* – so he says and affirms), (Acts 22:2)

This serves as one of several indications that the conversations later recorded in Greek throughout the so-called “Christian *New Testament*” were originally spoken in Hebrew – the language of Yahowah and Heaven. Therefore, any name or concept derived from Greek rather than Hebrew should be discarded. Inclusive of religious perversions, this includes Jesus, Christ, Christian, Gospel, Cross, Church, Grace, resurrection, religion, obedience, worship, holy, hell, and angels in addition to Peter, Paul, John, James, and Matthew, in addition to Jew, among the list of invalid names and corrupt concepts. There is no support for the following in the Greek text: Christmas, Easter, and Sunday as the Lord’s Day, as well as the Eucharist, Communion, and the Trinity were derived from the pagan religious practices of Babylon, Egypt, Greece, and Rome. They cannot be blamed on, but are merely

reflected in Christianity's *New Testament*.

Sha'owl then admitted...

'I am (*ego eimi* – I exist as) **a Jewish man** (*aner Ioudaios* – an adult male Jew; an inaccurate transliteration of Yahuwd, meaning Related to Yah), **having been born** (*gennaō*) **in Tarsus** (*en Tarsos* – from *tartaroo* – being appointed to decide who is held as a captive and cast into hell) **of** (*tes*) **Cilicia** (*Kilikia* – due south of Galatia in modern-day Turkey).

But then and now (*de*) **having been reared, nourished, and educated** (*anatrephō* – having been brought up, cared for, and trained; from *trephō*, fed by suckling at the breast, and *ana*, into the midst) **in** (*en*) **this** (*taute*) **city** (*polis*) **alongside** (*para* – from beside) **the feet** (*pous*) **of Gamaliel** (*Gamaliel* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *Gamly'el*, from *gamal 'el*, meaning to deal with God by repaying God), **having been educated and trained** (*paideuo* – having been taught and guided, having been instructed and disciplined in youth, having been chastised, criticized, and reprimanded with words; from *pais*, a child, slave, servant, attendant, or minister) **with regards to** (*kata* – according to) **the most perfect and strictest conformity to, being absolutely accurate in exacting accord with** (*akribeia tou* – the very careful, precise, and thorough approach to the fundamentalist and rigorous application of; from *akibestatos* – the most precise, the strictest, the most exacting and careful interpretation and observation of the most minute precepts of) **the forefathers'** (*tou patroos* – the ancestral) **apportionment which was received** (*nomou* – allocation of inheritance which is parceled out), **a zealous enthusiast and adherent** (*zelotes* – a devoted and emotional zealot), **present and existing** (*huparchon* – equivalent and identical to, belonging to and found at the hand) **of God** (*tou ΘΥ* – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God), **according to and in the same proportion degree as all of you**

(*kathos pas su* – inasmuch as you all, just as, and when compared to you all).” (Acts 22:3)

This single proclamation contains several exceptionally inappropriate statements. This man, who claimed to speak for Yahowsha’, wallowed in the idea of being “educated and trained” by a rabbi, the leader of those Yahowsha’ had said “were born of serpents.” It would have been one thing for him to admit in passing that he had once been one of Gamaliel’s students, but it is another altogether to speak of this acclaimed rabbi as if he was filling the role of the Set-Apart Spirit. It is obvious that Paul admired a man Yahowsha’ would have despised.

The problem Yahowsha’ had with rabbinical traditions, known as the Oral Torah (later codified in the *Talmud*), is that it changes, corrupts, counterfeits, and conceals Yahowah’s actual “*Towrah* –Teaching.” So why did Paul call the inheritance which was received from his forefathers “precisely accurate” when Yahowsha’ said the opposite? And speaking of perfect, Sha’uwl used the perfect tense with reference to the training he had received from Gamaliel, saying that while his education was complete, it had lingering effects. Therefore, we must ask: why did Sha’uwl claim to be a religious fundamentalist, to be a zealot in strict conformity with that which was parceled out by his forefathers?

This question is vital because it also suggests that Paul was either a compulsive liar who cannot be trusted or he never converted from Judaism to Christianity – not that one was better than the other. Further, based upon this statement, since Sha’uwl claimed to be in absolute accord with Judaism and its oral traditions, the argument cannot be made that he was assailing the *Talmud* instead of the *Towrah* throughout his letters. Also, Paul will twice attest that he had not been taught by men, and yet now when it suits him to gain credibility with this audience, he is admitting to have received training from the most

acclaimed religious scholar of his day. Was he lying then or now?

This is one of the few times Sha'awl specifically identifies whether it was Yahowah's Towrah that he was addressing, or the religious traditions of the Jews. And it is one of the few times he speaks favorably of the text. For those who know and love Yahowah, this juxtaposition is sufficient to demean and discount everything Sha'awl wrote and spoke.

Reinforcing this reality, by placing *nomou* amongst qualifiers such as the teaching of the Jewish religious scholar Gamaliel, rabbinical training, conformity, being a fundamentalist, adhering to the traditions of the forefathers, and being a zealous enthusiast, the "Torah" Sha'awl was declaring his loyalty had to be rabbinic, and thus could not have been Yahowah's Towrah. So when we are finally given some clarity, the picture being presented is the antithesis of the one painted by God. Set into the context of his overt animosity for Yahowah's Word, this is especially a-Paul-ing.

It's becoming apparent through his testimony that Paul loved the religious Law Yahowah and Yahowsha' despised, and hated the Towrah Yahowah and Yahowsha' loved. And perhaps that was why he so seldom differentiates between them in Galatians. If he had made his allegiance this obvious in his initial letters, his message would have been summarily rejected by all those who actually knew Yahowsha'.

In this regard it should be noted that of the 219 times the Hebrew word *towrah*, meaning "teaching, direction, guidance, and instruction," is found as a proper noun in Yahowah's Word, in the *Greek Septuagint* translation of it, *towrah* was rendered *nomos*, meaning "an allocation of inheritance which is parceled out," each time. Recognizing, therefore, the enormity of the *Septuagint's* influence on the

Greek texts which comprise the so-called “Christian *New Testament*,” a statement including *nomos* must reference unequivocal modifiers, such as are evident here in Acts, to render *nomos* as anything other than Yahowah’s “*Towrah*.” Therefore, throughout this book, unless the context dictates otherwise, we will continue to default to Torah when *nomos* is found in the Greek text. There is no other informed or rational option.

Addressing Sha’uwl’s concluding comment, “**present and existing** (*huparchon* – equivalent and identical to, belonging to and found at the hand) **of God**,” while religions such as Judaism, while religious leaders such as Gamaliel, and while religious traditions and customs such as those manifest in the oral traditions now found in the *Talmud* seek to nourish “a zealotry for god,” their god isn’t Yahowah. The religious god is a false deity modeled after the men who conceived him.

Some fifteen paragraphs ago, I suggested that Sha’uwl became Paulos and sought the acclaim of Gentiles largely because his own people refused to believe him. Already prone to anger, he became enraged. Should you want additional proof that Sha’uwl despised Yahowah’s Chosen People, consider these impassioned words from his second letter, where he rails against his race for doing what he had done: “**You suffered, and under your own countrymen, just as also themselves under the Jews, the ones having killed the Lord Iesoun and the prophets, and having pursued and persecuted us, not pleasing God and hostile adversaries against all men, hindering us as we speak to the races so that they might be delivered. For they are filled to capacity with continuous and eternal sins. So upon them is furious indignation and wrathful judgment unto the end of time.**” (1 Thessalonians 2:14-16)

If this unjustified and unbridled religious rant does not bother you, you cannot be bothered. An entire book could

be written about the many ways this is wrong. Woven as it was on a single thread of truth, this repositioning of Yahowah's Chosen People as being permanently disinherited, and as being the enemy of all humankind, as being completely evil, has the Adversary's fingerprints all over it. But at the very least, consider this: was Sha'awl not a Jew?

Returning to Galatians 1:14, the *Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear* conveyed Paul's arrogance thusly: "...and I was progressing in the Judaism beyond many contemporaries in the kind of me more exceedingly jealous existing of the fathers of me traditions." So it is not that the *King James* is wrong, albeit it is poorly worded, but that it is inadequate, saying: "And profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers." Jerome did the passage justice, however. In the LV he wrote: "And I advanced in *Iudaismo* beyond many of my equals among my own kind, having proven to be more abundant in zeal toward the traditions of my fathers."

Under Philip Comfort's guidance, the NLT suggested: "I was far ahead of my fellow Jews in my zeal for the traditions of my ancestors." It is as if the authors of the *New Living Translation* felt compelled to change even the simplest messages. *Ioudaismos* describes "Judaism—the practice of the Jewish religion." It is not the Greek word for "Jew." "Judaism" is a religion. "Jews" are a race. The difference is gargantuan.

Sha'awl's next statement is also untrue, feeding the myth of predestination and the mythos which became Calvinism. And speaking of mistakes, you should know that the independent clause depicted within the brackets below is not included in the text of Papyrus 46, the oldest extant witness of this letter.

"But (*de*) at a point in time (*hote* – when) it pleased

(*eudokeo* – it was chosen, preferred, enjoyable and better) **for God** (ΘΥ – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God), **the one** (*o*) **having appointed me, setting me aside** (*aphorize ego* – having separated me) **out of** (*ek*) **the womb** (*koilia*) **of my mother** (*mou meter*) [**and having summoned me by name** (*kai kaleo*) **on account of** (*dia*) **his Grace** (*charis autos*)], (1:15)

...to reveal and disclose (*apokalypto* – to uncover and unveil) **the Son** (*ton YN*) **of Him** (*autou*) **in** (*en*) **order that** (*hina*) **I** (*ego*) **could announce the healing message and beneficial messenger** (*euangelizo*) **among** (*en*) **the races and nations** (*ethnos* – the multitudes of people in different places), **immediately** (*eutheos* – straightaway, forthwith, without hesitation). **I did not ask the advice of or consult with** (*ou prosanatithemai* – I did not confer or communicate with) **flesh** (*sarx* – corporeal mass, physical nature, human or animal kind) **or blood** (*kai haima*).” (Galatians 1:15-16)

Unpolished in the *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear*, Paul’s words as he wrote them, read: “When but thought well the God the one having separated me from stomach of mother of me and having called through the favor of him to uncover the son of him in me that I might tell good message him in the nations immediately not I conferred in flesh and blood.”

Sha’uwl wants us to believe that God not only chose him but did so even before he was born. And yet, since this only occurred with Yirma’yah and perhaps, Yahowsha’, Sha’uwl is trying to put himself on par with God’s actual prophets.

It is one thing for God to have known us before we were born, as that simply attests to the nature of His Light, where He can see the past, present, and future as if they were all right now. But choice is sacrosanct with God. The entire purpose of the universe, of life, and of the Towrah is

for us to have the opportunity, and thus the choice, to know and love God. These options are ours and they necessitate freewill. Even with Abraham and Moseh, arguably the most important individuals in human history, Yahowah asked them. He did not appoint them.

That is not to say, however, that Yahowah was unaware of Sha'uwl. I have already shared two foreboding prophecies about him, and in due time you will be exposed to many more very specific predictions pertaining to the most influential man who ever lived.

Paul will soon speak of a three-year fanciful sojourn to Arabia, the heartland of the Torah, where he claims to have met with God. And yet while the timeline prepared by the historian Luke in Acts makes this trip impossible, the very notion of preparation is contrary to what this passage asserts.

While Paul's message is nothing more than "reject the Torah and believe in my Gospel of Grace instead," his condescending attitude and circuitous style make it readily apparent that Paul is a pathological liar with a faulty memory.

He began this letter in Galatians 1:1 with: "**Paulos, an apostle and messenger who is dispatched not from men, not even by the means of man,**" which would only be true if Gamaliel, Yisra'el's most acclaimed teacher, was not a man and if Judaism was not a manmade religion.

Then in Galatians 1:12, when he continued with: "**But I profess to you brothers of the beneficial messenger which having been communicated by myself, because it is not in accord with man.**" This would mean that Paul was lying when he said that he was in full accord with the strictest application of the religious traditions of Judaism in Acts 22:3. Also, his follow-on statement, "**But neither because I by man associating myself with it, nor was I taught,**" would have to be dishonest if he told the truth

about the many years he spent in the classroom learning how to argue against the Torah in rabbinical school at Gamaliel's feet.

But forgetting for a moment that Paul contradicted himself in the book of Acts when he stood up on the stairs to promote his religious credentials, he undermined his credibility in the 13th and 14th statements in this letter when he spoke of his **“practice of Judaism,”** stating that he **“continued to progress in the practice of Judaism over any beyond his contemporaries,”** and that he was **“excessively enthusiastic to conform to the traditions and teachings handed down by [his] forefathers.”** While it is possible to have been taught by both men and God, learning from each, Paul has both emphatically denied and enthusiastically embraced human teaching. And the notion that he was taught by God can only be considered valid if he, a known liar, is considered trustworthy.

So then now in Galatians 1:16, when Paul finally tells the truth, it only makes the situation worse. It is obsessively true that he: **“did not ask the advice of or consult with flesh and blood.”** But only because the *“aggelos – messenger”* prodding and controlling him was, by his own admission, Satan's messenger. Satan is not “flesh and blood.”

It should also be noted that Paul's unique path was completely unlike (if I may use the errant versions of some of their names for a moment to make a point) Adam, Enoch, Noah, Job, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moseh, Aaron, Yahowsha', Samuel, David, Ezra, Nehemiah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Joel, Jonah, Hosea, Zechariah, Malachi, Yahowsha', or Yahowsha's disciples, none of whom received any religious training. There was nothing for them to reject or unlearn as a consequence. And perhaps that is the reason behind Sha'awl's conflicting story. There is no denying that he continued to be extremely religious, and it is especially difficult for religious people to deal with the

truth because they first must abandon most everything they have valued, and then change their attitude, perspective and thinking. Very, very few overtly religious people are capable of doing so. Paul was not.

And it was because Sha'awl's past was so dissimilar to those who had previously spoken for Yahowah that he spent a considerable portion of his life promoting his credentials – but never as aggressively as in Galatians. Most new religions grow out of old religions. Buddha's teachings were considered viable because they grew out of Hinduism, the most popular religion in that part of the world. Muhammad's *Qur'an* derives all its credibility from the *Talmud*, just as rabbis surreptitiously usurped their authority from the Torah. Religions are seldom made from whole cloth but are instead a patchwork of previous traditions. That is what makes them so seductive and ultimately popular. And there is no better example of one religion growing out of another than Pauline Christianity.

It is also interesting to note that, with both Christianity and Islam, their inspiration became their enemy. Muslims turned on the rabbis who had provided the many hundreds of *Talmud* citations which were bastardized and plagiarized to form the *Qur'an*, ostensibly because they could prove that rabbis, not Allah, had served as Muhammad's inspiration. Similarly I suspect, Sha'awl turned on Judaism because, had he not done so, it would have become obvious that he had stolen their strategy and style.

Shakespeare wrote the line in Hamlet, “the lady doth protest too much, methinks,” to convey what is occurring here. By vociferously repeating his denial, we know, that more than anything else, Paul wanted his audience to believe what he knew to be untrue: that his message came directly from God, as opposed to having originated from man.

In truth, had Paul been telling the truth, he did not need to convey any of this *ad nauseam*. Yahowah had long ago established a method for us to determine who spoke for Him, and who did not. God's test is detailed in *Dabarym* / Deuteronomy 13 and 18 – so rest assured, we will determine with absolute certainty whether Paul can be trusted regarding his claims of inspiration.

According to the Towrah, there are three aspects to being a productive messenger. The first task is to cull the audience. There is no reason to waste time speaking to religious individuals because the truth will simply bounce off their veneer of faith as they struggle desperately to cling to their beliefs. Next, the ground must be prepared around those who remain. For the seeds of truth to take root, religious swamps must be drained of their stagnant waters, and the weeds of deception must be pulled. In this regard, the most effective weed pullers and swamp drainers are those who are cognizant of the delusions which permeate our societies and have polluted most people. This requires study. And speaking of preparation, we must come to understand Yahowah's Torah before we try to educate others. Simply stated, to share the truth, you first must know the truth.

During my first pass through this material, I erroneously assumed that Sha'uwl had come to recognize the truth and knew that his forefathers had crafted counterfeit rules and rituals, known as the Oral Law, to compete with Yahowah's Torah. I had hoped, therefore, that rabbinic tradition had become his primary foe, thinking that he was motivated to expose and condemn the suffocating religious regulations which had enslaved his people. Ideally, I would have liked to have seen him differentiate between man's religious rites and the healing and beneficial message conveyed in the Torah – the one lived out in history by Yahowsha'. But alas, it was not to be.

And since Sha'awl's story is not going to turn out well, I thought I would substitute my own journey from Christianity to the Torah, from religion to relationship, from believing to knowing, and from faith to trust. I was like Paul in a way. In my youth, I was the youngest ordained ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church. I provided a keynote address while in my teens at the national assembly on denominational reconciliation. I taught evangelism at a very young age, and devoured Christian literature at a prodigious pace. But a time came when I could no longer prop up my faith. There were way too many obvious conflicts between religion and reason for me to believe in Christianity, the religion of my youth, any longer.

A time came when I devoted my life to secular pursuits. As an entrepreneur, and with the help of others, I built three companies from business plans into corporations with sales exceeding one hundred million dollars. I had the privilege of taking two of those companies public. And as a result, at least for a brief moment, I became a billionaire. But a year after having left the management of my last enterprise, I found myself on the cover of an international publication, being publicly humiliated for things I had not done. It was my moment on the road to Damascus (albeit there were no flashing lights).

Fortunately for me, as I wished it had been for Paul, all my prior experiences, the successes and failures, were refined during this crucible of life. It was then that a dear friend taught me to write, and together we wove a word picture of what had happened at my former company, Value America. That story became the book, *In the Company of Good and Evil*.

Then, almost the moment we were done, Yahowah, the God I barely knew, asked me if I would be willing to do to Islam what I had erroneously anticipated Sha'awl having had done to Judaism – expose and condemn it based solely

upon its religious texts. After a brief negotiation, my literary friend and I were off to Israel to ascertain the mindset of Islamic suicide bombers. It was immediately after September 11th, 2001. Our meeting with al-Qaeda is retold in *Tea with Terrorists*. It was during this time that I began a journey which would lead me through the pages of the Towrah to the Covenant.

Unlike Sha’uwl, who was already an expert on Jewish scriptural literature, in my quest to expose Muhammad, I had to find and study the oldest Islamic sources to effectively condemn the religion. But like Paul’s alleged experience in Arabia, I spent three years preparing to engage in the spiritual battle against a satanic foe. The result of being immersed in the scriptures of mankind’s most repulsive swamp led to the production of *Prophet of Doom – Islam’s Terrorist Dogma in Muhammad’s Own Words*. I would ultimately invest five years of my life exposing and condemning Islam on behalf of Yahowah, doing nearly 5,000 hours of talk radio interviews before God finally let me know that we had accomplished what we had set out to do.

But we were not finished working together. Having known what it was like to be a Christian, having traveled to over 150 countries around the world, having learned how Islam corrupts its victims’ ability to think, Yahowah encouraged me to engage in another mission: *Yada Yahowah – A Conversation With God*. Recognizing that I was utterly unqualified to contribute to what is known about God is perhaps one of the reasons that I was asked. Making flawed instruments shine is one of Yahowah’s specialties. It was present again in *An Introduction to God* which I would encourage you to consider. The first of these two books recounts Yahowah’s scientific, historic, and especially prophetic testimony to prove beyond any doubt that He exists and that He inspired the Torah and Prophets. The second book reveals what He wants us to know about

Him. And since that time I have written the five volumes of *Observations* and the first two of *Coming Home*.

I share this story with you because, initially, I thought that I understood Paul. I thought that his flaws were my flaws. I initially saw the best and worst of myself in him. But that is no longer the case.

I now see myself as more flawed than ever. After all, I was fooled by this man for a long time. And yet the truth was blatantly obvious, even ubiquitous, but blinded by the religious indoctrination of my past, I missed it. Yet no longer. I now understand Sha'awl. I know his mindset and strategy. And I recognize his character flaws and his inspiration. Turns out, I have written a book detailing the life of a slightly more perverted and violent version of Paul, but that is a discussion for another chapter.

As I mentioned briefly once before, after coming to realize that Paul was a fraud, a wolf in sheep's clothing, I wrote other books, each designed to clear all the clutter away so that Yahowah could speak to us directly, Father to child, and reveal His Covenant relationship through His *towrah* teaching – just as He had with me.

As we return our attention to a more modern swamp, we find that the *King James Version* continues to render *euangelizo* inconsistently, preferring “gospel,” unless the context precludes the use of this inaccurate designation. Further, their inclination to translate *ethnos*, the basis of the English word “ethnic” and “ethnicity,” as “heathen” on some occasions and as “Gentiles” on others is both incriminating and unprofessional. Moreover, there is no basis for the title “God” in the Greek text of this passage. This known, the KJV reads: “**But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother’s womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood:**” Since “grace” cannot be found in the original

Greek manuscripts, the *King James* must have picked it up elsewhere. The *Vulgate*, perhaps...

Jerome wrote: “But, when it pleased him who, from my mother’s womb, had set me apart, and who has called me by his *gratiam*, to reveal his Son within me, so that I might *evangelizare* him among the Gentibus, I did not next seek the consent of flesh and blood.”

Should God have set Sha’uwl apart out of the womb to conduct this mission, then God would have been with him when he was a pervert and when he was an assassin. God would have been at his side when he was religious and when he was denouncing his religion. And that would make Paul’s god every bit as schizophrenic as his wannabe apostle.

The NLT, obviously infatuated with Grace, not only adds its alluring religious charm without any textual support but calls Grace “marvelous.” The idea of being “set apart” was evidently lost on these theologians. “But even before I was born, God chose me and called me by his marvelous grace. Then it pleased him to reveal his Son to me so that I would proclaim the Good News about Jesus to the Gentiles. When this happened, I did not rush out to consult with any human being.”

By way of review, here is the third stanza of Sha’uwl’s initial epistle:

“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 an extraordinary degree better than anyone else, I was aggressively and intensely, even systematically pursuing it by persecuting, oppressing, and attacking the Called Out of God as I was and am devastating her, continuing to undermine, overthrow, and annihilate her. (1:13)

And so I was and continue to progress, accomplishing a great deal, and I persist moving forward in the practice of Judaism, over and beyond many contemporaries among my race, enthusiastic, zealous, and excited, especially devoted and burning with passion to adhere to and assimilate with the traditions and teachings handed down by my forefathers. (1:14)

But at a point in time when it pleased and was chosen to be better for Theos, the one having appointed me, setting me aside out of the womb of my mother (1:15) to reveal and disclose, uncovering and unveiling the Son of Him in order that I could announce the healing message among the multitudes, races, and nations, immediately. I did not ask the advice of or consult with flesh or blood.” (Galatians 1:16)

✠✠✠

Questioning Paul
V1: Liars Lie
...*Contradicting God*

8

Pseudomai | I Lie

Into the Darkness...

We do not have a copy of the report Sha’uwl received from the Galatians, but it is obvious from his response to them that they were, at the very least, highly suspect of his credentials and his preaching.

“**I did not ascend** (*oute elthon* – I did not travel) **into** (*eis*) *Yaruwshalaim* | **Jerusalem** (*Hierosoluma* – a transliteration of the Hebrew name meaning Source of Information Regarding Reconciliation) **toward the goal of being with or against** (*pros*) **the Apostles** (*apostolos* – the messengers who are prepared and sent out, from *apo* sent out, and *stello* prepared and equipped) **before** (*pro*) **me** (*ego*), **but to the contrary** (*alla*) **I went away, withdrawing** (*aperchomai* – I departed) **to** (*eis*) **Arabia** (*Arabia* – a transliteration of the Hebrew ‘*arab*, meaning to grow dark), **and** (*kai*) **returned** (*hypostrepho*) **again** (*palin* – once more) **to** (*eis*) **Damascus** (*Damaskos* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *Dameseq*, meaning shedding silent tears in sackcloth).” (Galatians 1:17)

So that you know, Papyrus 46 uses *elthon* in the first clause, not *anerchomai* as is suggested in later-compiled manuscripts. Less accurate and verbose perhaps, the *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear* conveys: “But not I went up into Jerusalem toward the before me delegates but I went off into Arabia and again I returned into Damascus.”

Nothing would have been more compelling, more

reassuring, with regard to Sha'awl's credibility, than a trip to Arabia. It would put Sha'awl in the same conversation with Moseh. Just as the Torah was revealed to Moseh and the Children of Yisra'el on Mount Sinai in Arabia, affirmations regarding its teaching and guidance would have been revealed to Sha'awl for the benefit of the rest of the world. Only it did not happen.

The first of five compelling reasons to discount the Arabian sojourn is that Paul's Galatians testimony cannot be reconciled with his own account in Acts 9, which was written a decade later. In his testimony to Luke, Paul's portrayal of events following his experience on the road to Damascus does not include a trip to Arabia. In the historical account, he claims that his public mission began within days of his spiritual encounter. And since the book of Acts is far better attested and vastly more detailed than Galatians, logic compels us to favor the historian's authenticated chronology over Galatians, when they conflict.

In this regard, years after his so-called "conversion experience," Paul told his associate, Luke, who compiled Acts, that he was specifically instructed to spend time with an especially timid man named Ananias – an individual unknown to history apart from Paul's telling of the events. And while we will consider Sha'awl's recollection of this meeting in a moment, the newly minted "Apostle" told Luke that, after spending a few days recovering in the home of his reluctant benefactor from the trauma inflicted by the harassing spirit who besieged him, he immediately began preaching in Damascus.

We read: "He took some food and regained his strength. Now for several days he was with the disciples who were at Damascus, and immediately he began to proclaim Yahowsha' in the synagogues, saying that he is the son of God." (Acts 9:19-20)

There is a considerable difference between spending a few days in a home in Damascus regaining strength, and a long sojourn across the desert to Arabia. As such, Paul either lied to Luke or to the Galatians. Beyond the discrepancy in time, if we are to believe that Sha’uwl met with the “Healing Messenger” as he has so often attested, why did such an encounter be so debilitating?

This says that Paul was “with the disciples.” If true, it means that either he was meeting with two or more of the eleven surviving men who had walked alongside Yahowsha’, who just happened to be in Damascus. And if so, they were so irrelevant to Paul’s story that they went unnamed. Or Paul was lying once more. Moreover, in Galatians, Paulos specifically stated that he initially avoided all contact with the Apostles.

Also, in direct conflict with Galatians, this time the chronology, the next line in Acts reads: **“And all those who heard him continued to be amazed. And they said, ‘Is he not the one who in Yaruwshalaim destroyed those who called on this name and who had come here for the purpose of bringing them bound before the chief priests?’”** (Acts 9:21)

Annihilating people, as we are told Paulos had done, is very different than bringing them to trial. Also, since the Romans at this time were mostly ambivalent to a person’s perspective on God, inside the Roman province of *Yahuwdah* | Judea, the chief priests would have had no jurisdiction in such matters, not in Yaruwshalaim, and most especially not in Galatia. This scenario is not only unattested in history, it is incongruent with the evidence.

But Paulos would have us believe: **“And then Sha’uwl kept increasing in power** (*enedunamouto* – in raw strength), **confounding** (*sygcheo* – baffling, confusing, and causing consternation among) **the Jews who lived in Damascus.**” (Acts 9:22) Sure sounds like the

same arrogant fellow we have been reading about in Galatians. All that mattered was that the world should come to see Paul as great.

Well, and he also wanted the world to come to see Jews as lesser lifeforms. After all, just as the rabbis had been with Muhammad, Torah observant Jews knew that he was lying...

“And when many days had elapsed, the Jews plotted together to do away with him, but their plot became known to Sha’uwl. And they were also watching the gates day and night so that they might put him to death.

But his disciples took him by night, and let him down through the wall, lowering him in a basket. And when he came to Yaruwshalaim, he was trying to associate with the disciples, but they were afraid of him.” (Acts 9:23-25)

This reads just like the *Qur’an*. In all of the early surahs, the Meccans are shown scheming against Muhammad, only to have Allah alert his apostle and foil the plot. It was never true, mind you, in that Muhammad was little more than a whiney nuisance, but the same could be said for Paul in Damascus.

Most of this was fabricated to make Paul seem important. Just as with Yahowsha’, the Jews plotted to kill him. Just like Yahowsha’ in his infancy, he was spirited out of town to spare his life. And just like Moseh, he was lowered into a basket.

I have received over one thousand death threats after having compiled *Prophet of Doom*, but not once have I ducked for cover, sought the help of others to save me, or fled town. Yahowah protects those who work with Him.

The detailed testimony in Acts which, like Galatians was provided by Paul, is in direct conflict with his first

epistle:

“I did not ascend into *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem toward the goal of being with or against the Apostles before me, but to the contrary I went away, withdrawing to *Arabia* | the Darkness, and returned again to *Damascus*.” (Galatians 1:17) As such, the only possible conclusion is: Paul lied. And if Paul cannot be trusted to tell you about his own life, why would you trust him to tell you about Yahowsha’s life – or your life?

Please pause here a moment. If you are a Christian, the fate of your soul hinges upon your ability to process what you just read.

While Sha’uwl will self-inflict more than a thousand additional self-incriminating lashes on his credibility, this singular stroke is sufficient to undermine everything he had to say. And there is only one reason that Paul would lie about his calling and preparation: he was perpetrating a fraud.

And that is a serious problem considering what he has just written: **“Paulos, an apostle, not from men, not even by the means of man, but to the contrary, on behalf of Iesou Christou and God, Father of the one having roused and awakened him out of a corpse, (1:1) and all the brothers with me to the called out of the Galatias, (1:2) *Charis* | Grace to you and peace from *Theos* | God, *Pater* | Father of us and Lord Iesou Christou, (1:3) the one having given himself on account of the sins and errors of us, so that somehow, through indefinite means, he might gouge and tear out, plucking and uprooting us from the past inflexible and unrelenting circumstances and old system which had been in place which is like pornography, disadvantageous and harmful, corrupting and debilitating, maliciously malignant in opposition to the desire and will of *Theos* | God and *Paters* | Father of us, (1:4) to whom the**

assessment of the brilliant splendor, the opinion regarding the glorious radiance and appearance of the shining light, by means of the old and the new systems, Amen, let it be so. (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 healing message and beneficial messenger, (1:6) which does not exist differently, if not hypothetically negated because perhaps some are stirring you up, confusing you, and also proposing to change the healing messenger and pervert the beneficial message of the Christou, (1:7) but to the contrary, if we or a messenger out of heaven conveys a healing messenger or beneficial message to you which is approximately the same or contrary to, or even positioned alongside what we delivered as a beneficial messenger and announced as a healing message to you then a curse with a dreadful consequence exists. (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. (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, even regardless, if men, I was obliging and accommodating, exciting them emotionally, a slave of Christou, certainly not was me. (1:10)

So therefore, I profess and reveal to you brothers of the beneficial message which having been communicated advantageously by and through myself, because it is not according to or in accord with man. (1:11)

But neither because I by man associating myself with it. Nor was I taught (like a disciple). But to the contrary, by way of a revelation, an appearance serving to uncover and unveil Iesou Christou. (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 an extraordinary degree better than anyone else, I was aggressively and intensely, even systematically pursuing it by persecuting, oppressing, and attacking the Called Out of God as I was and am devastating her, continuing to undermine, overthrow, and annihilate her. (1:13)

And so I was and continue to progress, accomplishing a great deal, and I persist moving forward in the practice of Judaism, over and beyond many contemporaries among my race, enthusiastic, zealous, and excited, especially devoted and burning with passion to adhere to and assimilate with the traditions and teachings handed down by my forefathers. (1:14)

But at a point in time when it pleased and was chosen to be better for Theos, the one having appointed me, setting me aside out of the womb of my mother (1:15) to reveal and disclose, uncovering and unveiling the Son of Him in order that I could announce the

healing message among the multitudes, races, and nations, immediately. I did not ask the advice of or consult with flesh or blood. (1:16)

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

Paul wanted everyone to believe that he was more important and better prepared than Yahowsha’s disciples, and that his calling superseded theirs. According to Paul, both the disciples and he spent three years (based upon Paul’s testimony in the next verse) in Yahowsha’s presence, but Paul, unlike the others, received private, one-on-one instruction. And yet, since Paul’s testimony was false regarding the keystone of his credibility, the entire edifice of Pauline Doctrine crumbles – as does the religion based upon it.

This is not unlike Muhammad’s illusion of the Night’s Journey, in which he claimed to have flown on a winged ass from Mecca to Jerusalem to visit with Hebrew prophets in the Temple – thereby being their peer. Beyond the fact that asses do not fly, the Temple had been destroyed six centuries before the alleged flight. Trying to elicit credibility, Muhammad destroyed his own.

If you are still a Christian, you may not be ready to process what all of this actually means. I rejected Christianity for a relationship with Yahowah twenty years ago, but until a decade ago I could not deal with the errors or the conflicts in Paul’s testimony either.

For example, the “*enedunamouto* – raw strength” Paul was said to have increased in was a term only he used. The other seven times this verb is found in the Greek texts, they are all in his epistles. Therefore, since it is not said by or of anyone else, we know that this rather egotistical personal

evaluation came from Paul himself, not his audience or God. Apart from Paul, each time a unique capability is ascribed to an individual it comes from the Set-Apart Spirit and it is called: “*dunamis* – power,” as it is in Acts 1:8 during the fulfillment of *Shabuw’ah* | Seven Sabbaths, not “*enedunamouto* – raw strength”

Also troubling, the first “achievement” Paul would claim on his own behalf was “*sygcheo* – confounding, baffling, and confusing” Jews. That is the antithesis of Yahowah’s purpose, which is to use His Towrah to teach His children. There is but one spirit who would boast about deceiving others.

A Christian apologist might say that the change in Paul’s behavior and message confused the Jews, but that excuse is undermined by Sha’uwl’s insistence that he remained true to Judaism. Moreover, Luke expressed two separate thoughts, initially saying that those who listened to him were amazed by his oratory. Then after telling us that Paul’s physical power increased, Luke said that Paul went on to befuddle his would-be antagonists. The inference is that he was too clever for them to effectively refute, at least according to Paul.

The alleged plot, whereby the Jews conspired to do away with the self-proclaimed “messenger of god,” which was foiled by way of a revelation and uncanny escape, as I have just mentioned, is virtually identical to the story Muhammad was inspired to tell six hundred years hence at the inception of the Islamic Era. Then, in the immediate aftermath of quoting the Satanic Verses, as I have just shared, Muhammad imagined that he had flown from Arabia to Jerusalem (as opposed to the mythical journey to Arabia) at night, where he visited with Moses and Issa (the Qur’anic “Jesus” which is actually a transliteration of Esau) prior to visiting multiple levels of heaven (something Paul will also claim). Then after the so-called “messenger of god” told the Meccans this tall tale, they conspired to

kill him, but Allah revealed their plot, and Satan's messenger slithered out of town by miraculous means under the cover of darkness. It is the same story. So perhaps it was authored by the same spirit. And that is a problem because, in the *Qur'an*, Allah was modeled after Satan and he brags that he is the best schemer.

The other problems associated with Sha'awl's testimony begin with the realization that it is inappropriate for him to have his own disciples – should that be what he was inferring. It is as if he were trying to impersonate Yahowsha'. And further incriminating his account, as I have previously hinted, Jews under Roman dominion had no authority to put anyone to death – especially in Syria – and most especially a Roman citizen, like Paul. The Sanhedrin didn't have the authority to kill Yahowsha', which is why they begged the Roman authorities to do it for them. This whole sordid affair is preposterous from beginning to end.

If you are into fairytales, then embrace the notion that this self-proclaimed murderer, this man of enormous physical strength, was, as a newborn prophet “lowered” “in a basket” to save him from baffled and marauding Jews. Surely it was not to replicate the story of Moseh, where God's messenger was similarly spared from impending death.

The second of five proofs that the Arabian sojourn was a myth is a derivative of Paul's purpose in writing his first epistle. Galatians was composed to accomplish two goals. Paul wanted to differentiate his message from the Torah, and to accomplish that feat, he would have to be an extraordinarily credible witness. Therefore, the first two chapters focus on establishing his personal qualifications. But since everyone knew that Paul did not walk in Yahowsha's footsteps and did not thereby benefit from three years of training at his feet as the disciples had done, Paul had to make up a story which would appear to the

unsuspecting mind to put him on similar footing. Three years in Arabia with Yahowsha' would do the trick – at least if it were true.

But if Paul's claim to have met with Yahowsha' in the Arabian Desert was true then it would make Yahowsha' a liar. After all, while standing on the Mount of Olives Yahowsha' warned us: **“If anyone says to you, ‘Behold, here is the Messiah,’ or ‘There He is,’ do not believe him.”** (Matthew 24:23) Yahowsha' told us that if someone claimed that they had seen a Messiah, just as Paul has done, that they were lying. Do not believe him.

Further impugning Paul, the only one we know of who made these claims, Yahowsha' went on to say: **“For false Messiahs and false prophets will arise and will show great signs and wonders, so as to mislead, if possible, even the elect.**

Behold, I have told you in advance. If therefore they say to you, ‘Behold, He is in the desert,’ do not go forth, or ‘Behold, He is in the inner rooms,’ do not believe him.

For just as the lightning comes from the east and flashes even to the west, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be. Wherever the corpse is, there the vultures will gather.” (Matthew 24:24-28)

This is a deathblow to the veracity of Paul's testimony. If Yahowsha' has told us the truth, then Paul was lying about meeting with him along the wilderness road to Damascus and in the Arabian Desert. And if Yahowsha' was lying, then Paul's witness on behalf of a liar would be worthless. So since both Yahowsha' and Sha'awl spoke about this specific happenstance, and since this issue is central to Paul's credibility and to the merits of Yahowsha's advice regarding the reliability of a false prophet claiming to have seen him, a rational person can now close the book on Paul. It is over. His credibility has

been completely undermined by the very person he claimed to represent. If you have a Bible, rip Paul's letters from its pages.

Yahowsha' told his disciples that from the moment he left this world to the time Yahowah would return as brilliant as the stars and was seen by everyone at the same time that, anyone who claimed to have seen him, as Paul had now done, was a liar and should not be believed. And yet as clear as this is, as irrefutable as this verdict may be, this realization is but one in many which bury Paul. All that is left for us to do is to watch the vultures gather over his rotten corpse.

Returning to Paul's desperate, irritatingly repetitive, and almost pathetic attempts at setting himself up as God's lone authorized prophet to the world, if he had actually met with Yahowah as Moseh had done, his testimony would have been unassailable, should he have described the experience in a written narrative, recounting word for word what Yahowah had said – all in keeping with the Towrah's narrative. But we have nothing. Not a word from Paul or anyone else has ever been revealed regarding an event which would otherwise have authenticated Sha'awl's authority. When you contrast this missed opportunity with Paul's countless protestations that we should trust him because he was God's chosen messenger to the world, there is a credibility gap the size of the Great Rift.

Third, in an upcoming chapter (*Yaruwshalaim* | Source of Reconciliation), we will juxtapose Acts 15 and Galatians 2 in order to demonstrate that Paul's ability to accurately recount recent events in his life is highly suspect. In this regard, the entire 15th chapter of Acts is devoted to describing the Yaruwshalaim Summit, sometimes called the "Apostolic Conference," because this meeting was arguably the most important in Paul's life, and in the history of Christianity.

And yet Sha'awl's testimony in the second chapter of Galatians conflicts with the historical narrative provided by Luke in Acts in every imaginable way. In fact, it becomes readily apparent that, had Paul not written Galatians, as his rebuttal to Yahowsha's disciples, his credibility would have been destroyed. But reason tells us that if Paul was willing to write a detailed revisionist account of a meeting, which was well attended and which had occurred within the previous few months, his lone, unsupported assertion that he had gone to Arabia nineteen years earlier to meet with God – for which there were no witnesses nor corroborating testimony – is suspect in the extreme.

Fourth, as it turns out, the reason Sha'awl was summoned to appear before Yahowsha's disciples in Yaruwshalaim was that his preaching was in conflict with Yahowsha's example and the Towrah's teaching. And since Yahowah's Word was personally delivered by God to Moseh on Mount *Choreb* | Sinai in Arabia, the fact that Paul's message was entirely different means that either the Source of Moseh's inspiration was hopelessly unreliable or Yahowah was not the source of Sha'awl's conflicting mantra. This problem becomes insurmountable when we recognize that should the Towrah be unreliable, Yahowsha's life, words, and sacrifice were all for naught.

The conflict is acute because the central thrust of Galatians is designed to meticulously belittle and then annul the Towrah. Sha'awl will say that the Covenant memorialized on Mount Sinai was of Hagar and that it was enslaving as a result. He will speak of the Towrah as being of the flesh, so as to demean it, calling it an outdated and cruel taskmaster. He reports that the Towrah was a burden which no one could bear – the opposite of what Moseh said about this same Towrah.

With Paul writing that the Towrah was incapable of saving anyone, he placed himself in direct conflict with Yahowah's testimony and Yahowsha's purpose.

Regardless, Sha'awl will write that the Torah's usefulness had come to an end, effectively annulling it – in direct conflict with Yahowsha's testimony during the Instruction on the Mount. He will go so far as to say that there are two Covenants when God says that His one and only Covenant is everlasting. Since these messages are the antithesis of one another, Yahowah, who is the acknowledged Author of the Towrah, cannot be the same spirit who served as Sha'awl's inspiration.

And fifth, the timeline Paul provided in Galatians, delineating the number of years which transpired between his promotion from rabbinical hitman to his god's lone messenger and then to the Yaruwshalaim Summit, is too great. According to Paul's testimony in Acts 9, he spent a considerable time in Damascus amazing the locals while confusing the Jews after his "conversion." (Acts 9:22-23) He is so proud of himself; we can only assume that the Damascenes were graced with his stellar oratory for the better part of a year. Then he claims to have gone off to Arabia for three years before returning to Damascus (Galatians 1:17-18) only to be lowered down the wall in a basket. (Acts 9:24-25 and 2 Corinthians 11:32-33) His memory betrayed him, his story then changed, and he claimed to be fleeing a government official under the Arabian King Aretas who died in 40 CE. After his first brush with power, he is said to have gone to *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem to meet with *Shim'own* | Peter and *Ya'aqob* | James. (Galatians 1:18-19)

Sha'awl's | Paul's travelogue continues through Syria and Cilicia, a journey which collectively transpired over the course of a year. (Galatians 1:21) However, in Acts 9, Sha'awl adds that he went to Caesarea, bypassing Syria, and then to Tarsus. (Acts 9:30) But then Paul tells us that he was summoned to the Yaruwshalaim *ekklesia* "after the passage of another fourteen years." (Galatians 2:1) That is a total of nineteen years.

Dark years, as it would transpire, because we do not have a record of any sermon or any letter from Sha’uwl during the decade after his alleged promotion from murderer to preacher. In fact, during much of this period, it is apparent that god’s self-proclaimed messenger to the world went into hiding. And that is a far cry from the “immediacy” of his mission in Galatians 1:16.

But speaking of time, the timing of the Yaruwshalaim Summit is well-documented. It is dated to 50 CE. So, if you subtract nineteen years, Sha’uwl’s abuse at the hands of the prodding spirit on the road to Damascus would have occurred in 31 CE, two years before Yahowsha’ fulfilled Passover. And if that were not sufficiently incriminating, according to Sha’uwl, he had spent a protracted period of time building an international reputation as a ruthless assassin of Yahuwdym before encountering the flashing light that blinded him. If he was telling the truth about being bad, it would indicate that his “conversion” occurred in 29 CE, a year before Yahowsha’ chose his disciples. That also means that his pursuit of the *ekklesia* would have begun four or five years before it was conceived.

There is an old adage which says that the problem with lying is remembering what you said. These events represented the pivotal moments in Sha’uwl’s life, so they would have been forever etched in his memory. But since the truth did not serve his interests, and since his reality did not fit his ego, he lied, making up stories of daring do so he could not recall from one occasion to the next. It is why we have three different depictions of his alleged conversion experience, another problem we will detail in upcoming chapters.

Since Sha’uwl has regaled us in a fictitious rendition of his initial ministry, I would like to linger a moment longer in the 9th chapter of Acts before we return to Galatians. In Paul’s first and second, but not his third, accounting of his adventure on the road to Damascus, he

was asked to meet with a fellow named Ananias, who was reluctant due to Sha'awl's burgeoning reputation as an uncivilized brute. So according to Paul, after Ananias hesitated to tutor the now blind and lame would-be apostle, "the Lord" intervened a second time, saying (according to Paul):

“But then (*de*) the Lord [*o kurios* – the ruler and master who possesses (without a pre-Constantine manuscript of this verse, it's appropriate to deploy the title Paul would have used as he spoke on behalf of his Lord while recounting the affair to Luke)) spoke (*lego*) to (*pros*) him (*autos*), ‘Go (*poreuomai*) because (*hote* – namely) he is (*estin*) my (*moi*) chosen (*ekloge* – a selected instrument (*skeuos* – object and vessel), the one (*outos tou*) to carry or carry away (*bastazo* – to take up and bear, to tolerate and to put up with, to endure and sustain the yoke and weight) my (*mou to*) name (*onoma* – and reputation) so that it is seen by (*enopion* – so as to be witnessed by; a compound of *en* – in and *optanomai* – to look at and to be seen (the Lord said of the blind man)) the nations and races (*ethnos*), kings (*basileus*), and (*kai*) children of Yisra'el (*uios Israel*).

Because (*gar*) I (*ego*) by him will provide a glimpse into intimate secrets which have been concealed (*hypodeiknymi auto* – under him will show and suggest, pointing out using words and arguments to warn; from *hupo* – by and under and *deiknuo* – to show and reveal, to indicate and point out), as much as is necessary (*hosos* – to the degree, amount, and duration), as it is currently required and actually inevitable (*dei* – it is now compulsory, expected, and in fact necessary, actively binding, and realistically fitting (present tense, active voice, indicative mood)) for him (*auton*) for the sake of (*hyper* – because and on behalf of) my (*mou*) name (*tou onoma* – the designation, person, and reputation) to suffer through this experience (*pascho* – to undergo this ordeal,

vexed, afflicted, and ultimately enduring death (the aorist tense speaks of a moment in time unrelated to any plan or process, the active voice indicates that the subject is performing the action of the verb, meaning that Paulos is causing the speaker to suffer, while the infinitive makes this verb read like an active noun)).” (Acts 9:15-16)

While I am sharing this to point out yet another inconsistency in Paul’s story, I would be remiss if I did not share why I consider this to be the most egotistical nonsense I have ever read – and that is saying a lot since I have written *Prophet of Doom* to chronicle Muhammad’s repulsive existence. *Dowd* | David was Yahowah’s Chosen One, not Sha’uwl. Beyond having Yahowah’s testimony boldly confirming this throughout the 89th *Mizmowr* | Psalm for all to witness (*Coming Home*, Volume 1, Chapter 10, *To Dowd or Not to Dowd – The Root of Replacement Theology*), one would have to wonder why Dowd is returning with Yahowah to be King of the Earth, and Sha’uwl was presented in the Psalm as “the Son of Evil,” if Paul was God’s preferred implement. Moreover, Paul was diligent in telling us his given and chosen names, but never once correctly conveyed Yahowsha’s name. Further, Yahowsha’s name is not the one that matters, it is Yahowah’s name, and *Sha’uwl* | Paul never once mentioned it to anyone. Paul, by lying about this, is arrogantly claiming that he was replacing *Dowd* | David, becoming God’s lyricist.

Even the priorities of Paul’s Lord are telling. Having chosen Sha’uwl to replace Dowd, and inverting the Prophets, the Son of Evil was to go to the Gentiles first, meeting with their kings, and only then to the Children of Yisra’el. And as it would transpire, that is what *Sha’uwl* | Paul would do. It would not be to share Yahowah’s name, but instead to inspire the kings and their nations to join him and turn on Yisra’el, replacing and then removing them from the Earth.

Yahowah has conveyed His message in His Towrah, through His Prophets, and within Dowd’s Psalms. There is nothing more we need to know – especially God’s “secrets,” the things He has deliberately concealed because they are not needed for us to respond as we should to His instructions. In the Towrah, we read: **“That which has been deliberately concealed and not revealed (*ha sathar*) is for Yahowah (*la Yahowah*), our God (*‘elohym ‘anachnuw*), while (*wa*) that which has been made known, revealed and exposed (*ha galah*) is for us and for our children (*la ‘anachnuw wa la beny ‘anachnuw*) as an eternal witness for all time (*‘ad ‘owlam*) so that we may engage, acting upon (*la ‘asah*) everything that is conveyed through the words (*‘eth kol dabary*) of this Towrah | Guidance and Teaching (*ha Towrah ha zo ‘th*).”** (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 29:29*) Trying to present himself as more insightful and vital than Moseh, Sha’uwl has scuttled his credibility once again.

As for causing Sha’uwl to “*pascho* – suffer,” that is indeed the sentence he has earned. Paul will endure it with his Lord and inspiration, the Adversary, in Hell.

Previously, Paul claimed that Ananias told “the Lord” that: **“he had heard from many about the man who had to the greatest extent possible done immoral and injurious things to your holy ones in Jerusalem, and that here [in Damascus, Syria] he [Paul] has authority from the chief priests to forcefully bind and imprison everyone calling on your name.”** This was just another contrived fable designed to make Paul look as if he were the chosen one, even of the High Priests – a man to be reckoned with or else....

Contradicting Paul’s claim, historians of this period acknowledge that there were no Jewish “high priests” outside of Jerusalem, much less in Damascus, Syria. And outside of Israel, the priests would have had no authority whatsoever. And had there really been a man named

“Ananias,” since it is based upon the Hebrew *Chananyah*, meaning “Mercy is from Yahowah,” he would have known that Yahowah did not need or want the help of an incarcerating rabbi.

Turning to the alleged testimony from Sha’uwl’s Lord, knowing that Yahowsha’ chose twelve disciples at a time when Sha’uwl was available in Jerusalem and not selected, we are now to believe that Paulos, as a reward, I presume, for being especially immoral and injurious, was the chosen one. This resolutely religious and evil man claimed to be the “implement” of God, which is tellingly similar to “Ma’aseyah – the Implement Doing the Work of Yahowah,” even to *Chrestus* | Useful Implement. It is yet another attempt to position himself as God’s co-messenger, co-savior, messiah, and king of kings.

But consider what this “Lord” wanted Sha’uwl, the man who changed his name to Paulos, to do with his “*onoma* – name and reputation.” “The Lord” did not select Sha’uwl to introduce his name, explain his name, share his name, proclaim his name, invite people to Yahowah using his name, or save people in his name, even say his name, all things which would have been vitally important, and none of which Paul actually did. “The Lord,” which is Satan’s title, from the name, “Ba’al,” chose Sha’uwl to “*bastazo* – remove and carry away the burden” of his name and reputation. That is something Satan craves and Yahowsha’ disdains. This is because Yahowsha’s name is uplifting, describing the means God deploys to carrying away our burdens.

However, Satan’s reputation as the “Adversary” needs to be jettisoned for him to beguile souls into worshipping him as if he were God. By selecting *bastazo*, “the Lord” has to be Satan, who is the only one who would benefit from having the “burden” of his adversarial name and reputation “removed and carried away.” It would be senseless and counterproductive for God to ask for such a

thing.

And then we find Sha'owl's Lord mimicking Paulos' mantra, which is revealing secrets. Sha'owl even has his Lord say that the selection and implementation of Paulos was not only inevitable, it was actually compulsory and required. As for suffering, Yahowsha's sacrifice on our behalf was not only part of a very specific plan, it was also now long past, so once again, he cannot be Paul's Lord. But Satan's ordeal would endure.

If we are to believe Sha'owl's testimony here, the three years Yahowsha' spent with his disciples was a colossal waste of time. All of the prophecies and instructions that Yahowsha' shared with *Shim'own* | Peter would be hereby nullified. His name would have not only been irrelevant, it was a burden he wanted removed. And to believe Paul, the Lord had no choice, no say in the matter, no freewill. He was compelled to turn to Paul.

Not that we require more evidence to distrust Sha'owl, but this statement contradicts Paulos' testimony throughout Galatians, where he divides the world, giving *Shim'own*, *Ya'aqob*, and *Yahowchanan* | Peter, James, and John responsibility for the Jews, while he assumed authority over every other nation and race. Not so according to his Lord. And lastly, even if we discount the troublesome vocabulary, if Sha'owl's mission was to "*bastazo* – carry," but not "*bastazo* – carry away," Yahowah's name to every race and place, then he failed miserably. Not one Christian in a million knows the proper pronunciation of God's name.

But since Christians the world over know and proclaim the "Lord's" name, Satan was obviously the spirit who chose Sha'owl. Fixated as they both were on immorality and injury, on submission and death, on secrets and concealment, they were a match made in *She'owl* | Hell. After all, Sha'owl's testimony has been dishonest,

making the Lord *Ba'al*'s seed the Son of Deception.

As an interesting study, consider how many false gods have been called “the Lord.” *Ba'al*, which means “lord,” was the dominant deity of the Canaanites, of the Phoenicians, of the Babylonians, and of the Assyrians. The Philistines worshiped the infamous Baalzebub. Remarkably, the center of *Ba'al* / Lord worship was in the town of “*Ba'al Chermown* – the Lord of Destruction.”

In that we first considered Galatians 1:17 several pages ago, let's review it again in advance of presenting the Christian renditions. **“I did not ascend, traveling into *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem toward the goal of being with or against the Apostles before me, but to the contrary, I went away, withdrawing to *Arabia* | the Darkness, and returned again to Damascus.”** It would have been a different story, if only it were true.

These translations are passable (notwithstanding that there is no “J” in Hebrew, Greek, Latin or even in English prior to the 17th century). KJV: “Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus.” It reads similarly to the Latin *Vulgate*: “Neither did I go to Ierosolyman, to those who were *apostolos* before me. Instead, I went into Arabiam, and next I returned to Damascum.” The NLT published: “Nor did I go up to Jerusalem to consult with those who were apostles before I was. Instead, I went away into Arabia, and later I returned to the city of Damascus.”

You will notice, however, that all three texts made a reasonable attempt to transliterate the Hebrew names for *Yaruwshalaim*, ‘*Arab*, and *Dameseq*. So why were they all unwilling to transliterate *Yahowsha*’ accurately?

By way of background, *Sha'owl* (meaning Question Him (and indistinguishable from *She'owl*, the place of questioning more commonly called Hell)) was born and

initially educated in Tarsus, the capital of the Roman province of Cilicia. It is on the Mediterranean coast of what is southern Turkey today. It lies directly south of Galatia, the Roman province he was addressing with his first letter. At the time, it was home to the world's preeminent university. Sha'awl's father was both Jewish, from the tribe of Benjamin, and a Roman citizen – things which will loom large as this story unfolds. His father may also have been a Pharisee, which would affirm why Sha'awl remained a religious fundamentalist.

For a frame of reference, it is about a five-hundred-mile hike from Tarsus south-southeast to Damascus. Similarly, Mount Choreb (also known as Mount Sinai) in Arabia, is another 500 miles by foot, almost due south of Damascus (Choreb is directly east of Nuweiba on the west coast of the Gulf of Aqaba and is known as Jabal al-Lawz in Saudi Arabia). Jerusalem lies between the two, less than two hundred miles south-southwest of Damascus.

After lying, and telling us that he went to Arabia, but not even bothering to humor us with a word of what was spoken there, Sha'awl revealed exactly how long he remained in the wilderness. And that is odd because other than incriminate him, the one detail he shared was otherwise irrelevant.

“**Then later** (*epeita* – thereafter in the sequence of events), **after** (*meta* – with) **three** (*treis*) **years’ time** (*etos*), **I ascended up** (*anerchomai* – I went up) **to** (*eis*) **Yaruwshalaim** (*Hierosoluma* – transliteration of the Hebrew name meaning Source of Guidance Regarding Reconciliation) **to visit and get acquainted with** (*historeo* – went to inquire about and investigate, hoping to gain knowledge by becoming familiar with) **Kephas | Rock of Reconciliation** (*Kephas* – transliteration of the Hebrew word *keph* – hollow of a rock (*Strong’s H3710*); from *kaphah* – to pacify or subdue, *kephah* – branch, *kephel* – doubling dealing, *kaphan* – to be twisted and bent, *kaphaph*

– to bow down, and/or *kaphar* – to reconcile, a reference to Shim’own, who became *Petros* (a transliteration of the Greek word for stone), and is known today as Peter) **and remained** (*kai meno* – stayed and persevered, endured and abided, continuing to persist) **against** (*pros* – to, at, among, or with) **him** (*autos*) **fifteen** (*dekapente*) **days** (*hemera*).” (Galatians 1:18)

While it may be relevant, Papyrus 46 uses *meno* for “stayed” in the final clause, while later scribes wrote *epimeno*, a related word which is much more emphatic with regard to Sha’uwl remaining in close proximity to Shim’own. However, since the *Nestle-Aland* was compiled from the most popular texts, not the oldest manuscripts, their *McReynolds Interlinear* was oblivious to the alteration. “Then after years three I went up into Jerusalem to visit with Cephas and I stayed on toward him days fifteen.”

It is instructive to know that Moseh was on Mount *Choreb* | Sinai for 40 days, during which time he received the Towrah – a three-hundred-page book with prophecies so astounding and insights so profound, the resulting document left no doubt that it was inspired by God. And yet if we are to believe Paul’s story here in Galatians, as opposed to his story in Acts, Sha’uwl was in Arabia three years. And this pathetic letter is the product of all that time. Rather than being equipped to share Yahowah’s Towrah – Teaching as Moseh had been, and explain how Yahowsha’ had honored one of its most essential promises by fulfilling the initial Miqra’, we get an angry and egotistical diatribe that serves to negate everything God has said and done.

The interesting nuance in this passage is one we considered earlier. Sha’uwl may have been more comfortable communicating in Hebrew than he was in Greek. Recognizing that “*Petros*,” meaning “rock or stone” in Greek, was not Shim’own’s actual name, but instead his nickname, Sha’uwl was at liberty to transliterate it into

Greek – which he did, retaining the Hebrew pronunciation and meaning. The official language of Tarsus would have been Latin. Aramaic would also have been spoken as a result of the Babylonian, Assyrian, and Persian influence in the region. And Hebrew would have been the *lingua franca* of rabbinical school.

Therefore, we should be mindful of the fact that if a statement is being made by God, or if two Yisra’elites are in the midst of a discussion, then the Greek text represents a translation of what was conveyed in Hebrew. The reference to the Disciple Shim’own as “Kephas” keeps us mindful of this distinction, which is true for the entirety of the eyewitness and historical accounts.

If this is the nickname Yahowsha’ offered Shim’own during his alleged revelation regarding Yahowsha’s identity, it could have either been in recognition that the fulfillment of the Miqra’ would bring “*kaphar* – reconciliation.” Or it could have been a slight, “*kaphah* – pacifying” Shim’own for now knowing that he would be subject to Sha’uwl’s “*kephel* – double-dealing,” his words “*kaphan* – twisted and bent” to serve Paul and his Lord. This may be the reason that Yahowsha’ reprimanded “Kephas” at the time, telling Satan to back away.

But now that we know that Shim’own’s nickname was based upon a Hebrew word, there is no justification for translating his new name to *petras* and then transliterating it as “Peter.” And this also means, there is no “Saint Peter” associated with Yahowsha’ or disciple by the name “Peter.”

It is a distinction, however, which was lost on Francis Bacon and his associates. But other than changing the name of the place and person, the rest of the KJV is reasonably accurate with regard to this otherwise insignificant verse. “Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days.” LV: “And then, after

three years, I went to Ierosolymam to see Petrum; and I stayed with him for fifteen days.” NLT: “Then three years later I went to Jerusalem to get to know Peter, and I stayed with him for fifteen days.”

Speaking of names, the next passage destroys one of the foundational claims of Catholicism, in addition to devastating the foundation of Protestantism.

“**But** (*de*) **other** (*heteros* – different) **of the Apostles** (*ton apostolos* – of those who were prepared messengers and were sent out), **I did not see** (*ou eidon* – I did not pay attention to, concern myself with, or understand) **except** (*ei me* – if not) **Ya’aqob** | **Jacob** (*Iakobos* – a transliteration of the Hebrew Ya’aqob who became Yisra’el but then changed to “James” to appease the British king), **the** (*tov*) **brother** (*adelphos* – male sibling) **of the Lord** (*tou KY* – a placeholder used to convey *kurios*, giving the Greek word for lord and master a Divine sheen).” (Galatians 1:19)

In the *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear*, these same words were either translated or misrepresented to say: “Other but of the delegates not I saw except [not applicable] Jacob the brother of the Master.”

While it is impossible to know for certain if Paul actually wrote “*Kuriou* – Lord,” only to see his nomenclature replaced by a scribe who sought consistency and uniformity with the *Septuagint* and subsequent accounts of Yahowsha’s life, or whether Paul used the placeholders, knowing that if he didn’t, his letters would differ from the *Septuagint* and from the disciples, this leaves us in a bit of a quandary. Should these passages be translated as Paul likely intended, or as the placeholders might portend – at least as used in the *Septuagint*?

The reason this verse should be troubling to Protestants is that it undermines the credibility of the *King James Bible*, and indeed the credibility of every English translation since that time. While Sha’uwl correctly

transliterated the name of Yahowsha's brother, Ya'aqob, Francis Bacon changed his name to match that of his king's. The *King James Version* therefore reads: "But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother."

The political mindset required to justify altering the name of Yahowsha's brother, Ya'aqob, so that he would forever be known by the name of the reigning English monarch, is the same twisted mentality required to justify copyediting God and His messengers whenever it suits a religious purpose. Such men cannot be trusted – nor can their institutions or translations.

But what does this say about the attitude of those in the ministry today who know that this was done and yet have done nothing to correct the record – preferring instead to perpetrate the myth? Even to this day, in Christian Bibles, King James' name sits atop the letter written by Ya'aqob.

This literary fraud exposes the lack of moral character present among Christian leaders who continue to accept the wholesale infusion of Babylonian religious rites and symbols into Christendom. While it is one man's name, it is indicative of how the Towrah was replaced by "Gratia / Grace" in "Christianity," of how Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children became "Easter," how the Shabat celebration with Yahowah became "Sunday worship of the Lord." It is how Yahowah became "the Lord," and how Yahowsha', the Passover Lamb, became "Jesus Christ" to Christians.

This statement, however, contains an even bigger problem for Catholicism – a religion fabricated on the Babylonian presentation of the Madonna and Child, upon the Mother of God and the Queen of Heaven. Catholicism requires that Mary remain a virgin, and that she never age nor die. But this statement from Paul's pen clearly states that Ya'aqob was Yahowsha's brother, as do many other

passages. So Jerome was in a pickle.

Therefore, after writing: “But I saw none of the other *apostolorum*, except Iacobum, the brother of the Domini,” Jerome was forced to add the following to the Latin *Vulgate*: “This Iacobum is Iacobum the Less, who stayed in Ierosolymam, while the other *apostolorum* went out to preach the *evangelium* to the world. He functioned as the spiritual leader of the city where Christi preached and died; he was the Bishop of Ierosolymam. He was called the brother of the Domini because he was a cousin of Iesu, and also because he was similar in appearances to Iesu.” It was all untrue, every word of it, and Jerome knew it. But religious leaders will say and do anything to perpetuate the myths which empower and enrich them.

And yet now, with the benefit of over one hundred manuscripts dating to within three centuries of the actual witnesses, all of which affirm that Yahowsha’s brother was Ya’aqob, today’s esteemed religious scholars and theologians are still unwilling to convey the truth. Those associated with the *New Living Translation* failed to correct the political malfeasance in the *King James*. “The only other apostle I met at that time was James, the Lord’s brother.” So much for religious integrity and biblical inerrancy. Because familiarity sells, had they not included a book named after the English King, too few Christians would have purchased their Bibles for them to have profited from the endeavor.

Galatians 1:19 was otherwise inconsequential, and yet it laid two religions bare. The moral of the story is: you cannot trust men guided by religion or politics.

Seen as a collective whole, Sha’uwl’s fifth paragraph reads: “I did not ascend, traveling into *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem toward the goal of being with or against the Apostles before me, but to the contrary, I went away, withdrawing to *Arabia* | the Darkness, and returned

again to Damascus. (1:17)

Then later in the sequence of events, after three years' time, I ascended to *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem to visit, investigate, and inquire about *Kephas* | Rock of Reconciliation and remained against him fifteen days. (1:18)

But other of the Apostles, I did not see or concern myself with except *Ya'aqob* | Jacob, the (*tov*) brother of the *Kurios* | Lord.” (Galatians 1:19)

My initial inclination in composing this review was to pass over these positioning statements and move directly into the substance of the arguments Christians raise from Paul's writings to dismiss the Torah. And yet by studying them, we have come to know that Paul cannot be trusted. It was worth the effort.

שׁא׳עׁל

Sha'owl's next statement is troubling on three separate fronts. He wrote: “**But now** (*de* – because then) **what** (*o* – this means that which) **I write** (*grapho* – using a pen to form letters on papyrus I communicate in writing) **to you** (*umin*), **you must pay especially close attention to** (*idou* – you are ordered to intently look at, focus upon, behold, carefully consider, and remember this command (in the imperative mood this is a command)) **in the presence** (*enopion* – before and in front of) **of Theos** | **God** (*tou* ΘY – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God), **because** (*oti*) **I cannot lie** (*ou pseudomai* – mislead or deceive, speak falsely or communicate that which is not true).” (Galatians 1:20)

This message is wholly dissimilar to that of Yahowah's prophets and Yahowsha's disciples. They wrote “Thus says Yahowah...,” or “Yahowsha' said...,”

but Sha'awl proclaims "But now what I write to you, you have to pay especially close attention to." Those who speak for God, speak God's words, because they know that their choice of words pales in comparison to His. Even Yahowsha' quoted the word of God: **"For He (Yahowsha') whom God has sent, speaks the words of God."** (*Yahowchanan* / Yah is Merciful / John 3:34)

Even when we incorporate "in the presence of Theos," this gets worse. Paul would have the faithful believe that they must read his words in God's presence. Why? Does he want us to torture Him?

We read Yahowah's words to enter Yahowah's presence. There would be no point of reading what God told us in front of the One who shared these things. He already knows what He said.

The only rational conclusion which can be drawn from the statement, "I cannot lie," is that the one who made it is a liar. No man has or ever will tell the truth all of the time. As such, this statement alone rendered this epistle worthless. And in reality, based upon what we have read thus far, Paul has made many more invalid statements than accurate ones. But on the bright side, this means that Paul was telling the truth when he said that he was vicious and perverted, not to mention possessed by one of Satan's demons.

Liars lie, that is what liars do.

Further exposing Sha'awl, the Greek word for "writing a letter" is *epistello*, from which we get the English word "epistle." But it was not used, even though it would have been the perfect verb to state: "I'm writing a letter to you." And while *grapho* simply means "writing," the term was often deployed by Yahowsha', albeit through translation, to say, "It is written (*grapho*) in the Torah and Prophets." But what is particularly telling here is that Sha'awl has set his "*grapho* – writing" in the context of

something which “must be evaluated in the presence of God because I cannot lie.” And in that context, Paul is expressing that he wanted his letters to be seen as “Scripture,” equivalent to the Word of God in Christian parlance. And nothing could be further from the truth.

As we consider Christian Bible publications, the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear* provides a somewhat unbiased approach: “What but I write to you look before the God [not applicable] not I lie.” Turning to the *King James Version*, it is apparent that Christians desire the rationally impossible, for Paul to “truthfully contradict” God. And that is why the *King James Bible* says: “Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not.” And it is once again obvious that the *King James* was a revision of the Latin *Vulgate*, which reads: “Now what I am writing to you: behold, before God, I am not lying.”

As we consider the NLT, this statement, when converted to follow English grammar rules, begins with “o – what, not “ego – I.” Further, there are many Greek words which can be translated “declare” (*endeixis* – to prove by declaring, *apaggello* – to communicate a message, *gnorizo* – to make known, *diegeomai* – to describe by way of narration, *ekdiegeomai* – to relate, *kataggello* – to announce, and *euaggelizo* – to bring a beneficial message), but none of these appear in Sha’uwl’s epistle. So why then did the *New Living Translation* publish: “I declare before God that what I am writing to you is not a lie.” Desperate is as desperate does, I suppose.

Returning to Sha’uwl’s flight of fancy, we find:

“**Thereafter** (*epeita* – later then), **I came** (*erchomai* – I moved toward and happened upon) **to** (*eis*) **the regions** (*ta klima*) **of Syria** (*tes Suria* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *sowr*, meaning scorched rocks) **and also of Cilicia** (*kai tes Kilikia* – the Roman province in today’s southern

Turkey were Sha'awl was born). (1:21)

But (de) I was (eimi) not known or understood (*agnoeo* – not ignorant, neither recognized or disregarded) **personally** (*to prosopon* – by appearance as an individual) **by the (tais) Called Out (ekklesia) of Yahuwdah | Beloved of Yah | Judah (tes Ioudaia** – transliteration of the Hebrew name, meaning Related to Yah, errantly transliterated Judea) **in (eis) 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).” (Galatians 1:22)

As we know, Sha'awl was born and raised in Cilicia (Acts 22:3). He was the son of a prominent Roman citizen. If he was known anywhere, it would have been there. But should he have been telling the truth, he also would have been known to the Called Out Yahuwdym in Yahuwdah because he just said that he had met with *Shim'own Kephah* | Peter and *Ya'aqob* | “James” – the leaders of that Assembly. And while I suppose that it was possible, albeit unlikely, that Sha'awl was unknown in these communities, moments ago he claimed that his reputation preceded him. These assessments cannot all be true.

Also troubling, in Acts 9, Paul tells us that he went to Caesarea, which is on the Judean coast, before traveling to Tarsus, Cilicia, and thus bypassing Syria. While it is just a detail, the inconsistency is troubling juxtaposed against “I cannot lie.”

Turning first to the *Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear*, we find: “Then I went into the regions of the Syria and the Cilicia. I was but being unknown in the face to the assemblies of the Judea the in Christ.” The *King James* manages to properly transliterate Syria and Cilicia, but can't seem to do the same for *ekklesia*, *Yahuwdah*, or *Ma'aseyah*. KJV reads: “Afterwards I came into the

regions of Syria and Cilicia; And was unknown by face unto the churches of Judaea which were in Christ.” Jerome did a reasonable job transliterating *ekklesia* and *Yahuwdah* but must have thought that Yahowsha’ was a Greek bearing gifts. His Latin *Vulgate* says: “Next, I went into the regions of Syriae and Ciliciae. But I was unknown by face to the *ecclesiis Iudææ*, which were in Christo.”

Sha’uwl has made a habit of including the definite article before every title, from “the God” to “the Lord.” And in this sentence, even the title “*ekklesia*” was scribed “*tais ekklesia* – the Called Out.” So it is telling that he has not yet included the definite article before the title of the individual he claims to be representing. And yet since “Christo” isn’t a name, what options are available to us other than to conclude that Sha’uwl wanted readers to consider it as such?

Philip Comfort, the overall coordinator of the “*New Testament*” passages which comprise the *New Living Translation*, emphatically reveals on pages 224 and 225 of his *Encountering the Manuscripts* that he is aware that the initial Followers of the Way were called “Chrestucians,” not “Christians.” And he knows that in all three references to these individuals in the Greek texts – Acts 11:26, Acts 26:28, and 1 Peter 4:16 – that the oldest, most reliable manuscripts, including the vaunted *Codexes Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*, read “Chrestucians” not “Christians.” Furthermore, Philip Comfort is keenly aware that neither “Chrestucians” nor “Christians” appear in any other passage. So why do we find “Christians” in Galatians 1:21-22? “After that visit I went north into the provinces of Syria and Cilicia. And still the Christians in the churches in Judea didn’t know me personally.” Christian publishers must believe that their religious readers do not care that the “evidence” they are presenting is invalid.

While there is no textual basis for the NLT’s use of “that visit,” “north,” “still,” “me,” or “personally,” Mr.

Comfort's most egregious crime was changing "*ekklesia* – called-out assembly" to "**church**," and then associating this "church" with the nonexistent "**Christians**." It is as if he felt that he was at liberty to assist Paul in the creation of a new religion.

If you follow the link on the NLT's homepage to "**Philosophy & Methodology**," you will find that they don't acknowledge the methods they have deployed in creating their "translation." They simply list a pair of "philosophies" and a "method." And both philosophies are opposed to the liberal transformations we have witnessed in most every NLT passage. They say:

Essentially Literal (free only where absolutely necessary): This philosophy is reluctant to "clarify" the meaning of the text, though it is open to doing so when absolutely necessary for understanding. It holds English style at a higher value than the more literal approach and often adjusts syntax to help it read better, even if this makes it less literal.

Dynamic Equivalent (free where helpful to clarify meaning): This philosophy is open to "clarify" the meaning of the text whenever a literal rendering of the text might be confusing to the normal, uninitiated reader. This does not mean it deviates from the text; on the contrary, it does whatever is helpful to ensure that the text's meaning comes through in English. In general, such translations try to balance the concerns of both functional equivalence and literal approaches.

Based upon what we have experienced thus far, nothing the NLT has published has been "essentially literal." They have shown no "reluctance to 'clarify' the meaning of the text." So we must assume that either they don't abide by this philosophy (and that it was stated as a diversion), or they believe that it was "absolutely necessary" to revise, ignore, change, or extrapolate most

everything Sha’uwl wrote.

I recognize that this is standard operating procedure in politics, where even though the public has access to their constitution, their elected officials reinvent its meaning on a daily basis. But Paul’s epistles are positioned as the inerrant word of God, making this practice an outright fraud.

As for their pervasive use of what they call “dynamic equivalence,” we must conclude that they believe everything Sha’uwl had to say would have been “confusing to the normal, uninitiated reader.” And that means that if Galatians is to be considered “Scripture” (in the Christian sense of being inspired by God), then the folks working for the *New Living Translation* believe that God is a very poor communicator. And I would be remiss if I didn’t point out that the concept of being “initiated” in a religion, especially its mysteries, dates back to the Babylonians. And yet it is something Paul has continued to promote.

While it is egotistical in the extreme, not to mention ignorant, irrational, and foolish, to place one’s writing style and ability above the Creator of the universe (or even above someone claiming to speak for him), the NLT’s claim that they do not use dynamic equivalence to “deviate from the text” is laughably inaccurate.

But none of that really matters. This pedantic posturing was designed to take your attention away from the method they deployed.

Paraphrase (free for clarity and to catch attention): This method is normally used by an individual translator, while the other methods usually employ committees of scholars. Creativity and style are extremely important here; the translator sometimes tries to catch the attention of readers in a fresh way, seeking to jolt and surprise them into understanding.

The *New Living Translation* is so “fresh,” so “jolting and surprising,” it is as if Philip Comfort and Company (a.k.a., Tyndale House Publishers, Inc.) felt as if God, Himself, needed them to write another Bible.

Leaving one fictional realm, and returning to another, we find the *Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear* suggesting that Paul concluded his opening statement by writing: “Alone but hearing they were that the one pursuing us then now he tells good message the trust which then he was ravaging (1:23) and they were giving splendor in me the God.” (1:24)

Grammatically, this next statement is odd in that *Sha’uwl* | Paul is writing in the second, third, and finally first person. Also strange, the verbs were scribed in the present tense, suggesting that the attacks were continuing.

“But then (*de*) only (*monon* – alone) they were constantly (*eimi*) hearing (*akouo*) that the one (*oti o*) presently pursuing and persecuting (*dioko* – systematically, hastily, and intensely approaching, running and following after, oppressing and harassing (scribed in the present tense)) us (*emas*) at various times (*pote* – at any undisclosed period) now (*nyn* – at the present time) he presently proclaims a healing message (*euangelizo* – he currently announces a beneficial messenger (scribed in the present tense and middle voice, thereby influencing himself)) of faith (*ten pistis* – of belief) which (*os*) once or now (*pote* – at some unspecified period) he was attacking and continues to annihilate (*portheo* – he was consistently ravaging and destroying, he is devastating and overthrowing, he was sacking and is continually wasting and killing (the imperfect tense addresses an action which is in-process, something which began in the past but is still ongoing with no anticipation of its conclusion, the active voice says that Paulos was personally engaged in this savage behavior, while the indicative mood reveals that this depiction actually occurred)). (1:23)

And (*kai* – so) they were praising and glorifying me, attributing an exceptionally high value and status to me (*doxazo emoi* – they were considering me illustrious and magnificent, holding the opinion of an especially high rank for me, thereby supposing to honor me, extol and celebrate me, dignify and magnify me) in relation to (*en* – with regard to) **the (*ton*) *Theos* | God (ΘΝ – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God).” (Galatians 1:24)**

By writing in the third, second, and first person, *Sha’uwl* | Paul was out of touch with reality and himself. It is like a schizophrenic man saying, “we were crazy but he and you are better now.”

The presentation of “*portheo* – attack and annihilate” is identical to what we have seen before. By deliberately writing it in the imperfect tense, this grotesque behavior is ongoing. Paulos continues to ravage and destroy. That is the legacy of his letters. They remain as destructive and deadly as the day they were written.

While it is not currently apparent, we have been given another clue into the nature of what would become known as Pauline Doctrine. This time it comes through the forced inclusion of *pistis*, which I have translated “faith.” Etymologically, the word originally conveyed the exemplary concepts of “trust and reliance.” But that was before Paul made *pistis* so central to his religion that faith became synonymous with Christianity. Therefore, by alleging that his admirers equated his “*euangelizo* – beneficial message” to “*pistis* – faith,” Paul was setting the table for his treatise. *Pistis* was awkwardly tossed into the mouths of others because Paul’s entire edifice will be based upon faith. It will become his alternative to the Towrah.

No matter how we render “*en emoi ton* – in me for the” God, or “with regard to” God, there is no way to incorporate “*doxazo* – praising and glorifying” without gagging on the result. Paul has either imagined groupies

who are now worshipping him, or the Called Out from Syria to Cilicia were collectively suffering from the Stockholm syndrome. Either way, *Sha'awl* | Paul was now a legend in his own mind, with the Jews who he was persecuting now praising and glorifying him, considering him illustrious and magnificent. Pardon me while I gag.

Keeping in mind that the scenario *Sha'awl* has laid out, whereby the religion of Judaism, in concert with the instructions of its chief priests, recruited and then ordered *Sha'awl* to bludgeon Torah-observant Jews, is a charade, at least, based upon what *Sha'awl* has said about himself. It is entirely possible, however, perhaps probable, that the founder of the Christian faith was ruthless, a condescending bully and brute. But should this be the case, it means that we are dealing with a delusional schizophrenic and amoral psychopath.

Nonetheless, to the extent that *Sha'awl* told the truth, and that he was exceptionally and uniquely vicious, in concert with his repetitive claims, then the victims of his wonton savagery may have misconstrued this temporary remission in his brutality as being praiseworthy. In such cases, victims often bond with their abuser. They see the merciless as merciful. It is called the “Stockholm syndrome.” Therefore, in this concluding sentence, we are witnessing a psychological phenomenon that profoundly alters an individual’s ability to exercise good judgment regarding those who are abusing them, nineteen centuries before it was codified and explained.

This was not the first time, nor would it be the last, that this strategy would be deployed for nefarious means. Islam, for example, would not exist without it. Muhammad expressly authorized Muslim men to berate, imprison, and beat their wives so long as they occasionally relented and showed some mercy, which was usually in the form of having their way with their bodies. And if that was not sufficient to exercise complete dominion over women, then

they could murder them.

Doxazo, which is being directed at Paul, was translated: “they were praising and glorifying, attributing an exceptionally high value and status.” It also conveys: “they were considered illustrious and magnificent, holding the opinion of an especially high rank, supposing to honor, extol, celebrate, and dignify” Paul.

Doxazo is from the base of *doxa*, which is “to form a favorable opinion,” and thus “to hold someone in high esteem by taking into account their behavior and reputation.” And since Paul’s reputation, at least according to Paul, has been that of a libertine and terrorist, both of which in the sight of God’s people would be considered reprehensible, should this declaration have occurred, the Stockholm syndrome provides the lone rational reason to deploy “*doxazo* – glorified in the opinion of the beholder” in association with Paul.

And since the praiseworthy connotations associated with *doxazo* are directed “in me for God,” Sha’uwl’s statement can be read that people “thought highly of God in me,” which is extraordinarily arrogant, placing Paul in the company of the Caesars, Emperors, and Pharaohs who claimed to be god – or, at the very least, to represent Him before men. This serves to establish Paul as co-savior and co-author, his personal contribution toward completing God’s work.

This is yet another way in which Paul sounds like Muhammad in the *Qur’an*. This sentence pushes the envelope, elevating Paul’s opinion of himself well beyond anything which is appropriate.

But the other options may be even worse, especially if we read this as saying, “for God in me,” making Paul and his god one and the same. And if God is brought into the equation, and is seen as part of this arrogant evaluation, then Paul rises above his god in status.

Each of these themes will play out again in Islam, where Allah and Muhammad speak with the same voice because Allah is Muhammad's alter ego – having demonically possessed him as he had Paul. And this similarity is germane to our evaluation of Paul, because in Islam, Allah is indistinguishable from Satan. They have the same personality, ambitions, attitude, and methods. In Islam, which means “submission,” Allah replaces Yahowah as God. In Christianity, the Lord replaces Yahowah as God. The result is the same.

The *King James Version* crafted a bizarre ending that serves to exacerbate the problem: “But they had heard only, that he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed. And they glorified God in me.” The Latin *Vulgate*, from which the inappropriate ending materialized, reads similarly: “For they had only heard that: ‘He, who formerly persecuted us, now evangelizat/evangelizes the *fidem*/faith which he once fought. And they glorified God in me.”

While typically I am critical of these translations when they diverge from the original text, both conclusions are reasonable adaptations of Paul's poorly worded statement. It is easy to construe this as if Paul was suggesting that he and his god were equally praiseworthy. And keep in mind, the path to this place was paved with the pronouncement that Paul cannot lie.

In the context of religious deceptions, it's also important to recognize that the *King James* rendition of the beginning of this statement was errant because the Greek word for “preach” is *kerysso*, not *euangelizo* which means “to convey a healing messenger or beneficial message.” And since faith is the result of not knowing, how and why would it be “preached?”

Faith is required when there is insufficient information to know and thus understand. That is why it is part and

parcel to Pauline Doctrine. Paul never presents sufficient information to grow beyond “faith.” This realization drives to the heart of the Great Galatians Debate.

It is only out of a sense of duty, that of pulling weeds from the swamp that has become Christendom, that I continue to share the methodology of the *New Living Translation*: “All they knew was that people were saying, ‘The one who used to persecute us is now preaching the very faith he tried to destroy!’ And they praised God because of me.”

While this is not what Paul wrote, if this is what he was intending to say, if this is what he believed, then we should pity him. Neither Noah nor Abraham made such a claim. We do not find these words on the lips of Moseh (Moses) nor Dowd (David). Not even Yahowsha’ (“Jesus”) said this.

Recapping the sixth Pauline stanza serves as a real eye opener and head turner...

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

Thereafter, I came to the regions of Syria and also of Cilicia. (1:21)

But I was not known or understood personally by the Called Out of *Yahuwdah* | Beloved of Yah | Judah in Christo. (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. (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)

I do not think so. And if true, why did Sha’uwl call them “morons?”



The most appropriate way to conclude Paulos’ introduction of himself, his pronouncement of his calling, his disdain for the people he labeled apostates and traitors, and his zeal to be disjoined from the old system which he deemed pornographic and debilitating, would be to review what Paulos has written thus far. It has been a nauseating ride to a place most would not have dared imagine...

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

by means of the old and the new systems, Amen, let it be so. (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 healing message and beneficial messenger, (1:6) which does not exist differently, if not hypothetically negated because perhaps some are stirring you up, confusing you, and also proposing to change the healing messenger and pervert the beneficial message of the Christou, (1:7) but to the contrary, if we or a messenger out of heaven conveys a healing messenger or beneficial message to you which is approximately the same or contrary to, or even positioned alongside what we delivered as a beneficial messenger and announced as a healing message to you then a curse with a dreadful consequence exists. (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. (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. (1:10)

So therefore, I profess to you brothers of the beneficial message which having been communicated advantageously by and through myself, because it is not according to or in accord with man. (1:11)

But neither because I by man associating myself with it. Nor was I taught (like a disciple). But to the contrary, by way of a revelation, an appearance serving to uncover and unveil Iesou Christou. (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 an extraordinary degree better than anyone else, I was aggressively and intensely, even systematically pursuing it by persecuting, oppressing, and attacking the Called Out of God as I was and am devastating her, continuing to undermine, overthrow, and annihilate her. (1:13)

So I was and continue to progress, accomplishing a great deal, and I persist moving forward in the practice of Judaism, over and beyond many contemporaries among my race, enthusiastic, zealous, and excited, especially devoted and burning with passion to adhere to and assimilate with the traditions and teachings handed down by my forefathers. (1:14)

But at a point in time when it pleased and was chosen to be better for Theos, the one having appointed me, setting me aside out of the womb of my mother (1:15) to reveal and disclose, uncovering and unveiling the Son of Him in order that I could announce the healing message among the multitudes, races, and nations, immediately. I did not ask the advice of or consult with flesh or blood. (1:16)

I did not ascend, traveling into *Yaruwshalaim* |

Jerusalem toward the goal of being with or against the Apostles before me, but to the contrary, I went away, withdrawing to *Arabia* | the Darkness, and returned again to Damascus. (1:17)

Then later in the sequence of events, after three years' time, I ascended to *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem to investigate and inquire about *Kephas* | Reconciling Rock and remained against him fifteen days. (1:18)

But other of the Apostles, I did not see or concern myself with except *Ya'aqob* | Jacob, the (*tov*) brother of the *Kurios* | Lord. (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* | God, because I cannot lie, nor deceive, conveying that which is untrue. (1:20)

Thereafter, I came to the regions of Syria and also of Cilicia. (1:21) But I was not known or understood personally by the Called Out of *Yahuwdah* | Beloved of Yah | Judah in Christo. (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. (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)

It is spellbinding, albeit in the most nightmarish way.

☩☩☩☩☩

Towkechath | Rebuke

Say What?...

Sha'awl, the man who wanted the world to acclaim him as Paul, continued his disjointed travelogue and arrogant autobiography with another series of inaccurate statements. The reason behind, and timing of, the meeting at the heart of the Promised Land was not as he claimed. Therefore, the wannabe apostle lied when he wrote:

“**Later** (*epeita* – thereafter in the sequence of events), **through** (*dia* – by) **fourteen** (*ekatessares*) **years** (*etos*) **also** (*palin* – furthermore, again, and additionally), **I went up** (*anabaino* – I ascended and rose) **to** (*eis*) **Yaruwshalaim | Jerusalem** (*Hierosoluma* – transliteration of the Hebrew name *Yaruwshalaim*, meaning Source from which Guidance Regarding Reconciliation Flows) **along with** (*meta*) **Barnabas** (*Barnabas* – of Aramaic origin from *bar*, son of, *naby*, a prophet), **having taken along** (*symparalambano* – having brought) **also** (*kai*) **Titus** (*Titos* – of Latin origin meaning honorable).” (Galatians 2:1)

Before it was even born, *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem was where the Covenant was confirmed. It is the place Abraham and *Yitschaq* | Isaac tangibly confirmed their commitment to God’s Family and where Yahowah first revealed that He would provide the Passover Lamb. *Yaruwshalaim* is also the place where Passover, UnYeasted Bread, Firstborn Children, and Seven Shabats were fulfilled in 33 CE – year 4000 Yah.

Its name proudly declares that this city is the source from which guidance regarding reconciliation flows. It is, therefore, unconscionable that Sha'awl would spend nearly two decades within walking distance of the place and people who witnessed the most important four days in human history, and not stop by on occasion to soak it all in. And yet, *Sha'awl* | Paul remained fixated on Damascus.

Since Sha'awl will associate Yaruwshalaim with the enslavement of mankind two chapters hence, his disdain for Yahowah's favorite place on Earth should be evident. Paul, and the faith he conceived, would be averse to Yahowah's Chosen People, Promised Land, Torah, Covenant, Invitations, and city.

The events Paul has regaled in this letter and in Luke's correspondence, now called "Acts," suggest that more time had passed. But perhaps afraid that someone might do the math and recognize that, if the duration between being misled and blinded entering Damascus and being tried by the disciples was not trimmed to fourteen years, his conversion would have preceded Yahowsha's demise – ruining his entire story. And even then, if fourteen years transpired, Paul's transformation from misguided fists to words would have occurred in 36 CE, which was still too early for his mission to annihilate Jewish Ebionites in Syria to be credible. Prior to the advent of telephones, radio, television, and the internet, news did not travel at the velocity required to have a sufficient number of Ebionites (Towrah-observant Yahuwdym who knew of Yahowsha') to be in Damascus.

“I went up (*anabaino*), **but then** (*de*) **downward from** (*kata* – down, toward, along with, according to, and through) **an uncovering** (*apokalypsis* – a disclosure or vision that makes the unknown known, an unveiling which lays bare; from *apokalupto* – to uncover and unveil) **and set forth** (*kai anatithemai* – set before and laid down) **to them** (*autos*) **the beneficial messenger** (*to euangelion* –

the healing message) **which** (*o*) **I preach** (*kerysso* – I proclaim, announce, and herald) **among** (*en* – in) **the races and nations** (*tois ethnos* – people from different races, places and cultures) **down from** (*kata*) **one’s own** (*idios* – uniquely and separately),...” (Galatians 2:2)

As we consider the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear* rendition of this statement to further illustrate the deplorable quality of Sha’uwl’s writing, beware that I checked a dozen lexicons and all but one defined *kata* as “downward from,” not “by.” Not a single dictionary listed “by” as an option. “I went up but by uncovering and I set up to them the good message that I announce in the nations by own...”

If we were evaluating a creative writing assignment prepared by a developmentally disadvantaged child in the sixth grade, we would be inclined to listen to this with a sympathetic ear, but that is hard to do when the scribe is an adult claiming divine inspiration. And keep in mind, the *Nestle-Aland* is the most universally respected textual resource regarding the Christian *New Testament*.

In due time, we will come to understand the reason that this “unveiling” came “*kata* – downward,” why Paul “*anatithemai* – set forth and laid down” his message as opposed to simply sharing it, and why he did so “*idios* – on his own, uniquely and separately” from anyone else. But between the attitude on display here and the quality of the writing, something remains seriously amiss.

In actuality, Paul is lying again. He was compelled to go to *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem as a result of a conflict between his message and the Towrah’s instructions. This summit would include the most influential men on the planet at that time, Yahowsha’s disciples, in addition to the leadership of the Called Out in *Yaruwshalaim*.

This statement includes the Greek noun *euangelion*,

which as a compound of “*eu* – well done, prosperous, healing, and beneficial” and “*aggelos* – messenger or message,” literally means “healing message and beneficial messenger.” While plausible as an extension, it is a stretch to render it: “good news,” as is often the case in Christian Bibles. Also, since the Greek verb *kerysso*, “I preach,” means “to announce, herald, or proclaim,” by having used *euangelion* and *kerysso* together, we can now be certain that if Sha’uwl wanted to say “preach” he would have used *kerysso*, not *euangelizo*, here as well as in previous statements. And this realization exposes the ubiquitous and indefensible translation errors manifest throughout the *King James Bible* and the *New Living Translation Bible*.

As we are discovering, the epistle to the Galatians was Sha’uwl’s attempt to reestablish a tattered reputation – one that had been called into question because he alone, among those claiming to speak for God, was willing to contradict God. Therefore, the best way for him to appear credible would be to tell us that he and his message had been approved and endorsed by Yahowsha’s disciples, and specifically by Shim’own, Ya’aqob, and Yahowchanan, the most influential.

Had it been prudent to believe Paul, at least apart from his vile and vicious nature and lack of literacy, then they would have endorsed him. But if they did, there is no evidence of it and no reason for this heated letter. And if so notwithstanding these omissions, it would be a favor Paul would not reciprocate.

“...but then (*de*) to the one’s (*tois*) opinions (*dokei* – presumptions and suppositions) **not (*me*) **somehow perhaps** (*pos* – in some way possibly) **to** (*eis* – into) **foolishly and stupidly** (*kenos* – without purpose and falsely, for nothing and vainly) **I might run** (*trecho* – I may have run in haste (present tense which portrays an action in process with no anticipation of its completion, active voice which signifies that Sha’uwl is doing the running, and**

subjunctive mood which presents this action as a mere possibility)) or (e) **I ran** (*trecho* – I rapidly moved hastily (aorist active indicative which conveys a moment in the past performed by Sha’uwl)).” (Galatians 2:2)

This is nearly incomprehensible. So let’s confer with the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear* to ascertain whether this is what Sha’uwl actually wrote. “...but to the ones thinking not perhaps in empty I might run or I ran.” I suspect the problem is as much with the quality of the writing as it is the questionable merit of the translations.

Plunging into the words themselves, this is the first of five times we will confront “*dokei* – opinion” in the context of this letter. Its primary connotation is “to suppose and to presume,” as well as “to hold an opinion based upon appearances.” *Dokei* conveys the idea of “wanting to see something a certain way, or of someone being predisposed to a certain viewpoint.” It is neither flattering nor reassuring. And because it is not thoughtful, this is not a ringing endorsement.

Cutting to the chase, *dokei* conveys a “subjective opinion,” as opposed to an objective conclusion. So, in the context of an endorsement on a topic which is literally life and death, and one so easily verified by way of the undisputed standard, Yahowah’s Towrah, this is a glaring red flag.

It gets worse in context because, in addition to the “presumptuousness” of *dokei*, we must add the “somehow and perhaps” aspects of *pos*. Further, the standard Paulos is claiming to have bested was “*kenos* – stupid and foolish.” Even I would not accuse Paul of being “stupid” – false and vain, yes.

As weak as these opinions appear, there are reasons to suspect that Sha’uwl’s tepid assessment may not even be accurate, or at the very least, it may be purposefully

misleading. There is another account, one more credible and detailed than this, expressing what transpired during this meeting. This is what politicians would call “spin,” as opposed to an outright lie. And in that light, this is not actually an endorsement of Paul, his message, or his mission. This is more of an indication that something was seriously wrong: **“opinions not somehow perhaps to foolishly and stupidly I might run or I ran.”** Even if we could figure out the rest, this still doesn’t say what he was running to, for, or from.

In that Protestant Christianity is predicated in large part on the *King James Bible’s* interpretation of Paul’s theology, it is incumbent upon us to compare these texts. So we must recognize that Paul actually wrote: **“I went up, but then downward from uncovering an unveiling which lays bare, laying down to them the beneficial messenger which I preach among the races and nations down from one’s own, uniquely and separately, but then to the opinions and presumptions, not somehow perhaps into foolishness and stupidity, without purpose and falsely, I might run or I ran.”**

Therefore, there is no basis for “Gospel,” “privately,” or “which were of reputation” in the KJV, which reads: **“And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.”**

Should this be accurate, why would Sha’uwl consider running from them? He had come to impress them and dazzle them with his oratory and rhetoric. And it had been he who had persecuted them, not the other way around. Further, should Paul have actually been inspired by Yahowah, he would have known that God’s message is never in vain – only man’s. So if he is attributed saying these things, then Paul is providing us with a window into the origin of his mantra.

By adding “privately” to this text without justification, biblical scholars, inadvisably trusting their *King James Version*, have tended to disassociate Paul’s description of this meeting in Yaruwshalaim from the detailed account of the “Apostolic Council” presented in Acts 15. I can only assume that they do so because, when the divergent testimonies are compared, Paul’s credibility is shattered – and, with it, their religion.

It is easy to see where the KJV went wrong. Rather than accommodate the Greek text, they twisted the Latin *Vulgate*, the translation which gave rise to Roman Catholicism. Jerome’s amalgamated rendition reads: “**And I went up according to revelation, and I debated with them about the *evangelium* that I am preaching among the *Gentibus* / Gentiles, but away from those who were pretending to be something, lest perhaps I might run, or have run, in vain.**”

The origin of words is always a fascination. There is a misguided belief that “gentile” is from *gowy* or *gowym* (in the plural form). And while the evolved meaning of “gentile” is consistent with *gowy*, that has not always been the case. The English word is transliterated from the Latin noun *gentilis*, a variation of which was highlighted in the *Vulgate* passage. It meant “of the same family or clan of Romans.” The Latin word was used by Jerome to translate the Greek *ethnos*. It evolved over time such that it was thought to translate the Hebrew word *gowy*, meaning non-Yisra’elite races and nations. As an interesting aside then, *gentilis* | gentile, based upon its root, could be reasonably attributed from Romans to Roman Catholics as the Empire morphed into the Church. That being the case, all of Yahowah’s warnings against Gentiles would serve as a rebuke of Roman Catholicism.

As for the introduction of “privately,” since it does not appear in the *Vulgate* or in the Greek,” it may have been deployed by Francis Bacon, the suspected coordinator of

the KJV. He would have wanted to steer clear of the Latin translation, “but away from those who were pretending to be something,” because it would have undermined the notion that kings were appointed by God. However, by translating *dokei* “pretending to be something,” Jerome and the Roman Church were acknowledging that Paul was deliberately demeaning Yahowsha’s disciples. And indeed he was.

The Latin *Vulgate’s* presentation also suggests that Paul was in competition with others, debating with them – racing against them. In this context, and based upon what is revealed elsewhere, this could only mean that Sha’uwl is trying to dismiss Yahowsha’s disciples, discrediting them by suggesting that they were pretending to be Apostles, while he was presenting himself as being “*idios* – uniquely qualified” to run on his own in this race.

However, as we have acknowledged, this is actually a lame proposition. If we are to believe that Paul was inspired by Yahowah, and doing what God wanted done, nothing would have caused him to run independently from the very disciples with whom Yahowsha’ had entrusted with His witness. And this is especially disturbing considering what follows, where Sha’uwl condemns Shim’own for running in fear.

It is becoming increasingly easy to see why so many Christians remain befuddled and in the dark. The popular *New Living Translation* perpetuates the mistakes inherent in the *King James Version*, and then adds some myths of its own. “I went there because God revealed to me that I should go. While I was there I met privately with those considered to be leaders of the church and shared with them the message I had been preaching to the Gentiles. I wanted to make sure that we were in agreement, for fear that all my efforts had been wasted and I was running the race for nothing.”

It is evident from his nomenclature and attitude that

Paul was not interested in knowing if the disciples disagreed with him. Their opinions would never have caused him to question himself. No, Paul has already told us that there was a curse on those who challenged him. This translation is nonsense.

While his intent may have been to skirt the truth by inferring that God, rather than the disciples, had ordered him to appear in Jerusalem, Paul did not actually say that his “unveiling” came from “God,” or that it was the reason for his ascent. The contemporary audience would have immediately recognized such suggestions as disingenuous. There is no reference in Paul’s testimony to a “private meeting,” but instead, Paul speaks of “setting forth and laying down” the message through “preaching,” which is public discourse. There was no reference to a “church,” nor “leaders,” nor to “sharing” in Paul’s prose. And the terms Paul selected to frame his statement were all equivocal and are thus the antithesis of “making sure” he wasn’t a “foolish, stupid, deceiver, running in vain.” As a result, if you have been led to believe that this novel is a translation of the “inerrant word of God,” it’s time to abandon both myths.

In addition to rebuking the *New Living Translation* for their contrived interpretation of Sha’uwl’s letter, it is important to reinforce the fact that those who know they are presenting the Word of God do not seek the endorsement of others – ever. They rely exclusively on Yahowah. His testimony is memorialized in writing, it is unambiguously and consistently stated, it is available to everyone, and it does not change – making it reliable, and those who share it, dependable. Further, no matter the response, the time we spend conveying our Heavenly Father’s teaching is never “wasted.” While most human endeavors are “run in vain,” those who work alongside Yahowah never “run [His] race for nothing.”

However, those lost in a world of “faith” do not know,

so they are compelled to seek human approval. That is why believers congregate together. Perhaps the inadequate faith of these religious publishers seeped into their prose.

This is no small matter. It reveals why so many Christians get upset when others do not agree with them. The insecure nature of faith cannot handle the strain of knowing that informed and rational individuals don't support what they have been led to believe. It is as if they worry that the slightest chip on the veneer of their faith will cause everything to crumble. Questioning scares them, so they react by reinforcing one another and collectively pushing the perceived threat away.

Perhaps this is why history is rife with many delusions and with the madness of crowds, demonstrating that popular acceptance has never been a measure of truth. Said another way, individual deceptions are relatively rare, but collective misconceptions are common, especially among the religious, political, conspiratorial, and militaristic.

Before we press on to Sha'awl's next sentence, let's linger here a good while longer – especially since the mother's milk of faith, the specter of supposition, has now been raised. Opinions are to conclusions as faith is to trust. Since Yahowsha's disciples had at their disposal a pair of unassailable tests to ascertain with absolute certain whether Sha'awl was speaking for Yahowah, for himself, or on behalf of the Adversary, there was no reason for them to presume anything. God's criterion is straight forward, and it is easily accessible because it is found at the conclusion of His Towrah Guidance. The best known of these tests contains six elements (with six being the number of man):

1. Is the person a *naby*': someone who claims to speak on behalf of God? (This is a screening codicil, because if a person admits that they are speaking only for themselves, then there would be no reason for anyone to associate his or her message with God. As for

Sha'awl, he unequivocally claimed to be a “*naby*’.”)

2. Is the person *zyd*: someone who oversteps their bounds, speaking presumptuously and contemptuously, with an inflated sense of self-worth, demonstrating self-reliance while taking liberties to defy God. Are they someone who arrogantly pretends to know, who insults others and is disrespectful? Do they display pride in the pursuit of personal recognition and acclaim while despising and demeaning perceived competitors, lashing out at anyone who rebels against that which is established? Are they prone to rage, seething with anger and often furious, overbearing, rude, and conceited in their plans? (As we shall discover during our review of Sha'awl's initial epistle, this could be written to say: does the person act like *Sha'awl* | Paul.)
3. Does the person *dabar ba shem*: openly and publicly preach to others, communicating his or her message in the name of God? (As was the case with the first codicil, this is also a screening test. If the person has an insignificantly small audience, if his or her statements are exclusively conveyed in private, if his or her influence is limited to a specific time and place without an ongoing legacy or lingering consequence, then there would be no reason to apply this test. But such is not the case with Paul, whose public preaching and copious letters have influenced billions.)
4. Is the person's message *lo' tsawah*: inconsistent with what Yahowah has instructed and directed? Does his or her message conflict with what God appointed, constituted, and taught? Does it vary from His Instructions? (This is where *Sha'awl* | Paul is the most vulnerable because his theology is usually the antithesis of Yahowah's teaching.)
5. Does the person *dabar ba shem 'aher 'elohym*: speak in the name of gods other than Yahowah? (Paul's “in

the name of *Charis* | Grace,” his “Amen” salutation, his renaming of Yahowsha’ as *Iesou*, along with the derogatory title *Christos*, and his constant use of “*Kurios* – the Lord” are all in violation, so he failed this test miserably.)

6. Are the individual’s written and spoken statements consistent with that which *hayah*: has occurred and is existing, as well as what has been established and instituted by God, and do their prophetic pronouncements *bow*’: come to fruition? Does what they have said in the past transpire in the future? (Sha’uwl not only inaccurately conveyed the history of the Covenant, the Exodus, and Yahowsha’s life, he misrepresented current events in his own life, while also failing in his lone attempt at prophecy.)

We are still early in our review of this epistle, so not all of the evidence necessary to prove that Sha’uwl failed every aspect of this test has been revealed thus far. Nonetheless, it has been presented here in connection with Paul’s reference to “*dokei* – subjective opinion” which Sha’uwl interjected into the previous statement. Since he wants to trade on opinions, I wanted you to be equipped with the facts because God has provided an objective test. You are now properly equipped to quarrel with Sha’uwl if he violates clause two (of which we already have serious concerns), four (which will serve as the focus of our evaluation), five (of which *Charis/Gratia/Grace* is a problem), and six (when he misrepresents the timing of his “*harpazo* – rapture”).

We will also be looking for historical chronologies (such as his testimony regarding the Yaruwshalaim Summit) as well as other prophetic predictions because, without them, Yahowah’s signature and endorsement will be missing. Yahowah’s prophetic trademark is required if this, or any of Sha’uwl’s letters, is to be considered

inspired. So once we have completed our review of Galatians, we will deploy this same test to objectively demonstrate with absolute certainty that *Sha'uwl* | Paul did not speak for God.

Since Yahowah provided ample prophetic warning regarding *Sha'uwl* | Paul, and then equipped us with the means to evaluate his subsequent credibility, let's take a moment and review the text of the Towrah from which my summation of God's test emerged:

“Surely (*'ak* – indeed and reliably, emphasizing the point), **the person who proclaims a message on behalf of a deity** (*naby'* – a prophet speaking for God regarding the past, present, or future) **who** (*'asher* – relationally) **oversteps their bounds and speaks presumptuously, contemptuously, and improperly** (*zyd* – has an inflated sense of self-worth, demonstrating self-reliance while taking liberties to rudely defy God, who arrogantly disapproves while pretending to know better, who insults others and is disrespectful, displaying pride in the pursuit of personal recognition and acclaim while despising rivals, who rebels against that which is established and is prone to rage, who seethes with anger and is often furious, overbearing, rude, and conceited in their plans (here the hiphil stem reveals that the prophet and his statements are working together and that he causes this result to occur, while the imperfect conjugation speaks of their continual and ongoing influence)) **for the express purpose of conveying** (*la dabar* – for the intent of saying, of communicating verbally or in writing (piel infinitive construct – by design and intent)) **a statement** (*dabar* – a message, written or verbal in a letter or speech) **in** (*ba*) **My** (*'any*) **name or reputation** (*shem* – proper designation or renown) **which accordingly** (*'asher 'eth* – inferring access, relationship, and benefit which) **I have not expressly appointed, taught, guided, nor directed him** (*lo' tsawah* – I have not provided his instruction, nor

assigned, constituted, decreed, prescribed, or ordained this guidance through him, deliberately and demonstrably making him My understudy (piel stem and perfect conjugation)) **to (la) speak** (*dabar* – to say or write, conveying a statement or message), **and (wa) who** (‘*asher* – relationally) **speaks** (*dabar* – communicates) **in (ba) the name** (*shem*) **of other** (‘*aher* – different and additional, even subsequent) **gods** (‘*elohym*), **indeed, then (wa) that prophet** (*ha naby*’ – that individual who claims that their message regarding the past, present, or future is from God), **he** (*huw*’) **is deadly** (*muwth* – devoid of life and destructive).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 18:20)

This test only applies to those who claim to speak for God by name or renown – as was the case with *Sha’uwl* | Paul. It pertains to those who are vocal, and who promote their perceptions of God through the spoken and written word. To justify such scrutiny, the individual’s speeches and books must, therefore, be published and widely distributed so that the test can be fairly and accurately conducted.

By using *naby*’, only those who are prophetic can be considered. The person under scrutiny must be a prophet, which means that they must accurately reveal what occurred in the past and will transpire in the future. Therefore, if someone like *Sha’uwl* | Paul does not provide proof of his inspiration by revealing something relevant in the past or meaningful in the future that only Yahowah would have known, he is not speaking for God. Since there are no such revelations or insights in any of *Sha’uwl*’s numerous letters or copious speeches, there is no chance whatsoever that Paul spoke for Yahowah. He was lying when he claimed otherwise.

Arrogance is an anathema to God. Ego is odious. Therefore, *zyd* serves as a benchmark, such that we can make a determination based upon the speaker’s attitude toward God and man. In this light, it is a poor life decision

to suggest that God is wrong and that we, by comparison, are right. It is never right to infer that God is wrong, which makes *Sha'uwil* | Paul wrong.

We ought not overstep our bounds. This means we should not go beyond where Yahowah's words lead. His Way is narrow, restrictive, and unpopular. But since it is His Way, we are not at liberty to widen it, change it or, worse, replace it.

Knowing Yahowah exudes confidence, but since it is based upon our relationship with Yah and upon His assurances, it is the furthest thing from conceit. Self-reliance is presumptuous, while trusting God is not.

This known, there is nothing wrong with calling something or someone "stupid," so long as we correctly demonstrate why it or they are foolish. Contradicting God is disrespectful, even arrogant and appalling. Challenging me based upon what I have written is fair game, so long as the criticism is properly evidenced and reasoned.

Therefore, since it takes an enormous ego or tremendous confidence to speak on behalf of Yahowah, the charlatan condemns himself by being presumptuous and contemptuous. *Sha'uwil* | Paul is eminently recognizable as such, overbearing and conceited, derisive and repugnant. With his every word, he is promoting himself and seeking worldwide recognition and acclaim. And when he is challenged, he is enraged.

The core of God's test is based upon a comparison between what Yahowah has "*tsawah* – instructed and directed" and what another has written. Therefore, the surest way to know if Yahowah has appointed someone to speak for Him, is that you will likely find an affirmation of their mission, its timing and purpose, in the established Towrah and Prophets. For example, Yahowah predicted what I am doing for you, referring to me as *Yada'*, His *Choter* and *Nakry*, and these books as His *Nes*. You will

find the evidence for this in *Observations* and *Coming Home*. While that does not make me a prophet, it does indicate that I am speaking for Yahowah. And as for *Sha'uwil* | Paul, I have uncovered a plethora of prophetic warnings regarding him – all of which I will share with you.

My calling does not make me special, but instead puts you in a position to be special. Yahowah does not choose those who represent Him based upon their merit or acclaim, but instead on their willingness to be used and to go where His words lead. Through these books, Yahowah is introducing Himself to you, trying to get your undivided attention, so that, if you respect Him, you will be in a position to act upon His instructions and enter His Covenant.

We can validate a prophet's calling by comparing what they say to what God has instructed and directed. If the message is the same, if the writer and speaker are accurately conveying Yahowah's instructions and directions, beginning with His *Towrah* | Instructions and Directions, then they can be trusted because Yahowah can be relied upon. My books are entirely consistent and complementary, and Paul's are universally conflicting and contradictory.

To apply this test to any individual's books or speeches, two things are required of the evaluator. They must know what Yahowah instructed by having become *Towrah* observant, and they must be aware of what the individual being scrutinized conveyed. The corresponding citations must be correctly presented and logically compared. The process should be consistent, comprehensive, and methodical – which is why *Questioning Paul* is over 2000 pages and the *Yada Yahowah* series is 15,000 pages long and growing.

And lest I forget something that makes most people

uncomfortable; for any valuation to be meaningful, it must be judgmental. To discern fact from fiction we must exercise good judgment and be discriminating and rational.

According to Yahowah, those who speak for Him, speak in His name. They do not make pronouncements in the names of other gods, nor do they negate Yahowah's name by writing "HaShem" or "Adoni" instead. If you see names like Amen, Charis, Grace, Jesus, Christ, the Lord, or Allah in someone's writings (other than to point out that they are wrong), such individuals were not inspired by Yahowah.

Muwth makes the statements of a false prophet "deadly and destructive," revealing that those who believe him or her "will die." And because this is nothing to trifle with, we should do everything we can to decimate their message before it infects and kills more unwitting souls.

Yahowah continued...

"And if (*wa ky*) you actually say (*'amar* – you genuinely ask over the course of time (scribed in the qal imperfect)) in (*ba*) your heart, applying your best judgment (*lebab* – your inner nature and thinking (in recognition that the heart was considered the seat of judgment)), 'How (*'eykah*) shall we actually and consistently know (*yada'* – shall we come to acquire the information needed to genuinely distinguish, discriminate, understand and acknowledge (here the qal stem was used to convey actually, genuinely, and literally while the imperfect conjugation reveals that the ability to know is ongoing, consistent, and continual irrespective of time)) accordingly if the (*'eth ha* – whether the) statement (*dabar* – written or spoken communication) which (*'asher* – under the expectation of a beneficial relationship) he speaks or writes (*dabar* – his complete testimony (here the perfect conjugation requires us to examine the totality of the person's written and spoken communication while the

piel stem reveals that our perceptions of the object's writings, Yahowah's Towrah in this case, suffer the effect of the false prophet's testimony)) **is not** (*lo'*) **Yahowah's** (𐤅𐤃𐤁𐤀)?'

If that which (*'asher*) **is deliberately spoken over time** (*dabar* – has continually orchestrated through written or spoken communication (with the piel stem the subject influences the object and with the imperfect conjugation the consequence is ongoing)) **by the one who proclaims the message** (*ha naby'* – prophet who claims divine inspiration) **in** (*ba*) **Yahowah's** (𐤅𐤃𐤁𐤀) **name or reputation** (*shem* – designation or renown) **did not occur or is not literally and consistently established** (*lo' hayah* – is not actually instituted and existing (qal imperfect)), **or it does not actually come to be** (*wa lo' bow'* – does not consistently arrive (such as a predicted harvest) or literally happen (an errant prediction) (qal imperfect)), **the message** (*ha dabar* – the written statement and spoken communication) **which** (*'asher* – from the perspective of a beneficial relationship) **he** (*huw'*), **himself, has deliberately spoken to influence** (*dabar* – the totality of what he has communicated orally and in writing to effect one's perceptions regarding the object, which is God (piel perfect)) **is not** (*lo'*) **Yahowah's** (𐤅𐤃𐤁𐤀).

In (*ba* – with) **arrogance and presumptuousness** (*zadown* – with an inflated view of himself, self-willed and self-motivated, this morally flawed, disrespectful, imprudent, insulting, and shameless individual has taken great liberty while overstepping all due bounds in contempt of the established authority), **the prophet** (*ha naby'* – the one claiming to be issuing inspired statements from God) **has spoken and written** (*dabar* – he has conceived and presented his message (piel perfect – he has completely and deliberately sought to influence)).

You should not respect or revere him nor conspire to rebel with him (*lo' guwr min* – you should not fear him,

join him, congregate or live with him either).” (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 18:21-22*)

At the time Moseh shared this test with the Children of Yisra’el, the heart was considered the seat of judgment, of personal conviction, and character. The liver was the source of emotions.

God’s test is for those who genuinely want to “*yada’* – know.” If your faith takes precedence over the truth, please get out of the way and move along. This test is not for you.

As a surprise to those who are religious, God has no interest being around a bunch of dunderheads who do not care to know His name, understand His instructions, nor think about what He has to say. To avoid the embarrassment of being rejected, only thoughtful and discerning individuals should apply.

To be with Yahowah, we must seek to *yada’* | know Him and understand what He has conveyed to us. And therefore, *dabar* | words matter. Emphasizing this, *dabar* was spoken four times in the opening statement and was repeated another six times in the second.

This is a word-for-word evaluation, where the word of God and the words of men are compared side by side. If they match, they are both right. If they do not, then the prophet is a liar.

It should be noted that while “*hayah* – exists, is instituted, and is established” and “*bow’* – come to be” convey somewhat similar thoughts in English; they do not in Hebrew. By using them in conjunction with each other, Yahowah is telling us that if anything a prophet says is divergent from what He has already instituted and established in His Word, or inconsistent with history, both past and future, this prophet was not inspired by God. Those who speak for Yahowah must, therefore, accurately

describe what has occurred in addition to accurately predict what will occur, while never contradicting anything God has said.

So while it should already be obvious that *Sha'awl* | Paul flunked historical accuracy and Towrah consistency, it is only a matter of time before he fails prophecy, too.

Prophecy is not only about the future. For example, Moseh was called the greatest of the prophets and he had far more to say about the distant past and his present circumstances than the future. Never discount the difficulty of flawlessly reporting prior events. Neither Paul nor Muhammad could do it, and they, thereby, failed the test of history past.

In addition, *hayah* is not only the basis of Yahowah's name, it is related to the Hebrew word for "life," *chayah*. To ignore Yahowah's *hayah* is to deny *chayah*.

The primary meaning of *bow'* is "to go from one place to another, and to arrive, coming upon the scene." It is all about the future and where Yahowah and we are going. The test is to determine if we are going in the same direction.

The reason *zadown* | presumptuous arrogance is reaffirmed in this manner is because this test is designed to determine if someone is speaking for themselves, and if they are self-reliant, rather than speaking for God – and thereby predicating their message on His message. What I or anyone says only matters if it is based upon what Yahowah has said. And therefore, *Sha'awl's* trademark line, "But I, Paul, say..." is the surest sign of a false prophet – especially when what follows contradicts God.

Based upon the negation provided by *lo'* in the concluding thought, Yahowah is saying that a false prophet should "not be revered or respected, neither dreaded nor feared." He is conveying this so that we become more comfortable aggressively exposing and condemning those

who deliberately contradict His message. And make no mistake, it takes character and courage to excoriate the likes of Paul and Muhammad. This alone limits the number of people available for Yahowah's use.

Now that we are aware of this assessment, let's consider another. Yahowah's teaching regarding false prophets was initially broached in *Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 13*. Its evaluation is especially troubling for those who embrace *Sha'uwil* | Paul and his *New Testament* because it reveals that we should not listen to anyone who dismisses any aspect of the Towrah, who adds to the Towrah, or who claims to have received divine revelations, especially if they claim to perform signs and wonders, or if they promote service to or worship of a different god. It reads:

“With regard to (‘eth) every (kol) word (dabar – statement) which to show the way to benefit from the relationship (‘asher – to reveal the path to get the most out of life) I am (‘any) instructing (tsawah – providing guidance and direction to) you with accordingly (‘eth ‘eth), observe it (shamar – closely examine and carefully consider it, focusing your attention on it) for the purpose of (la) engaging in and acting upon it (‘asah – responding by profiting from and celebrating it), not adding to it (lo’ yasaph ‘al – never increasing it (through a *New Testament*, for example)) and not subtracting from it (wa lo’ gara’ min – reducing or diminishing the intent (by suggesting that it can be distilled into a single promise, a single act, a single statement, or a single profession of faith, for example)). (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 12:32*)

Indeed, if (ky) a prophet (naby’ – a person who claims to proclaim the message of a deity to explain the past or foretell the future) stands up trying to establish himself (quwm – rises up and exalts himself) in your midst (ba qereb) or an interpreter of revelations (chalowm chalam), and provides (wa nathan) a sign (‘owth – an

omen via a consent decree (thereby claiming to be authorized to speak for God as Sha'uwl did)) **or** ('o) **miracle** (*mowpheth* – something which appears marvelous or wonderful, inspiring awe (as Sha'uwl claimed as well)) **to you** ('el), **and the omen or miracle worker** (*ha 'owth 'o ha mowpheth*) **appears before you** (*wa bow*') **who has spoken thusly** ('*asher dabar* – who has communicated and promised this) **to you** ('el) **to say** (*la 'amar*), **'Let us go after** (*halak 'achar* – later let us again walk toward and follow) **other** ('*acher* – different or additional) **gods** ('*elohym*) **which** ('*asher*) **you have not known** (*lo' yada*' – you do not recognize and are not familiar with) **and let us serve and worship them** (*wa 'abad* – ministering on their behalf), **do not listen to** (*lo' shama*' 'el) **the words** (*dabar* – statements) **of that prophet** (*ha huw' naby*') **or** ('o) **interpreter of revelations** (*ha huw' chalowm chalam*).

Indeed, this is because (*ky*) **the test** (*nasah* – the means to learn if something is true) **of Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – a transliteration of יהוה, our 'elowah – God as directed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** ('*elohym*), **accordingly** ('*eth*) **is for you to know, understand, appreciate, and acknowledge** (*la yada*' – to recognize and comprehend) **whether this affirms your** (*ha yesh*) **love** ('*ahab* – relationship with and affection) **for Yahowah** (יהוה – the pronunciation of *YaHoWaH* as guided by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** ('*elohym*), **with all** (*ba kol*) **your heart** (*leb* – your thinking and judgment) **and with all** (*wa ba kol*) **your soul** (*nepesh* – conscious awareness, character and persona).

After ('*achar* – following) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of *YaHoWaH*, our 'elowah – God as directed in His *ToWRaH* – teaching regarding His *HaYaH* – existence and our *ShaLoWM* – restoration), **your God** ('*elohym*), **you should walk** (*halak* – you should be guided

and directed (which means following His Towrah guidance)).

And with Him (*wa 'eth*), **you should be genuinely respectful** (*yare'* – you should actually show admiration, reverence, continually and esteem (qal stem denotes a literal interpretation and genuine response while the imperfect conjugation conveys that this respect should be ongoing throughout time)).

Also (*wa* – in addition), **in concert with** (*'eth* – in association with and concerning) **His terms and conditions** (*mitswah* – His directions and prescriptions of His binding covenant contract and His instructions regarding the relationship), **you should continually be observant** (*shamar* – you should consistently focus upon them, closely examining and carefully considering them (qal imperfect)).

Concerning His voice (*wa ba qowl* – then regarding His proclamations and pronouncements), **you should literally listen** (*shama'* – you should make a habit of continually hearing (qal imperfect)) **so that** (*wa*), **with Him** (*'eth*), **you can consistently engage and serve** (*'abad* – always work alongside as a productive associate (qal imperfect)).

And (*wa*) **to Him** (*ba* – with Him), **you should choose to cling** (*dabaq* – you should literally and genuinely stay close, actually choosing to join together and be united, tightly holding on (scribed in the literal qal stem, the continuous imperfect conjugation and the paragogic nun ending which serves as an expression of freewill)).

So therefore (*wa*), **a prophet** (*ha huw' naby'*) **or** (*'o*) **interpreter of revelations** (*ha huw' chalom chalam*) **is deadly** (*muwth* – he is the absence of life, is destructive and damning (with the hophal stem, the subject of the verb, in this case, the false prophet, causes the object of the verb, which is those listening to him, to participate in the action

which is to die)) **if by contrast** (*ky* – if by comparison), **he has spoken** (*dabar* – that which he has communicated is (scribed in piel stem whereby the object suffers the effect of the action and the perfect conjugation, which addresses the limited scope of the pontificator’s existence)) **rebellious renunciations** (*sarah* – revolting disassociation, turning away and departing, of defection and withdrawal, or of being removed) **against** (*‘al*) **Yahowah** (*Yahowah* – written as directed by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** (*‘elohym*), **the One who led you out** (*ha yatsa’ ‘eth* – the One who descended to serve you by extending Himself to lead you out) **from** (*min*) **the realm** (*‘erets*) **of the Crucibles of Oppression Egypt** (*mitsraym* – of human religious, political, economic, and military control and subjugation) **and the One who redeemed you** (*wa ha padah* – the One who ransomed you) **from the house** (*min beyth*) **of bondage and slavery** (*‘ebed* – of servitude and worship).

His desire is to seduce and scatter you (*la nadach* – his purpose is to entice and compel you to be drawn away and thrust aside) **from** (*min*) **the way** (*ha derek* – the path) **which beneficially leads to the relationship** (*‘asher* – which fortuitously reveals the proper, narrow, and restrictive path to), **Yahowah** (𐤏𐤃𐤏𐤃𐤁 – the pronunciation of *YaHoWaH* as guided by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **your God** (*‘elohym*), **described, providing you with a complete set of directions** (*tsawah* – He taught, told, and instructed you, totally appointing these prescriptions for you (scribed in the piel stem, these directions guide those who follow them, teaching and instructing them, and in the perfect conjugation, it means that these existing directions are totally complete)) **for you to walk in** (*la halak ba*).

And so (*wa*) **you should choose to remove** (*ba’ar* – as an expression of freewill, you can purge that which should no longer exist (scribed in the piel stem, perfect

conjugation, and consecutive mood telling us that all things displeasing to Yahowah are to removed from us when we choose to follow His Towrah directions, including)) **that which is disagreeable, displeasing, and incorrect** (*ha ra'* – that which is wrong and thus wicked, no good and therefore counterproductive, immoral, malignant, mischievous, troubling, undesirable, unpleasant, distressing, injurious, and harmful) **from your midst** (*min qereb* – from your inner nature and thus from your soul).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 13:1-5)

It is for certain that Paul has done everything his words allow to tear believers away from Yahowah and to disrespect Him. Sha’uwl’s animosity toward Yahowah’s Towrah Teaching does not engender love or respect for the God who authored and offered them. Therefore, the only way to cling to Paul would be to let go of God.

What Yahowah has reinforced with this test is consistent with my personal experience. It was not until I took the Towrah seriously, closely examining and carefully considering its guidance and teaching, that I came to realize that Paul was a false prophet. The god Paul was describing and the means to salvation he was presenting in his letters were completely different than the God and path I came to know and respect in the Towrah.

Summarizing this, Yahowah has said that the best way to know who is not speaking for Him is to closely examine and carefully consider His every written word and then compare them to those chosen by others competing for your attention. He says that knowing and understanding that His Towrah is His source of instruction comes first. Acting upon His guidance and engaging in the Covenant Relationship is next.

No one has been or will ever be authorized to add to or subtract from His Towrah. Therefore, if we witness someone attempting to diminish the Towrah’s role in our

lives, or if we find a writer adding something new, like a new covenant, be careful because such a person is not speaking for God.

Yahowah reveals that if the prophet stands up claiming to have received a revelation from God, and establishes himself, personally speaking his own words in his own name, he is a false prophet. If he claims to have performed miracles, he is a false prophet. If he encourages his audience to go after other gods by other names, like the Roman Gratia or Greek Charis, he is a false prophet. If he promotes religious worship, he is a false prophet. If his writings do not affirm our love for Yahowah, he is a false prophet. If he directs his audience to disregard the terms and conditions of the Covenant, he is a false prophet. And of such revelations, God says that they are in opposition to Him, both ruinous and deadly, so we should completely remove that prophet's disagreeable, displeasing, and evil stain from our midst.

One last thought before we move on. If you witness someone showing off with a display of miracles – run. Yahowah's words are sufficient. Those who love Him cherish them. They do not need or want anything to upstage them. His words are the stars of this story.



Since this has been Sha'awl's personal revelation, his testimony, and his race against Yahowsha's disciples and, indeed, his pursuit against everything Yahowah has established and offered, in the context of him running this race, it is time we return to *Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk. While we briefly considered Yahowah's foreboding testimony through this largely unknown prophet in a previous chapter, this time we will linger and be more thorough.

But first, this reminder. Sha'uwl wrote: "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)

As we shall discover in a subsequent chapter of *Questioning Paul*, Yahowah's haunting prediction regarding Sha'uwl was announced 666 years prior to the time Galatians was written by the Devil's Advocate. As a preview of this revelation in *Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk, here is an excerpt of what the actual prophet revealed in his opening statements regarding a false prophet...

"This is the prophetic pronouncement (*ha masa*) which, for the benefit of the relationship and to show the way to get the most enjoyment out of life (*'asher*) was received as a revelation by way of witnessing a prophetic vision of the future by (*chazah*) *Chabaquwq* | Embrace This (*Chabaquwq*), the prophet who proclaims the message of God (*ha naby*'). (*Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk 1:1)

For how long and to what extent (*'ad 'an*), Yahowah (𐤆𐤃𐤁𐤀), shall I plead for relief during this desperately horrible and dangerous situation (*shawa*) because (*wa*) You will not actually listen for a prolonged period of time (*lo' shama*') to my anguished appeal and summons (*za'aq*)?

Toward and against You (*'el 'atah*) there is a devastating plot comprised of cruel lies regarding being Towrahless, plundering of people without moral

restraint (*chamas*), and as a result (*wa*) You must continuously withhold salvation (*lo' yasha'*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:2)

For what reason, for whom and why (*la mah*) are You having me witness (*ra'ah 'any*) this grotesque corruption and deliberate fraud (*'awen*) along with (*wa*) the distressing misery and abysmal situation being inflicted that (*'amal*) You are having me consider (*nabat*)?

The demonic spirit seeking to be worshiped as God, who is exceedingly malicious and oppressive, the Devil, himself (*shod / shed*), is a destructive force, completely Towrahless and lacking moral restraint (*wa chamas*), and yet he is conspicuously before me, publicly conveying this message right out in the open (*la neged / nagad 'any*).

He has been and continues to be (*wa hayah*) contentious and conflicting, taunting and quarrelsome, harboring in hostile opposition a different perception regarding the proper standard (*ryb*). He brings forth and continuously advocates (*nasa'*) dissention regarding condemnation and vindication (*wa madownd*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:3)

In this regard (*ken 'al*), he will consistently seek to incapacitate, invalidate, and paralyze the purpose of, striving to nullify, while bringing an end to (*puwg*) the *Towrah* | Teaching and Guidance (*Towrah*).

Therefore, he will never disseminate or carry forward (*wa lo' yatsa'*) the everlasting and eternal approach (*la netsah*) to vindicate by justly resolving disputes or to exercise good judgment by making informed and reasoned decisions regarding the adjudication of relational issues (*mishpat*).

Instead, by contrast (*ky*), wickedness is invasive and

injustice encompasses (*rasha' kathar*) the means to be right and become innocent ('*eth ha tsadyq*). For this reason, that which ('*al ken*) he brings forth and disseminates (*yatsa'*) perverts, distorts, and convolutes ('*aqal*) the way to make informed and rational decisions regarding judgment (*mishpat*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:4)

You can witness this (*ra'ah*) among the Gentiles (*ba ha gowym*) if you care to be consistently observant, carefully considering and evaluating (*wa nabat*).

And should you avoid being among those negatively influenced, you will be astonished and astounded, and thus by remaining free of societal influences, you will independently exhibit an exceptionally negative reaction, bewildered and dumbfounded, wondering how it was even possible (*wa tamah tamah*).

Indeed, it is true that (*ky*) a considerable undertaking will transpire (*po'al pa'al*) in your days (*ba yowmym*) which you will not find credible in spite of it being truthfully and reliably verified (*lo' 'aman*), even when it is properly assessed, written down, and he is held accountable (*ky saphar*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:5)

For this reason (*ky*), look to Me, and pay attention (*hineh 'any*), being upright while taking a firm stand (*quwm*) regarding ('*eth*) the Chaldeans and the religious influence of Babylon (*ha Kasdym*), the population of Gentiles (*gowy*) who are disagreeable and embittered (*mar*), impetuous and hasty (*wa ha mahar*).

Through the vast expanses of the region (*la merchab 'erets*) he makes his way (*ha halak*) acting as if it were his inheritance, taking possession of (*la yarash*) inhabited places that are not his to own (*mishkan lo' la huw'*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:6) He is (*huw' min*) terrible and repugnant, exceedingly distressing and terrorizing ('*aym*) as well as intimidating while demanding to be

venerated (*wa yare'*).

And yet his decisions and judgment, his plans and means to resolve disputes (*huw' mishpat*) are his alone (*huw'*). His proposals on being accepted into the relationship and to be forgiven (*wa se'eth huw'*), he brings forth and disseminates (*yatsa'*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:7)

They will be despised as abhorrent so they will fade away (*wa qalal*) as the dregs of a scummy remainder (*min namer*).

His swift airborne weaponry (*suws huw'*) will be as fierce and menacing as a lone wolf (*wa chadad min za'ed*) as the sun sets in the gloomy dusk at the approach of night by commingling and intermixing light and darkness, weaving things together while exchanging one thing for another, bartering with the darkness to replace and obscure in league with foreigners (*'ereb*).

Their randomly dispersed and widely scattered (*puwsh*) mobile war machines and accompanying soldiers (*parash huw' wa parash huw'*) will come from afar in the future (*min rachowq bow'*) flying through the air, even hovering (*'uwph*), like (*ka*) birds of prey (*neshar*), quickly swooping down and ready (*chuwsh*) to consume and destroy (*la 'akal*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:8)

With all of his (*kol huw'*) devastating plots to plunder the people of the Towrah comprised of cruel lies and great injustice (*chamas*), he persistently pursues (*bow' magamah*).

They appear in the east in confrontational fashion, antagonistic and belligerent (*hem paneh qadym*). He gathers the victimized (*'asaph*) captives (*sheby*) as if they were sand, innumerable and comparatively dense (*ka chowl*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:9)

And he, along with the religious and political rulers (*wa huw' ba ha melek*) mock and ridicule (*qalas*). Those

who govern and are empowered (*wa rozen*) **scoff, as they are haughty and egocentric** (*mischag*) **because of him** (*la huw'*).

He, at everything (*huw' la kol*) **which defends and fortifies and should have remained off limits** (*mibtsar*), **laughs in amusement while degrading Yitschaq** (*tsachag*).

He piles up a massive amount (*wa tsabar*) **of progeny along with their dust and debris** (*'aphar*), **and he seizes them** (*wa lakad huw'*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:10)

Then at that time (*'az*), **he will actually go with a new and completely different spirit, discarding the Spirit, sweeping Her aside, and actually exchanging the existing Spirit for a totally dissimilar spirit** (*chalaph ruwach*).

And he will arrogantly travel throughout, intoxicating and alienating based upon an unjustified opinion of himself, sacrificing an inheritance while revoking the prospect of salvation by repealing Passover (*wa 'abar*).

He will be wrong, incur guilt, and will genuinely suffer punishment for his acknowledged offenses (*wa 'asham*). **For this is** (*zuw*) **his influence** (*koach huw'*) **on behalf of his god** (*la 'elowah huw'*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:11)

Yahowah (*YaHoWaH*), **my God** (*'elohym 'any*), **my Set-Apart One** (*qodesh 'any*), **are You not eternal, from an unlimited duration of time** (*ha lo' 'atah min qedem*)? **Yahowah** (*Yahowah*), **we will not die** (*lo' muwth*) **as the means to decide guilt or innocence** (*la mishpat*).

You have actually appointed for him (*sym huw'*), **accordingly** (*wa*) **the Rock** (*tsuwr*) **which You have assigned and positioned to argue against and rebuke him** (*la yakach yasad huw'*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:12)

Too flawless (*tahowr*) **are eyes to witness** (*'ayn min*

ra'ah) such malignant and displeasing evil (*ra'*). You cannot endure nor prevail when (*lo' yakol*) looking upon or responding to (*wa nabat*) such a perverse and grievous undertaking (*'el 'amal*).

For what reason would (*la mah*) You look at or consider (*mah nabat*) the betrayal of an offensive and deceitful trickster and traitor engaged in chicanery (*bagad*)?

So You will enable an implement to write against the plot, facilitating an inscribed response with ongoing implications by composing an effective demarcation while remaining otherwise silent and unresponsive, taking no other action for a prolonged period (*charash*) concerning that which is befuddling and confusing, doing so with effective communication, thereby devouring (*ba bala'*) the wicked (*rasha'*) more accurate and righteous than him (*tsadyq min huw'*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:13)

Therefore, You act and engage with (*wa 'asah*) humankind (*'adam*) in a manner which could be compared to (*ka*) fish (*dag*) of the sea (*ha yam*), similar to (*ka*) creatures which move freely about (*remes*) without anyone ruling over them or seeking to control them (*lo' mashal ba huw'*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:14)

In everything associated with him (*kol huw' ba*), he will use a lure and hook to entice, withdraw, and sacrifice (*chakah 'alah*). When (*wa*) he catches them, he drags them away (*garar huw'*) in his dedicated trap (*ba cherem huw'*). And he gathers them together and removes them (*wa 'asaph hem*) in his dragnets by kindling his victims' yearnings while emotionally agitated and mentally dysregulated (*ba mikmereth huw'*).

And yet, concerning this (*'al ken*), he is elated, being intoxicated with himself (*samach*), and he is glad,

shrieking and shouting over this outcome (*wa gyl*).
(*Chabaquwq* 1:15)

So therefore in this way (*'al ken*), he sacrifices and slaughters (*zabach*) his devotees as they approach his net and are ensnared in his trap (*la cherem huw'*). And he blows smoke to make illicit worship seem pleasant (*qatar*), ensnaring his victims while remaining emotionally agitated and unstable (*la mikmereth huw'*).

For indeed (*ky*), by them (*ba hem*) he is enriched and satisfied (*shaman*), through seductive words while he claims a share of his persuasive plot (*cheleq huw'*).

And so what he devours (*wa ma'akal huw'*) is contrived, newly fashioned and artificial, recently created, entirely new, and synthesized, comprised of circumstances and conditions which have been amalgamated (*barya'*). (*Chabaquwq* 1:16)

So how is it (*ha 'al ken*) that he continues in vain to advocate such worthless fantasies and delusions from so far away, promoting that which is unreal and has never existed, doing so without any benefit, only to disgorge into oblivion (*ryq*) believers from his trap (*cherem huw'*), thereby (*wa*) eternally and intentionally end the lives (*tamyd la harag*) of Gentiles (*Gowym*), showing no concern, compassion, or mercy (*lo' chamal*)?" (*Chabaquwq* / Habakkuk 1:17)

With that introduction, God reveals that He isn't about to alter any of the requirements to participate in His Covenant or change the approach that He has taken to facilitate our restoration by way of His Invitations. This alone is sufficient to put *Sha'uwl* | Paul in opposition to Yahowah.

“Upon (*'al* – on this) **My requirements and responsibilities and what I observe** (*mishmereth 'any* – My mission which functions and serves as a safeguard to

watch over, protect, and preserve the observant; from *my* – to ponder the implications of *shamar* – to observe, closely examining and carefully considering, retaining My focus), **I have decided of My own volition that I will literally and continually stand** (*'amad* – I will always choose to be present, actually standing and thereby genuinely enabling others to consistently stand, enduring and sustaining while being properly positioned and accountable (scribed in the *qal* stem which addresses actual events which are to be interpreted literally, imperfect conjugation which reveals that God's presence here will continue throughout time, and in the cohortative which expresses volition and desire in first person)).

And (*wa*) **I will choose to always stand firm and present Myself** (*yatsab* – I will consistently serve, providing assistance by prominently appearing and presenting Myself (the *hitpael* stem tells us that God alone is taking this stand, and that He will not be influenced by anyone or anything, the imperfect conjugation reveals that His stand is consistent, continual, and enduring throughout time, and the cohortative conveys volition, making this God's will)) **upon** (*'al* – on the Almighty's) **that which strengthens, protects, and fortifies** (*matsowr* – the defensive stronghold which safeguards, preventing a successful attack by the adversary).

Therefore (*wa*), **I will be on the lookout** (*tsapah* – I will continually keep watch and be on guard, surveying the situation (scribed in the *piel* stem where the object of the verb suffers its effect, imperfect conjugation which reveals that God is constantly observant)) **in order to see** (*la ra'ah* – so as to observe, consider, and perceive) **what he will say about Me** (*mah dabar ba 'any* – posing a question concerning what he will communicate regarding Me and what message he will convey in association with Me).

So then (*wa*) **how can I be expected to change My attitude, thinking, or response** (*mah shuwb* – why should

I reverse course and mislead) **concerning** (*'al* – during and upon) **My disapproving rebuke** (*towkechath* ‘*any* – My complaint, correction, reproof, and strong disapproval, My rational arguments in response and subsequent chastisement and punishment; from *yakach* – to adjudicate and correct).” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:1)

God announced that He would be on the lookout for the likes of *Sha’uwl*, ever ready to disapprove and rebuke him or anyone suggesting that He has changed His plans or approach. So should we have been.

No one else in all of human history fits this prophecy besides *Sha’uwl* / Paulos / Paul – the author of Galatians and Romans. He not only tried to change God’s requirements, specifically His stand on participation in the Covenant relationship and the path to reconciliation, replacing God’s approach with his own, he claimed to speak for God while consistently contradicting and undermining Him. And it was all based upon the spurious notion of Replacement Theology – turning God into a liar.

That is why Yahowah has introduced this prophecy in this way. By affirming that He is not going to replace His specific requirements for participating in the Covenant with something as nebulous as faith, especially in Grace, nor shirk His own personal responsibilities, He has promised to become the living embodiment of His approach to salvation through His participation in Passover, UnYeasted Bread, Firstborn Children, and Seven Shabats en route to honoring the Day of Reconciliations. God has established Himself as being forever disapproving of Christianity, based as it is upon *Sha’uwl*’s repudiation of His Towrah.

A connection worth noting in what follows is that *Sha’uwl*’s | Paulos’ preferred conduit of misinformation was letters, often large and distinct ones from his own

hand. And not only has *Sha'uwI* | Paul admitted that he was running, he should have been, just as we should be running away from him.

“Then (wa) Yahowah (*Yahowah* – God’s name transliterated as guided by His *towrah* – instructions on His *hayah* – existence and His role in our *shalowm* – reconciliation as *‘elowah* – Almighty God) **answered me, approaching me** (*‘anah ‘any* – responded to me, testifying by providing useful information).

And He said (*wa ‘amar*), **‘Write down** (*kathab* – use the alphabet to inscribe, describing in writing) **this revelation** (*chazown* – this communication from God regarding the agreement), **and then (wa) expound upon and reiterate it using those letters** (*ba’ar* – teach others its significance by plainly and clearly declaring it using large and distinct alphabetic characters) **upon** (*‘al*) **writing tablets** (*ha luwach* – engraving it in stone or inscribing it on a panel or screen such that it is enduring and memorable) **so that** (*la ma’an* – for the express purpose and intent that), **by reading or reciting this** (*qara’ by huw’* – by proclaiming this and making it known), **he might run and go away** (*ruwts* – he might flee).” (*Chabaquwq / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:2*)

Yahowah realized that *Sha'uwI* would attempt to deceive His children. Therefore, He not only warned us about him, He provided the means to rebuke him so that we would not be fooled by him. By reciting this prophecy, we distance ourselves, and all who will listen, from *Sha'uwI* | Paul – from his letters, speeches, and influence.

Yahowah finds the perpetrator of this scheme sufficiently deadly to warn us specifically about him, and that is because this charlatan would claim that God had authorized him to undermine His credibility and competence. The lines of demarcation are clear, and the consequences are at the far extremes of what is possible, so

Yahowah left no doubt whatsoever regarding this man, naming him as we shall soon see in the prophecy.

Only one man is guilty of every charge which is being laid out before us. This explains why “he” is identified in the third-person masculine singular throughout. This known, there are three additional men who have earned a rebuke of this magnitude. So pushing aside the principal culprit for a moment, chronologically, the first of the remaining three is Rabbi Akiba. He was responsible for establishing the Jewish religion. He was a schemer of the highest order, and extremely arrogant, but not much of a writer. He operated in Yaruwshalaim, and he was preoccupied with his own self aggrandisement. He even promoted a false Messiah, Simon bar Kokhba, in 133 CE. His mistake led to the Yisra’elites being thrown out of Yahuwdah and to the Diaspora in Europe. It is immediately obvious to anyone other than an orthodox Jew that his proclamations were deadly and destructive. He was a lot like *Sha’uwl* | Paul in some of these ways.

Then there was Muhammad, the self-proclaimed “Messenger of God.” And while his *Qur’an* recital in 600 CE in Arabia was based upon *qara’*, the verb of the last sentence (*Chabaquwq* 2:2), he spoke for Allah, not Yahowah, and he was illiterate. Moreover, a literate person would not need this assessment to remain clear of Muhammad’s verbal diarrhea, because he was simply too stupid for words. There would have been no chance whatsoever that someone reading Yahowah’s prophets would have been fooled by Allah’s messenger. Although it is interesting to note that, while Muhammad claimed that his *Qur’an* confirmed the Torah, it is actually its antithesis. And while called a prophet, Muhammad never got one prophecy right. He was a lot like *Sha’uwl* | Paul in these ways.

One millennia after Akiba and five centuries post-Muhammad, Maimonides codified the principles of

Judaism. He was a prolific writer, but rather than change the Towrah, he preferred instead to augment it and then misinterpret it. Maimonides, however, was only briefly in Yisra'el, as he lived his life around Muslims, not Jews, in Islamic Spain, Morocco, and Egypt. Also, like Akiba, the Rambam never pretended to speak for God. But like Paul, he was especially adept at making up his own rules.

If there is to be a fourth candidate in Yahowah's hall of infamy, he would be Israel ben Eliezer, the founder of Hasidic | Orthodox Judaism as the religion is practiced today. Hailing from the Polish-Ukrainian town of Miedzyboz circa 1700 CE. Oppressed and subjugated Jews in their black mourning clothes refer to this religious mystic and miracle worker as *Baal Shem Tov*: Master and Lord of the Good Name. He has become the stuff of legend to the foolish and a fool to the wise. His affinity for Kabbalah over the Towrah is to his shame.

Collectively, these men deceived billions, but they did not promote their delusions during the “*mow'ed* – meeting times” – something common only to Sha'uwl, and which we shall learn in a moment is germane. Sha'uwl was in Yaruwshalaim when Yahowsha' was fulfilling the *Mow'ed Miqra'ey* – Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God. And he not only became infamous for his letters, he was a rabbi who did an about face to attack God from an entirely new direction. Further, Sha'uwl admitted to being conceited and demon-possessed – things which will loom large in a moment.

Speaking through the Prophet Chabaquwq as the years ticked down to 600 BCE, it would be six centuries, six decades, and six years before Sha'uwl would question God's Word, earning Yah's disapproval and punishment. Therefore, Yahowah encouraged those who first read this prophecy to be patient. This warning was for another day.

“Still indeed, the subsequent realization of (*owd ky*

– so therefore and nonetheless, the expectation regarding **this revelation from God** (*chazown* – this divine communication) **is for the Mow’ed | Appointed Meeting Times** (*la ha mow’ed* – for the designated season for celebrating the festival feasts).

It provides a witness to and speaks, pouring out evidence (*puwach* – it reveals facts which condemn and malign, trapping and ensnaring, even censuring the puffery from the blowhard) **in the end** (*la ha qets* – toward the conclusion of the process concerning the last days regarding limit of the ordinary flow of time; from *qatsats* – to tear asunder and cut off, casting away).

Should it seem slow to develop, the extended period of time required for this question to be resolved (*im mahah* – if hesitant, question him, because no matter how long it takes; from *mah* – to ponder the who, what, why, when and how of this question) **shall not prove it false** (*lo’ kazab* – this revelation shall not deceive, delude, nor fail).

Expect him in this regard (*chakah la huw’* – be certain concerning this and regarding him) **because indeed (ky), he will absolutely come** (*bow’ bow’* – he will certainly arrive upon the scene and make his appearance), **neither being delayed nor lingering** (*lo’ ‘achar* – not take longer than expected nor live for a protracted duration of time).” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:3)

The first four *Mow’ed* | Appointed Meeting Times – *Pesach*, *Matsah*, *Bikuwrym*, and *Shabuw’ah* – were fulfilled by Yahowsha’, Yahowah, and the Set-Apart Spirit in year 4000 Yah, more commonly known as 33 CE. They enable our inclusion in the Covenant and provide God’s Family with the ultimate set of benefits. Sha’uwl was in Yaruwshalaim at the time training to be a rabbi. Shortly thereafter, he began undermining them.

I find it interesting that now, in 2021, just twelve years shy of Yahowah’s return, we are reading this prophecy and

identifying it with Sha'awl. Better late than never, I suppose.

As bad as this is, it is about to get much worse. This specificity suggests that Yahowah read *Sha'awl's* | Paul's letters and was responding to them. It also means that Yahowah applied His own Towrah test to this man and found him wanting, setting an example we would be wise to follow.

“Pay attention (*hineh* – behold, look up and consider the details because), **he will be audacious and oblivious, puffed up with false pride** (*'aphal* – his head will swell and he will be daring, becoming an oozing sore and pain in the butt, haughty and arrogant, he will be lifted up for being boldly presumptuous heedless of the truth, reckless, hemorrhoidal, and foolhardy).

His soul (*nepesh huw'* – his attitude and personality, and thus his character), **it is neither right nor straightforward** (*lo' yashar* – he does not consider anything appropriately and is circuitous in his reasoning, he wanders away by twisting and convoluting the teaching, and nothing is on the level) **in him** (*ba huw'*).

And so (*wa* – as a result, it follows) **through trust and reliance** (*ba 'emuwnah* – by being firmly established, confirmed and upheld by that which is dependable and steadfast, always truthful and reliable, as well as being honest and truthful; from *'aman* – to be supported and confirmed by upholding the truth), **he who is correct and thereby vindicated** (*tsadyq huw'* – he who is right and thus acquitted) **shall live** (*chayah* – he will be restored to life and kept alive by being nurtured and growing).”
(*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:4)

While narrowing in on *Sha'awl* | Paul in the first stanza, in the second, Yahowah reminds us that vindication and life everlasting come to those who trust and rely on His firmly established and always dependable testimony. This

is and always has been the antidote for religion, especially Paul's Christianity.

And yet in Galatians 3:11, in the midst of his initial assault against the Towrah, Sha'uwl misquotes this verse, the very one which condemns him for mocking God, removing it from its context and truncating it, all to promote a faith based on ignorance...

“But because with regard to the Torah absolutely no one is vindicated or justified by God becomes evident because: ‘Those who are vindicated, justified, and righteous out of faith will live.’” (Galatians 3:11)

As is the tendency of a daredevil when faced with the specter of death, *Sha'uwl* | Paul was so transfixed by this damning and deadly prophecy regarding him, he cited it again, this time at the beginning of his most famous letter:

“For in it the righteousness of God is revealed from belief to belief, as it has been written, ‘But the righteous shall live by belief.’” (Romans 1:17)

Sha'uwl and Satan are taunting God. Their collective arrogance is unmatched.

There are six specific details in this next prophetic statement from Yahowah, all of which implicate Sha'uwl | Paul six hundred and sixty-six years before he incriminated himself. But one clue in particular removes any doubt about the identity of the individual God is excoriating because Yahowah identifies His foe by name. If you are a Christian, you may want to pay special attention to this...

“Moreover (*wa 'aph* – in addition and much more), **because** (*ky*) **the intoxicating and inebriating spirit** (*yayn* – the consequence of the naturally processed and fermented wine and resulting drunkenness) **of the mortal man** (*geber* – the individual human being) **of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal** (*bagad* – who is untrustworthy, unprincipled, unfaithful, and unreliable, of

adulterous and offensive behavior, a traitor handing people over to the influence and control of another without justification through chicanery, trickery, and deceit) **is an overbearing moral failure of unwarranted self-importance** (*yahyr* – is arrogant, meritless, and presumptive, high-minded and conceited individual aggrandizing himself), **he will not rest, find peace, nor live, nor will he find appropriate words** (*wa lo' nawah* – then he will not succeed, achieve his aim, or reach his goal, nor will come home or be beautifully adorned, he will not camp out or abide because there is no laudable, honorable, nor beneficial message for (qal imperfect)), **whomever is open to the broad path** (*'asher rachab* – when one is receptive to the wide open, broadened and expanded, public and limitless, albeit contrived, opportunistic, and improper way) **associated with** (*ka* – according to) **Sha'uwl** (*Sha'uwl* – the personal and proper name of the individual in question, but also the name of the place of separation, the realm of the dead, the dominion of questioning: She'owl [*she'owl* and *sha'uwl* are written identically in the Hebrew text (consider *Strong's* H7585 and H7586)]).

He (*huw'*) **and** (*wa*) **his soul** (*nepesh huw'* – his essential essence, consciousness, character, attitude, inner nature, and personality) **are like** (*ka* – can be compared to) **the plague of death** (*ha maweth* – the pandemic disease that kills a large population of people).

And so (*wa*) **those who are gathered in and brought together by him, accepting him** (*'asaph 'el huw'* – those who associate with and join him, those who are removed and withdrawn by assembling with him, moving toward him and thereby victimized by him) **will never be satisfied** (*lo' saba'* – he will not find contentment nor fulfillment [based upon 8HevXII among the Dead Sea Scrolls ('he will not be satisfied' versus 'and will not be satisfied')]).

Most every gentile ethnicity (*kol ha gowym* – those

of every race and place estranged from Yisra'el) **he will claim as his own and gather together unto himself** (*qabats 'el huw' – he will grasp hold of, obtain, assemble, and collect for himself*), **all such people will be among his followers** (*kol ha 'am – including the nations*).” (*Chabaquwq / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:5*)

It is obvious, so let's go ahead and say it: this prophecy identifies *Sha'uwI* | Paul by name and condemns him along with the gentiles he has beguiled. The Plague of Death is not *She'owl* because Hell is not a *gerber* | mortal man nor does this place of incarceration have a *nepesh* | soul.

This is one of many scores of prophecies wherein Yahowah specifically warns us about *Sha'uwI* | Paul and the plague he has inflicted upon *gowym*. Never in the annals of human events has one man done as much to harm mankind. Paul is quite simply: the worst man who ever lived.

In 1 Corinthians 11:20-21, *Sha'uwI* | Paulos tells those who have joined his assembly not to participate in Passover, which is the ultimate plague of death, and not to drink wine in association with it, which thereby nullifies the symbolism associated with the blood of the Passover Lamb. This serves as a treacherous betrayal of Yahowah's instructions regarding the narrow path He provided to the Covenant and life eternal.

Attacking the core of Yahowah's plan is the epitome of presumptuousness and immorality. Those who ascribe to such moral turpitude die. Those who promote it will find themselves in *She'owl* along with *Sha'uwI*. And yet, Pauline Doctrine is popular, providing, for those who are open to it, man's broadest path to destruction. Yahowsha' will differentiate this same, immensely popular and broad, path from the Towrah in his Instruction on the Mount, revealing that religious affiliations lead to death and destruction.

Sha'awl promises the gift of life, but his religion, the most popular ever conceived, is the plague of death. Sha'awl promises heavenly rewards to those who place their faith in his Gospel of Grace, and yet those intoxicated by this myth will find no satisfaction or contentment. They will remain estranged from God because, unlike Yahowah's assurances in the Towrah, Sha'awl's hollow promises will all go unfulfilled. And that means that the people Sha'awl claimed as his own, the Gentiles – individuals from many different races and places – will suffer the consequence of his *New Testament*.

Even if Sha'awl had not been condemned by name, with the mention of the Gentiles, or the “*ethnos* – races” in Paul's parlance, Rabbis Akiba, Maimonides, and Lord Shem Tov have now been eliminated from the potential list of contentious culprits – not that it isn't already obvious. These religious stalwarts corrupted *Yahuwdym* not *Gowym*.

Pauline Doctrine has influenced more people in more places in this world than any other corruption of Yahowah's testimony. And the means to this madness is consistent with Yahowah's prophecy, in that Paul inferred that God had authorized him to alter the requirements upon which Yahowah had already taken His stand.

Sha'awl, like Satan before him in the Garden, shortchanged Yah's testimony, removing His directions from their context to beguile individuals into believing that God had instituted the changes. Every time Sha'awl quotes Yahowah, it is always a terse reference which is lifted as an object of scorn to ridicule the Torah, most often with these allusive references serving as clichés – simple adages which are easy to articulate and remember.

In spite of this, and even though Sha'awl means “Question Him,” nary a Christian considers the irresolvable conflicts between Paul's letters and God's Word. So while the following continues to identify the

culprit, most Christians remain oblivious to Yahowah's prophecy regarding them or him...

“They do not ask questions, any of them, about him (*ha lo' 'eleh kol hem 'al* – why are none of them against him). **Terse references to the Word they lift up as taunts to ridicule** (*mashal nasa'* – simplistic and contrived equivalencies, often easy to remember aphorisms (clichés, dictates, and adages) become bywords with implied associations with that which is well-known to mock and to exercise dominion through comparison and counterfeit), **along with** (*wa*) **allusive sayings and mocking interpretations** (*malytsah* – derisive words wrapped in enigmas arrogantly spoken, even that which is undecipherable).

There are hard and perplexing questions which need to be asked of him (*chydah la huw'* – there are difficult enigmas to be solved, dark and hidden secrets, and double dealings, to be known regarding him).

And (*wa* – moreover) **they should say** (*'amar* – they should declare), **‘Woe** (*howy* – alas, expressing a dire warning) **to the one who claims to be great so as to increase his offspring, acting like a rabbi** (*rabah* – to the one who thrives on numbers and who considers himself exceedingly great (the basis of *rabbi*, something Sha'uwl claimed to be)), **neither of which apply to him** (*lo' la huw'* – which is not his).

In the meantime, for how long (*'ad mathay* – until when) **will they make pledges** (*'abtyt* – will they be in debt) **based upon his significance** (*kabed 'al huw'* – pursuant to the weight and burden of his testimony and the grievous honor afforded him)?” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:6)

Sha'uwl dismissed and cursed all those who would dare question him, claiming that by doing so they were opposed to God, that they were Satanic, when the opposite

was true. And speaking of truth, the reason religious belief systems like Christianity are averse to questions is because those who do so lose their faith. Evidence and reason seldom matter in matters of religion. It is only the believer's pledge of allegiance which is considered binding.

Besides, now you know why this book is entitled *Questioning Paul*. Turns out, it was not my idea.

This next statement is associated with the previous prediction. It is rendered from the Dead Sea Scrolls because the Qumran text differs considerably from the *Masoretic*.

“Since (wa) he loads himself down (ta’an – he burdens himself) with (’eth) thick (’aphelah – dark and wicked) mud (tyt – dirt and dust to be swept away), why not (ha lo’) quickly, even if only for a short period of time (peta’ – instantly and all of a sudden), rise up and take a stand (quwm)?

And (wa) those of you who are bitten and under his influence, perhaps making payments to what he represents (nashak ’atah – those showing interest, earning money, or becoming indebted to him), wake up from your stupor (wa yaqats – stop being so sedentary, take action, and alter your state of awareness) such that you move away in abhorrence (zuwa’ ’atah – fleeing in dread of him, terrified of vexing nature).

Because otherwise (wa) you will be (hayah) considered (la) plunder and be victimized by them (mashisah la hem – as booty, spoiled by them).”
(*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:7)

Only Paul, among those who claimed to speak for God, solicits money. It is why Christian clerics embrace him. So following his example, his instructions, Christian institutions have made merchandise of men – and worst

among them has been the Roman Catholic Church. Yah is trying to rouse their victims before it is too late.

But there is a consequence...

“Indeed, because (ky) you (*‘atah* – as a single individual) **have plundered and impoverished, victimizing** (*shalal* – you have looted and wronged, seizing and preying upon) **an enormous number of** (*rab* – a great many; and serving as the basis of rabbi) **Gentiles** (*gowym* – people from different races and places), **so** (*wa* – therefore (from the DSS)), **they shall seize, harass, and diminish you** (*shalal ‘atah* – appropriate, impoverish, and victimize this singular individual being addressed).

For all (kol) of the remaining (*yether* – of the remnant of, including the residue of the wealth of) **people** (*‘am* – populations, nations, or families), **as a result of** (*min* – from and because of) **the blood (dam) of humankind** (*‘adam* – mankind), **and also (wa) the violent and cruel destructive forces terrorizing** (*chamas* – the immoral maiming and murdering which oppresses) **the Land** (*‘erets* – the Promised Land, singular, and thus Yisra’el), **Yah’s city** (*qiryah* – to Encounter Yah, Yaruwshalaim – the source of teaching regarding reconciliation, also singular; from *qarah* – to encounter and meet *Yah* – an abbreviation of Yahowah), **and all (wa kol) who dwell in her** (*yashab ba hy’* – who inhabit and live in her (*Yaruwshalaim*)),...” (Chabaquwq 2:8)

As twisted and perverse as was *Sha’uwl* | Paul, it is unlikely that Yahowah would have revealed this prophecy regarding him, or the scores of others, without the imposition of Replacement Theology or the murderous effect it has had on Jews. Yes, Paul robbed billions of Gentiles of their possessions and souls, but what made him the worst man who ever lived is that he inspired his followers to plunder the Chosen People. Christianity is the most lethal curse ever inflicted upon Yisra’el and

Yahuwdah.

Paul mercilessly attacks “Jews” throughout his letters, making them the enemy of his god and his new religion, thereby creating the anti-Semitism that ultimately took root in the Christian church. Paul, a Roman citizen, seeded the hatred of God’s Chosen People that boiled over seventy years later with the destruction of Yisra’el and Yaruwshalaim by the Empire’s legions. It happened just as Yahowah predicted it would. Seven hundred years from the time this prophecy was committed to writing, Yaruwshalaim was sacked, Yisra’el was salted, and those not murdered by Rome were hauled off into slavery.

According to Yahowah, to be “cut off” from Him is to be estranged from the Covenant, thereby, excluded from this relationship and forsaken – which is to be damned. Therefore, you do not want God to say of you what He said of Sha’uwl...

“...this is a warning (*howy* – woe) to one who coveted ill-gotten gain and would do anything to take advantage, but now, as an extension of the dead, is cut off and finished soliciting (*batsa’ batsa’* – to one who was manipulative and divisive, unjust and dishonest, greedy and deadly) evil (*ra’* – that which is harmful and immoral, maligning and malignant, improper and injurious) to approach his house and temple (*la beyth huw’* – concerning the establishment of his familial covenant).

He sets it on high (*la sym ba ha marowm* – he places and appoints it in the heights of heaven, exalting its lofty position) to spare (*la natsal* – for delivering and saving the plunder associated with) his elevated abode (*qan huw’* – his nest) from the paws (*kaph* – hands and palms, the reach and control) of corrupt coconspirators and perverted associates (*ra’* – of the evil residing in close proximity).”
(*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:9)

It is difficult to know if *qan* is the contracted form of

“*qana*’ – to acquire wealth,” “*qanan* – nest,” “*qenets* – snare,” or more likely “*qanah* – acquire property and possessions,” even “*qana*’ – jealousy, envy, religious zeal, and sexual passion.” But in this context, I suppose they would all apply.

The Roman Catholic Church, which was founded on Pauline Doctrine, not only constructs gold-laden cathedrals and has storehouses filled with unfathomable wealth all via ill-gotten gain, they have positioned themselves as having sole possession of the keys to heaven. It is interesting, however, that recently they have had to return billions of dollars to the families of children their homosexual priests have molested, priests following the Pauline mandate to follow his example and not marry.

We are not yet at the point where Paul has revealed the ploy that helped me initially understand the scheme he was using to foist his plot on the unwary. But six hundred years before he conceived and articulated it, Yahowah was cognizant of his intent to confuse.

“You have deliberately decided upon and conspired at the advice of another to promote a shameful plot to confuse (*ya’ats bosheth* – you (masculine singular) after consultation, have come to an informed conclusion through deliberation to conceive and perpetrate a lowly plan with the intended purpose to confound while displaying an adversarial attitude; *bosheth* – shameful, lowly, and confusing is from *bashan* – the serpent, associating this adversarial scheme with Satan, with whom Sha’uwl admittedly consulted) **those who approach your house** (*la beyth’atah* – those who enter and are associated with your household and your covenant construct), **ruining and reducing by cutting off** (*qatsah* – severely injuring, maiming, decreasing, and destroying by scraping away and ending the existence of) **many** (*rab* – a multitude of) **people** (*’am*).

And in the process (*wa*), **you have forfeited** (*chata'* – you bear the loss by impugning guilt through missing the way, surrendering) **your soul** (*nepesh*).” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:10)

This answers a question I’m often asked: did Paul deliberately perpetrate this fraud or was he misled. It also affirms the now obvious connection between Paul and Satan, the very spirit Sha’uwl claimed had possessed and goaded him.

Since *beyth* serves as the basis for *beryth* – covenant, God is inferring that Sha’uwl’s “new covenant” is a shameful plot designed to confuse the unwary. And make no mistake, Paul referred to himself as the father of his faithful children, and thus of his new covenant family. He wrote about life in the household he had conceived.

To be cut off from Yahowah’s one and only Covenant, the very Covenant Sha’uwl condemned in Galatians, is to die with one’s soul ceasing to exist. So while the perpetrator of this crime will endure forever in She’owl, the souls of his victims are reduced to nothing, their lives squandered as a result of Sha’uwl’s shameful scheme.

“Indeed (*ky* – surely and truly), **the Cornerstone and Rock** (*'eben*) **as part of the structure of the home** (*qyr* – as the walls and ceiling which provide protection for a family), **will issue a proclamation** (*za'aq* – will issue a summons for an assembly meeting and will cry out (qal imperfect)).

And (*wa*) **that which makes a connection** (*kaphys* – the rafter and the beam comprising the finished structure of a home) **from** (*min*) **the timber** (*'ets* – the carpenter’s work, the tree, and gallows, the wooden plank), **he will answer and respond** (*'anah huw'* – making a public declaration, providing a contextual reply (qal imperfect)).” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:11)

Dowd is the cornerstone of the Covenant, the one who articulates the structure of God's home. And it is in his Psalms, more than anyplace else, where Sha'uwl is exposed, labeled, and condemned. As for the one representing the wooden pillars forming the doorway to life, by answering the call to fulfill Passover, Yahowsha', too, made a declaration against Sha'uwl.

And while these men, in addition to Moseh, are the leading characters in God's story, we will soon discover that *Shim'own* Kephas, the man Yahowsha' personally named the Rock, "summoned" Sha'uwl to Yaruwshalaim and issued a "proclamation" against him. And Shim'own acquired the moniker "Rock" when Yahowsha', in Hebrew, told Shim'own: "**Upon ('al) this (ze'th) Rock ('eben) I will build (banah) My Invitations to be Called Out and Meet (Miqra'ey).**"

In addition, the wood and rock symbolize what is real, tangible, and sustainable, which is the antithesis of the shifting sands of faith. Yahowah is, therefore, also pitting His reality against Paul's embrace of Gnosticism. This debunked philosophical and religious affinity of the Greeks will soon be deployed by Sha'uwl to denounce the Towrah, thereby fixating on the flesh. So God says...

"Woe to (howy – a strong warning to) the one who establishes (banah – the one who builds a family and constructs (qal participle)) a terrorist shrine, an anguishing place of incitement ('iyr – a haunt for asses, and a temple complex which is exposed and where violence is incited; 'uwr – to provoke, inflame, goad, and stir up by blinding and rendering the chaff exposed while laying the skin bare in a popular place) in blood (ba dam – through death; from damam – to destroy by making deaf and dumb).

And he conceives and forms (wa kuwn – he proposes, prepares, establishes, and supports (the polel stem reveals

that the subject suffers the effect of the verb's action and the perfect conjugation indicates that the process was completed in a finite amount of time)) **a populated institution promoting** (*qiryah* – a place to meet; from *qarah* and *qary'ah* – to encounter and meet, a building and its furnishings as part of an institution where people congregate for preaching) **that which is unrighteous and incorrect, invalid and harmful** (*ba 'awlah* – in wickedness with evil intent, unjustly damaging others through perversity).” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:12)

And since there is a better option, the prophet reveals...

“**Why not pay attention** (*ha lo' hineh* – why not look up and consider this) **as part of an association with** (*min 'eth* – by means of approaching and in accompaniment with) **Yahowah** (𐤎𐤏𐤃𐤇 – a transliteration of *YaHoWaH* as instructed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **of the spiritual implements** (*tsaba'* – of the vast array of heavenly envoys who serve as effective and compliant tools)?

But instead (*wa*), **the people** (*'am* – the family) **expend their energy and grow weary** (*yaga'* – they toil and labor, growing tired for lack of rest (qal imperfect)) **amidst a profuse conglomeration** (*ba day* – amongst a great excess and abundance) **of worthlessness, trifling with a dangerous flame** (*'esh* – of that which is combustible and consuming and has no value).

So the people united by a single individual in an antiquated system (*wa la'om* – the peoples who congregate under a common cause) **exhaust and then destroy themselves, falling** (*ya'eph* – are worn out, fatigued and weakened, and fall) **into excessive emptiness and extravagant delusions** (*ba day ryq* – into endless fantasies and an overabundance of vain misrepresentations).” (*Chabaquwq* 2:13)

After witnessing Sha'awl's blaspheme and resulting carnage, he interrupts the flow of his nauseating presentation of human malfeasance with a simple question: "Why not pay attention to Yahowah and build a relationship?"

“Indeed (*ky* – this is reliable and true), **She will fulfill, edify, and completely satisfy** (*male*’ – She will impart an abundance of that which is healthy, valuable, empowering, and satisfying (the niphath stem is the grammatical voice of genuine relationships where the subject is fulfilled and the imperfect conjugation addresses ongoing effects of edifying)) **the land** (*ha ‘erets* – realm, region, and world) **to approach, to actually know, to become genuinely familiar with, and understand** (*la yada*’ *eth* – to move toward, discover, and acknowledge, coming to understand and appreciate becoming friends in association with (qal infinitive)) **Yahowah’s** (*Yahowah* – written as directed by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **manifestation of power, glorious presence, and abundant value** (*kabowd* – splendor, honor, respect, status, and reward).

This should be similar to (*ka*) **the waters** (*maym* – the various forms of water, including ice, snow, liquid, humidity, clouds, and steam) **providing a covering** (*kasah* – spread over and adorning (piel imperfect)) **upon the sea** (*‘al yam* – upon a lake).” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:14)

There is a ray of light at the end of this nightmare. By fulfilling the Towrah’s promises in the Land, we can come to know Yahowah, even enter His glorious presence.

God has a lot more to say about Sha'awl, and while we need to move on and continue to expose his letter, I would be remiss if I did not share a couple of additional thoughts. In the first, we find the prophet not only warning us about Sha'awl's profuse venom and his perverted

sexuality, he addresses Paulos' "little and lowly" reputation in addition to his animosity toward circumcision. So from "*Sha'uwI* | Question Him" to "Paulos | the Lowly and Little," from poisonous toxins to an unacceptable approach to the sign of the Covenant, this is an indicting summation of this man's legacy.

“Woe to (*howy* – a strong warning to) the one who is responsible and then who partakes, pouring out for (*shaqah* – the one who appoints and then associates with (hifil participle – in an explicit and demonstrable manner he causes his victims to be like him)) his corrupt companions and evil countryman (*ra' huw'* – his wicked coconspirators and inept associates) that which causes them to join together and be exposed to (*saphach* – he encourages them to share in (piel participle – the object suffers the effect in dramatic fashion)) your debilitating poison, intense passions, antagonizing venom, and serpentine toxin (*chemah 'atah* – your poisonous and injurious rage, indignation, and debilitating rancor, while being all worked up emotionally with your life in turmoil).

And much more than this (*wa 'aph*), becoming drunk and then intoxicating others to the point of incapacitation (*shakar* – being under the influence while causing others to drunk such that they become weakened and giddy such that their judgment is impaired) for the express purpose of (*la ma'an* – for no other reason than) gazing upon while demonstrating a preference for (*nabat 'al* – to look at and consider, showing a favorable regard for (hifil infinitive – he is trying to convert his victims such that they share his highly demonstrative affinity for)) their genitals (*ma'aowr hem* – their male genitalia, the private parts of a man's or boy's body, specifically with their pudendum being naked and exposed either publicly to shame and embarrass or privately for sexual activity; from *mah* – to question and *'uwr* – being exposed, bared, and made to be naked).” (*Chabaquwq /*

Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:15)

Anyone who deliberately intoxicates others, incapacitating them to have sex with them, is scum. And while such despicable behavior is individually criminal, the problem with *Sha'uwel* | Paul is infinitely more egregious. He not only convinced billions to denounce and disregard the *Towrah* | Guidance of Yahowah, he turned Gentiles against Jews, fanning the flames of anti-Semitism.

“You will get your fill of (*saba'* – you will be met with an abundance of (the qal perfect indicates that his is completely reliable while the second-person masculine singular reveals that this is directed a lone male individual)) shame and infamy, insults befitting such a lowly individual (*qalown* – dishonor and disgrace, scorn and contempt, along with a humbling, degraded and discredited reputation) instead of (*min*) honor and glory (*kabowd* – the manifestation of the power and presence of God which rewards and empowers).

You choose to be inebriated yourself in addition to intoxicating others (*shathah gam 'atah* – you decide to consume and experience large quantities of alcohol yourself and to become a drunkard while also inebriating others (qal imperative – of your own freewill, actually desiring intoxication)), and then (*wa*) you what them to be unacceptable because of your choice to not become circumcised (*'arel* – you choose to expose them, making them unacceptable and unredeemable by remaining uncircumcised for religious reasons (nifal imperative – the subject of the verb both carries out and suffers from the action based upon his choices and desires)) encompassing them from all angles with circular reasoning (*sabab* – going round about in circles, on and on infinitum with this alternative direction (qal imperfect – literally with ongoing implications)).

Upon you is (*'al 'atah* – before you is) the binding

cup (kows) of Yahowah's (*Yahowah* – a transliteration of יהוה, our 'elowah – God as directed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence) **right hand** (*yamyn* – serving as a metaphor for judgment and as a reference to *yamyny* – being a Benjamite).

Therefore (wa), public humiliation and an ignominious reputation as a result of being dishonorable and disgraceful (*qyqalown* – insults befitting a lowly and little individual of degraded status who is sleazy, disreputable, and contemptable; from *qalown* – being scorned and humbled with a discredited reputation) **will be your reward** ('*al kabowd 'atah* – the manifestation of your reputation and attribution of your status (second-person masculine singular suffix – thus addressing a solitary man))." (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:16)

Pauline Doctrine is poison, intoxicating venom from the most vile of serpents. But more indicting still, Sha'uwl, who never knew the love of a woman, provocatively expressed his love for a young man, Timothy. And even though Paul detested circumcision and spoke hatefully about the sign and requirement of the Covenant, he personally circumcised the young Greek youth at the nexus of his affection.

Furthermore, Sha'uwl so craved recognition and status, he heaped it upon himself. But here God is saying that Sha'uwl's poisonous attack against circumcision will come full circle and slather him in shame. The man who claimed to be God's exclusive apostle to the Gentiles has become the man of infamy.

I dare say, in the whole of Yahowah's prophetic testimony, no prediction is as dire as this one. But that is because no one ever did what Paul has done. It was not required of anyone else.

Yahowah has provided His evaluation of *Sha'uwl* |

Paul and His assessment of his followers. In this light, the only way to view him and his religion favorably is to ignore God and estrange ourselves from Him. The debate now is between good and evil, because the issues are white and black. We will question everything Paul says and writes. And we will hold him accountable. It may be too little, but it is never too late.

And that is why we find Yahowah conveying...

“Indeed and by contrast (*ky* – this is reassuring because), **He will constantly keep you covered and continually protected** (*kasah ‘atah* – He will always provide a covering by which He adorns you, clothing and forgiving you (the *piel* imperfect jussive energetic nun affirms that we, as those being clothed, receive continuous and enthusiastic protection by choice)) **from this grievous injustice and blatant wrongdoing in opposition to** (*chamas* – this unrighteous and unrestrained campaign of error and of towrahlessness in destructive conflict with) **that which purifies, empowers, and enriches** (*labanown* – that which cleanses and whitewashes, becoming morally pure and white as snow, typically transliterated Lebanon, but from *laban* – purifying, cleansing, and whitening” and *‘own* – being substantially empowered, growing vigorously, while becoming enormously enriched).

And as for (*wa*) **the destructive and demonic influence of the Devil seeking to be worshiped as God as satanic** (*shed / shod* – Satan’s devastating and ruinous, plundering and oppressive) **beasts** (*bahemah*), **He will shatter and separate them** (*chathath hem* – He will astound them, causing them to wane as the experience something truly dreadful) **because of** (*min* – as a result of) **the blood** (*dam* – death) **of humankind** (*‘adam*), **and also** (*wa*) **this grievous injustice against and blatant wrongdoing in opposition to** (*chamas* – this unrighteous and unrestrained campaign of error and towrahlessness in destructive conflict with) **the Land** (*‘erets* – realm, region,

or earth), **the city** (*qiryah* – to encounter, meet and be present with Yah), **and all** (*wa kol*) **of her inhabitants** (*ba yashab* – who have settled there to meet, to marry, to be restored, to be established, and to live (qal participle)).” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:17)

Yahowah’s light grows ever brighter as the flickering flame of Christianity fades. Bereft of Sha’uwl, we find Dowd, too, singing to Yisra’el, pleading with his people to come home.

And yet since most people remain oblivious to the obvious, not realizing that the Christian “Jesus Christ” is a caricature who has become an object of worship, Yahowah asks a foreboding question...

“How does he succeed with a caricature (*mah ya’al pesel* – why does he benefit with a false representation of God, what is the value of a religious deity, and how can one profit with a created image (hifil perfect))?

Indeed (*ky*), **he will construct him** (*pasal huw’* – he will shape it), **fashioning him** (*yatsar huw’* – he will devise, form, and ordain him (qal perfect)) **by concealing the association with the representation of the pagan god** (*masekah* – by forming an alliance which covers over and veils the connotation with the false god, hiding and covering up the true identity of the idolatrous image (qal perfect)) **and by becoming a teacher of lies** (*wa yarah sheqer* – tossing out deceptive instructions and misleading directions, along with mistaken and useless guidance for no reason or benefit (with the hifil stem the subject, Sha’uwl, is putting the lies which reflect his nature into action while the participle is a verbal adjective, making Paul a deceiver)).

Thereby (*ky*), **he adds credence to and encourages reliance upon** (*batach* – he makes credible and believable, even preferable that which causes believers to stumble and the unsuspecting fall as a result of their penchant and

fondness for trusting and depending upon) **the one who created the construct of himself** (*yatsar yetser huw* – the one who was motivated to devise, plan, prepare, and form such idolatrous thoughts and inclinations regarding himself and his desires by fashioning himself into someone to be venerated and worshiped (qal participle)).

For he, himself, performs to make (*'al huw' 'asah* – he personally acts and engages to fabricate and profit from) **worthless gods who do not speak** (*'elyl 'ilem* – references to imagined and ineffectual religious deities to worship who are silent, speechless, mute, and dumb). (*Chabaquwq* 2:18)

Woe to the one who says (*howy 'amar* – this is a warning to him because he will state) **with regard to the Wood** (*la ha 'ets* – approaching the upright pillar, timber, wooden planks, and tree), **'Awaken and become alive** (*quwts* – be roused from lifelessness and become alive again after death; from the verbal form which addresses the idea of abruptly starting something after having been asleep). **Arise while precluding further observation by providing false testimony** (*'uwr* – rouse oneself and rise up, choosing to be angry over the malicious misfortune, becoming unknowable in body in skin, blinding the observant so that they are unjustly deprived of an accurate recollection of what was witnessed (qal imperative)), **'silencing the Rock by depriving him of life, thereby muting** (*'eben duwmam huw* – as if the Cornerstone was an inanimate object, muzzling) **his desire to guide and teach** (*yarah* – his decision to instruct and direct, showing the way and making it known (hifil imperfect jussive)).

Behold (*hineh* – pay attention), **it** (*huw*) **has been seized and overlaid** (*taphas* – has been grasped hold of and held as an object signifying victory, dealt with and manipulated such that it wields considerable influence when adorned (qal passive – having this actually done to it)) **with gold** (*zahab*) **and silver, becoming extremely**

valuable and desirable (*wa keseph* – gilded in silver so as to be yearned for and desired), **but completely devoid of** (*wa kol 'ayn*) **the Spirit** (*ruwach*) **in its midst** (*ba qereb huw'* – associated with it so as to animate its existence).” (*Chabaquwq* / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:19)

The Pauline Iesou Christo was modeled after Dionysus and bears little in common with Yahowsha'. He is nothing but a caricature, an object of idolatrous worship. Sha'awl made him in his own image, not unlike Muhammad concocted with Allah – the messenger's alter ego.

Dowd | David was Sha'awl's enemy, just as it had been between his namesake (King *Sha'awl* | Saul) and the actual Messiah (the Beloved, Dowd). So Sha'awl tried to silence Dowd, Yahowah's Shepherd, such that the world would admire the caricature he had contrived rather than the genuine article.

It is, therefore, the Rock, a reference to Dowd and later to Shim'own Kephah which Sha'awl must moot to fool the unwary with his irrational rhetoric. Dowd's teaching in particular, most especially his 119th Mizmowr, his ode to the Towrah predicated upon the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, is as brilliant and edifying as words allow.

Sha'awl will repeatedly state that “the wooden pillar,” more commonly known as the “Christian Cross,” exists as the means to be “*quwts* – awakened from the dead,” or to be “resurrected” in religious parlance. He will even equate “sleep” with death and speak of those who were sleeping rising up abruptly. So this is an allusion to the Pauline fixation on the wooden cross, from which he promotes resurrection from the dead, thereby dismissing *Pesach*, *Matsah*, *Bikuwrym*, and *Shabuw'ah* in addition to *Taruw'ah*, *Kipurym*, and *Sukah*.

Paul's plan begins and ends at the cross with the death of his god. It was an edifice constructed out of false

testimony – every perception a delusion.

And in the end, it is Dowd who will once again prevail over Sha’awl. According to Yahowah, His Messiah, Shepherd, and King will return as brilliant as the sun. And when that occurs, just twelve years from now in 2021, the spirits which tormented Sha’awl, as they did his namesake, will vanish – leaving Yahowah and His beloved to enjoy *Sukah* | Camping Out together.

אֱלֹהֵינוּ

Alla | To the Contrary

Discordant...

In the most favorable light, from the narrowest possible interpretation, what comes next, had it been set into a different context, and then properly explained, it might have been designed to encourage us to “*shamar* – observe” the Torah and then act on our own volition. Yahowah’s instructions and directions are vastly 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 that 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 statement is misleading, even counterproductive. His only redeeming content was to say that we should never be compelled, but should instead act on our own accord. However, that is not exactly 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 *tomoterous*, to cut something so as 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 witnesses of this statement.)

For those who may place greater confidence in the *McReynolds English Interlinear* associated with the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th 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.

Regardless of one's preference or interpretation, someone actually trying to share Yahowah's message would have provided some context and an explanation as to why it would never have been appropriate to “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 from Heaven. It mattered not that he was Greek, only that he remained without identifying himself with the sign of the Covenant.

So 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 is after all life and death. And that is because while circumcision does not guarantee participation in the Covenant, or thus salvation, a man who dies uncircumcised has no chance of either. If Titus remained uncircumcised, his soul no longer exists or it is imprisoned in She'owl.

Few things are more obvious to the observant than Yahowah does not “*anagkazo* – compel.” He is first and foremost a proponent of freewill. The decision as to whether 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 position their children and themselves to enjoy the Covenant’s benefits. Those who do not are automatically and summarily excluded.

The Torah’s sign demonstrating a family’s acceptance of the conditions and benefits of the Covenant, and denoting their desire to be included in it, is circumcision. The symbolism is hard to miss, as this sign deals with the part of the male anatomy responsible for conceiving new human life.

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: “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, but never regarding something as clear and compelling as circumcision.

Akiba in particular, playing off Yahowah’s penchant for volition, promoted the view 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,” (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) That Paul wanted it to appear as if the disciples 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 for the meeting had been the disconnect between Paul's message and God's position relative to circumcision. And as such, for this reason and many more, it is apparent that Galatians was written immediately after the Yaruwshalaim Summit in 50 CE, which was before Sha'awl's first visit to Thessalonica, Corinth, or Rome – the other candidates for his initial epistle.

Further, as we will learn, 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 already happened.

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. So if what I'm claiming is true, and it is, this begs the question: how then can an informed, rational person 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.

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'uwl went to Yaruwshalaim to undermine the competition: Yahowsha's disciples. This letter was designed to discredit them so that Paulos could rise unchallenged.

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 anyone without demonstrating that what they have said or have done was inconsistent with Yahowah's instructions. Paul did not. And it will not be the last time. And worse, it is Paul who should actually be exposed and condemned for advocating the contrarian position.

With all of this in mind, Paul’s subsequent statement transitions from being inappropriate to being devastating when seen flowing out of his opening salvo against the Torah. 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 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 17th century after the invention of the letter “J”) **in order that** (*hina*) **us** (*emas*) **they will actually make subservient** (*katadouloo* – they will control for their own ends, making slaves and bringing 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,...” (2:4)**

Therefore, we know that, 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 credibility and mission, he felt compelled to deliberately demean the character and motives of the participants. Paul claimed that either Yahowsha's Disciples, or those they had invited into the Covenant, or both, were “impersonators who faked their relationship.” He claimed that the beneficiaries of Pesach, Matsah, Bikuwrym, and Shabuw'ah in Yaruwshalaim 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 worse, the intent of the clandestine interference of the interlopers was “to make [Paul and associates] subservient, controlling them for their own means.”

You would expect such divisive delirium from Machiavelli, perhaps Goebbels, or from a conniving and immoral politician, but it is crude, even rude, when written about those who personally knew Yahowsha’ by someone claiming to speak for Christ Jesus – Paul’s caricature. But at the very least, the lines of the debate have been drawn and we are all compelled to take sides.

If we are to believe Sha’uwl’s words, they suggest that someone who claimed to be born anew into our Heavenly Father’s Covenant family, in the city of reconciliation where the Miqra’ey were fulfilled, under the disciples’ guidance, were fakers, spies, and enslavers who wanted to deprive Paul and his companions of freewill, making these idiots subservient to them. I am not buying it, not for a minute.

Since the Covenant is Yahowah’s means to liberate His children from oppression, Paul’s claim upends reality and suspends credulity. All it means is that *Sha’uwl* | Paul was paranoid and delusional. And that is particularly bad when it is coupled with his bouts of narcissism and occasional schizophrenia, even his propensity to be 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 Covenant family, 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 taunted the others with their status and not acted as spies.

But why even speak of “surreptitiousness, false pretenses, slipping in, and secrecy” in relationship to the “*ekklesia* – called out” Yahowsha’ and His disciples, especially Shim’own Kephas, had guided? These would have been the same individuals who had been empowered and enriched by the Set-Apart Spirit during the Miqra’ of Shabuw’ah (discussed in Acts 2).

Yahowah’s plan of salvation is not a secret. We should not be concerned that someone hears the Word of God because we should want everyone 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 Mithraism, the Babylonian religion which became the dominant mystery religion practiced in the Roman Empire in the 1st through 4th 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’uwl 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 Christo. 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 and see the son's religion being presented as superior to that of the father's 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 Yahowsha', 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 larger set between the others. Especially interesting considering Paul's inverted and twisted testimony, depictions of Mithras are most 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 claimed to have done as well.

The caduceus, the symbol of Mercury, the "messenger of god," is universally 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 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 25th, 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," carried a shepherd's staff, and wore elaborate robes emblazoned with sunbursts, a Phrygian cap covered in thunderbolts, and a ruby ring – most of which survive today in Roman Catholicism. Their hierarchy of participation and status are all echoed in Paul's writings as well as in Paul's legacy: the Roman Catholic Church. Believers were united and universal, 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 mythology, and the fact that it plays no part of 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 has implied that he assumed the disciples were somewhat supportive of his message, and that no one suggested that a Greek be circumcised, strongly inferring that everyone agreed with his position. But now, in the next breath, we discover that Paul is facing such severe opposition that he is compelled to exclude his adversaries and demean his foes. It is a sure sign that he could not effectively refute their message.

And 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. Further, we cannot even blame these conflicting notions on the difficulty of translating words from one language into another. In this case the words are perfectly clear. There is no dispute regarding their meanings – only the justification for them.

Then there is 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 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. They were all elders in the Yaruwshalaim Called-Out Assembly, which means that they were not "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.

Those who would excuse Galatians 2:4 forfeit the high ground of reason. 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 "Christian *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.

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 Yahowsha' 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 upon 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’uwl 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.

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 1st century witness of this letter, even though it is included in more recently compiled texts (following *eiko*, meaning “yield”). Additionally, *euangelion*, rendered “Gospel” in most English translations, but more accurately translated “healing message and 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.

So, 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. Therefore, at the very least, this 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 ΘY* – Divine Placeholder for *Theos* | God) [**beneficial message and healing 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’uwl, 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 Torah 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 brave 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?"

The issue here is that, since circumcision is a condition to participate in the Covenant, the inference is that you must submit to and obey the Torah to benefit from the old system. But you should know that 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 should "listen and respond to," rather than a set of "laws" to which we must "submit and obey." It is comprised of God's guidance, not His orders.

No one can diminish Yahowah's gift, so I am at a loss to see how Sha'awl's failure to yield to these men 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'awl is freeing believers

from listening to God.

While it is irrelevant in this context, should you be curious, 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, having allegedly imprisoning Paulos, did not silence him. And if the Romans had incarcerated him to moot his message, and if he was actually speaking for God, Yahowah would have found another witness. 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 Torah. And Jews do not evangelize. The notion of a "Judaizer" is yet another of Paul's anti-Semitic myths.

That means Christian theologians would be 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 Torah pivots is the Exodus: the story of Yahowah freeing His people from religious and political oppression in Egypt as a result of His Covenant.

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 Egypt, 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 with God.

The Miqra’ey, the first of 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. 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 an idea, especially since the path to freedom delineated, commemorated, predicted, explained, and fulfilled in Yahowah’s seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with Him gave birth to the Called-Out Assembly Sha’uwl was addressing.

Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis chronicles Abraham’s journey away from the religious 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 Family-Oriented Covenant which served as the backbone of the Torah and as the expedient of the Exodus. The first four Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God were fulfilled to deliver its promises on Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children, giving birth to the empowering and enriching aspects of Seven Shabats. In this way, Yahowah has freed us from death and from sin, from all forms of human oppression. 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 Life grows. Its fruit is a loving relationship leading to salvation, to knowing God and to living forever with Him. Every word of the *Towrah* exists to highlight this path.

As discussed briefly a moment ago, while infinitely 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 so that we can enter into 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. 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)

So much of this is awkward and disjointed. And the combination of the odd selection of verbs, the missing prepositions, the inappropriate grammatical forms, and the overall lack of sufficient information, renders the result an enigma. But in the context of a meeting with the Called Out in Yaruwshalaim, besides Yahowsha’s disciples, and specifically 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?” No one else could have been held to be especially important. But then to say that these men “were actually worthless” to Paul is gut-wrenching. And 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 is 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.

But I must ask: why does Sha'uwl's opinion matter? Why attend a meeting if the counsel of others is considered meaningless? Why did Paul respond by undermining the credibility of those who challenged him rather than by debating them? Typically, those who counter challenges in this manner do so because they realize that they cannot prevail on the merits of their argument. And why demean the very same people whose endorsement you claim. It is like saying, "They were all complete idiots, and they accepted me as one of them."

And it is what's not said at the beginning that renders the result somewhere between senseless and slanderous. It is that, as he progresses, we must question whether Paul was even lucid. *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?" Furthermore, 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. 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 copyediting,

Paul's entire mantra is contradicted.

As a result, all we know for sure is that Paul writes poorly and thinks irrationally. He held Yahowsha's disciples in low esteem. He felt that it was easier to demean them than it would have been to debate them.

Overall, this is an interesting comment for Sha'awl to make considering his penchant for offering unsubstantiated opinions as if they were snowflakes in the Arctic. To him it is as if the three years the disciples spent listening to and observing Yahowsha' didn't mean squat. Sha'awl, after all, had been to rabbi school, and they were manual laborers. 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 unequivocally prevails. According to Paul, these men "purported" to be important, and they "considered" themselves authorities. They were wannabes in Paul's opinion. And yet, they were irrefutably called by God, publicly appointed Disciples by God, and led and instructed by God over the course of time, all within the purview of history. But compare that to Sha'awl 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 god, does not recognize human hierarchies. Those who claim rank in relationship to the Pauline god, such as popes, not only have no such authority, they are operating in direct opposition to the founder of their faith.

In actuality, 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.

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 Yahowsha's handpicked disciples, 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 this letter, from Paul's perspective the worthless wannabes were disciples, specifically Shim'own, Yahowchanan, and Ya'aqob. And their testimony was discounted because they encouraged everyone to observe the same Towrah Yahowsha' had 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’uwl’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 into the text of the epistle as well. And “by the way” must have seemed like the way Paul would have conveyed his thought 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.)**” To the contrary, God has favorites. Adam, Chawah, Enoch, Noah and his family, Abraham, Sarah, Yitschaq, Ya’aqob, Moseh (through whom the Torah was revealed), Dowd, Shamuw’el, and Yahowsha’ 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 Called-Out Assembly, it infers that Paul thought that Peter’s “opinions added nothing to the conversation.”

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 dates to as early as 85 CE.

The *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th 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 Kephas 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 “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 *ekklisia*?

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 99.98% share for himself, his use of *tounantion alla* screams that

neither his power grab nor his disdain for the Torah were well-received. So he was telling Yahowsha's Disciples to capitulate – to accept his terms and their fate or else.

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 since God only saves His Covenant children, they would all die. He was as Yahowah foretold: the Plague of Death.

He has staked out his turf. Unfortunately, by doing so he has announced his animosity toward everything God holds dear – including truth, people, and their lives.

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'uwl* 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, the Philistines, the Hittites, Moabites, Amalekites, the Babylonians, Assyrians, Greeks, and Romans, Paul's religion would be their most formidable 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, the overwhelming preponderance 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’uwl’s lust for power and this meeting, Paul’s new covenant would be contrarian, upending an auspicious beginning.

A wedge was being driven between Jews and Gentiles creating a distinction that had not existed previously. 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 Kochba revolt against Rome (climaxing in the Yowbel Year of 133 CE) which led to the Diaspora was rooted in Sha’uwl’s animosity for his own people. The false messiah’s sponsor, Rabbi Akiba, was able to wage his revolt by completing the job Sha’uwl had begun, isolating and marginalizing the Yisra’elite members of The Way, the Ebionites, so that they had no safe harbor. Hated by everyone, 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. The constraints he put on Shim’own Kephass’ mission were now in direct opposition to Yahowsha’s instructions.

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

Especially proud of it, *Sha’uwl* | Paul answered this question: 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. If you were opposed to God, it was a brilliant 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 Petros.”

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. In fact, to the contrary, Yahowsha’ called Petros “the rock upon which I will build My called-out assembly.” So either Yahowsha’ was lying or Paul was.

The reality that we must confront here, at least to be honest with ourselves, 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 poor. It is most certainly 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 were inadequately developed or deliberately hidden. Although there is no mistaking which set of instructions Paul was assailing. He despised Yahowah's *Towrah* and had no 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'uwl'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 become pervasive. 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.

Therefore, it is obvious that Paul's letters are from Sha'uwl of Tarsus, not God. And Paulos had his issues, being both insane and demon-possessed. These problems rise 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.

But even if you do not agree with this assessment, it would be preposterous to conclude that the manuscript copies of this letter, both ancient and modern, replete as they all are with numerous grammatical deficiencies and inaccurate statements, represent the word of the God being demeaned by them. The God I have come to know through the Towrah does not make mistakes; He is literate and consistent.

Moreover, even with the change of his name from Sha'uwl to Paul, the Devil's Advocate will never escape the dark shadow of death Yahowah cast upon him in Habakkuk.

What matters is that Yahowah has 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. Our relationship with God is predicated exclusively upon Yahowah, His credibility and His Word.

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 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 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)

It is hard to fathom this as the product of a sane or rational mind. It is rambling and psychotic, delusional and paranoid. It serves to prove that Yahowah was right when He warned us about this horrible individual.

✠

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 results the Christian world has come to ingest.

Sha’uwl | Paul will infer that it was the same “o – one” who inspired Shim’own Kephas, now called “*Petro* | Peter.” But we know better, and so did *Sha’uwl* | Paul.

“**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 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 yet another desperate lie, deliberate and

inexcusable.

According to the testimony provided by Shim'own Kephah to Luke and then conveyed in the opening chapters of Acts, this is wildly inaccurate. *Sha'uwl* | Paul was nowhere to be seen during the fulfillment of *Shabuw'ah* | the Promise of the Shabat, which Christians have renamed using the Greek word for fifty – Pentecost. The Spirit which had come upon the beneficiaries of *Pesach* | Passover, *Matsah* | UnYeasted Bread, and *Bikuwrym* | Firstborn Children did not envelop *Sha'uwl* | Paul. And in fact, She could not have done so – not on this day or ever.

Shabuw'ah is the result of the first three *Miqra'ey* | Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God. To forego any one of them, much less all of them, as *Sha'uwl* | Paul has done, is to be precluded from being enriched, empowered, and enlightened by the Set-Apart Spirit on this day or any other day. *Shabuw'ah* is for the Covenant's children – the very Covenant Paul has demeaned and rejected and will soon seek to replace with his own.

I have read the Towrah, and as a result, I know the truth. But so had he, which makes his lie deliberate.

The expressed benefit of receiving the Set-Apart Spirit on Seven Shabats was the ability to share Yahowah's message with those who did not speak Hebrew – and thus to the ethnicities. A dozen or so nations were listed, delineating the additional languages the Called Out in Yaruwshalaim were now able to speak. It was so that they would be able to communicate in languages which were the most familiar to the “uncircumcised” gentiles in nations as distinct as Greece and Rome, Persia and Arabia, Asia and Egypt, even Libya and Crete. (See Acts 2:1-12)

And therein lay two insurmountable problems for Christians. Since the Set-Apart Spirit specifically enabled the very disciples Paul has been demeaning to speak the languages of the gentile world, it means that either God's

Spirit was confused or Paul was wrong when he claimed all of these people for himself. And second, as attested by his letters and the reaction to his speeches, *Sha'uwI* | Paul was a horrible communicator.

Informed and rational, we now know for certain that Paul's claims were unfounded, both with regard to expanding his domain and limiting Shim'own's, as well as claiming that he had been inspired by the same spirit. If you are still clinging to Paul, or his Kurios Theos Iesou Christo, the air has gone out of the room.

Let it be known: since Shim'own and all of Yahowsha's disciples were among those empowered by the Set-Apart Spirit to specifically witness to ethnicities and nations, Sha'uwI's limitations on them are as errant and troubling as is his claim to the rest of the world. Just as he has lied about their relative territory, he has also misrepresented the commonality of the inspiration working within them.

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'uwI 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 Yahowsha’ and the Set-Apart Spirit bother with Peter and the disciples in the first place?

Translated “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 Yahowsha’ is never translated 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.

But that false impression evaporates when we examine the Greek text even 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 Shim’own’s inspiration and ability (as documented in Acts 2). 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.

Yes, I am aware, there is a massive difference from 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 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 Calls Out, of Coming Home*.

So now regarding *Sha'awl's* | Paul's highly misleading and inaccurate statement, the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th 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 "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 this 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, featuring 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 nor excessively exalted or lifted up, overdoing it (scribed in the present tense, meaning at this time, in the passive voice, affirming that this is being done to him, with the subjective mood indicating that this outcome is a mere possibility, and in the first-person singular, thereby identifying Paulos as the one being possessed and controlled)).” (2 Corinthians 12:6-7)

Sha’uwl revealed the identity of his power. He

explained why “the one” providing it was masculine, not feminine.

In the upcoming chapter in Volume Two of *Questioning Paul*, “*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.

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, (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 is 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, palm of one’s hand, and reconciliation, the nickname Yahowsha’ gave *Shim’own* | He Listens), **and also** (*kai*) **Yahowchanan** (*Ioannas* – an 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 Shim’own Kephas did not do so, lingering hostilities will cause

Sha'uwil | Paul to condemn him later in this same letter. Further, there was no mention of *Yahowchanan* | John being at this meeting in Acts, and that is because he had moved on to Ephesus. And even then, *Sha'uwil* will tell Timothy to undermine and refute him. Moreover, *Shim'own* explicitly challenged Paul's claim to the Gentile world, largely because *Yahowsha'* had equipped and authorized him to serve them on his behalf. 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 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'uwil* 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 translates that *Sha'uwil* claimed that the three men closest to *Yahowsha'*, his brother, *Ya'aqob*, the excitable, albeit thoughtful, *Shim'own* *Kephas*, and the most beloved disciple, the man named to refute *Sha'uwil's* protestations, *Yahowchanan* (*Yahowah* is Merciful), all allegedly “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.

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 told us 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.

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.

Yahowsha’s disciples would have recognized the Greek and Roman goddesses, and they most likely suspected that Paul was associating his faith with the Charities, but that is not a good thing. Although, in this conversation between four Yahuwdym, they all would have spoken Hebrew, so *charis* would have been *chanan*. For there to be mutual familiarity and acceptance, they

would have had to agree on circumcision, because without it there is no mercy.

Beyond his enslaving remarks, associating with false gods, promoting a religion, and taunting 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 may have 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, making this account, where "*ginosko* – recognition" precedes acceptance, invalid.

In Galatians, the inference is that the Disciples had listened to Paul's presentation of his past preaching, and then approved of 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 acknowledgement should be equated to an acceptance of his 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.

On the positive side, the Greek word *stulos* is related to *stauros*, the "upright pillar" upon which Yahowsha' hung, opening the door to life. His 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*)." And that is why in most of the early manuscripts, "*stauros* – upright pillar" was written by way of a Divine Placeholder – literally associating Passover's Doorway to Life with God, Himself.

Stulos, which literally 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.”

On the less than admirable side of the ledger, while the metaphor being established here is uplifting, 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'awl'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'awl choose to refer to the three most important 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 Paul against the Disciples, as opposed to unifying them and their mission.

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.

Yahowchanan’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 Yahowchanan was the leader of the *ekklesia* there, not Sha’uwl. Moreover, Yahowchanan’s eyewitness account of Yahowsha’s words and deeds was written in Ephesus, a city which lies well beyond the province of Galatia from the perspective of *Yahuwdah* | Judea. And it is interesting, that according to his second letter to Timothy, everyone, who knew Paul intimately, ultimately rejected him.

Further, Yahowchanan’s Revelation, which was developed on the Greek Island of Patmos, provides a set of clues which assists us in our quest to understand the words of the prophets, especially those predictions which pertain to the last two thousand years of human history. Without the book of Revelation, understanding what they predicted would be a bit more challenging. Although to be fair, Revelation is mostly an amalgamation of other prophets, the likes of Daniel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, and

Malachi, to name a few using their “Christian names.” That said, if Sha’uwl’s sentiments were true and Yahowchanan had been retired and was no longer relevant outside Judea, why was the Revelation given to him and not to Paul?

I share this with you because to this Gentile, Yahowchanan’s writings were helpful. There are insights to be gleaned from Yahowsha’s meeting with Nicodemus, for example. Without Yahowchanan’s testimony, many of the seeds the disciples spread throughout the nations would not have grown.

So, not only was Sha’uwl wrong in limiting Yahowchanan’s influence, claiming it for himself, in conjunction with his use of “*dokei* – presumed” regarding Yahowchanan’s status, 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. After all, Sha’uwl was a self-proclaimed expert on all things pertaining to Rabbinic Judaism. And He was a Roman citizen from Tarsus, the center of Greco-Roman enlightenment.

Adding to his résumé, Sha’uwl had studied in *Yaruwshalaim* | Jerusalem under Gamaliel, the foremost religious scholar of his day, and he wanted to be known as an extraordinary student with a 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 seemed to rank himself far above others.

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. (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.” 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 Yahowah 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 *Charis*?

With many preferable words at his disposal, and especially *chrestos* and *eleos*, why on earth did Paul choose to promote the name of a pagan goddesses and select *Charis*? And since his motivation is less important than 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 an imaginary deity.

Since Paul’s path has led so many souls away from the Torah, it is important to recognize that the concept we have come to know as “grace” is advanced more aggressively in

Yahowah's Testimony than it is in Paul's letters. While I am sure that is 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 "grace" as we know it today, but instead with Paul's choice of words.

We are called to nourish both body and soul. And that is why the stonemason and fishermen admonished the scholar...

"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 spending three years walking in the footsteps of God, witnessing everything that He 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 Yahowsha's life's work, there would have been just one unidentified and unspecific statement etched on a singular tablet. 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? For that matter,

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.” I suspect 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. (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. (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 Yaruwshalaim Summit, also called the “Council of Jerusalem” and the “Apostolic Conference,” between Sha’uwl and Yahowsha’s disciples, is also presented in the book of Acts, dominating the 15th chapter. And Luke’s account stands in stark contrast to what Paul has written.

Keeping in mind that Luke was Paul’s leading publicist and propagandist (having failed to serve as a successful exorcist), beginning with the 15th 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 things 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, 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 this testimony in relation to Sha'awl rendition, let's check to see if the message these Yahuwdym were conveying was consistent with the Towrah. Yahowah's instructions regarding circumcision are 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 (*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*)

This is the fourth of five conditions of the Covenant. It may be the most important because it leads to and 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 codicils 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*.

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 “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.

What many miss, and especially those who are religious, is that this statement from God is utterly devastating to Pauline Doctrine. Paul's thesis, better 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.

Those who know, trust. Those who do not know often resort to believing. Moreover, the means to "knowing" is "*shamar* – careful observation."

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 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 niphal stem denoting the genuineness of this relationship while stressing the benefit accrued to the parent, while the

infinitive absolute intensifies the importance of the act, and in the imperfect conjugation, reveals 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, demeaning it while promoting a second and different covenant, why did anyone believe him? Why have billions of souls been beguiled into trusting him?

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 niphal stem. The niphal, 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 niphal, as the reflexive counterpart of the qal, indicates that the subject, which are parents, receive the benefit of the verb's action, which is circumcision.

Collectively then, when the niph'al 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. And that is a very good thing, because circumcision is the sign of the Covenant. It affirms our acceptance, confirming our willingness to be cut into this relationship with God. We are in essence saying: we will raise our children to become Your children.

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 curse with 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 Covenant, 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 that 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 us 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 political, religious, economic, and military 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, 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 niph'al 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 animalistic instincts 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 obviously 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 and animal 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. Therefore, the “*’owth* – sign” of the “*beryth* – covenant” is a reminder that we must walk away from Babylon 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 therefore a symbolic sign, the act itself is literal and physical. Further, *hayah*, which was scribed in the third-person masculine singular, and was rendered “this will exist” in the passage, was more literally scribed “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 prerequisite, requirements, and benefits.

“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 – ∞) 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 Yahowsha’s 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 paid the price for us to live with Him as His children. This is what Passover, UnYeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children represent.

As we return to God’s Covenant testimony, it is important that we consistently approach Yahowah’s Word from the proper perspective 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 passage.

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** (*huw*’ – third-person masculine singular pronoun, addressing fathers) **should absolutely circumcise him, definitely cutting off the foreskin** (*muwl muwl* – he can ward off a deadly and debilitating curse by way of this oath, promising to cease what he is currently doing by changing his priorities while making a binding promise to undergo circumcision (scribed with the niphil stem denoting the genuineness of this relationship while stressing the benefit accrued to the parent, 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 benefits)) **of the naturally born** (*yalyd* – naturalized as a

member of an extended family through natural childbirth) **in your home** (*beyth* – into your household and your family) **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** (*miqnah* – purchased through adoption and included) **with your money** (*kesep* – 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** (*ba*) **the flesh** (*basar* – physical realm with humanity), **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 a nonstarter. 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 where the flesh is considered bad.

God's instructions have been all encompassing and perfectly clear – especially 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'awl's* | Paul's toxic rhetoric.

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 this occurred. Yahowah said one thing, and Paul said the opposite. One of them was not telling the truth. Guess who?

Beyond this, if God changed His mind, if He decided to do something new which was counter to His previous promises, He would then 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.

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 (*'arel* – 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) **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** (*lo’ muwl* – willing to change his direction and priorities and embrace this binding promise to ward off the curse (nifal imperfect – men who continually remain uncircumcised as a result of their inaction suffer the consequence)) **with regard to** (*‘eth*) **the flesh** (*basar* – physical, human, and animal nature in addition to being separated from those who preach and publish what mankind wants to hear in association with) **of his foreskin** (*‘arlah* – symbolic of *‘aram* and *‘arak* – man’s propensity to be drawn together by crafty counsel, by cunning tendencies, and that which is 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’uwl’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, 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, 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 by those Yahowsha' had selected and taught. When they did not concur with his contrarian approach, Paul wrote to the Galatians to demean Yahowsha's Disciples, especially *Shim'own* | Peter (He Listens), *Yahowchanan* | John (Yahowah is Merciful), and *Ya'aqob* | Jacob (Yahowsha's brother, who was renamed "James" to flatter an English king). Therefore, Christians have a choice. They can trust Yahowah, or they can believe Paul. Their claims are diametrically opposed and irreconcilable.

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 2nd 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 1st century CE.

And that means the conflict between Yahowah and Paul cannot be resolved. If you side with Paul, you will

invalidate the benefits of the Covenant. You will be excluded from God's family. And your soul will cease to exist. And that is why the choices we make in the flesh, while we retain our physical and animal nature, 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 monogamous marriage relationship. Yahowah does not want anyone to miss this point.

There should be no doubt. There should be 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 anew by way of our Spiritual Mother 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,” and that if we want to participate and to be included then we must make the choice to 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, willing to change his direction and priorities and make this binding promise to ward off the curse (*lo’ muwl*) with regard to (*eth*) the flesh, becoming separated from those who preach and publish what mankind wants to hear 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* / In the Beginning / Genesis 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 Covenant is about bearing children and building a family by way of a mother and father. Yahowah does not want anyone to miss this point.

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 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 *Sha’uwl*’s | Paul’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 associated with Paul’s position on this matter in which he flaunted his rejection of the Towrah, 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'uwl's* | Paul's position on circumcising Greeks in particular and Gentiles in general. And it is God's conclusion, His judgment, that *Sha'uwl's* | Paul's claims were 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 are irrelevant. When it comes to the relevance 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.

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

Sha'uwl was a Yisra'elite. He corrupted and defiled the Word of God. And by so doing, he violated and revoked Yahowah's one and only Covenant.

His unwillingness to take Yahowah and His Word seriously has led to the nullification of the Covenant for many. And this problem has become ubiquitous as a result of Galatians and its byproduct: Christianity.

Specifically, Paul's antagonism toward circumcision is mixed with references to the body of the Passover Lamb, represented by "bread," the Spirit, represented by "oil," and the sacrifice of the Lamb to open the Doorway to Life, denoted by "blood." By demeaning one, Paul demeaned all. He broke the connection between them and thereby

nullified the Covenant and thwarted its intent.

For Yahowah to be this angry at this one thing – inappropriately inviting uncircumcised Gentiles into His family and home in opposition to His Towrah Instructions – it suggests that 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 and we have just begun.

Paul’s thirteen or fourteen ill-advised letters, and his influence on Mark, Luke, and Matthew, and his litany of speeches were sufficient to separate Christians from God, because 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 individuals because the one-thousand-year commemoration of *Sukah* is a celebration of the Covenant. And throughout this time, Yahowah will reside in His Millennial Temple, making such ubiquitous malfeasance impossible.

Second, as a celebration of the *Miqra'* of *Sukah*, 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.

These things known, I am haunted by two questions. With Yahowah's position on circumcision being so clearly stated, so vital, unequivocal, and nonnegotiable, why did Sha'uwl choose this issue to pick a fight with the disciples and with God? And with Yahowsha's position on the Torah being so clearly stated, so vital, and nonnegotiable, how is it that Sha'uwl thought he could contradict the Passover Lamb and not be repudiated and dismissed for having done so?

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.” (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. (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. (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. (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. (2:8)

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, 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.” (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 Yahowsha's fulfillment of Passover.

Now that we know that the pretext for this meeting was

misrepresented by Paul, how about the spies? Were they false brothers unknown to the Called Out 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 (ο 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 hairesis – 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 left their ranks to follow Yahowsha’), 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 (parangelo – 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. I suspect that Nicodemus, the Pharisee who is shown meeting with Yahowsha’ in *Yahowchanan* | 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 the One they followed, were Towrah observant.

While Paul’s first five statements regarding this meeting have all crumbled in the face of evidence to the

contrary, Sha'awl'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 acknowledgement 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 it might have been. 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 Yahowsha'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** (*tou 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, Kephass, of the same meaning in 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) **Yahowah** (ΘΣ – a placeholder used by Yahowsha’s

Disciples, like Shim'own, and in the *Septuagint* to convey 'elohym, the Almighty, and 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)

Yahowsha' had personally trained Shim'own, teaching and guiding him every step of the way, equipping him to articulate Yahowah's healing and beneficial message to the world. And then God deliberately and unequivocally 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 Yahowah because they had heard His message shared by Shim'own or Yahowsha', himself.

And let's be very clear about this. Shim'own did not say that his words had saved anyone. The Rock's role was in sharing *the Word* – therefore reciting the Towrah. Better trained and prepared than anyone else on the planet (except Yahowchanan and Ya'aqob perhaps), this Apostle knew Yahowsha', he understood Yahowah, he acknowledged the importance of the Towrah, and therefore he was an especially effective witness.

By acknowledging his history and theirs, Shim'own Kephas confirmed what Yahowsha' had instructed, and thereby pulverized Paul's ninth claim. The “Rock” upon which the “*Ekklesia* – Called-Out Assembly” would be established was Shim'own's pronouncement of Yahowah's Word, whereby he proclaimed that Yahowsha'

was fulfilling it.

Beyond this, everyone who answered the Invitation to be Called Out in Yaruwshalaim during the fulfillment of the observance of Seven Shabats was specifically equipped by the Set-Apart Spirit to share the healing and beneficial message with the entire world, regardless of what languages the Gentiles spoke. Simply stated, the ministry of the Apostles had never been limited to Jews as Paul had claimed. The exact opposite was true.

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 Yahowsha's disciples, to bolster his 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 wakeup 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.

✠✠✠

RESOURCES

YadaYah.com

ProphetOfDoom.net

Tea with Terrorists

<https://www.amazon.com/Tea-Terrorists-Who-They-Kill/dp/0971448116/>

InTheCompanyOfGoodAndEvil.com

Forum.yadayah.com

BlogTalkRadio.com/Yada

Facebook:

<https://www.facebook.com/YadaYahowah/>

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/YadaYahowah/>

Instagram:

<https://www.instagram.com/YadaYahowah/>

Printed and eBooks: Amazon.com (Craig Winn)

Contact: email@YadaYah.com

ASSOCIATED RESOURCES

YahowahBeryth.com (Books & Audio Archives)

BlessYah.com (Books & Audio Archives)

Yada Yah on YouTube (Audio Programs)

ver photo courtesy of www.hystar.wordpress.com

Ver. 20230106