

Towrah – Teaching and Guidance

Are We Saved or Enslaved by Observing the Towrah...

At long last we have arrived at the verses cited by a New Zealand radio program which ultimately prompted this review of Paul's letters, especially Galatians. The Christian's message, one predicated upon Paul's epistle, "stressed that we are *not* required to pay attention to the Torah because it has been replaced by faith in the Gospel of Grace." And while that is consistent with what Sha'awl has written, it is amazing that such a preposterous notion has fooled so many for so long.

Paul's testimony in this regard was based upon a twisted portrayal of Abram and his participation in the Covenant offered by Yahowah. And what makes that perplexing is that this man and his relationship with God would be unknown to us if not chronicled in the Torah. So how, Christians, can the only account of the Covenant be irrelevant to the Covenant? How can Abraham's response and reward disavow the words written about these things? And if Abraham matters, why was the Covenant he formed with God besmirched and dismissed by Paul, only to be replaced by his "New Covenant?"

Before we resume our consideration of Paul's assault on Yahowah's Torah, since most readers may be somewhat unfamiliar with Yahowah's Teaching, a quick review of God's perspective on His Torah is in order. However, for those of you who would prefer a more detailed presentation of the Towrah's role in our lives, this would be a wonderful time to take a break from *Questioning Paul* to systematically consider what God has to say about His foundational text. In *An Introduction to God* (www.IntroToGod.org), Volume Three, you will find a comprehensive evaluation of Yahowah's "*Towrah* – Teaching." Part One presents what the Towrah says about itself. Part Two delves into what can be gleaned from comments made about the Towrah in the Proverbs and Psalms. Part Three is my favorite, because it is devoted to the greatest song ever written – presenting Dowd / David's lyrics on how to properly observe, actually understand, and intelligently

respond to the Towrah. And then in Part Four, most everything Yahowah revealed about His Towrah through His prophets is presented for your consideration.

Now, for those who would prefer a quick review, please consider the following citations regarding the Towrah, the terms and conditions of its Covenant, and the overall relevance of the words and teaching of Yahowah...

“Listen (*shama*’ – hear this message) **children** (*ben* – sons) **to the correct instruction** (*muwcar* – to the accurate teaching) **of the Father** (*‘ab*), **and pay attention** (*qasab* – accept, process, and consider this information and respond appropriately) **so as** (*la*) **to know and acknowledge** (*yada*’ – to find, become aware of, to become familiar with, to care about, to respect, and to embrace) **understanding and discernment** (*bynah* – to gain knowledge through observation and insight and wisdom through consideration so as to be intelligent and distinguish between right and wrong, fact and fiction).

For indeed (*ky* – this is important, trustworthy, and reliable), **such teaching and learning** (*laqah* – receiving instruction and possessing it to the point of comprehension) **is good, beneficial, and helpful** (*towb* – is proper, prosperous, favorable, beautiful, pleasing, enjoyable, valuable, and healing).

For this reason I have given you (*la natan* – therefore, for this purpose, I have actually provided and bestowed you with the completed gift of) **My Towrah** (*Towrah*: from *tow* – My signed, written, and enduring, *towrah* – way of treating people, *tuwr* – giving you the means to explore, to seek, to find, and to choose, *yarah* – the source from which My instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction flow, which *tuwb* – provides answers that facilitate your restoration and return, even your response and reply to that which is *towb* – good, pleasing, joyful, beneficial, favorable, healing, and right, and that which causes you to be loved, to become acceptable, and to endure, *tahowr* / *tohorah* – purifying and cleansing you, *towr* – so as to provide you with an opportunity to change your thinking, attitude, and direction).

You should not forsake, neglect, or reject it (*‘al ‘azab* – without it you will be forsaken, neglected, rejected, abandoned, separated, and left behind). **Indeed** (*ky* – this is important, reliable, and true), **I have and will actually come to exist as** (*hayah* – I was, am, and will be as) **a Son** (*ben*) **to approach the kind and merciful Father** (*la rak ‘ab* – on behalf of My compassionate, gentle, and tenderhearted Father), **the only begotten and unique Son** (*yahyd* – as the one and only child) **by way of** (*la*) **the Mother’s** (*‘em*) **presence** (*paneh*).

And He has and will teach Me (*yarah* – He has and will become the source of My instruction, guidance, and direction). **And He said to Me** (*‘amar la* – He told Me), **‘Accept, uphold, fulfill, and keep** (*tamak* – receive, grasp hold of, and retain) **My Words** (*dabar* – My message) **upon Your heart** (*leb*). **Focus upon**

and closely observe (*shamar* – carefully examine, thoughtfully contemplate, thoroughly evaluate and consider) **My terms and conditions** (*mitswah* – My authorized directions and instructions regarding the covenant contract) **and live** (*chayah* – be restored to life, embracing the source of continuous and sustained growth, which is healthy, beneficial, and abundant, accepting the promise of renewal and restoration).” (*Masal / Word Pictures / Proverbs 4:1-4*)

The Towrah (*Towrah* – the signed, written, and enduring means to search for, find, and choose the instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction, which provides answers which facilitate our restoration and return that are good, pleasing, joyful, beneficial, purifying, and cleansing) **is Light** (*’owr*) **and** (*wa*) **the Way** (*derek* – the Path) **of Life** (*chay* – the source of continuous and sustained existence, abundant growth, of revival, renewal, and restoration, the promise of the most favorable of circumstances, prosperity, and blessings).” (*Masal / Word Pictures / Proverbs 6:23*)

“**My son** (*beny* – My child), **choose to actually observe** (*shamar* – elect to focus upon, carefully examine, diligently consider, and thoughtfully evaluate, agree to pay close attention to and genuinely care about (qal imperative indicating that an actual relationship will be established between Father and son should the child choose of their own volition to pay attention to this exhortation to revere and regard)) **My Words** (*’emer* – My answers, explanations, and promises). **And** (*wa*) **My Terms and Conditions** (*mitswah* – My authorized directions and binding instructions regarding My covenant contract), **you should habitually treasure and store** (*tsaphan* – you should value and keep (qal imperfect affirming the relationship between us and Yah’s terms and conditions ought to be genuine because by properly valuing them, their influence will be ongoing, producing everlasting results)) **with you** (*’eth*).

Choose to keep focused upon, closely examine, and carefully consider (*shamar* – elect to actually observe, pay close attention to, and genuinely care about (qal imperative)) **My Terms and Conditions** (*mitswah* – My authorized instructions and binding directions regarding the covenant agreement) **and** (*wa*) **live** (*chayah* – be restored and renewed, be nourished and grow, electing to exist forever as a result of God’s promise and favor) (qal imperative – affirming that our decision to observe the Terms and Condition of Yah’s binding Covenant is equivalent to choosing to be restored to life and living forever)). **My Towrah Teaching** (*Towrah* – My Torah Instruction, Guidance, and Direction: from *tow* – My signed, written, and enduring, *towrah* – way of treating people, *tuwr* – giving you the means to explore, to seek, to find, and to choose, *jarah* – the source from which My instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction flow, which *tuwb* – provides answers that facilitate your restoration and return, even your response and reply to that which is *towb* – good, pleasing, joyful, beneficial, favorable,

healing, and right, and that which causes you to be loved, to become acceptable, and to endure, *tahowr / tohorah* – purifying and cleansing you, *towr* – so as to provide you with an opportunity to change your thinking, attitude, and direction) **should be as** (*ka* – should be considered as and akin to) **the pupil, the center, and the focus** (*'iyshown* – the extant essence and individual nature) **of your eyes and understanding** (*'ayin* – your sight and perceptions, your perspective and thoughts).” (*Masal / Word Pictures / Proverbs 7:1-2*)

“**The wicked** (*rasa'* – the guilty and condemned who deserved to be punished, those in violation of the standard) **arrogantly boast and make fools of themselves** (*halal* – they are flashy, and while pretending to be bright and enlightened they display an improper attitude of haughtiness, glorifying themselves, praising themselves they mock and slander) **by abandoning and rejecting** (*'azab* – by forsaking and separating from, by neglecting and disassociating from, by departing from and ignoring) **the Towrah** (*Towrah* – the signed, written, and enduring means to search for, find, and choose the instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction which provides answers which facilitate our restoration and return that are good, pleasing, joyful, beneficial, favorable, healing, and right, purifying and cleansing, thereby giving us the opportunity and means to change our thinking, attitude, and direction to the way which is more fortuitous and beneficial). **And** (*wa*) **those who observe, focusing upon** (*shamar* – those who closely examine and carefully consider) **the Towrah** (*Towrah* – Instruction, Teaching, Guidance, and Direction), **they take the initiative to oppose and resist them** (*garah ba* – they are overtly hostile to them and they provoke them, they actively engage against them and irritate them by not conforming to their pressure or power). **Evil** (*ra'* – wicked and violent, mischievous and malignant) **individuals** (*'ysh* – men) **do not** (*lo'*) **apprehend or teach** (*byn* – consider, realize, perceive, understand, instruct, or implement) **good judgment** (*mishpat* – the proper means to resolve disputes, to be discriminating, to be fair, to obtain justice, and to make sound decisions). **But** (*wa*) **those who diligently seek** (*baqas* – those whose search and investigation allows them to procure the information necessary to learn about) **Yahowah** (אֱלֹהֵינוּ) **consider and understand** (*byn* – apprehend, perceive, and realize) **everything** (*kol*).” (*Masal / Word Pictures / Proverbs 28:4-5*)

“**The one who turns away his ear from hearing** (*suwr 'ozen min shama'* – the one who avoids listening to) **the Towrah** (*Towrah* – the source of instruction and direction, guidance and teaching), **his prayers and requests** (*taphilah* – his pleas and petitions for intervention) **also** (*gam*) **will be considered detestable** (*tow'ebah* – will be seen as a disgusting abomination). **The one who misleads** (*sagah* – the one who deceives and leads astray) **the upright** (*yashar* – the straightforward) **in the way** (*ba derek*) **of evil** (*ra'* – in that which is harmful,

malignant, afflicting, and adversarial, severing the relationship), **into the pit** (*ba shachuwth* – the place where one is brought down, prostrating themselves in worship before false gods and reduced to despair), **he will fall and be cast down** (*huw' naphal* – he will descend from a higher position to a lower one, wasting away), **but the innocent** (*tamym* – those who have been perfected, who are genuine and unblemished) **will enjoy a good, generous, festive, and beneficial inheritance** (*towb nachal* – will inherit and acquire that which is agreeable, moral, joyous, and valuable).” (*Masal / Word Pictures / Proverbs 28:9-10*)

“**Without revelation** (*ba lo' chazown* – with no communication from God, without prophecy; from *chazah* – without seeing and perceiving, without understanding) **people** (*'am*) **take charge and run wild** (*para'* – they are ignorant and they take their own initiative and behave like an uncontrolled and unrestrained mob). **But** (*wa*) **he is happy and blessed, he walks upright on the correct path** (*'esher / 'ashur* – he finds good fortune and experiences great joy along the restrictive but valid, straight way to stand safe and secure), **who observes and focuses upon** (*shamar* – who closely examines and carefully considers) **the Towrah** (*Towrah* – Teaching, Instruction, Direction, and Guidance).” (*Masal / Word Pictures / Proverbs 29:18*)

“**Blessed and happy is** (*'asry* – by walking the straight path the enjoyment of a favorable outcome awaits) **the individual** (*ha 'iysh*) **who** (*'asher*) **does not walk** (*lo' halak*) **in** (*ba*) **the plans and schemes** (*'esah* – the strategy, advice, and counsel) **of the wicked who violate the standard** (*rasa'* – of those who are evil and unrighteous). **And in** (*wa ba*) **the way** (*derek* – path) **of sinners** (*hata'* – of the offensive who have missed the way), **he does not stand** (*lo' 'amad* – he does not appear and is not even present). **In the assembly** (*wa ba mowshab* – in the dwelling places and settlements, the communities and households) **of those who arrogantly mock** (*lys* – of those who boast and interpret which showing no respect), **he does not stay** (*lo' yasab* – dwell, live, settle down, sit, or remain). **To the contrary** (*'im*), **instead** (*ky*), **in** (*ba*) **the Towrah of Yahowah** (אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ) – the Teaching, Instruction, Guidance, and Direction of Yahowah), **he finds enjoyment and pleasure** (*chephets* – he prefers, refers, and desires). **And regarding** (*wa ba*) **the Towrah** (*Towrah* – teaching, instruction, guidance, and direction), **he speaks thoughtfully and purposefully** (*hagah* – he reviews the material, meditates upon the information, considers its implications, and then makes the decision to roar, declaring these conclusions forcefully, emotionally, and powerfully (*qal imperfect* – telling us that these informed declarations on behalf of Yah's Instructions are genuine and ongoing)) **in the daytime** (*yowmam* – in the heat of the day) **and at night** (*wa laylah* – in the darkness and shadows).” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 1:1-2*)

“Yahowah’s (יְהוָה) Towrah (Towrah – Source of Teaching and Instruction and the Place from which Direction and Guidance Flow) is wholly complete and entirely perfect (tamym – without defect, lacking nothing, totally correct, sound, genuine, right, helpful, healing, beneficial, and true), returning, restoring, and transforming (suwb – turning around, bringing back, changing, and renewing) the soul (nepesh – our consciousness). Yahowah’s (יְהוָה) restoring testimony (‘eduwth – enduring witness) is trustworthy and reliable (‘aman – is instructive, informative, verifiable, confirming, supportive, and establishing), making understanding and obtaining wisdom (hakam – making education, learning, and enlightenment to the point of comprehension) easy for those who are receptive (pethy – simple for the open-minded). Yahowah’s (יְהוָה) directions (piquwdym – instructions and prescriptions, precepts and guidance; from paqad – that which we should pay especially close attention to, care about, look at, and examine so that we respond appropriately) are right (yashar – are straight (and thus neither crooked or circuitous) and upright (and thus are disassociated from bowing down), they are approved, esteemed, correct, proper, and pleasing), causing the heart to rejoice (leb samah – facilitating an attitude of elation). Yahowah’s (יְהוָה) terms and conditions (mitswah – His authorized instructions regarding the codicils of His covenant contract) are morally pure and are purifying (bar – paving the way to inheritance, to enlightenment, and to comprehension), shining a light toward understanding (‘owr ‘ayn – illuminating the proper perspective, shedding a brilliant light on the path to enlightenment). Revering and respecting (yir’ah) Yahowah (יְהוָה) is cleansing and restoring (tahowr – purifying and perfecting), sustaining and establishing (‘amad – causing one to be established, standing upright) forever (‘ad). The just means to resolve disputes of (mishpat – the means used to achieve justice and exercise good judgment of) Yahowah (יְהוָה) are trustworthy and reliable (‘emeth – are enduring, dependable, honest, and true). They are wholly (yahdaw – all together and completely) vindicating (tsadaq – justifying, causing the recipient to be righteous and innocent).” (Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:7-9)

יְהוָה

With that introduction from Yahowah, the man who claimed to speak for God, began his crusade against Him by writing these words:

“Paulos, an apostle, not of men, not even by the means of man, but to the contrary on behalf of Iesou Christou and god, father of the one having awakened Him out of a dead corpse, (1:1) and all the brothers with me to the

called out of the Galatias, (1:2) Grace to you and peace from god, 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, He might gouge or tear out, uprooting us from the past circumstances of the old system which had been in place which is disadvantageous and harmful, corrupt and worthless, malicious and malignant according to the desire and will of god and father of us, (1:4) to whom the opinion regarding the glorious appearance of the shining light, a manifestation of God's reputation, by means of the old and the new systems, Amen, let it be so. (1:5)

I am astonished, wondering in this way quickly you changed, becoming disloyal, apostates and traitors away from your calling in the name of Grace to a different beneficial messenger (1:6) which does not exist differently, conditionally negated because some are stirring you up, confusing you, proposing to change and pervert the healing message of Christou, (1:7) but to the contrary, if we or a messenger out of heaven conveys a beneficial messenger to you which is contrary to what we delivered as a good messenger to you then a curse with a dreadful consequence exists. (1:8)

As we have said already, and even just now, repetitively, I say, if under the condition someone communicates a useful message to you contrary, even greater than that which you received, it shall be (in fact I command and want it to exist as) a curse with a dreadful consequence. (1:9) For because currently, men I persuade presently, actually use words to win the favor of, seducing, misleading, and appeasing the god. Or by comparison and contrast, I seek and desire to please and accommodate humans? Yet nevertheless, if men, I was pleasing and accommodating, exciting the emotions of and lifting up a slave of Christou, certainly not was me. (1:10)

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

For because indeed you heard of my wayward behavior in some time and place in the practice of Judaism, namely that because throughout, showing superiority, surpassing any measure of restraint, to an extraordinary degree, and better than anyone else, I was aggressively and intensely pursued, persecuting, oppressing, and harassing the called out of god, and 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, zealous and excited, devoted and burning with passion to belong to the traditions and teachings handed down by my forefathers. (1:14) But at a point in time when it pleased and was chosen enjoyable and better for god, 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 races, immediately. I did not ask the advice of or consult with flesh or blood. (1:16)

I did not ascend into Yaruwshalaim toward the goal of being with or against the Apostles before me, but to the contrary I went away, withdrawing to Arabia, and returned again to Damascus. (1:17) Then later in the sequence of events, after three years time, I ascended up to Yaruwshalaim to visit and get acquainted with Kephass and remained against / with him fifteen days. (1:18) But other of the Apostles, I did not see, I did not pay attention to, or concern myself with except Ya'aqob, the brother of the Lord. (1:19)

But now what I write to you, you must pay especially close attention in the presence of god, because I cannot lie. (1:20) Thereafter, I came to the regions of Syria and also of Cilicia. (1:21) But I was not known and was disregarded, I was either ignored or ignorant, not recognized or understood, personally by appearance as an individual by the called out of Yahuwdah in Christo. (1:22) But then only they were constantly hearing that the one presently pursuing and persecuting us at various times now he presently proclaims a healing message of faith which once he was attacking, continuing to annihilate, he was consistently ravaging and destroying. (1:23) And so they were praising and glorifying, attributing an exceptionally high value and status, considering illustrious and magnificent, dignifying and magnifying in me for god. (1:24)

Later, through fourteen years also, I went up to Yaruwshalaim along with Barnabas, having taken along also Titus. (2:1) I went up from uncovering an unveiling revelation which lays bare, laying down to them the beneficial messenger which I preach among the races down from my own, uniquely and separately, but then to the opinions, presumptions, and suppositions, 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, forced or pressured, to be circumcised. (2:3) But then on account of the impersonators who faked their relationship brought in surreptitiously into the group to spy upon and plot against the freedom from conscience and liberation from the

constraints of morality that we possess in Christo Iesou in order that us they will actually make 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 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 god of man not take hold of or receive, because to me, the ones currently presuming and dispensing opinions based upon reputed appearances, of no account, worthless was their advice and counsel in the past. (2:6)

Contrariwise, nevertheless, the objection and exception, having seen and 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. (2:7) 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 recognized, becoming familiar with the Grace of the one having been given to me, Ya'aqob, Kephas, and also Yahowchanan, the ones presently presumed and supposed to be leaders, the right place of honor and authority they granted to me, and to Barnabas fellowship as a result. We to the nations and ethnicities, but they to the circumcision. (2:9) Only alone by itself the lowly and poor, the worthless beggars of little value that we might remember and possibly think about which also I was eager and quick same this to do. (2:10)

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

Nevertheless, when I saw that they were not walking through life rightly with the truth of the healing and beneficial messenger, I said to Kephas in front of all: 'If you Jews actively being ethnic, how the ethnicities you compel and force into being or acting Jewish? (2:14)

We Jews by nature and not from the social outcasts of sinful and heathen races (2:15) having come to realize without investigation or evidence that by

no means whatsoever is made right, vindicated, or righteous man by means of tasks or activities associated with the Towrah if not by belief and faith in Iesou Christou, and we on Christon Iesoun, ourselves believed in order for us to have become righteous, to have been acquitted and vindicated out of faith in Christou, and not by means of acting upon or engaging in the Towrah, because by means of engaging in and acting upon the Towrah not any flesh will be acquitted, vindicated, nor be made righteous. (2:16)

But if seeking to be made righteous and innocent in Christo, we were found also ourselves social outcasts and sinners, shouldn't we be anxious that Christos becomes a guilty, errant, and misled, servant of sin? Not may it exist, (2:17) because if that which I have actually torn down, dissolved, and dismantled, invalidated and abolished, subverted, abrogated, and discarded, this on the other hand I restore or reconstruct, promoting this edifice, I myself bring into existence and recommend transgression and disobedience. (2:18) I then, because of, and by the Towrah's allotment or law, myself, actually died and was separated in order that to god I might currently live. In Christo I have actually been crucified together with. (2:19)

I live, but no longer I. He lives then in me, Christos. This because now I live in the flesh, in faith I live of the god and Christou, the one having loved me and surrendered, entrusting authority, yielding and handing over the power to control, influence and instruct, and to betray exclusively and especially of himself for the sake of and because of me. (2:20)

I do not reject or disregard the Charity / Grace of the god if because then by or through the Torah righteousness consequently as a result, Christos undeservedly, for no reason or cause, without benefit, for naught, and in vain, he died. (2:21)

O ignorant and irrational, unintelligent and unreasonable, Galatians. To whom you bewitched, deceived, and slandered, brought evil upon and seduced? (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? (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? (3:3) So much and so long these things you suffered, you were affected and you were vexed, annoyed, and angry, without reason or result, even chaotically without a plan. If indeed, really and yet then also thoughtlessly and for nothing without cause, reason, or result. (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? (3:5)

Just as and to the degree that Abram believed and had faith in the God so it was reasoned and accounted to Him as righteousness. (3:6) You know as a result that the ones out of faith, these sons are Abram. (3:7)

Having seen beforehand then by contrast, the writing, that because out of faith makes right the people from different races and places, the God, He before beneficial messenger acted, to the Abram that they would in time be spoken of favorably in you to all the races. (3:8) As a result, the ones out of faith, we are spoken of favorably, even praised together with the faithful Abram.” (3:9)

Given the choice between relying upon Yahowah’s Word or believing what was scribed in Sha’uwl’s letters, it is a wonder three people, much less three billion, chose to place their faith in this man. It is also hard to imagine that someone claiming to speak for God would call His Torah a “curse,” but nonetheless, that is precisely what the founder of the Christian religion said next...

“Because (*gar* – for) to the degree that (*hosos* – as many and as far as) out of (*ek*) tasks and activities of (*ergon* – works or actions associated with, engaging in) the Torah (*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)), they are and they exist (*eisin eisin*) under (*hupo* – by way of) a curse (*katara* – that which a supernatural power deploys when he wishes to invoke harm by promoting evil, that which is accursed, denounced and detested), 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*) Torah (*nomou* – the allotment which is parceled out, the inheritance which is given, the nourishment which is bestowed to be possessed and used to grow, the precepts which are apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and the prescription to become an heir (singular genitive, and thus restricted to a singular specific and unique characterization)), the of (*tou*) to do (*poieomai* – to make, produce, or perform) them (*autos*).” (Galatians 3:10)

This is the ultimate confession. And for informed and rational individuals, the case is closed. The testimony Yahowah has called “good, beneficial, and perfect,” Sha’uwl has just labeled “abhorrent and malicious.” Since both cannot be telling the truth, who do you suppose is lying?

We have comprehensively researched every discernible connotation of “*nomos*.” And here, Sha’uwl has finally and openly confessed to what we have long since known. He is using *nomou* to describe the “Torah,” as if *nomos* and *towrah* were synonymous. We know this because in the attempt to prove this point he translated the Hebrew word “*towrah*” into Greek as “*nomou*.” As a result, a Pauline apologist can no longer promote the myth that Paul was condemning Rabbinic Law instead of the Towrah without contradicting Paul’s own testimony. With this single statement, the debate is over, the question has been answered. Paul is demeaning and denouncing not just the Word of God, but Yahowah’s foundational testimony.

Beyond emphatically demonstrating that Sha’uwl was using variations of *nomos* to convey “Torah” throughout his letters by rendering *towrah* as *nomou*, to be intellectually honest, the meaning of *towrah* in Hebrew which is “teaching, instruction, direction, and guidance” must prevail over “law.” Therefore, not only is Paul implicating himself by disparaging the Word of God, those who publish Christian bibles are universally guilty of misrepresenting one of the most important words ever written when they render *towrah* via *nomos* as “law.”

While Sha’uwl has bragged about annulling and destroying Yahowah’s Teaching, he has now upped the ante. He has devolved to name-calling. *Katara*, translated “a curse,” is actually a considerably more demeaning concept. This noun is defined in the dozen lexicons at my disposal as being “an execration, imprecation, and malediction.” Since these are not common terms, let’s consider how they are defined. To execrate is to “denounce someone or something, declaring it or them to be hateful, abhorrent, and loathsome.” To imprecate is “to invoke evil on someone or something, cursing them or it.” And a malediction is “slander which maligns and is malicious.” If we are to believe Sha’uwl, all of these things apply to Yahowah and to His Towrah.

Katara is a compound of *ara*, “a malevolent prayer which is harmful, hateful, and repugnant,” and *kata*, meaning “down from, according to, and throughout.” Therefore, there is no getting around the fact that Sha’uwl is denouncing Yahowah’s Towrah because he loathes it. Sha’uwl wants us to believe that the book Yahowah authored to introduce Himself, to reveal His Covenant, to present His Invitations, and to provide His Guidance is “hateful and abhorrent, something to be maligne because it is evil, slanderous, harmful, and malicious throughout.”

This known, I have a confession. I joined the two verbs in the opening statement together because the second insertion of *eisin*, which means “they are or they exist” when it is scribed in the third person plural, is out of place at the statement’s conclusion. According to the *Nestle-Aland*, this sentence actually reads: “For as many as from works of law are under curse they are....” Therefore, I combined the verbs to convey the concepts of “being and existing.”

In both instances, *eisin* was scribed in the present active indicative third person plural. In the present tense, Paul is portraying the evil curse as being in process with no end in sight. The active voice reveals that those who have chosen to observe the Torah have brought this abhorrent, harmful, and repugnant condition upon themselves. Worse, in the indicative mood, Paul is saying that his evaluation of the Towrah and its consequence is real, genuine, and actual.

Sha’uwl used a variation of *katara* to convey “accursed” in his citation of the Torah’s *Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26. This variation is from *epikataratos*, an adjective that adds the prefix *epi*, meaning “on, upon, before, or against.” As such, Paul is attempting to ascribe each of the horrendous aspects of *katara* to the Towrah, itself, impugning its author, by inserting this abhorrent concept directly into the Torah’s dialog. And yet, I’ve seldom been as pleased to see the Torah quoted. By doing so in this context, Sha’uwl is affirming beyond any doubt that the *nomou* he is attempting to destroy is the one Yahowah authored. If he had meant to demean Rabbinic Law, he would have quoted from the Oral Law which became the Talmud.

Incidentally, Sha’uwl’s initial condemnation is actually undermined by his citation. If the Torah is “*katara* – a curse from a supernatural power designed to invoke harm by promoting evil,” and if it is “*katara* – abhorrent, slanderous, and malicious,” then it cannot be a credible source. That which is *katara* is not reliable, thus should not have been used to validate his claim.

Having thought about this passage now for several months, having come to understand Paul’s strategy relative to dissolving and dismantling the Torah, and now viewing it within the context of Paul’s overall thesis as it is presented in Galatians 3:6 to 4:31, there is no denying the fact that Paul was trying to use the Torah to demonstrate that the Torah should not be used.

By citing a passage that includes “curse” and “Towrah,” Sha’uwl was hoping that his audience would believe that he was right in stating that “the Towrah is a curse.” Beyond this singular similarity, it was counterproductive for him to cite *Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26 in this context. After all, the passage says nothing about working for one’s salvation.

But if, as Christians protest, Paul was intending to say that “observing the Torah” cannot save us because we have to do “everything that is written in the

scroll of the Torah” or be “accursed” by it, then they and he would still be wrong. While that is the most reasonable interpretation of Paul’s rhetoric, the very purpose of the Torah is to provide a remedy for that very condition.

As we discussed, the second half of this statement presents a flawed and truncated Greek rendering of *Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26. The discussion in which it is found begins with a long list of blessings, all of which flow from observing the Torah – all of which, therefore, negate the point Sha’uwl was attempting to promote. As always, the context destroys his argument.

Starting with the 9th verse of *Dabarym* 27, we find:

“Then (*wa*) **Moseh** (*Moseh* – One Who Draws Out), **the priests** (*ha kohen* – ministers), **and the Lowy** (*Lowy* – those who unite) **spoke** (*dabar* – sharing the word) **to** (*‘el*) **all** (*kol*) **Yisra’el** (*Yisra’el* – individuals who engage and endure with God) **to say** (*la ‘amar* – in order to communicate), **‘Choose to be quiet** (*cakath* – refrain from speaking and elect being silent (the hiphil stem and imperative mood mean that we facilitate our ability to listen when we choose to close our mouths)) **and** (*wa*) **listen** (*shama’* – hear), **Yisra’el** (*Yisra’el* – everyone who exists and endures with God). **This** (*ha zeh*) **day** (*yowm*) **you are** (*hayah* – you exist as (in the niphil perfect, the existence of an individual who lives with God is predicated upon their willingness to listen to God’s complete testimony) **a family** (*la ‘am* – of related people) **on behalf of and to approach** (*la*) **Yahowah** (𐤀𐤁𐤍𐤅), **your God** (*‘elohym*). (27:9)

Choose to genuinely and completely listen (*shama’* – under the auspices of freewill, elect to literally hear the totality of (the qal stem encourages a literal interpretation, the perfect conjugation conveys completeness, and the consecutive mood is an expression of volition)) **to the voice of** (*ba qowl* –to the speech and words of) **Yahowah** (𐤀𐤁𐤍𐤅), **your God** (*‘elohym*), **and** (*wa*) **of your own volition, act, engaging with** (*‘asah ‘eth* – elect to observe, celebrate, gain from, and profit in accordance with) **His terms and conditions** (*mitswah* – the directions associated with His relationship agreement), **and with** (*wa ‘eth*) **His inscribed prescriptions for living** (*choq* – His written instructions which cut us into the relationship), **which beneficially** (*‘asher* – as a result of the relationship) **I am directing you** (*‘anky sawah* – I am instructing, guiding, and teaching you) **this day** (*ha yowm*).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 27:9-10)

In other words, rather than “praying without ceasing,” which is a constant jabbering and something only Paul insisted upon, our Heavenly Father is encouraging His children to listen to everything He has to say so that they can then choose to respond to the terms and conditions of His Covenant which serve as prescriptions for living.

From this point, Yahowah inspired Moseh to explain that by listening to God and by responding to His Towrah that they would be established and blessed. But then, knowing that many would choose a different course, with many being misled by the likes of Sha'awl, the Towrah delineates a series of behaviors which God says will engender an *unfavorable* response.

“Invoking harm upon oneself (*'arar* – bringing a curse upon oneself by making oneself unlikable) **is the individual** (*'ysh*) **who** (*'asher*) **engages and acts with regard to** (*'asah* – who conceives, performs on behalf of, and makes) **a presentation of a false god** (*pesel* – an idol or icon fashioned to be believed and worshiped). **Any** (*wa*) **representation of a pagan god which is spouted out** (*macekah* – cocktail of imagined deities poured out or image which is cast and offered) **is a detestable thing** (*tow'ebah* – an abomination which is repulsive, loathsome, and abhorrent) **to Yahowah** (𐤆𐤃𐤁𐤀). **It is the work** (*ma'asah* – the pursuit, practice and undertaking) **of the hand** (*yad* – influence [note that Sha'awl's epistles were inscribed by the hand]) **of a clever and crafty man** (*charash* – of an artificer who contrives and devises an inscribed and artificial construct), **choosing to present it** (*wa sym* – and through their designs to formally place it, bringing it about, establishing, listing and appointing it) **slyly, concealing their purpose** (*ba ha cether* – acting covertly in a veiled manner so as to hide their disingenuous behavior, doing it in a hidden way obfuscating their motives). **And then** (*wa*) **the entire family** (*ha kol 'am*) **replied** (*'amar*), **‘This is truthful, trustworthy, and reliable** (*'amen* – this is verifiable and dependable).” *Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 27:15*

The list of counterproductive behaviors continues with he: **“who lightly esteems his Father and Mother..., who steals his neighbor's property..., who misleads a blind person..., who denies justice to a stranger, foreigner, orphan, or widow..., who commits any form of incest..., who commits bestiality..., who strikes and beats his neighbor..., and who accepts a bribe and harms an innocent person.”** (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 27:16-25*)

We should not be surprised, therefore, that those who perpetrate these unsavory behaviors will be shunned by God. But it is telling that the course Paul charted was listed first (in 27:15), and unlike the others was called “an abomination,” suggesting that few things are worse than what Sha'awl has done.

This summary conclusion followed. It is the statement Sha'awl misquoted and also removed from the context which incriminated him:

“Invoking harm upon oneself (*'arar* – cursing oneself by making oneself undesirable) **is whoever relationally and beneficially** (*'asher*) **is not** (*lo'*) **established** (*quwm* – restored, supported, encouraged, lifted up and caused to stand, confirmed, and enabled to endure) **by** (*'eth* – with and through) **the words**

(*dabar* – message and accounts) **of this** (*ha zo'th*) **Towrah** (*towrah* – source of guidance, direction, teaching, and instruction), **approaching** (*la*) **by engaging through them** (*'asah 'eth* – by acting upon them and doing productive things according to them, celebrating and profiting with them). **And then** (*wa*) **the entire** (*kol*) **family** (*'am* – people and nation) **responded** (*'amar* – answered, promised, and declared), **‘This is true, acceptable, and reliable** (*'aman* – this is affirming, supportive, verifiable, and dependable).” (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 27:26*)

Therefore, we can now say for certain, that according to Yahowah: **“Invoking harm upon oneself is whoever relationally and beneficially is not established, restored, and supported by the words of this Towrah teaching and guidance, approaching by acting upon them. And the entire family responded, ‘This is true, acceptable, reliable, verifiable, and dependable.”** And this means that any attack on the Torah, any belittlement of it, any attempt to negate or annul it, any statement which suggests that it is a curse, is directly opposed to Yahowah’s Word. It also means that to “make” his point, Sha’uwl had to misquote God. But more on that in a moment.

When Paulos misquoted Yahowah’s instruction regarding the restorative nature of His Towrah teaching to call God’s Towrah a curse, two things became indisputable. First, Paul is deliberately and undeniably contradicting Yahowah. The man’s message and God’s message are incongruous. Their conclusions are the antithesis of one another. Therefore, this man could not have been speaking for God.

And second, since Paulos wrote *nomou* in his letter to translate the word, *towrah*, in Moseh’s statement, each time we see any variation of *nomos* in the Greek text, we should translate it “Towrah.” The man whose letter we are evaluating defined it for us. And in this case, that must take precedence over any lexicon.

Reinforcing God’s essential instruction, the very next statement from Moseh regarding the value of Yahowah’s Towrah reveals:

“And it shall reliably exist (*wa hayah* – it totally was, without interruption is, and literally will be (the qal stem affirms that this promise can literally be relied upon, the perfect conjugation conveys that this realization is total and complete without interruption, and consecutive mood affirms that this is God’s desire and our choice)) **that if** (*'im* – predicated upon the condition that) **you really listen to and consistently hear** (*shama' shama' ba* – you actually pay extremely close attention to and continually and literally receive (the qal stem presents the ideas of actually, genuinely, and literally, while the imperfect conjugation communicates that which is continual and consistent, unfolding

throughout time)) **the voice of** (*qowl* – the recited words of) **Yahowah** (יְהוָה), **your God** (*'elohym*), **for the purpose of** (*la*) **observing** (*shamar* – closely examining and carefully considering) **and for the purpose of** (*la*) **engaging in and acting upon** (*'asah 'eth* – celebrating and profiting through) **all of** (*kol*) **His terms and conditions** (*mitswah* – the codicils of His covenant) **which beneficially and relationally** (*'asher*) **I** (*'anky*) **am instructing** (*sawah* – I am directing, teaching, and guiding) **you this day** (*ha yowm*), **then** (*wa*) **Yahowah** (יְהוָה), **your God** (*'elohym*), **He will place and appoint you** (*natan* – He will grant you the opportunity to be) **as the most high** (*'elyown*) **among and above** (*'al*) **all** (*kol*) **the ethnicities** (*Gowym* – people from different races and places) **of the earth** (*ha 'erets*). **And** (*wa*) **flowing over you** (*bow'* – coming upon you) **will be all of these, the Almighty's, blessings** (*kol ha barakah 'eleh* – beneficial promises and valuable gifts), **continuing to reach and inundate you** (*nasag* – will be offered to you) **when** (*ky*) **you consistently listen** (*shama'*) **to the voice of** (*ba qowl* – the recited words of) **Yahowah** (יְהוָה), **your God** (*'elohym*)." (*Dabarym / Words / Deuteronomy 28:1-2*)

The Torah's message is as wonderful as it is consistent, as rewarding as it is enlightening. The Torah's instructions exist to bless us in this life and especially in the next. All we have to do to benefit from Yah's promises is to listen to Him – which is accomplished by reciting His Towrah.

Now that we have an appreciation of the Towrah's role in our lives, let's compare what Yahowah inspired Moseh to affirm regarding His Towah with Sha'uwl's misquotation of the same statement. 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*)

So why does Galatians say:

“Because to the degree that out of tasks and activities of the Torah, they exist under a curse which a supernatural power deploys when he wishes to invoke harm by promoting evil, doing what is accursed, denounced and detested, for it has been written that: ‘To become accursed, to become abhorrent, and repugnant, everyone who does not remain in everything that having been written in the scroll of the Torah, to do them.’” (*Galatians 3:10*)

These statements aren't remotely similar, and in fact they are diametrically opposed to one another. The Towrah says: “a person evokes harm upon themselves, they are not restored or established, when they ignore the Towrah and when they fail to act upon it.” Galatians says: “to become accursed, a person should remain associated with Towrah, doing everything its God asks.” This

“citation” is so blatantly fraudulent, so obviously disingenuous, why have so many people been fooled by Paul’s errant quotations and subsequent assertions? This isn’t the first time Sha’uwl has misquoted God, nor will it be his last. It is just the worst.

Along these lines, please make a note of Yahowah’s instruction in *Dabarym* 28:1-2, where He has asked us to “really listen to and hear the voice of Yahowah, our God,” repeating the request twice. Later in Galatians, Sha’uwl will play off of Yahowah’s “listen to Me,” mocking God to say “the Torah cannot hear you.” Inverting God’s message is his specialty.

Now that you are informed, if you are rational, it is now impossible for you to view Paul and Galatians favorably. He is a liar, and it is filled with his lies. And while I wish it was that simple, it isn’t because Paul has placed his deceitful, destructive, deadly, and damning rhetoric in the place it does the most harm. He has undermined Yahowah’s credibility and testimony, and promoted something that is completely opposed to both, while at the same time pretending to speak for one and to quote the other.

In this way, Sha’uwl has done more to separate souls from God than anyone who has ever lived. It is the reason he alone was called out by Yahowah, by name, by time, by character, and by strategy with God telling us that his religion would be as popular as it would be devastatingly deadly.

According to the *Nestle-Aland*, the statement Paul wrote actually reads: “For as many as from works of law are under curse they are. It has been written for (not applicable) curse on all who not stay in all the things having been written in the small book of the law the to do them.”

Not bothering to examine the passage Sha’uwl cited in the Torah, as it was written in Hebrew, Bacon’s King James Version, and Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, misquoted Sha’uwl and Yahowah. And by doing so, they demeaned the source of life. KJV: “For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” LV: “For as many as are of the works of the law (*operibus legis*) are under a curse. For it has been written (*Scriptum*): “Cursed is everyone who does not continue in all the things that have been written in the book of the Law (*Libro legis*), so as to do them.”

After considerable study and thought, I’m convinced that while the *New Living Translation* is inconsistent with the Greek text, this Christian publisher accurately conveyed Paul’s intended message: “But those who depend on the law to make them right with God are under his curse, for the Scriptures say, ‘Cursed is everyone who does not observe and obey all the commands that are written in God’s Book of the Law.’” You’ll notice, of course, that the NLT had to corrupt

the *Dabarym* quotation to keep it from refuting Paul's thesis. But that is precisely what Paul wanted them to do, what he expected them to do, which is why he thought he could get away with misquoting a passage to support his declaration when he knew that it was actually in direct opposition to it.

Paul's strategy here, as it will be in each of the four passages which comprise the foundation of his thesis, is to play off word pairs and patterns. In Galatians 3:10, the operative words associating Paul's premise with the inaccurately cited verse are "cursed – towrah – doing." Variations of each of these words appear in both statements, albeit to communicate mutually opposed ideas.

Ambivalent to Paul's tactic, of his willingness to twist the Towrah to serve his agenda, Christians have been cursed by the legacy of Galatians. They have now been led to believe that the Torah is not just irrelevant and passé, but is actually a curse to be avoided. And yet, God's instruction is clear. It is neither hidden nor obscure. This is hard to misinterpret: **"Invoking harm upon oneself is whoever relationally and beneficially is not established, restored, and supported by the words of this Towrah, approaching by engaging through them. And then the entire family responded, 'This is true, acceptable, and reliable.'"** (*Dabarym* 27:26)

In light of this statement, and the ones which precede and follow it in *Dabarym*, Paul's thesis is torn asunder. According to God, the Torah isn't just the means to eternal life, it is the only way – which is why those who don't capitalize upon it are all said to be harming themselves. And yet Christians the world over have managed to justify the juxtaposition of two mutually exclusive thoughts, one from man, the other from God, to infer that the Torah is a curse, rather than the source of salvation. It is little wonder that Yahowah called Sha'awl the plague of death.

☩☩☩☩☩

Continuing to play off word patterns, Sha'awl reinforced a similar presumption by once again misappropriating God's testimony: **"But** (*de* – if follows, moreover, and namely) **because** (*oti*) **with** (*en* – inside and with regard to) **the Torah** (*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** (*to* ΘΩ) **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)

This statement is as errant as it is unequivocal. Sha’uwl has misquoted Yahowah, twisting His words again to claim that God, Himself, is incapable of saving anyone. Sha’uwl wants Christians to believe that “*oudeis* – absolutely no one, not even one person,” can become righteous or vindicated as a result of Yah’s Towrah.

But if this is so, why did the Ma’aseyah Yahowsha’ enable the Towrah’s promises on the *Miqra’ey* (Invitations to be Called Out and Meet) of *Pesach* (Passover), *Matsah* (Un-Yeasted Bread), *Bikuwrym* (First-Born Child), and *Shabuw’ah* (Seven Sabbaths)? Why did Yahowsha’ refer to the Towrah (Teaching and Guidance) as the doorway to eternal life during His Instruction on the Mount? And if Yahowah cannot save, how is it that Yahowsha’, a diminished manifestation of Yahowah, can do what God could not?

If Paul is right, why does Yahowah say that Dowd (David) is righteous and vindicated? Why did Yah bother saving Noah and Lot? What was the purpose of liberating the Children of Yisra’el (Individuals who Engage and Endure with God) from the Crucible of Egypt? If this is so, why bother with the Covenant, where through the Towrah, Yahowah promised to make His children immortal and perfect, adopting them, enriching them, and empowering them? How then would it be possible for Yowseph to be “righteous” in Mattanyah 1:19, for Yahowsha’ to say that there were “righteous ones who longed to witness to what you are seeing” in Mattanyah 13:17, that “it was known that Yahowchanan was a righteous and set-apart man” in Mattanyah 6:20, or that “Zakaryah and Abyah...were both righteous before God, blamelessly walking in all of the provisions and means of vindication of Yahowah” in Luke 1:6? If the Towrah cannot do any of these things, the children of Yahowah’s Covenant, Abraham, Yitschaq, Ya’aqob, and all twelve of Ya’aqob’s sons, are dead, along with Adam, Chawah, Noah, his family, Lot, Moseh, Aharown, Yahowsha’ ben Nuwn, Dowd, Shamow’el, all of the prophets including Yasha’yah and Yirmayah, even Yowseph and Miriam, along with Yahowchanan the Immerser. If Paul is right, there would have been no hope for anyone who lived in the first four millennia of human history. Even the man who scribed the Towrah would have been destined for She’owl.

Why write the Torah? Why bother with the Prophets? What is the purpose of the Psalms? Why was the Covenant conceived? Why were the Ten Statements

etched in Stone? Why did God bother inviting us to attend His seven annual Feasts? What is the benefit of God accurately predicting the future if not to demonstrate that He can be trusted?

What was the purpose of Yahowsha's life? Why did He affirm every stroke of every letter of every word which was written in the Towrah – telling us that not even the smallest aspect of the Towrah would be disregarded? Why predict His arrival and mission in a book that can neither be trusted nor perform as promised? And if God is incapable of doing what He has sworn to accomplish, why quote Him knowing that He cannot be trusted, especially to lend credence to a contrarian position?

Sha'awl has clearly thrown down the gauntlet by saying that God's Teaching and Guidance, His Towrah, has not, cannot, and will not save a single solitary soul. But if that is the case, by what mechanism was Yahowsha's soul reunited with Yahowah's Spirit during *Bikuwrym*? If what Sha'awl has written is true, then men did kill God, as Christians claim. And if the "resurrection" was the answer, why was it that the only common denominator among the *Bikuwrym* eyewitness accounts was that no one recognized Him?

Please tell me, how does anyone benefit from what Yahowah has done if he or she does not know what He has done? How does Passover restore life? How does Un-Yeasted Bread perfect souls? What is the means to adoption into the Covenant Family on First-Born Child? How and why did Yahowah enrich and empower His children on Seven Sabbaths? These are all questions without answers should the Towrah be rendered moot. And that, perhaps, is the reason Sha'awl never addresses any of these questions. All he asks is that you believe him when he lies, especially when misquoting and contradicting God.

Most people don't know that Chabaquwq / Habakkuk was one of Yahowah's prophets and that is to their detriment, because taunting and mocking those he played for fools, Sha'awl ripped a passage out of a prophecy which actually condemned him by name. This is as brazen as Muhammad telling Muslims that the proper food for them to consume was "Halal" – which is Satan's given name.

So now that the proper perspective has been established, the lines have been drawn in the sand. There is no getting around what is at stake. This is Sha'awl and his letters versus Yahowah and His Towrah, Prophets, and Psalms. So let's compare notes.

Way back in Chapter Three, "*Yaruwshalaim* – Source of Reconciliation," we considered Yahowah's narrative in Chabaquwq / Habakkuk based upon Sha'awl's insistence that he was running a race. In that this review was a very long time ago, let's not make the same mistake that Sha'awl made by removing part of one verse from the context of that prophetic discussion.

Yahowah begins...

“Upon My requirements and responsibilities, I will continually stand. I will stand up, providing affirmation and validation for that which protects and fortifies. So 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 responded to me, and He said, ‘Write this revelation and expound on it using letters upon writing tablets so that by reciting this, he might run away. (2:2) Still surely, this revelation from God is for the appointed time of the Mow’ed Meetings. It provides a witness and speaks, pouring out evidence in the end. Whatever extended period of time is required for this question to be resolved, this shall not be proven false. Expect him in this regard, because indeed, he will absolutely come, neither being delayed nor lingering. (2:3)

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 upright and vindicated live.” (Chabaquwq / Habakkuk 2:4)

Before we press on and consider the remainder of this prophetic warning regarding Sha’uwl, let’s check to see if Sha’uwl quoted Yahowah accurately when he wrote: **“But because with the Torah absolutely no one is vindicated or justified by the God becomes evident because: ‘Those who are correct, righteous, and proper, out of faith will live.’” (Sha’uwl / Galatians 3:11)**

Once again a modicum of inquiry reveals that Sha’uwl once again twisted Yahowah’s statement so significantly that the opposite of what was conveyed was used to undermine God’s credibility. But this time, in so doing, Sha’uwl took us directly to Yahowah’s single most damning personal rebuke.

The prophecy continues, with Yah saying...

“Moreover, because the intoxicating and inebriating spirit of the man of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal is a high-minded moral failure, and his is 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’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 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?” (2:6)

“Woe to one who is cut off, coveting, while wickedly soliciting ill-gotten gain in league with him, setting up and appointing his temple in association with heights of heaven, thereby snatching away acquired property and possessions from the paws of fellow countrymen. (2:9) You have deliberately decided upon and conspired at the advice of another to promote a shameful plot to confuse those who approach your temple, ruining and reducing many by separating people from different races and places, and in the process losing your soul.” (2:10)

“Woe to the one who causes and allows his neighbors, companions, or countryman to drink, thereby associating them with this venomous wrath, but also making them drunk for the purpose of observing their genitals. You will get your fill of shame and infamy instead of honor and glory. Inebriated, in addition, you also show yourself unacceptable, going round about over the lack of circumcision. Upon you is the binding cup of Yahowah’s right hand. Therefore, public humiliation and indignity will be your status and reward.” (Chabaquwq / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:15-16)

Sobering.

In so many ways, faith is the antithesis of trust, just as belief is the inverse of reliance. This dichotomy exists because trust is predicated upon knowing and understanding, while faith fills the void when both are absent. From this perspective, the *King James Version*, which is a revision five times over of the Latin Vulgate, which was a blended compilation of Greek translations of the Hebrew text, is worse than misleading with regard to the Torah’s message. They are wrong. KJV: “**But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, ‘The just shall live by faith.’”**

The King James’ position is illogical, albeit since it’s a translation, it may not be entirely their fault. Even if no one was justified by the Torah, that does not infer that the just shall live by faith. Rather than cause and effect, these are mutually exclusive ideas. It is like saying: Islam does not work so it is evident we should all be atheists.

The Roman Catholic text reads: “And, since in the law no one is justified with God, this is manifest: “For the just man lives by faith.” That is not what Yahowah said or Habakkuk wrote. And it is not true.

Often entertaining, NLT postured: “So it is clear that no one can be made right with God by trying to keep the law. For the Scriptures say, ‘It is through faith that a righteous person has life.’” While this was Sha’uwl’s intent, Paul has been anything but “clear.” The passages he has quoted he has muddled, and he is often guilty of contradicting his own statements in addition to God’s. Moreover, the Scriptures don’t say anything about “faith,” much less that belief leads to being “righteous.”

As has become our custom, let’s also consider the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear. It conveys: “But that in law no one is made right along the God clear because the right from trust will live.”

Once again, I ask: if God’s Word cannot save anyone, then whose words can? Should “faith” actually be the key to salvation, who should we believe? Said another way: who would be so foolish as to believe a man who said that he spoke for a god who he claimed could not be trusted?

Speaking of trust, you may have noticed that with exception of the Nestle-Aland Interlinear, all three of the most popular bible translations rendered *pistis*, “faith,” and not “trust.” So while we’ve done all of the etymological archeology necessary to prove that *pistis* meant “trust and reliance” to Greeks circa 50 CE, the uniformity found in old and modern translations regarding *pistis* demonstrate that Paul’s letters caused its meaning to migrate, becoming “faith and belief” as a result of his popularity. As a direct result of Paul’s letters, Christians refer to themselves as “believers,” and use “faith” as if it were synonymous with religion.

Frankly, the moment we recognize that “trust” is not achievable in the context of Galatians, we must acquiesce to the modern interpretation. After all, it would be absurd to ask someone to “trust or rely” upon anything without giving them sufficient evidence or reason to do so. But it would be perfectly appropriate to ask them to “believe” that which they do not know, that which was neither explained nor verified, much less rational. And that is the rub; Paul’s position is irrational, necessitating faith.

The reason that Paul never provides the basis of trust, which is evidence, nor the basis of reliance, which is understanding, is that his letters are focused upon articulating contrarian opinions and conflicting conclusions. Reason is his enemy, his most debilitating foe. His singular ploy is to draw invalid cause and effect relationships between false statements.

We have seen nothing but a litany of lies tied together by circular reasoning. Not once in the entirety of this epistle has Paul, or will Paul, provide any reliable evidence, and thus nothing to bolster his use of *pistis*. Even here, where he has misquoted a portion of two verses, neither validates his point. Instead, both mirror his rhetoric when they are inverted. Therefore, since a reader is incapable of trusting his position, Paul has limited “believers” to putting their “faith” in his assertions – all of which are false.

A very thoughtful friend sent a note. He wrote: “When I was agnostic, I would ask Christians why I should place my faith in their religion, and not believe the Islamic Allah, Buddha, or even the Hindu gods. No one was able to provide a rational answer. Their only “proof” was that they felt the presence of their god controlling their lives. And yet, every Islamic terrorist would say the same thing, with many of them willing to kill others in the process of dying for their faith. So I came to realize that faith was this fuzzy nebulous concept which required no thought, no actual evidence, and no proof. With faith a person does not have to learn anything or think. Both of which are appealing to many.”

Therefore, the most logical and informed conclusion based upon the corpus of evidence available to us is that Paul established his faith, his religion, with these words, with us now rendering them as he intended them:

“O ignorant, and irrational, and unreasonable, Galatians. To whom were you bewitched and deceived, being seduced to evil? (3:1) This alone I want to learn from you: out of acting upon the Towrah did you receive the spirit, or alternatively out of hearing of belief? (3:2)

In this way, you are ignorant and irrational, lacking in knowledge and unable to think logically. Having begun with the spirit, now in the flesh are you completing? (3:3) So much and so long you suffered and were vexed, annoyed and angry without reason or result, if indeed, thoughtlessly. (3:4)

The one, therefore, supplying you with the spirit and causing you to function, operating the powers in you, was that out of acting upon the Torah or out of hearing faith? (3:5) Just as Abram believed and had faith in God so it was accounted to Him as righteousness. (3:6) You know, as a result, that the ones out of faith, these sons are Abram. (3:7)

Having seen beforehand then by contrast, it was written that because out of faith are the races made right, so God acted before the beneficial messenger with Abram so that they would in time be spoken of favorably with you to all the races. (3:8) As a result, the ones out of faith, we are spoken of favorably, even praised together with the faithful Abram. (3:9)

For as long as they exist by means of doing the assigned tasks of the Torah, they are under a curse, because it is written that: ‘All are accursed who do not remain alive and persevere with all that is written in the scroll of the Torah, doing it.’ (3:10) So with that Torah, absolutely no one is vindicated or justified alongside God. It becomes evident: ‘Those who are justified, correct, and righteous, out of faith will live.’” (3:11)

Therefore, based upon what he has written and what follows, this is what Paul meant to say. It is the basis of Pauline Doctrine. It is what Christians believe. It is wrong.

The Torah says that Yahowah will shower us with blessings, and He will lead us to salvation, so long as we listen and respond to the advice He has shared in His Torah. And based upon the fulfilled prophecies He has articulated therein, we can trust Him.

A relationship with Yahowah is predicated first upon coming to know Him based upon what He had to say about Himself in His Towrah. And second, it is predicated upon observing the Towrah’s teaching closely and carefully regarding the Covenant, which enables us to properly respond to its conditions. Salvation follows. It is a byproduct of the Covenant. It, like all of the Covenant’s blessings, is afforded to those who answer Yah’s Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with Him, and most especially Passover, Un-Yeasted Bread, First-Born Child, and Seven Sabbaths.

To engage in a relationship with God and to be saved by Him, we must come to understand His Torah sufficiently to trust and rely upon Him, His message and His plan. And so while no one has ever been saved because they performed Passover, Un-Yeasted Bread, First Born, or the Promise of Seven perfectly, all who are saved are beneficiaries of Yahowsha’ and the Set-Apart Spirit observing *Pesach*, *Matsah*, *Bikuwrym*, and *Shabuw’ah* perfectly.

The reason Yahowah consistently uses the Hebrew word, *shamar*, meaning “observe,” in connection with His Towrah Guidance, is because He wants us to examine the Torah closely, to look at it intently, to investigate it thoroughly, to not only move in close and scrutinize its jots and tittles, but to step back and visualize how its threads are woven into a comprehensive and cohesive tapestry. In this regard, *shamar* and *shama’* are related concepts. *Shama’* means “listen to” and *shamar* means “to observe.” By combining our senses of hearing and sight, our understanding of God grows.

By inspecting the Torah as if our life depended upon it, by listening to what Yahowah had to say, by understanding the message, and by coming to know its Author, we are in a position to trust Him, to rely upon His Word. And that is the sum and substance of the Towrah, its Covenant, and our subsequent salvation.

Yahowah told us what to eat and what to avoid consuming, not only because His advice, if respected, would keep us healthy, and enable us to live longer, more enjoyable lives, but because He wants us to look at the words we are being asked to consume. Ingest too many unhealthy and poisonous propositions, and eventually they will kill you. Dine on a feast of trustworthy terms, like those found in the Torah, and you will live. No one has ever engendered themselves with God because they never ate pork, but if you roll around in the mud with pigs, you are going to die estranged from Him. The reason that Chawah, Esau, and Yahowsha' were tempted with things which were not good to eat is because nothing is more deadly than a deceitful diet.

God wants us to know Him and understand His message, so that we can objectively and rationally choose to trust and rely upon Him. He doesn't want us to jump into the darkness with our eyes closed, in a giant leap of faith, because that will get us killed. He wants us to walk with Him into the light, with our eyes, ears, hearts, and minds open and receptive to His message.

☩☩☩☩☩

This next Pauline proposition also includes a citation from the very Towrah the writer was demeaning. And while it is another truncated misapplication of Yah's Teaching, this time from *Qara'* / Leviticus 18:5, without referencing it, we would be challenged to make sense of these words:

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

Or if you prefer, the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear, reads: **“But the law not is from trust but the one having done them will live in them.”** While both are reasonably accurate renditions of the text, neither approach literate.

The prevailing verbs are *“poieomai – having done”* and *“zao – will live.”* *Poieomai*, which means “do, make, perform, carry out, cause to be, work, toil, behave, or accomplish an assigned task,” was written in the aorist participle which designates antecedent time. That means a person must perform, doing what the

Towrah says, to live, at least according to Paul. Antecedent time addresses that which has gone before, that which precedes another event – in this case, future life. Further, in the active voice, *poieomai* presents the individual performing the action, which is to say that he is trying to prolong his own life. The nominative case requires us to view the subject, those attempting to perform as the Torah directs, as becoming reclassified, thereby actually becoming defined by the Torah.

Zao was scribed in the future tense, once again reinforcing the process Sha’uwl is rejecting. In the middle voice, we discover that the Towrah observant individual is being affected by his own actions, suggesting that his performance will determine his fate. And finally, in the indicative, the writer is portraying this cause and effect scenario as real, even though he may not actually believe what he’s saying.

Reflecting Paul’s intent without actually translating what he wrote, the fervent Pauline apologists at the *New Living Translation* published: “**This way of faith is very different from the way of law, which says, ‘It is through obeying the law that a person has life.’**” Apart from changing “having done” to “obey,” altering all three verb tenses, and adding without justification “this way,” “very different from,” “the way,” “which says,” “it is through,” “the law,” and “that a person has,” while ignoring “but,” “not out of,” “to the contrary,” “the one,” “having done,” and “them” twice, what the NLT has proposed appears to convey the spirit of Sha’uwl’s proposition. However, by promoting a loose paraphrase, they have run even farther afield of the partial passage Paul cited.

To their credit, it is true that the “way of faith is very different from the way of the Torah.” One is the opposite of the other, telling us that the way of faith actually leads in the opposite direction of the way presented in the Torah, with faith being at cross purposes with Yahowah’s Guidance.

To satisfy our quest for understanding, the *Qara’* 18:5 passage Sha’uwl is misappropriating is set into the context of the following instruction:

“Speak (*dabar* – communicate using words) **to** (*‘el*) **the Children of Yisra’el** (*beny Yisra’el* – children who engage and endure with God), **and** (*wa*) **say** (*‘amar* – affirm) **to them** (*‘el*), **‘I am** (*‘anky*) **Yahowah** (יהוה), **your God** (*‘elohym*). (18:1-2) **With regard to things which could be considered similar to** (*ka* – as with and making a direct comparison to) **the practices** (*ma’aseh* – the pattern of behavior, the work, the things done, undertakings, and pursuits) **of the realm** (*‘erets* – land) **of the Crucible of Egypt** (*Mitsraym* – crucibles of religious, political, military, and economic oppression) **where** (*‘asher*) **you dwell** (*yashab*), **you should not engage in or act upon** (*lo’ ‘asah* – you should not celebrate or profit from) **similar** (*ka*) **pursuits** (*ma’aseh* – patterns of behavior, things done, undertakings, and practices) **in the land** (*ba ‘erets*) **of Kana’any**

(*Kana'any* – Zealousness which subdues, bringing people into subjection; commonly transliterated Canaan), **which beneficially as a result of the relationship** (*'asher*), **I am** (*'anky*) **bringing and accompanying you** (*bow' 'esh*). **There** (*sham*), **you should not act upon or engage in** (*lo' 'asah*) **their decrees and customs** (*chuqah* – their prescriptions for living and their traditions and statutes), **never walking in or following them** (*lo' halak* – never patterning your life after them). (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** (יהוה), **your God** (*'elohym*)." (*Qara' / Called Out / Leviticus 18:4*)

This Fatherly advice serves as an open indictment against religion and politics. It is a call to expose and condemn the incorporation or adoption of the rites, rituals, and festivals of pagan religions into a community or culture. It is therefore denouncing the very fabric of Roman Catholicism, where the entire religion is predicated upon incorporating such things. And it speaks against the integration of religion and politics, the propensity of the initial civilizations to maintain large militaries, as well as their tendency to improperly compensate workers for their labor. The civilizations Yahowah is describing in Egypt and Canaan were famous for creating and worshiping religious imagery. They gave birth to the concepts of the Trinity, to crosses, to Easter, Christmas, and Sunday worship, to Communion and to the Eucharist, to faith and to bowing, to gods dying and being resurrected, even to viewing a woman as the Mother of God and Queen of Heaven – all of which were incorporated into Christianity. They were the first to refer to God as the Lord, and they called God all manner of names, none of which was Yahowah.

Yahowah's next statement is the verse Sha'awl misrepresented to promote his agenda – one that adopted the political and religious practices of the Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans. But before I share it with you, take note of the fact that in it "*shamar* – observe," which is to "closely examine and carefully consider something by focusing upon it with your eyes," was scribed in the qal perfect consecutive. Thereby, Yah is encouraging us to choose of our own volition to literally examine the totality of His "*chuqah* – inscribed prescriptions for living" and His "*mishpat* – means to resolve disputes," viewing God's written testimony as a whole while recognizing that it is complete.

But then you'll note, with “*asah* – engaging in and acting upon” what we have observed and come to know about His prescriptions for living and His means to resolve disputes, the qal imperfect was deployed. From this we learn that our response does not have to be complete, nor perfect, but simply ongoing. God is not expecting us to do anything flawlessly, nor is He even asking us to behave in complete harmony with His instructions.

This realization has profound implications which exonerate the Towrah and condemn Sha’uwl. God has given us the opportunity to examine and consider His Towrah testimony, but the choice is ours whether we elect to read it, ignore it, or oppose it. All God is asking is that we don’t take snippets of what He has said out of context, but rather that we review His Towrah as a whole while recognizing that it is complete. This means that we should consider it from *Bare’syth* to *Dabarym*, from creation to Eden, from the flood to the Covenant, from slavery in Egypt to freedom in the Promised Land. We should also view Yah’s Towrah as lacking nothing. It provides answers to every question regarding life and relationship. Nothing should be added, nothing should be taken away, and thus nothing should be changed.

And yet, our willingness to observe what God has written is just the input side of this equation. On the output side, we have our reaction, which is essentially our attitude and our words in response to God. Here, scribed now in the imperfect, God is neither expecting nor asking, and most especially not requiring perfection from us. We are only being asked to continually try to do the best we can. As we learn more, our testimony improves. As we understand more, we become more trusting and thus more capable. It is a process, as are all relationships, with us growing with Yah over time.

But you see, Sha’uwl’s point has been that there is no reason to observe the Towrah because unless a person does everything the Torah demands flawlessly, they will be condemned by God. But that is the antithesis of what Yahowah is saying here...

“And so (*wa*) you should choose of your own volition to actually and completely observe (*shamar* – under the auspices of freewill, you should consider choosing to carefully examine the totality (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 Meet). Whoever (*’asher* – relationally and beneficially) over time and as an ongoing process acts upon and engages (*’asah* – consistently endeavors to genuinely celebrate and continually benefit (qal imperfect)) with them (*’eth*), that individual (*ha ’adam* – that man and person)

indeed (*wa* – emphasizing this) **is actually and completely restored to life as a result of this desire and his decision, living forever** (*wa chayah* – he is literally revived, perfectly renewed, actually nurtured, completely spared, and kept alive into perpetuity through this exercise of freewill, raised, preserved, and allowed to flourish (qal perfect consecutive)) **through them** (*ba* – with and by them). **I am** ('any) **Yahowah** (אֲנִי יְהוָה).” (*Qara'* / Called Out / Leviticus 18:5)

If I may add another interesting consideration. Yahowah has promised to “*chayah* – restore the lives” of those who not only choose to examine and consider His Towrah, but who also respond favorably to His prescriptions for living and His means to resolve disputes. And since the restoration and elongation of His children’s lives is our Heavenly Father’s doing, He had Moseh scribe “*chayah* – life” in the best way possible. The qal stem is relational, creating a connection between the subject, which would be those of us who listen to Yah, and the action of the verb which is to be restored and live. The qal stem also conveys actions which are simple to understand, straightforward, and real, and thus actual. The perfect conjugation reveals that Yahowah is not only promising to make us whole and complete, entirely perfect, He is saying that He will do all of the work to accomplish this on our behalf – with nothing additional added on our part. He is even saying that the restoration of our lives isn’t a process that could be abated for some reason, but is instead, done, as in leaving nothing to prove, nothing more to accomplish, and nothing more to do. Then it gets better because here the perfect was prefixed with a *wa*, making this the consecutive form. This causes the perfect conjugation to reflect the unfolding and ongoing nature of the imperfect, telling us that our lives are being restored forever. In addition, the consecutive form reveals that this is volitional, and thus it reflects our choice and God’s will.

Returning to Galatians, Paul said: **“But the Towrah exists not out of faith or belief, but to the contrary, ‘The one having done and performed them will live in them.’”** (Sha’uwl / Galatians 3:12)

Comparing that to the Towrah, Yahowah said: **“And so you should choose of your own volition to actually and completely observe My prescriptions for living and also My means to resolve disputes. Whoever over time and as an ongoing process acts upon and engages with them, that individual indeed is actually and completely restored to life as a result of this desire and decision, living forever through them. I am Yahowah.”** (*Qara'* / Called Out 18:5)

It is hard to miss the horrible pattern that is emerging. This time, however, Sha’uwl’s statement is misleading principally because he removed Yahowah’s statement from the context of the point God was making, and in so doing created a perception which is invalid. He did the very thing Yahowah asked us not to do in the passage he abbreviated.

Yahowah is telling us that restoration and life eternal are a direct derivative of observing His means to resolve disputes which serve as prescriptions for living. And Paul is promoting blind faith.

Once again, Sha'awl has abridged, misquoted, and misapplied a passage which is inconsistent with his own message, perhaps hoping that the use of a common word, this time, "perform / do," in conjunction with an aspect of the Towrah would be sufficient to convince the impressionable and ignorant that God agrees with his position.

But at least we have another affirmation that it is Yahowah's Towrah that Sha'awl is assailing by misappropriating citations from it. Under these circumstances, a rational argument cannot be made in favor of the Oral Law or the Yaruwshalaim Talmud being the focus of Sha'awl's ire. He consistently refers to the Towrah in order to undermine it, while never once referring to nor citing the Oral Law which was ultimately memorialized in the Babylonian Talmud.

Also, while Yahowah's message was clear, even straightforward and easy to understand, Sha'awl's was not. What on earth does "the law exists not out of faith and belief" mean? What is the connection or contrast between this clause and Yahowah's statement in *Qara'* / Leviticus 18:5? Why did Paul only cite the end of the verse when its meaning is derived from the introduction?

Since Paul's castrated citation of this passage was as inappropriate as his statement was undecipherable, let's turn to those hypnotized by his spell for additional insight into the Christian mindset. The King James Version reads: "And the law is not of faith: but, the man that doeth them shall live in them." At least it's clear that it was derived from the Latin Vulgate which says: "But the law is not of faith; instead, "he who does these things shall live by them."

If nothing else, we know that Shim'own Kephas / Peter was right in saying that Paul's letters would be twisted, such that they would deceive the ignorant and malleable, robbing them of their salvation. But like so many prophecies, just because it's true doesn't mean that we should allow ourselves to be destroyed by it.

In that Paul was fanning the flames he was using to burn Yahowah's Torah, I am convinced that he meant to say: "**The Torah is not like the way of faith, but to the contrary, it requires you to do what it says in order to live.**" (Galatians 3:12 reflecting Paul's intended message.)

At this point, we must ask ourselves: can Paul's faith, his religion, be "unlike" "the Torah" and still facilitate a relationship with God? Is it possible that God could have endorsed a plan which is counter to the one He authored?

Irrespective of the answer (which is obvious), at least the battle lines have been drawn. According to Paul, it is his testimony against God's Word. We are now immersed in the Great Galatians Debate: Are we to trust Yahowah's Torah or believe Paul's Gospel of Grace?

Before we press on, since the context of the *Qara'* / Leviticus passage was particularly germane to Paul's Galatians epistle, a letter which serves as the foundation of Christendom, I'd like to reinforce Yahowah's advice. God encouraged His people not to follow the religious practices or political traditions of the Egyptians and Canaanites. That means we are to avoid doing the same things which were also done in Babylon, Greece, and Rome whose civilizations either inspired or copied them. And that means we should not celebrate New Year's Day, Saint Valentine's Day, Lent, Easter, Halloween, or Christmas, nor gather in churches on Sundays.

كٲٲٲٲ

The key to understanding this next statement is "*katara* - curse." As we discovered at the beginning of this discussion when reviewing Galatians 3:10, *kata* is either being used to communicate "down from," "according to" or "against," with the latter serving as a negation of *ara*, and its root, *airo*, which is either a "prayer" or "a curse." Therefore, the "*ara* - curse" could well be "not having one's prayer answered, not having one's "*airo* - burdens lifted," or not having one's soul "carried away" to heaven. Further, *katara* is especially demeaning. It suggests that Yahowah uses His "supernatural power to invoke harm by promoting evil, doing what is accursed and abhorrent, detestable and loathsome, maligning and malicious."

According to the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear, Paul wrote: "**Christ us brought out from the curse of the law having become on behalf of us curse because it has been written curse on all the one having hung on wood.**" And now, literally...

"Christos (XPΣ - placeholder for Ma'aseyah [but it is unlikely in this context and with this audience that Sha'uwl would have associated the Ma'aseyah with Yahowah]) **us** (*ego*) **bought back** (*exagorazomai* - worked to redeem and purchase, making good use of the opportunity, taking advantage to buy and deliver; from *ek*, out of, and *agorazo*, doing business in the marketplace where (*agora*) people assemble for a public debate, to buy, sell, and vote) **from** (*ek*) **the curse** (*katara* - from the evil, hateful, abhorrent, loathsome, maligning, and malicious influence) **of the** (*tov*) **Towrah** (*nomou* - the means to being nourished

by that which is bestowed to become heirs, precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and to be approved through prescriptions for an inheritance; from *nemo* – that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to heirs to nourish them (singular genitive, and thus a specific characterization)), **having become** (*ginomai* – having existed as) **for our sake** (*hyper ego*) **a curse** (*katara* – a repugnant prayer, invoking the power to harm others by wishing evil upon them, maligning and malicious), **because** (*hoti*) **it has been written** (*grapho* – inscribed): **‘A curse on** (*epikataratos* – being exposed to divine slander and vengeance) **all** (*pas*) **the one** (*o*) **having hung** (*kremamai* – suspended) **on** (*epi*) **wood** (*xylon*).’” (Galatians 3:13)

Paul is reaffirming his diagnosis. In his view, Yahowah’s “Torah is an abhorrent and detestable curse which promotes evil.” God’s Word, according to Sha’uwl, is “malicious and repugnant.” Rather than Yahowsha’ affirming, observing, and fulfilling the Towrah as God, Himself, attests in the 5th and 7th chapters of Mattanyah / Matthew, according to Sha’uwl, the Ma’aseyah has cut a deal and engaged in a business transaction whereby He has redeemed us, not from sin, but instead from the Torah itself.

Since this hideous lie is the antithesis of what Yahowsha’ said and did, we now know for absolute certain that Paulos was psychotic. Calling this man who contradicted God’s message while claiming to speak for Him “delusional” is wholly inadequate. Paul’s position has also made it obvious that he was demon-possessed, goaded and controlled by one of Satan’s envoys. But even then, this is hard to swallow.

This insane admission does, however, confirm that Paul was deliberately maligning the Towrah in his opening statement, because what he wrote in Galatians 3:13 echoes the same sentiment found in Galatians 1:4. Remember:

“Iesou Christou, the one having produced and given Himself on account of the sins and errors of us, so that somehow, He might possibly gouge or tear out, rooting out and taking us away from the past inflexible and unrelenting circumstances of the old system (*aionos* – the previous era; from *aei* – circumstances which are incessant, unremitting, relentless, invariable, and inflexible) **which had been in place 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) **extending down from and according to the desire and will of the God and Father of us...**” (Galatians 1:4)

Now, the “*poneros* – worthless and malevolent” “*aionos* – inflexible and unrelenting old system” which is being called “*katara* – a repugnant curse” is

identified as the “*nomou* – Towrah” – the Teaching and Guidance of Yahowah. If true, then everything Yahowah said and everything Yahowsha’ did was untrue and unreliable. So how is it possible that someone who claims he was exclusively authorized to speak for the former is believable when he contradicts God? How can Sha’uwl’s message about “Iesou Christou” be credible when it is the opposite of Yahowsha’s own Instruction on the Mount? By calling Yahowah’s Towrah a curse, and by saying that Christos therefore became a curse because of it, Paul has proposed the preposterous. The proposition is so asinine it serves to prove that religion renders its victims incapable of rational thought.

Yahowah’s, and thus Yahowsha’s, soul on *Matsah*, not *Pesach*, and thus not while He was hanging on wood, bore our sins, not to free us from the Towrah, but from their consequence, when His soul descended into She’owl. He did not become a “*katara* – curse,” but instead the means to facilitate the Towrah’s promises and the Covenant’s blessings. Yahowsha’ was perfect because He observed the Towrah. He did not become a “*katara* – repugnant prayer,” He did not “*katara* – invoke evil,” and there was nothing “*katara* – malignant, maligning, or malicious” about Him. It is impossible for the living manifestation of the Towrah to free us from that which He, Himself, observed. And if we are to believe that the Torah is a curse, then as its corporeal representation, Yahowsha’ was a curse. So Paul is saying that the cure for the disease is the disease.

His claim on behalf of Christianity, is so absurd it strains credulity. Yahowsha’, by His own admission, is the diminished manifestation of Yahowah, the human representation of God. So how is it that Yahowah would curse us with His Word only to Himself become a curse to ransom us from His Word?

And yet as spellbinding deceivers have done throughout time, Paul continues to weave the semblance of a good thread through his evil tapestry, all to make his lies appear plausible. Yes, it is true, “the Ma’aseyah redeemed us,” but *not* “from the curse of the Torah.” Our redemption was based upon Him enabling “the Torah’s” promises. Yahowsha’s sacrifices apart from the Torah were useless, because there would have been no reason for them, nor any benefit. Unless the Ma’aseyah fulfilled Passover and Un-Yeasted Bread in perfect harmony with the Towrah’s Instructions, His sacrifices were irrelevant. In fact, if the Towrah didn’t depict Yahowah’s enduring plan of salvation, then Yahowsha’ would have been a liar who should not have been trusted, because He said otherwise.

The statement Sha’uwl 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 considered to be guilty of sins (*chata’ mishpat* – it is judged, 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 the living, completely fulfilling the penalty (hophal stem perfect conjugation consecutive mood)), **and then** (*wa*) **you decide to suspend Him** (*talah* ‘*eth* – you want to literally hang Him by completely fastening Him (qal perfect consecutive)) **on** (*‘al*) **a wooden timber** (*‘ets* – or tree), **His corpse shall not remain overnight** (*lo’ lyn nabelah* – His body must not endure the night, staying there after sunset) **on that timber** (*‘al ha ‘ets* – near the wooden pillar).

Rather instead (*ky* – truthfully and certainly), **you should surely 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** (*talah* – the one being hanged) **is being diminished and slighted as a result of an owth** (*qalalah* – is maligned and abated, going away as a result of a promise (in the construct form, the abated and diminished is being associated with and is connected with and bound to)) **of 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 thus your human nature), **which relationally and beneficially** (*‘asher*) **Yahowah** (יְהוָה), **your God** (*‘elohym*), **gave** (*natan* – produced, offered, and bestowed) **to you** (*la* – for you to approach) **to become an heir** (*nahalah* – as a means to an inheritance).” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 21:22-23)

This is a prophetic picture of the Ma’aseyah’s fulfillment of the Torah’s presentation of Passover and Un-Yeasted Bread leading to First-Born Child and to inheriting the Covenant. It confirms that the source of our salvation is based upon the very book Paul is demeaning and attempting to depreciate and annul.

Yahowah’s prophetic testimony reveals that Yahowsha’ would be considered to be guilty of sin 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, God’s soul would become the slighted and diminished aspect of God – in other words, it would be separated and abated in She’owl. It tells us that His body, in keeping with Yahowah’s instructions regarding Passover, would cease to exist that night. Also, by using *‘adamah*, it is “‘*adam* – human nature” which is no longer defiled as a result.

So while the passage is powerful in the sweeping nature of its predictions, it was not even remotely supportive of Paul's argument. If anything, this precise prediction demonstrates that the Towrah and its Author can be trusted to do what He has promised.

Recognizing that Sha'awl quoted a truncated portion of the *Dabarym* reference to Yahowsha', and recognizing that his was a woefully inaccurate rendering of it, we are compelled once again to question the veracity of everything Sha'awl wrote and said, even question his intentions. There is a very significant difference between: **"A curse on all the one having hung on wood,"** and **"Indeed when it comes to pass that by association an Individual is considered to be guilty of sins in order to resolve disputes worthy of death, and He chooses to be dispatched to the realm of the dead, and then you decide to suspend Him on a wooden timber, His corpse shall not remain overnight on the wood. Rather instead, you should prepare and entomb His body on this same day. Indeed, because the One being suspended is being diminished and slighted as a result of an oath of God. So you should not defile your soil or your nature, which relationally and beneficially Yahowah, your God, gave to you to become an heir."**

Without the context provided by Yahowah, the reference to being the slighted and diminished aspect of God is senseless. A profound and precise eyewitness account, serving as both prediction and explanation of an event which would transpire fifteen centuries hence, becomes incomprehensible, and thus worthless apart from God's explanation.

And yet Sha'awl has now plucked three statements Yahowah has made from the context that makes them valuable, miscasting his redacted variations such that each truncated citation now infers the antithesis of what God actually revealed. Each time he revised God's Word to suit his thesis. So are we to suppose that Sha'awl was misinformed, even ignorant, and that these were just careless and uninspired mistakes, or was this deliberate, making Sha'awl a disingenuous deceiver? The only other possibility requires us to view most every Greek manuscript of the "Christian New Testament" as being unreliable, including the Papyrus 46 codex dated to the vicinity of 85 CE, in which Paul's letters are extant.

Paul is stuck in a rut. Each Towrah quotation has been chosen, not because it affirmed his position, but because of word linkage. He has gone from "*towrah* – doing," to "*towrah* – justified," to "*towrah* – performing," and then to "curse – hanging on wood." In all four couplets, he has abridged God's statement and then twisted it to make it appear as if his preaching was consistent with God's position. To excuse this pattern of malfeasance as "being an honest mistake," "being God's

will,” “being inspired by the Spirit,” or “being a product of scribal error” is to be played for a fool.

Paul is a false witness. He is purposefully misquoting and perverting Yahowah’s Word in order to establish his doctrine. This is evil in the worst sense of the word. And the consequence has been catastrophic. Billions of souls have been ensnared in his hideous trap and cursed by these letters.

Unwilling to consider the Greek or Hebrew text, and relying instead on the Latin Vulgate, the Christian theologians who created the revision known as the King James Version missed the fact that the Torah predicted what Yahowsha’ fulfilled: “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, ‘Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.’” If the King James has accurately reflected Paul’s thought, then, at least according to Paul, the Torah is actually a curse. Rather than fulfilling the Torah, Yahowsha’ ransomed us from it. And rather than being the perfect Lamb of God, Yahowsha’ embodied all the negativity a “curse” implies.

Had Jerome created his Latin Vulgate from Greek manuscripts, as opposed to blending his preferred readings from Old Latin variations, he would have seen the light as well. But alas, he didn’t. “*Christus has redeemed us from the curse of the law, since he became a curse for us. For it is scriptum / written: ‘Cursed is anyone who hangs from a tree.’*”

The only curse pronounced by the Torah is upon those who disregard it, and Christians are wont to do just that. NLT: “But Christ has rescued us from the curse pronounced by the law. When he was hung on the cross, he took upon himself the curse for our wrongdoing. For it is written in the Scriptures, ‘Cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree.’” When they added “he was hung on the cross,” it became obvious that they noted the very same pattern I’ve been warning you about. The NLT translation team members, like their patriarch, aren’t oblivious, they are mischievous.

Moving on to the next statement, Paul remains consistent. This is also untrue. Abraham’s words do not comprise the “healing and beneficial message,” Yahowah’s do. Further, there is no connection between Abraham’s statements and the Ma’aseyah, but instead the Covenant. And the connection that matters most is between Yahowah’s Word and the Ma’aseyah.

“As a result (*hina* – in order that), **to** (*eis* – in, among, or in reference to) **the people from different races** (*ta ethnos* – the cultures and ethnicities) **the beneficial word** (*e eulogia* – the praise, flattery, or polished language, the laudation, benefit, or favorable terms; from *eu* – to be well off, to fare well, and to prosper and *logos* – speech or word) **of** (*toe*) **Abram** (*Abraam* – a truncated pre-Covenant transliteration of ‘*Abraham* – the Merciful, Forgiving, and

Compassionate Father) **might become** (*ginomai* – may happen (the aorist tense denotes a snapshot event without respect to any process, the middle voice signifies that Abraham was being affected by his own actions, and the subjunctive mood presents this as being probable)) **in** (*en*) **Christo** ‘**Iesou** (XΩ IHY – divine placeholders for Ma’aseyah (Work of Yah) and Yahowsha’ (Yah Saves), but since this epistle has disassociated Yahowsha’ from Yahowah and His work regarding salvation, it’s misleading to connect that which he has severed) **that** (*hina* – in order to) **the promise** (*ten epaggelia* – the announcement of claim to do something (singular)) **of the** (*tou*) **spirit** (IINΣ) **we might take hold** (*lambano* – we may grab and grasp, obtain possession, being carried away) **through** (*dia* – by) **faith** (*pistos*).” (Galatians 3:14) Papyrus 46, scribed within as few as fifteen years of the original letter, includes a second *eulogia*, “beneficial word or polished language” before the placeholder for Spirit, but since it is so awkward, I’ve elected not to include it in this translation.

The story of Abraham, and his relationship with Yahowah, is detailed for us in the opening book of the Towrah. God’s presentation of His Covenant prioritized and detailed, chronological and historical, and set into a very specific geographical and geopolitical context so that we might come to know its terms and benefits in a very tangible way. The formation of this Covenant relationship is God’s first priority, the very reason He created the universe, and Yahowah wants us to know what He wants and what He is offering so that we are empowered to respond appropriately. We are in fact given the same opportunity to engage in the same Covenant in the same way, enjoying the same benefits that Abraham was afforded. And that is why knowing its conditions and accepting its terms is so important.

There are five specific requirements. First, we must walk away from our country, and specifically from Babylon, which denotes the corruption of politics and religion. Second, instead of being dependent upon one’s country, we are asked to trust and rely exclusively on Yahowah. This in turn necessitates coming to know Him and coming to understand what He is offering and asking – things known only to those who study the Towrah. Third, we are asked to walk to Yah and become perfect. This is achieved by answering Yahowah’s seven annual Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with Him. Fourth, so that none of this is a blind leap of faith, we are encouraged to observe the Covenant – which is to closely examine and carefully consider its terms and rewards. And fifth, as a sign of our acceptance, and as a commitment to raise our children so that they also choose to embrace the Covenant, God has asked parents to circumcise their sons.

Those who accept these conditions are rewarded. The five promised benefits of the Covenant include: eternal life, being perfected and thus exonerated, being adopted into God’s family, being enriched with the Towrah’s teaching, and being

empowered by the Spirit. If there is an “*e eulogia* – beneficial word,” this is it. And this then makes the Towrah – the only place where Abraham and the Covenant are known – essential, thus negating everything Sha’uwl has written.

And make no mistake, it is absolutely and unequivocally not “the beneficial word of Abram that became in Christo Iesou,” but instead the Word of Yahowah that is Yahowsha’. Further, Abraham was the beneficiary of the Covenant and not its source. He benefited from Yahowah’s words not his own. Paul’s testimony is therefore a lie from beginning to end.

It is worth restating: it is irrational to predicate a thesis on a book that one is negating and invalidating. Apart from the Towrah, Abraham and the Covenant are unknown and unknowable. So to suggest that a person can believe in a promise expressed by an individual known exclusively through the Towrah, while discrediting the Towrah, is absurd. And since this conclusion is obvious, even irrefutable, how is it that this letter launched a religion?

Abraham was a beneficiary of Yahowah’s Covenant. He was not its author. Abraham didn’t conceive it, offer it, modify it, deliver it, or codify its terms or benefits. Abraham cannot influence our lives in any way. He does not have the power or authority to grant life, to perfect us, to adopt us, to enrich us, or to empower anyone. The Covenant is based upon Yahowah’s testimony, Yahowah’s plan, Yahowah’s promises, and Yahowah’s ability to deliver, not Abraham’s. And yet Sha’uwl would have you believe that all of this occurred because of Abram, because that way he could sidestep Yahowah while bypassing His Torah, thereby separating Yahowsha’ and Christians from both. And the result is Christianity. And that is why it is so destructive, deadly, and damning.

But imagine hating God so much that you would ascribe His Covenant to its initial beneficiary. That is like saying the passenger in seat 1A designed, built, paid for, and is flying the airplane.

While the promises made by Yahowah to Abraham were showcased to reveal the conditions and rewards of the Covenant relationship, this portion of the story isn’t the Towrah’s most adroit connection between the Ma’aseyah and the Covenant’s promises. Had Paul wanted to make a case from which his audience could build a solid foundation of understanding, he would have referenced what happened on Mount Mowryah, where the Ma’aseyah’s purpose and sacrifice were foreshadowed by the experience of Abraham, Yitschaq, and Yahowah. But he didn’t.

The reason that we are indirectly blessed by way of Abraham is because he trusted and relied upon Yahowah at one of the most pivotal moments in all of human history—thereby becoming the first beneficiary of the Covenant’s blessings. He tangibly demonstrated this trust by acting upon Yahowah’s

instructions, taking his son to Mount Mowryah as God had asked. But Yahowah provided the lamb to predict His own fulfillment of Pesach on this same mountain, just as He would forty Yowbel (exactly 2000 years) later at the summit of Mowryah. Yahowsha' fulfilled what Yahowah had predicted, facilitating the promises God made to Abraham and to the rest of us through him. Yahowah's message does not change from beginning to end. It is one story. Everything points to the same opportunity.

NA: "That in the nations the good word of the Abraham might become in Christ Jesus that the promise of the spirit we might receive through the trust."
KJV: "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."
LV: "This was so that the blessing of Abraham might reach the Gentibus through *Christo Iesu*, in order that we might receive the promise of the *Spiritus*/Spirit through faith."

Most every word presented in the NLT is wrong, either errantly transliterated, mistranslated, or simply not represented in the Greek text: "Through Christ Jesus, God has blessed the Gentiles with the same blessing he promised to Abraham, so that we who are believers might receive the promised Holy Spirit through faith." In total, 26 of the 30 words found in the *New Living Translation* were not translated or transliterated, but instead authored. It's little wonder Christians are deceived.

Paul's comments are out of sync with his preposition when *pistis* is translated "trust or reliance" in the 11th, 12th, or 14th verses. It is only by rendering *pistis* "faith or belief" in these passages that the distinction he is making fits his thesis. So, he has not only defined the fulcrum of his argument, but has also presented the opening salvo of Pauline Doctrine. He proposed:

But when Kephas (Peter) came to Antioch, I was opposed to and against his presence. I stood in hostile opposition because he was convicted and condemned, even ignorant. (2:11) Because before a certain individual came from Ya'aqob (James), he was eating together with the different races, but when he came, he was withdrawing and was separating himself, out of fear of the circumcised. (2:12) So they were hypocritical, and also the remaining Jews. As a result, even Barnabas was led away and astray with them in the duplicitous hypocrisy. (2:13) Nevertheless, when I saw that they were not walking through life rightly with the truth of the healing and beneficial messenger, I said to Kephas in front of all: 'If you Jews actively being ethnic, how will you compel the ethnicities, forcing them into acting Jewish?' (2:14)

We are Jews by nature and are not from the social outcasts of sinful and heathen races, (2:15) having come to realize without evidence, that by no

means whatsoever is man vindicated or made righteous by means of activities associated with the Towrah, if not by faith in Iesou Christou. And we on Christon Iesoun, ourselves, believed in order for us to have become righteous out of faith in Christou, and not by means of acting upon the Towrah, because by means of engaging in the Towrah not any flesh will be acquitted, vindicated, nor made righteous. (2:16)

But if seeking to be made righteous and innocent in Christo, we were found also ourselves social outcasts and sinners, shouldn't we be anxious that Christos becomes a guilty, errant, and misled, servant of sin? Not may it exist, (2:17) because if that which I have actually torn down, dissolved, and dismantled, invalidated and abolished, subverted and discarded, this on the other hand I restore or reconstruct, promoting this edifice, I myself bring into existence and recommend transgression and disobedience. (2:18) I then, because of and by the Towrah's 'law,' myself, actually died and was separated in order that to god I might currently live. Together with Christo, I have actually been crucified. (2:19)

I live, but no longer I. He lives then in me, Christos. This because now I live in the flesh, in faith I live of the god and Christou, the one having loved me and surrendered, entrusting authority to control, influence, instruct, and to betray exclusively and especially of himself for the sake of and because of me. (2:20) I do not reject or disregard the Charity / Grace of the god if because then by the Torah, righteousness as a result Christos undeservedly, for no reason or cause, without benefit, for naught, and in vain, died. (2:21)

O ignorant and irrational, unintelligent and unreasonable, Galatians. To whom were you bewitched, deceived, slandered, and seduced? (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? (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? (3:3) So much and for so long these things you suffered. You were affected and you were vexed, annoyed, and angry, without reason or result, if indeed, really without result. (3:4)

The one, therefore, then supplying you the spirit and causing it to function, operating powerfully in you, out of acting upon the Torah or out of hearing faith? (3:5) Just as Abram believed and had faith in the God so it was reasoned and accounted to Him as righteousness. (3:6) You know, as a result, the ones out of faith, these are Abram's sons. (3:7)

Having seen beforehand then by contrast the writing, that because out of faith makes the people from different races and places right, God, He, before

the beneficial messenger acted for Abram, that they would in time be spoken of favorably in you to all the ethnicities and nations. (3:8) As a result, the ones out of faith, we are spoken of favorably, even praised together with the faithful Abram. (3:9)

For as long as they exist by means of doing the assigned tasks of the Torah, they are under a curse, because it is written that ‘All are accursed who do not remain alive, persevering with all that is written in the scroll of the Torah, doing it.’ (3:10) So with that Torah, absolutely no one is vindicated or justified alongside God. It becomes evident: ‘Those who are justified and righteous, out of faith will live.’ (3:11) But the Towrah exists not out of faith, but to the contrary, ‘The one having done and preformed them will live in them.’ (3:12)

Christos bought us back from the evil and hateful curse of the Towrah, having become for our sake a maligning and malicious curse, because it has been written: ‘A vengeful curse on all those having hung on wood.’ (3:13) As a result, to the people from different races, the beneficial word of Abram might become in Christo Iesou that the promise of the spirit we might take hold, being possessed through faith.” (Galatians 3:14)

This is so twisted and perverse, so completely invalid, and so utterly ignorant and irrational, it speaks poorly of the human race, because so many people have placed their faith in this charlatan. What is wrong with us? It’s as if there is no longer any desire to think, any merit to evidence or reason, not even when the evidence comes from God, Himself, and is unassailable.

A rational case cannot be made in Paul’s defense. His message comes full circle in the manner of all great spellbinders. From his perspective, the “good word” came from Abram, not Yahowah, making a man responsible for the Ma’aseyah and the Covenant, even our salvation, not God. Knowing the truth no longer matters because righteousness comes through faith.

As a result of these words, humanity is faced with a choice. We can decide to listen to Paul or listen to God. Both is no longer an option. They are adversaries, not allies. Therefore, it is long past time that we acknowledge that his words demonstrate that he was a liar, and thus a false apostle and false prophet.

☩☩☩☩☩

As we press on, making our way through this insidious web, some foresight might be helpful. In addition to Paul’s present course, that of denouncing and

attempting to nullify Yahowah's Towrah, replacing it with his faith-based "Gospel of Grace," Sha'awl will soon attack the centerpiece of the Towrah, its Covenant. By miscasting and misrepresenting the parties who were engaged in the Covenant which was established between Yahowah and Abraham, Paul will seek to invalidate it, calling the Towrah's Covenant "enslaving." This sleight of hand will then set the stage for a new, entirely different covenant, the one conceived by Paul, the one which became Christianity's "New Testament."

I have shared this glimpse into the next chapter of Galatians because it helps highlight the hypocrisy of Sha'awl's next ploy, which is to say: once an agreement is established, it cannot be invalidated or augmented. Beyond the fact that this conclusion is untrue, Paul will use this strategy to further invalidate the Towrah, suggesting that since the Towrah came after Abraham, it has no bearing on the Covenant established prior to its existence. While this assumption is also untrue, for reasons we considered in the previous chapter, and which we will confront once again, truth has become irrelevant in Paul's fictitious realm of faith. The self-proclaimed apostle is counting on his audience remaining as he sees them, ignorant and irrational, so that they will believe him when he says that Abram was considered righteous simply because he believed.

And yet, every nuance of this is opposed to the Towrah's presentation of this relationship. In the Towrah, God reveals that it was Abraham's actions, his response to the terms and conditions of the Covenant, that facilitated his receipt of its benefits, one of which was vindication. This is why Paul requires his audience to completely overlook, even reject and discard, the Towrah.

But how is it even remotely plausible that the only historical account, the lone eyewitness testimony, regarding the interactions and conversations between Abraham and Yahowah, isn't germane to their relationship? If God's witness regarding what He requested of and offered to Abraham isn't reliable, how can Paul's suppositions regarding a Covenant that he was not party to, one that was formed two-thousand years before he was born, have merit?

Sha'awl's argument is akin to discounting the Towrah's creation account, its revelations regarding Eden, its presentation of the flood, and the story of the Exodus, since these things all occurred before God's explanation of them was recorded in writing. But worse, he is then offering a contrarian view of the Towrah's Covenant while using the Towrah, itself, as his only reference.

In his next statement, Sha'awl writes that men realize how to honor covenants, and that they neither invalidate nor disregard them. So he is either oblivious to what he, himself, is now doing, or he no longer thinks he is human.

The tactic which Sha'awl is deploying is to distinguish between the conversational promises God made to Abraham and the terms of the Covenant as

they were inscribed in the Torah. The fact that a case cannot be made that their actual discussion differs from the lone record of it was apparently irrelevant to his argument. Paul simply wants Christians to believe that they can bypass the Torah and still have a relationship with God. But that is not possible according to God.

Sha'awl perpetrates this scheme in part by suggesting that “adding to” the Covenant’s conditions or benefits, which is something Yahowah does as the relationship develops, somehow invalidates the preexisting oral agreement. Therefore, his argument is: to capitalize upon the promises made to Abram, Christians ought not consider Yahowah’s stipulations, but instead ignore them. That is because, as a man, Moseh was not in a position to delineate conditions for participation.

The fact that Sha'awl does this very thing is something he wants Christians to overlook. Just because Paul is deceitful doesn't mean that he isn't clever. After all, Yahowah warned us way back in Eden that the Serpent, Sha'awl's guiding spirit, would be cunning.

To position the second plank in his thesis, Sha'awl had to ignore these words which were spoken to Yitschaq, Abraham's son: **“I will grow and thrive with your offspring in connection with the highest and most illuminated heaven. So I will give to your offspring everything associated with this realm of God. And also, all people from every race and place on the earth will be blessed with favorable circumstances through your offspring. This is because, beneficially focused on the relationship, Abraham listened to the sound of My voice and he continuously observed and closely examined My considerations, the terms and conditions which comprise the Covenant, My inscribed prescriptions for living which cut you into the relationship, and My Towrah (Towrah – My teaching, guidance, direction, and instruction).”** (*Bare'syth / Genesis 26:4-5*)

Disregarding the Divine affirmation that Yahowah shared His “*Towrah – Teaching and Guidance*” with Abraham concurrent with His presentation of the Covenant, Sha'awl would like his devotees to believe:

“Brothers (*adelphos*), according to (*kata* – among, down from, against, and in opposition to) **man (*anthropos* – human beings), **I say** (*lego* – I speak and provide meaning) **nevertheless as a concession** (*homos* – similarly, likewise, and all the same, even so and yet) **a man** (*anthropos* – a human being) **having been validated with** (*kyroo* – having shown something to be real, having been ratified and reassured, even authenticated by (in the perfect tense the ratification occurred in the past and is producing validation presently, the passive voice reveals that said man is being acted upon as opposed to choosing to engage himself in the process, where the participle form serves as a verbal adjective and the accusative**

case marks the direct object of the verb)) **an agreement** (*diatheke* – a covenant or promise, a testament or will designed to dispose of assets after death), **no one** (*oudeis* – nobody ever) **rejects** (*atheteo* – sets aside, does away with, disregards, invalidates, thwarts, voids, nullifies, abrogates, or refuses to recognize) **or** (*e*) **actually accepts added provisions** (*epidiatassomai* – actually or currently accepts something additional (present tense (currently), middle/passive voice (accepts), indicative mood (actually))).” (Galatians 3:15)

As is the case with so many of Paul’s statements, this paradigm appears reasonable until you actually think about it. Then it becomes laughably absurd. Man has elevated the violation of agreements to an art form. Legions of attorneys attest to this sorry state of affairs. Not to mention that Paul is, himself, in the process of rejecting and invalidating the Torah and its Covenant. Moreover, in business and in life, as relationships grow, provisions are added to accommodate the parties engaged in the agreement, delineating what is being sought by each and offered in return.

For example, when our sons were infants, we fed and cuddled them, and expected nothing in return. When our sons were children, we provided a loving home and sent them to school, providing an education. But at this point in their lives, there were expectations, rules if you will, regarding the kind of behavior that was considered permissible within our family. When our sons became adults, we helped them buy their first cars and homes, hoping that they’d show some appreciation in return. And now they are self-sufficient, building their own families. Our relationship, therefore, with our sons has evolved as they have grown. The same is true with most every business relationship in which I’ve participated. It is the nature of things.

With the Covenant, Yahowah initially asked Abram to walk away from his country, which was Babylon, and his family, which was pagan. After they had come to know one another, Yah asked Abram to trust Him. Then Yahowah encouraged this man to walk to Him and become perfect, but not before He provided the path and explained it to him, guiding Abram through the process by sharing His “*towrah* – teaching.” All along the way, God presented the conditions and benefits of His Covenant to His associate and friend. He even asked Abraham to pay especially close attention to what He had offered as well as what He expected in return. Then, many years into this relationship, Yahowah asked Abraham to demonstrate his acceptance through circumcision. Therefore, the benefits of the Covenant were offered and explained over time as were the requirements. This relationship grew, it matured; it was not invalidated.

It should be noted that during the Instruction on the Mount, Yahowsha’ said that “the Heavenly Father’s gift is the Torah and Prophets,” and that “the Torah represents the narrow gate to life.” This occurs in the same discussion where

Yahowsha' obliterated the Christian theological position that the "Law was annulled by Grace" when He affirmed that He "came to fulfill the Towrah, not annul it," saying that every "jot and tittle" of every Hebrew letter comprising every word "in the Torah would remain in effect as long as the universe existed, and until its every promise was fulfilled."

So, the only way Christians can be right is for Yahowsha' to be wrong. And if Yahowsha' was wrong, Christians can't be right. And therein lies the rational conundrum the religious are unwilling to confront. Properly understood, this passage is Christianity's death nail. After all, their "New Testament" isn't just a monumental addition to the Towrah and its Covenant, it alters everything, invalidating the entirety of Yahowah's testimony regarding life, relationships, and salvation.

The Christian interpretations of this passage are as errant as Paul's suppositions. The NA proposed: "Brothers, by man I speak likewise of man having been authenticated agreement no one sets aside or adds." The KJV published: "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto." Jerome in his LV promoted: "Brothers (I speak according to man), if a man's testament has been confirmed (*confirmatum testamentum*), no one would reject it or add to it." Men and women have disavowed vastly more "covenants" than they have upheld. And this Covenant is God's, not man's.

Politically correct and charming, the NLT presents: "Dear brothers and sisters, here's an example from everyday life. Just as no one can set aside or amend an irrevocable agreement, so it is in this case."

The inspiration for Sha'uwl's "zera' – seed" ploy also appears in *Bare'syth* / Genesis 17:8. But so as not to err in the way of Sha'uwl, let's consider the statement in context. Here, Yahowah, who was speaking to Abraham, promised:

"And (*wa*) I will stand up, establish, and restore (*quwm*), accordingly, with (*'eth*) My Familial Covenant Relationship (*beryth*), as a means to recognize Me and as the source of understanding with regard to an association between Me (*byn*) and (*wa*) between you, to help you observe, think, and respond (*byn*), and between your offspring, so that they might be observant and responsive (*wa byn zera'*) after you (*'achar*) regarding, and on behalf of (*la*), their dwelling places and generations (*dowr*) for an eternal and everlasting (*'owlam*) Family Covenant Relationship (*beryth*), to literally be and to genuinely remain (*la hayah*) as your (*la*) God (*'elohym*) and (*wa*) to approach (*la*) your offspring (*zera'*) after you (*'aharown*). (17:7)

So (*wa*) I will give (*natan*) to you (*la*), and to (*wa la*) your offspring (*zera'*) after you (*'achar*), this (*'eth*) land (*'erets*) where (*'eth*) you are living as an

alien (*magowr*), **the entire** (*kol*) **land** (*'erets*) **of Can'aow** (*can'aow*) **to** (*la*) **eternally** (*'owlam*) **possess and settle within** (*'achuzah*). **And** (*wa*) **I will exist** (*hayah*) **unto them as their** (*lahm la*) **God** (*'elohym*). (17:8)

And (*wa*) **God Almighty** (*'elohym*) **said** (*'amar*) **to** (*'el*) **Abraham** (*'Abraham*), **'And** (*wa*) **as for you** (*'eth 'atah*), **you should actually and continuously observe, closely examine and carefully consider** (*shamar*) **My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth-y*), **you** (*'atah*) **and** (*wa*) **your offspring** (*zera'*) **after you** (*'achar*) **throughout** (*la*) **their generations, dwelling places, and eras of time** (*dowr*).” (*Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:9*)

Observation which yields understanding is overtly opposed to Paul's pretext of a faith-based relationship. And so is the realization that Yahowah's words govern His Covenant, not Abraham's. But playing off a minor nuance in the Torah's *Bare'syth / Genesis 17:8* and *26:4* presentation, Sha'uwl nurtured a seed into a full born theory.

'But (*de* – then) **to** (*to* – the) **Abram** (*Abraam* – the abridged pre-Covenant name of *Abraham*, which is based upon the Hebrew *'ab* and *raham*, meaning Merciful, Compassionate, and Forgiving Father), **these** (*ai*) **promises** (*epaggelia* – announced agreements (this time plural rather than singular)), from *epaggello*, meaning to announce and promise to do something voluntarily while professing the ability and authority to do as sworn, from *epi*, to be in position, and *aggelos*, to be a messenger) **were said** (*erreoesan* – were spoken and verbally communicated (aorist, passive, indicative, third person, plural)): **'And** (*kai*) **to the** (*to*) **offspring** (*sperma* – seed (singular)) **of him** (*autos*).’ **Not** (*ou*) **it says** (*lego*): **'And** (*kai*) **to the** (*tois*) **seeds** (*spermasin* – offsprings (plural)),’ **like** (*hos* – as) **upon** (*epi*) **many** (*polys* – a great number), **but to the contrary** (*alla* – by contrast) **as** (*hos* – like) **upon** (*epi*) **one** (*heis*), **and** (*kai*) **'to the** (*to*) **seed** (*sperma* – offspring (singular)) **of you** (*sou*)’ **which** (*hos* – who) **is** (*eimi*) **Christos** ($\text{XP}\Sigma$ – while the placeholder represents Ma'aseyah, the Work of Yah, Sha'uwl discredits Yahowah's involvement, thereby negating the title)).” (*Galatians 3:16*)

Yahowah promised to supply five specific benefits to those who embraced His Covenant. These include: immortality, perfection, adoption, enrichment, and empowerment. So while it would be accurate to speak of these as “promises” plural, up to this point Sha'uwl has said that there was only a singular “*epaggelia* – promise.” Therefore, this new twist reveals a troubling inconsistency – one which lies at the very heart of his thesis. Was there one promise, that being the arrival of the Ma'aseyah, or were there a number of promises? And since God says that there was more than one, articulating each of them in His Towrah, why hasn't Paulos noted them or described them?

It is widely known that the promise to bless all humankind through Abraham was fulfilled in part through Yahowsha'. But Yahowsha' was simply the implement Yahowah deployed to facilitate the Covenant's promises. So while Paul is acknowledging the obvious, using methods which are not altruistic, he is simultaneously promoting a cover up. Somewhere along the line, he turned on his own people and became anti-Semitic. What he is attempting to accomplish here is to sidestep the lineage of the Covenant through Yitschaq and Ya'aqob, who became Yisra'el. By writing them out of the story, he can jump directly from Abraham to the Ma'aseyah and bypass the preponderance of the Towrah, the Covenant, the Invitations, the Promised Land, and the Chosen People. Christianity, which disassociates itself from all of these things, is the residue of this ploy.

But credit to where credit is due. In the whole of the Greek language, it would be difficult to find a more appropriate term in this context than *epaggello* – especially in the plural. It embodies the essence of the healing and beneficial message Yahowah, through Yahowsha', brought to the world. It says that Yahowah made a promise to voluntarily, on His own accord, furnish the Ma'aseyah, the Messenger, who was in a position, and who had the ability and authority, to do what He had announced in the Torah.

But I would be remiss if I didn't point out that Sha'uwl's specificity here with regard to *zera'* being “seed” singular, not plural, suggests that I was right when I said that it was unlikely that he accidentally misappropriated and misquoted Yahowah's testimony to convince his readers that his message was supported by the God he was offending. How is it that this man could have misconstrued the intent of everything Yahowah has said, and yet isolate one aspect of *zera'*?

In reality, this is pure madness. Even today, both “seed” and “offspring” have plural connotations and implications. If you asked someone to bring you a bag of seed, what would you think of them if they made certain that there was only one seed in the bag? Likewise, we say “offspring” when depicting our children, not “offsprings.” Moreover, proving this point, *zera'* does not have a differentiated singular and plural form when addressing seed. When a person is depicted sowing an entire field, *zera'* is used, as it is when the descendants number in the thousands or even millions. This argument, thereby, preys on ignorance.

Demonstrating that one requires faith to believe that God inspired these words, the Nestle Aland has Paul saying: “To the but Abraham were said the promises and to the seed of him. Not it says and to the seeds as on many but as on one and to the seed of you who is Christ.”

Missing the magnificence of the word which served to unify the Torah's promises with their fulfillments, the inadequate KJV writes: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."

The Catholic Church's Latin Vulgate reads: "The promises were made to Abrahæ and to his offspring. He did not say, "and to descendents," as if to many, but instead, as if to one, he said, "and to your offspring," who is Christus." To this Jerome added: "~ The Promise was certainly made to many descendents of Abraham, since God used the figure of the stars in the sky and the sand on the shore. But Paul is saying that the word used for offspring can be taken in the singular sense, because the promise is primarily about Christ, (the one offspring who redeems all other offspring), and only secondarily about the physical and spiritual descendents of Abraham." The Roman theologian is saying that Paul made a big deal out of nothing, and I concur. And to make his point, Jerome had to change "promises" back to "promise."

Speaking of making something out of nothing, the *New Living Translation* would have us believe that *zera'* and *sperma* both mean "child." "God gave the promises to Abraham and his child. And notice that the Scripture doesn't say 'to his children,' as if it meant many descendants. Rather, it says 'to his child'—and that, of course, means Christ." Therein we see one of the problems of Paul's writing and reasoning exposed. His words and thoughts are far too easily misconstrued and misrepresented.

The less evident, but more intriguing, message related to the use of "*zera'* – seed" is found by connecting this promise to the one made in the Garden of Eden. There, Yahowah predicted that the "*zera'* – seed" of woman would bruise Satan on his head, which is precisely what the Ma'aseyah did. God also warned that the Serpent would bruise mankind in the heel, which serves as the basis of Ya'aqob's name – the child of the Covenant who became Yisra'el.

Apart from appreciating the eternal nature of the relationship between Yahowah and Abraham, and how that led to God blessing Yitschaq and Ya'aqob, and therefore Yisra'el, in addition to providing the line which led over chasms of time to the Ma'aseyah, this is all much ado about nothing. It is a pathetic argument for the reasons already discussed. Abraham's seed is both the Ma'aseyah, singular, and the Covenant's children, plural. God obviously meant to convey both aspects of *zera'*, and spoke vociferously of the Children of Yisra'el and the Ma'aseyah. And indeed, as the children of the Covenant Yah made with Abraham, those who are born into Yahowah's family become the Merciful Father's seed. Also, we have and will continue to see Paul speak of himself as the seed of Abraham, discrediting his argument while feeding his ego.

Once again, citing the book Christians are wont to claim Galatians was nullifying, Sha'awl's next sentence is based upon *Bare'syth* / Genesis 15:13. In context, here is some of what Yahowah's Towrah reveals about the ongoing nature of the Covenant, which He said would remain in force:

“And He said to him (‘amar ‘el), ‘I am (‘any) Yahowah (יְהוָה) who relationally (‘asher) brought you out (yasa’) from (min) Ur (‘Uwr) of the Chaldeans (a synonym for Babylon (Casdym)) to give (la natan) accordingly (‘eth) this (zo’th) land (‘erets) to possess as an inheritance (la yaras). (15:7)

So he said (wa ‘amar), ‘Yahowah (יְהוָה), in what way (ba mah) shall I know (yada’) that indeed (ky) I shall possess it as an inheritance (la yaras)?” (15:8)

“He said (‘amar): ‘Abram (‘Abram), you should know with absolute certainty (yada’ yada’) that indeed (ky) as one making a sojourn (ger), your seed (zera’) will exist (hayah) in (ba) a land (‘erets) which is not for them (lo’ lahim). And they shall serve them (‘abad). And they will respond and seek resolution (‘anah), accordingly, in (‘eth) four (‘arba’) hundred (me’owah) years (sanah). (15:13) But also (wa gam), therefore (‘eth), that Gentile nation (gowy) which (‘asher) reduces them to servitude (‘abad), I will judge (dyn). And afterward (‘ahar), accordingly (ken), they shall come out (yasa’) with (ba) an intensely important and tremendously valuable (gadawl) possession (rakuws). (15:14)

As for you (wa ‘atah), you shall go to (bow’ ‘el) your Father (‘ab) in (ba) peace, satisfied, reconciled, and saved (salowm). You shall be buried (qabar) with (ba) grey hair (sebah), good, moral, and pleasing (towb). (15:15) And they shall return (suwb) here (henah) in the fourth (raby’y) generation of time (dowr), because indeed (ky), the corruption, distortions, and perversity (‘aown) of the ‘Emory (‘emory) are not yet (lo’ ‘ad) fully finished or totally complete (salem). (15:16)

On (ba – in) this (huw’) day (yowm), Yahowah (יְהוָה) cut (karat) the Familial Covenant Relationship (beryth) with (‘eth) ‘Abram (‘Abram) to promise and affirm (la ‘amar): ‘To your offspring (zera’), I give (natan) therewith (‘eth) this (ze’th) land (‘erets).” (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 15:18) (Please note that while Yahowah is still using Abram, as a result of the Covenant, God would soon change his name to Abraham, telling us that this would be his name forevermore.)

The duration of time between the Covenant being announced through and being established with Abraham, and it being affirmed in writing, was 430 years. While Yisra’elites lived in bondage for 400 years, Abraham didn’t leave the Promised Land immediately after the agreement was reached, and the Yisra’elites

were initially welcomed guests in Egypt. Therefore, the Torah is right with 400 years of bondage and Sha'awl was correct mathematically with regard to the overall duration of time, because the Torah itself uses both numbers.

And while that explains the arithmetic, very few Christians have ever attempted to explain what Sha'awl does next. This is the first of countless times that Sha'awl will deploy a phrase that sets him apart from those who scribed the Torah and Prophets. They spoke for God, but Paul speaks for himself. His "but I say" is used so frequently, it should have alerted everyone to the fact he was speaking for Paul when he wrote...

“But (de) this (houtos) I say (lego – I speak), ‘A promised covenant agreement (diatheke – a testament, will, or agreement of some kind to dispose of and distribute a deceased individual’s property) having been ratified beforehand (prokyroo – having been sanctioned and validated in advance; from kuroo, to promise and confirm publicly that something is valid, and thus truthful and reliable, and pro, ahead of time) by (hupo – because of, under the auspices of, by the means of, and for the reasons that) the God (tou ΘΥ), this (o) after (meta – with) four-hundred and thirty (tetrakosioi kai triakonta) years (etos), having become (ginomai – having appeared on the scene and arrived upon the stage of history as) Towrah (nomos – the means to be nourished by that which is bestowed, becoming heirs, precepts which are apportioned, established, and received as a means to proper and to be approved, prescriptions for an inheritance) does not (ou – objectively denying the reality of an alleged fact) revoke it (akyroo – invalidate, nullify, contradict, or void it, depriving it of authority) so as to (eis) invalidate or abolish (katargeo – idle or inactivate, diminish or remove the force of) the (o) announced promise (epaggelia – the heralding of the consent approval and agreement (singular)).” (Galatians 3:17)

You may have noticed that the singular promise which became promises, plural, is now singular again. This is a symptom of one of the many problems associated with lying: remembering what was said.

Let there be no doubt, speaking for Himself, Yahowah, in *Bare'syth* / Genesis 26:5, told us unequivocally that He not only shared His Towrah with Abraham, but that the reason He was now honoring its provisions with Yitschaq was because Abraham listened intently and carefully observed everything He had to say. Therefore, the very Towrah which presents the Covenant was concurrent with it. These are parallel events, not sequential.

For comparison sake, the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear* attests that Paul wrote: **“But this I say, agreement having been validated before by the God, the after four hundred and thirty years, having become law not invalidates for the to abolish the promise.”**

As has become his custom, Paul has positioned a principle that is only plausible if the audience is unaware of what Yahowah has written. He is suggesting that the Towrah is irrelevant because the Covenant preceded it, and therefore cannot nullify it. When in reality, the Towrah not only confirms every nuance of the Covenant, without the Towrah, the Covenant is unknown and unknowable. Therefore, this argument is irrational, preying on people's ignorance.

Simply stated: without the Towrah, there is no Covenant. With the Towrah, there is only one Covenant. The Covenant is inseparable from the Towrah. One does not exist without the other.

As mentioned a moment ago, it is inappropriate, although not out of character, for Paul to begin this statement with "But this I say." It is as if he thinks his personal suppositions, even when they are in conflict with God, are superior. And yet here, what he is saying is only believable if you are unaware of what Yahowah has said.

Rather than affirm that the Covenant established with Abraham was validated and memorialized in the Towrah, Sha'awl is proposing the notion that the Torah "did not revoke or invalidate" it. In that way, rather than the Torah being essential to the Covenant, it becomes irrelevant to it. This strategy was ingenious, albeit insidious.

To understand why Sha'awl used such twisted logic, blending half-truths with outright lies, we have to consider this statement within the context of the point he has been trying to advance. Paul is linking "the promise / promises made to Abraham" with "the Ma'aseyah" and then to "believing the message he has been preaching," while at the same time bypassing the entirety of Torah, which must be negated for his formula to prevail. Therefore, he is telling the Galatians that since the Torah cannot revoke or invalidate the promise / promises, the Torah is extraneous to that promise or promises.

The reason this clever, although ridiculous, line of reasoning prevailed is that the natural tendency of people ensnared in a religious system is to give those who claim to speak for God the benefit of the doubt. I am embarrassed to say that I was once counted among those he beguiled. And that is why I shared my preconceived thoughts regarding Galatians at the outset of this evaluation. I was predisposed to justify the discrepancies between the Christian interpretation of this epistle and Yahowah's testimony. I had hoped to solve the many conundrums by suggesting that it was Rabbinic Law, not Yahowah's Towrah, that was being assailed. But I'd have to sacrifice my integrity and my soul to do either. Since the facts condemn Paul, it would be immoral and irrational to absolve him by concealing or twisting his testimony.

It is ironic in a way. I have been vilified for having turned over and exposed the rocks Paul has hurled at the Torah. And yet, in actuality, and for far too long, I was guilty of letting my desire to validate Paul's message taint my judgment.

Had Sha'awl simply said that the "Covenant was validated by God after 430 years, becoming memorialize for our benefit in the Torah," he would have been correct. But he had an entirely different agenda. And not recognizing it initially, I understand how easy it is to fall prey to his rhetoric. Yes, it is true, the Torah didn't invalidate Yahowah's promises. But that is like saying the novel Moby Dick didn't invalidate Ahab's vow to get the whale. Every last detail associated with these promises would be completely unknown without the Torah. In this light, please ponder:

“Brothers, according to man I say nevertheless a man having been validated with an agreement; no one rejects or actually accepts added provisions. (3:15) But to Abram these promises were said, ‘And to the offspring of him.’ It does not say: ‘And to the seeds,’ like upon many. But to the contrary, as upon one, and to the seed of you which is Christos. (3:16)

But this I say, ‘A promised covenant agreement having been ratified beforehand by the God, this after four-hundred and thirty years, having become Towrah does not revoke it so as to invalidate the promise.’”
(Galatians 3:17)

In context, the transition from “promises” to “promise” in the beginning of 3:16 and at the conclusion of 3:17 is glaring. Those skilled in rhetoric recognize that inconsistencies of this type serve as proof that an individual is lying and cannot be trusted.

The twist here is “invalidate” as opposed to “validate.” In reality, the Covenant's promises which were discussed between Yahowah and Abraham were *affirmed*, that is to say, they were “validated,” while and after they were being established, concurrent with the salvation of the Children of Yisra'el from bondage in the crucible of Egypt—a story central to the message of the Towrah and its Covenant.

Rather than the Torah being bypassed, or worse, being negated and annulled, by Abraham, the Covenant formed between he and God became the basis of the promises made between God and all men.

Turning to the interpretive translations of Galatians, we find the KJV inferring that since the Law cannot invalidate the promise, the Law must be wrong, which is worse than, albeit a natural extension of, what Sha'awl was trying to say. **“And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God**

in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.”

The Latin Vulgate isn't wrong; it's just inadequate: “But I say this: the testament confirmed by God (*testamentum confirmatum a Deo*), which, after four hundred and thirty years became the Law (*Lex*), does not nullify, so as to make the promise empty.”

The New Living Translation published: “This is what I am trying to say: The agreement God made with Abraham could not be canceled 430 years later when God gave the law to Moses. God would be breaking his promise.” After all, Paul was composing the lyrics for their hymnals.



At this point, the writing quality, which has been abysmal, suddenly deteriorates. This next verse requires a reordering of the words, the addition of a verb, a preposition, and some articles. So let's begin with the most credible source, the acclaimed *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*: “If for from law the inheritance no longer from promise to the but Abraham through promise has favored the God.”

“**Because** (*gar* – for) **if** (*ei* – as a condition) **from** (*ek* – out of) **the Towrah** (*nomou* – the allotment which is parceled out, the inheritance which is given, the nourishment which is bestowed to be possessed and used to grow, the precepts which are apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and the prescription to become an heir (singular genitive, and thus restricted to a singular specific and unique characterization)) **the** (*e*) **inheritance** (*kleronomai* – possession of gifts from a deceased parent), **no longer** (*ouketi*) **from** (*ek* – out of) **a promise** (*epaggelia* – an agreement or consent (singular)), **but** (*de*) **to** (*to*) **Abram** (*Abraam* – a transliteration of ‘Abram, Abraham’s original name) **by** (*dia* – through) **promise** (*epaggelia* – agreement or consent (singular)) **he has favored** (*charizomai* – he has done a favor to gratify and pleasure, showing hospitality and merriment, serving as a derivative of *Charis* – the name of the Greek goddesses of Charity) **the God** (*ο ΘΣ*).” (Galatians 3:18)

While this is preposterous from beginning to end, if we were to put some lipstick on this pig, we'd have to begin by reordering the last three words: “**the God** (*ο ΘΣ*), **He has given and favored.**” Albeit this requires us to highlight the fact that *charizomai* is the verbal form of *Charis* – the name of the naked goddesses of sexual pleasure and merriment in Greek mythology.

While I suspect that we've all had our fill of Paul by now, in a way, his continued and desperate attempt to portray Abraham and the Covenant as being outside and apart from the Towrah adds considerable credence to the assertion that this ploy is the fulcrum upon which Pauline Doctrine, and thus Christianity, pivots. He is saying that, Abram, circa 2000 BCE, became "righteous and vindicated," and thus "saved," as a result of "believing an undisclosed promise." He then wants us to differentiate this wholly unverifiable and conflicting "promise of salvation through faith" from the Towrah's account which methodically presents Abraham engaging in a relationship with Yahowah based upon responding to what God had requested. But even if Paul's contradictory claims were true, and they are not, even if Paul could validate his proposition, and he can't, why would God deliberately present an inaccurate depiction of the most pivotal relationship He ever formed? And if God cannot be trusted to tell us what happened, why should we believe someone who claims to speak for Him regarding this relationship and its consequences?

While this determination may strike some as premature and too far reaching, please consider the following. First, in the Towrah, the process is relationship and then salvation. With Paul, a relationship is immaterial. He goes directly from believing to vindication. It is this improper perspective that beguiles so many Christians.

According to Yahowah, trust is the second of five steps we must take to participate in His Covenant. These steps, or requirements, include: 1) walking away from our country, especially that which is represented by Babylon, and therefore, from religion, politics, and patriotism, 2) trusting and relying on Yahowah, which necessitates knowing Him and coming to understand what He is offering, something that can only be achieved by studying the Towrah, 3) then based upon this knowledge, walking to Yahowah to become perfect, a path guided by the Towrah, 4) which is why we are asked to closely examine and carefully consider every aspect of the Covenant relationship, which again can only be achieved by studying the Towrah, and 5) as parents, we are asked to circumcise our sons as our commitment to raise our children to become God's children. After we do these five things, Yahowah responds by making our souls immortal, perfecting us, and adopting us into His Covenant family, so that He can enrich us with His teaching and empower us with His Spirit.

It would be foolish for Yahowah to save someone who does not know Him, who is not part of His family, who hasn't so much as bothered to consider what He wants or to know what He is offering. If He were to do so, heaven would be no different than earth.

In the Towrah, salvation is a byproduct of the Covenant relationship because our Heavenly Father cares for His children. And this is why faith in the unknown is not part of this equation.

But with Paul, salvation is instantly awarded to those who believe him. A person does not need to know Yahowah's name, consider Yahowah's instructions, engage in Yahowah's Covenant, or answer Yahowah's Invitations. Nothing is required. No knowledge. No thinking. No relationship. No action. No commitment. And yet, should Paul be right, heaven would be hell for Christians because those who have an affinity for the thoughtless and inactive myth will, like Paul, hate the voyage of discovery we will take with Yahowah through His word and world.

The second reason to discard Paul's ploy is that the scenario he is presenting is rationally impossible. Since the Towrah is the only place where God introduces Himself to us, the only place where the terms and benefits of the Covenant are presented, and the only place where the path to God and thus to salvation is explained, by negating and bypassing it, there are no promises.

Third, to suggest that a person cannot rely on the written testimony of God in His Towrah, but can believe an unrecorded and unsubstantiated promise from this same God, is insane.

Fourth, most every aspect of Paul's "salvation by believing a promise made to Abram" theory is in conflict with the lone eyewitness account of what actually occurred. To discard the written testimony of an eyewitness, especially when that eyewitness is God, only to believe an arrogant, insane, and demon-possessed man, is far too foolish even for faith. Doing so requires the faithful to believe that God authorized a man to trash His reputation, to annul His testimony, to deny His purpose, and to refute His solution, so that everything He promised and proposed could be discarded.

And fifth, since Yahowah proved beyond any doubt that He is God and that He authored the Torah and Prophets, and did so through countless prophecies, all of which have occurred precisely as predicted, or are in the process of coming true right before our eyes, to reject such affirmed testimony, and instead believe in Paul's letters, a man who got his lone prediction wrong, isn't real smart.

Returning to the text of Galatians 3:18, *kleronomai*, translated "inheritance," highlights one of many problems with Christianity. As a result of Paul's letters, the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms have been relegated to an "Old Testament," with the inference that it is "*kleronomai* – the will and testimony of a deceased parent," or at least that of a retired and incapacitated father who is no longer relevant because he "allotted everything he possessed to his son." The same concern is also evident in *diatheke*, which Paul has used relative to the "agreement," which

also speaks of “a testament or will which was written to dispose of and distribute a deceased or incapacitated individual’s property.”

Also interesting, *kleronomai* is a compound of *kleros* which is “a means of selecting someone by random chance” and, specifically, “to cast or draw lots,” and the all too familiar *nomos*, “allotment which is parceled out as an inheritance.” It is therefore a “random chance” means of determining one’s inheritance which is being errantly associated with the Torah.

Beyond this, the notion that because something is written it ceases to be a promise is also absurd. A “promissory note” is a written pledge to pay someone what is owed to them. A legal contract stipulates responsibilities and delineates the things each party promises to perform. The contract does not change the nature of the promises, it simply holds the parties accountable to the promises they have made. Likewise, while it is actually a three-party agreement with the government, most consider their marriage license to be a written affirmation of a husband’s and wife’s oral vows regarding their union. Similarly, an affidavit serves to memorialize oral testimony, making one’s oath legally binding rather than nullifying it. Written agreements mitigate misunderstandings and create an enduring legacy.

This passage, combined with the previous one, once again precludes us from pretending that Paul was referencing the Oral Law or Traditions of the Rabbis. According to Pauline Doctrine, the Torah must be bypassed for the promise to remain valid and for “believers” to become heirs of his god. Therefore, in his warped mind, the affinity between the Covenant established between Yahowah and Abraham, and the Towrah in which this Covenant has been memorialized, is counterproductive. Therefore, with Paul, this is an “either – or” proposition. According to Sha’uwl, you can fail by following the Towrah’s guidance or you can be saved by believing in an unspecified promise made by the very same God whose testimony is incapable of saving anyone.

Christians believe that Paul was right, because they have been misled by his letters into believing that the Torah represents a works-based, onerous, and thus impossible, means to salvation. And yet that is not remotely accurate. While we must engage in specific ways to participate in the Covenant, our salvation is the byproduct of that relationship. All we are required to do to become perfect and immortal is to answer Yahowah’s Invitations and meet with Him on the days that He has set aside to save us. He does the work, as do all loving fathers on behalf of their children. This is what “*Ma’aseyah* – the Work of Yahowah” means. It is what “Yahowsha’ – Yahowah Saves” affirms.

Since from a Pauline perspective, “faith in a promise” requires nothing from the beneficiary, what would be the benefit, if the result is to eternally coexist in

the home of a God with whom you share nothing in common and whose agenda and priorities are the opposite of your own? After all, Yahowah is adverse to everything Christians hold dear: Paul and his letters, being religious, discounting His name, being referred to as Lord, the Christian New Testament, an Old Testament, being anti-Semitic, a new covenant, Grace, calling His Word “the Bible,” everything associated with the Church, the Trinity, the cross, bowing down, being worshipped, Sunday observances, Christmas, Lent, Easter, Halloween, the pagan myth of a dying and bodily resurrected deity, and prayers apart from responding to His Towrah.

Relative to Galatians 3:18, the problem isn't with the translations, but instead with the original document. Paul wrote: **“Because if, as a condition, from the Towrah the inheritance, no longer from promise, but to the Abram by promise of the God, He has favored and pleased.”** The King James Version published: **“For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise.”** It was a precisely accurate translation of the Latin Vulgate. **“For if the inheritance is of the *lege*/law, then it is no longer of the promise. But God bestowed it to Abraham through the promise.”**

However, Gerald Borchert, of the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Douglas Moo of Wheaton College, and Thomas Schreiner of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, working under the auspices of Mark Taylor, the “Chief Stylist,” Daniel Taylor, the “Senior Stylist,” and Philip Comfort, the “N.T. Coordinating Editor,” collectively known as “Team Tyndale,” with regard to Galatians, coordinated this stylish theological twist whereby the promised inheritance was nullified by trying to keep the law. Then for good measure, they tossed in an extra “grace,” just to be sure they had paid proper homage to Paul’s goddesses. **“For if the inheritance could be received by keeping the law, then it would not be the result of accepting God’s promise. But God graciously gave it to Abraham as a promise.”**

Since the Torah provides the world’s lone depiction of the one and only Covenant, it makes no sense whatsoever to differentiate between “Old” and “New” Testaments. Moreover, according to Yahowah, His Covenant has not yet been renewed, and when it ultimately is reaffirmed on *Yowm Kippurym* in Year 6000 Yah, that restoration of the familial relationship will be predicated upon a full integration of the Towrah. Yahowah, Himself, has promised to place His “*towrah* – teaching” inside His children, writing it on our hearts on this day. So the notion that the Towrah and its Covenant are somehow outdated, necessitating new approaches, is inconsistent with Yahowah’s promises.

Turning to Sha’uwl’s next statement, we are confronted with considerable differences between an older manuscript and the majority texts as presented in the *Nestle-Aland*. So while I’ve included the additional verbiage found in post-

Constantine codices, I've placed these words within brackets. But with or without them, this nearly incomprehensible.

After having said that Yahowah's Towrah was both irrelevant and diabolical, Paul was compelled to explain why God even bothered to write it. So, here is Paul's most lucid explanation as it is chronicled by the *Nestle Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear*: "What then the law? Of the transgression on account it was set forward until which might come the seed to who it has been promised having been directed through messengers in hand of mediator."

Rearranging these same words a bit, but not misrepresenting any of them, here is another perspective on the same statement:

"**Then** (*oun* – therefore), **why** (*tis* – or what) **the** (*o* – this) **Towrah** (*nomos* – allotment which is parceled out, inheritance which is given, precepts apportioned, established, and received as a means to be proper and approved, and prescriptions to become an heir)?

[**Of the** (*ton*) **transgressions** (*parabasis* – violations and promulgations, disobediences and disregarding, lawbreaking and overstepping) **because of the favor** (*charin* – for the purpose and reason of, for the charity and pleasure of) **it was continued** (*prostithemai* – it was provided and added to)]

Until (*achri*) **the** (*to*) **seed** (*sperma* – offspring and descendants) **which** (*hos* – who) **might come** (*erchomai* – may happen (in the subjunctive mood the verb's action is a mere possibility)) **to whom** (*hos* – to which) **it has been promised** (*epangellomai* – asserted, professed, or announced) **having been commanded** (*diatasso* – having been instructed, arranged, and planned) [**by** (*dia* – through)] **messengers** (*angelos / aggelos* – a class of spiritual beings serving as envoys commonly known as angels) **in the hand** (*en cheir* – in control of) **of a mediator** (*mesites* – of a reconciler; from *mesos* – middleman)." (Galatians 3:19)

Paul has painted himself into a corner. At this time, especially within walking distance of Yisra'el, the Towrah was the best known and most often quoted text. That is still true. It is the most accurate historically, the most prophetically precise, the most thoroughly moral, the most consistently enlightening, and the most innovative and important document the world has ever known. So now that Paul has trashed it, his audience is obviously questioning why God bothered with it in the first place. What was God's purpose? What, if anything, did He accomplish by writing it? Where did God go so wrong that His teaching is no longer valid?

So Sha'uwl is floating another trial balloon, hoping that no one actually reads or considers the book he is relegating to a bygone era. In Paul's view, Yahowah's

Towrah was a document “*ton parabasis* – associated with transgressions.” Yahowah’s Teaching and Guidance “*ton parabasis* – overstepped its bounds with promulgations, which is the spread, proliferation, and dissemination of things which should be disobeyed and disregarded.” At best, at least according to this self-proclaimed apostle of God, the Towrah “*prostithemai* – was provided, augmented, and continued” only “*achri* – until” the “*charin sperma* – the fortuitous and charitable seed” “*erchomai* – might come” to rescue mankind from the mean-spirited and incompetent god of that old testament. The replacement “*sperma* – offspring” would be more “*charin* – pleasurable, charitable, and agreeable, treating everyone favorably,” liars like Paul apparently included.

So attractive would be the replacement god, he would come in the name of the Greek *Charis* – Charities and the Roman *Gratia* – Graces, emulating the beautiful party girls of pagan mythology. That, according to Paul, was the full extent of the Torah. And now that the seed had come, you were encouraged to cast the Torah aside. Goodbye and good riddance, God’s alleged spokesman said of said God.

I would also be remiss if I did not share two additional facts. First, Yahowah specifically asks us not to “*prostithemai* – add to” His Towrah. And second, Yahowah routinely affirms that His Towrah is “*owlam* – eternal and everlasting.”

If that were not enough to strongly suggest that Sha’uwl ought not be trusted, the second half of his pontification is especially ripe with rotten fruit. From whence is anyone to understand how to capitalize on the favor being provided by the new seed? If the mercy He is providing doesn’t come by observing the Towrah, why was He promised in the Towrah? And why did He observe the Towrah and encourage us to do the same – especially when trying to understand Him – if we are to ignore it? Since He was the Word of God, how can He be good if those words were bad?

Why pretend that the seed’s credibility is enhanced because it was promised that He “*erchomai* – might come?” Scribed in the subjunctive mood, the promise was at best probable. Do you suppose that Paul is trying to disparage Yahowah’s prophetic record in the Towrah and Prophets, where everything He has promised has materialized? After all, any rational open-minded individual who studies God’s predictions and their fulfillments comes to realize that Yahowah not only proves that He is God, but also that His Towrah testimony can be trusted. So is Sha’uwl implying that God just got lucky this time, and that we’d be wasting our time to observe His prophecies more closely? Or is he trying to discourage his audience from considering the fact that the most complete and accurate presentation of Yahowsha’s name, title, nature, purpose, timing, place, words, and deeds is found in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, in eyewitness accounts committed to parchment five to fifteen centuries before His arrival?

Facts aside, it would be in Sha'awl's interest for his audience to relegate Yahowah's Word to the scrapheap of time, because those who consider God's testimony will reject Paul's letters.

But that is not the end of the rotten fruit. Yahowsha's arrival in the fourth millennia of human history to fulfill the Towrah's promises in the Yowbel year of 4000 Yah, entering Yaruwshalaim four days before Passover, at the exact moment predicted in the opening chapter of the Towrah and ninth chapter of Dany'el, to enable the benefits associated with answering Yahowah's Invitations to Meet on *Pesach, Matsah, Bikuwrym, and Shabuw'ah*, wasn't per chance, but by design. And while predicted and explained, it was not a command, and more importantly, His arrival was not "*dia angelos*" by way of "angels." Yes, Gabriel announced His arrival to Dany'el and to Miryam, but that was the full extent of any "*mal'ak* – spiritual messenger's" contribution. So once again, Sha'awl is willing to mislead his audience, hoping that they disassociate Yahowah from Yahowsha'. And yet in reality, Yahowsha' is nothing more or less than a diminished corporeal manifestation of Yahowah, set apart from Him to serve us.

Further, Yahowsha' is neither "*mesites* – mediator or middleman." There is one God, one Savior – Yahowah. That is what Yahowsha' means. No one comes between Yahowah and His Covenant children.

Since Yahowah affirms that His Word would abide forever, Paul's letters remain diametrically opposed to God's Word. There is nothing in the Towrah which suggests that it was a "temporary" solution, and if there were, you could bet your oldest shekel Sha'awl would have cited it. Virtually every important instruction in the Torah comes with the provision that "this is to be '*olam* – eternal and everlasting."

Especially relevant, the Ma'aseyah's message is also the antithesis of Paul's. It isn't just Yahowah's testimony Sha'awl is opposing. Yahowsha' expressly refuted the notion that He came to annul the Torah, and said that even the smallest strokes of the letters which comprise the words which proclaim its message would endure as long as the universe exists and until every last promise is fulfilled. So since Paul's message is in direct conflict with the Ma'aseyah Yahowsha', who is Paul's "*sperma* – seed?"

For the few, like me many years ago, who were hoping to salvage this epistle by substituting Rabbinical Law for the Torah, this is one of many statements where that argument becomes impossible. Rabbinical Law was still in its infancy during the Ma'aseyah's arrival. Unlike Christians, who were beguiled by Paul into believing that Yahowsha' put an end to the Towrah, Rabbis never postured such a claim.

The Torah does not say that it was given because of “transgressions.” But that didn’t stop the KJV from proposing: “Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.” The inspiration for those words came from the Latin Vulgate: “Why, then, was there a *lex*/law? It was established because of transgressions, until the offspring would arrive, to whom he made the promise, ordained by *Angelos* through the hand of a mediator.”

A disclaimer is in order: what you are about to read is not true. Using the New Living Translation may be harmful to your health. “Why, then, was the law given? It was given alongside the promise to show people their sins. But the law was designed to last only until the coming of the child who was promised. God gave his law through angels to Moses, who was the mediator between God and the people.”

That is not what Paul wrote, and thus the NLT is not a translation. It isn’t even true. It is not what Yahowah said about the Torah’s purpose, so this message is counter to Scripture. And this position is the opposite of Yahowsha’s statements regarding the Torah. Moreover, not only is “law” an invalid depiction of the Towrah, it was not given by way of angles. That means that Gerald Borchert, of the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Douglas Moo of Wheaton College, Thomas Schreiner of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and their stylists Mark and Daniel Taylor, and Philip Comfort, have joined with Sha’uwl to deceive – all gaining fame and making money in the process.

How do you suppose these “scholars” reconcile their “but the law was designed to last only until the coming of the child who was promised” with the Child of the promise saying:

“You should not think or assume (*me nomizomai* – you not consider, expect, nor suppose at any time even the possibility of the commonly held or popularly established presumption, never accepting the prevailing precept or justification (negative particle, aorist active subjunctive verb)) **that** (*hoti* – namely) **I actually came** (*erchomai* – I 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, to discard, or to put an end to it** (*kataluo* – to tear it down, to dissolve, to destroy, to disunite, to subvert, to overthrow, to abrogate, to weaken, to dismantle, or to abolish it, dismissing any implication or influence), **but instead** (*alla* – to the contrary, emphatically contrasting that to the certainty) **to completely fulfill it** (*pleroo* – to proclaim and complete it, providing the true meaning and thinking, to liberally supply, carrying out, accomplishing, and rendering it totally and perfectly). (5:17)

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

Therefore (*oun* – indeed and as a result), **whoever may** (*hos ean* – if at any time anyone introduces a contingency or condition whereby the individual) **dismiss or attempt to do away with** (*luo* – may seek to toss aside, invalidate, or abolish, tearing away or asunder) **one of the** (*mian ton*) **smallest and least important of these** (*houtos ton elachistos*) **prescriptions and instructions which are enjoined** (*entole* – rules, regulations, and authorized directions, precepts, and teachings), **and** (*kai*) **he may instruct or indoctrinate** (*didasko* – he might teach, delivering moralizing discourses while conceiving and instilling doctrine, expounding or explaining so as to enjoin) **people** (*anthropos* – humanity or mankind) **in this manner** (*houto* – thusly and likewise), **he will actually be called by the name and will be judicially 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* – a.k.a., Paulos, which means small, inadequate, and insignificant, scarce and insufficient, irrelevant and unimportant, of no consequence, immaterial, and inconsequential (*Paulos*, the Latin name Sha’uwl adopted as his own means “*elachistos* – lowly

and little)) **in the kingdom of heaven** (*en te basileia ton ouranos* – by, within, among, and with regard to the reign and royal authority of the heavens).

And then (*de* – but by contrast), **whosoever** (*hos an*) **might act upon it** (*poieomai* – may engage through it, making the most of it, attempting to carry out its assigned tasks (aorist active subjunctive)), **teaching it** (*didasko* – trying to provide and share its instructions, expounding upon it), **this individual** (*houtos* – these things) **will properly be referred to and named** (*kaleo* – it will be judiciously and appropriately called and designated) **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).” (Mattanyah / Yahowah’s Gift / Matthew 5:19)

While Yahowsha’ spoke to His audience in Hebrew, the translation of His Instruction on the Mount begins using “*me nomizomai*” in the aorist active subjunctive, which is “an express prohibition against accepting what will become a commonly held belief.” In this tense and mood, this “is something so wrong we should not allow ourselves to even begin to think this way, no matter how popular or prevalent this sentiment is within our society.” Therefore, Yahowsha’ was telling us that so many people would embrace the myth that Sha’uwl has been promoting that his justification and supposition would ultimately become commonly held, customary, presumed settled, and regarded established throughout the world. And yet it was absolutely and irrefutably wrong to assume that Yahowsha’ came to invalidate any aspect of the Towrah, as Paul was claiming.

Kataluo is an unequivocal term in this context – and it is repeated twice. It means that a person is in irreconcilable conflict with the Ma’aseyah Yahowsha’ if they are of the opinion that His life in any way invalidates, subverts, sidesteps, abrogates, weakens, abolishes, or dismisses any aspect of the Towrah. And that means that the terms and conditions of the Covenant remain in effect and must be acted upon to participate in a relationship with God. That means that Yahowah is still inviting us to attend the same Meetings, expecting us to respond to Him if we desire immortality, vindication, adoption, enrichment, and empowerment. That means that the Towrah and its Covenant have not been replaced. That means that everything Paul has said is wrong. Believe this insignificant man, and you will die.

The most common Christian dismissal of God’s unequivocal statement is to suggest that “*pleroo* – to completely fulfill” somehow means “to do away with” as opposed to “doing what one has promised.” But twice in this very same statement, Yahowsha’ told us by using *kataluo* that this interpretation was in irreconcilable conflict with His explanation of His life. Moreover, last time I

checked, the universe and the earth still exists. So we can count on the fact that every promise, every prediction, every direction and inspiration in the Towrah is going to remain true. This is what makes God so reliable.

Eliminating any potential for misunderstanding, Yahowsha' was extraordinarily specific, telling us that not so much as the smallest Hebrew letter, a Yowd, which not-so-coincidentally is the first letter in His name, nor even the smallest stroke of the lines which comprise the Hebrew letters, which comprise the Hebrew words, of the Hebrew Towrah, would be disregarded, then, now, or in the future. Therefore, no matter how limited one perceives Paul's global attack on the Yahowah's Towrah to be, it is now impossible to reconcile it with Yahowsha's statement. As a result of Yahowsha's specificity, we are compelled to conclude that Paul lied when he claimed to be authorized by God, no matter how tortured the justification.

Incidentally, the reason that the validity of the smallest strokes and letters which currently comprise the Towrah wasn't presented in Yahowah's customary fashion in reference to His Towrah Teaching and Guidance, which is to call these things eternal and everlasting, is because the words which comprise the current Towrah do, in fact, have a limited life. By the end of the Millennial Shabat in year 7000 Yah (3033 CE), there will be no need for the Towrah's Teachings regarding how to come to know Yahowah, nor His Directions on how to engage in the Covenant relationship, even His Guidance on how to walk to Him by answering His Invitations, because by this time every soul will have taken advantage of Yahowah's Instructions. We will all know Him, be members of His Covenant, and be recipients of every promised benefit. At that time, as we watch our Heavenly Father create a new universe, we will still require His "*towrah* – guidance," but then on how to live the most productive and enjoyable lives in the spiritual realm where our power will be unlimited.

Yahowsha's second to last statement is confusing for some. There is a tendency to translate "*kaleo*, he will be called" "insignificant" as opposed to "he will be named" "Little and Lowly," i.e., Paulos, in the kingdom of heaven. The former seems to imply that this insufficient individual is in heaven, but holds a lowly status, while the latter reveals the individual's personal and proper name, as well as describing heaven's utter disdain for Paulos. Not only is there no hierarchy, therefore, status, in heaven, since we are family, lowly and little is Paulos chosen name, the name of the individual best known for having done specifically what Yahowsha' condemned.

Remember, Paul, which is a transliteration of the Latin "Paulos," meaning "little and lowly," was born with the Hebrew name "Sha'owl," a name which is synonymous with She'owl and means "to question." But since this man despised being questioned, he abandoned his given name and chose to speak and write as

Paulos. Further, Paulos isn't a transliteration or translation of Sha'awl, but is instead a Roman moniker. And since it means "little and lowly," it would be foolish to ignore this "coincidence," especially since Paulos founded the world's most popular religion by doing the very thing Yahowsha' admonished us not to do.

From the opposing perspective, those who do the opposite of what Paulos said and did, who act upon the Towrah, and who to the best of their ability teach the Towrah, expounding upon it, their contribution to Yahowah's Covenant family is called great, even important. It isn't that those who do so hold some sort of elevated status, but instead it is their willingness to engage with God and share His instructions which is seen as uncommon, both astonishingly valuable and sensible.

It is also interesting to note that many, if not most, of the prophecies presented in the Torah are yet unfulfilled. Yahowsha' has not returned. Yisra'el and Yahuw'dym have not been reconciled. The Millennial Sabbath has not commenced. The Towrahless One, or "Antichrist," has not yet been manifest. The Tribulation has not occurred. Neither the Magog nor Armageddon wars have been waged. The promises associated with the final three *Miqra'ey* – *Taruw'ah*, *Kippurym*, and *Sukah* – have not been enabled. Therefore, the Torah could not have ended its useful life, even if such a thing was possible, 2,000 years ago. Paul is wrong on all accounts.



Returning to the anti-Towrah diatribe being promoted by the little and lowly one, I must admit, his next statement is somewhat confusing. We are required to speculate on what he is attempting to convey. And based upon the most popular and respected translations, I'm not the first to go down this winding road.

“But now (*de*) the mediator and middleman (*o mesites* – one who intervenes and either reconciles an existing relationship or creates a new covenant (singular/masculine)), he is (*estin* – exists) not (*ouk*) of one (*heis* – of a single thing or lone individual), but (*de*) the God (*o ΘΣ*) he is (*estin* – he exists as) one (*heis*).” (Galatians 3:20)

The interlinear associated with the Nestle-Aland 27th Edition reads: **“The but mediator one not is the but God one is.”** In the King James Version, we find: **“Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.”** Jerome wrote the following in the Latin Vulgate: **“Now a mediator is not of one, yet God is one.”** The NLT suggests: **“Now a mediator is helpful if more than one party must reach**

an agreement. But God, who is one, did not use a mediator when he gave his promise to Abraham.” The self-proclaimed literal New American Standard Bible published: “Now a mediator is not for one *party only*; whereas God is *only* one.” To their credit, they used italics to indicate that “*party only*” and “*only*” were not written in the Greek text. The New International Version, an extremely popular paraphrase, conveys: “A mediator, however, does not represent just one party; but God is one.”

As an eternal optimist, I’m wont to derive something sensible, even if Paul’s sentiments are all wrong. So, here is my best shot. I suppose Sha’uwl may be trying to say that his “mediator and middleman” is going to create new covenants for many, unlike the old god who is limited to one. As such, Paul’s reconciler “may not exist as a diminished manifestation of God who is one.” Perhaps even, since a mediator exists to reconcile differences between parties, Paul’s middleman came expressly to conceive more accommodating covenants. But admittedly, I am guessing, something a person would not be expected to do if they were reading words which were actually inspired by God.

While this extrapolation of Paul’s last point is not clear, it is clearly inaccurate. It is a given that Paulos has not specified the nature of the undisclosed “promise” he alleges an unnamed god privately made to Abram, or how he became privy to it. But now he is saying that Yahowah’s Towrah, which describes every known aspect of this relationship and this man, is not only contrary to, but is actually opposed to a supposed promise made by the same God to this same individual. It is one thing for Paul to errantly claim that Yahowah’s Towrah, which is the lone reservoir of information pertaining to the conversations which were pursuant to the Covenant is irrelevant, but to call the Constitution of the Covenant “opposed to” the promises of that Covenant is a giant stride closer to She’owl, and to eternal separation from God.

“Indeed (*oun* – therefore and consequently), **the** (*o*) **Torah** (*nomos* – that which has been assigned to nourish and provide an inheritance) **accordingly is against** (*kata* – is contrary to) **the** (*tou*) **promises** (*epaggelia* – the announcements (this time plural)) **of the God** (*tou* ΘU). **Not may it become** (*me ginomai* – it could but shouldn’t exist (the optative mood is used by a writer to portray an action as possible or to express a wish or desire)).

For (*gar*) **if** (*ei* – per chance) **had been given** (*didomi* – had been produced, granted, allowed, and appointed) **the Torah** (*nomos* – the source of nourishment and inheritance) **to be the one with the power and ability** (*o dynamai* – the capacity and resources) **to impart life** (*zoopoieo* – to make alive), **certainly** (*ontos* – surely and truly) **in** (*en*) **the Torah** (*nomos* – that which has been assigned to nourish and provide an inheritance) **would** (*an*) **be** (*en*) **the** (*o*) **righteous and vindicated** (*dikaiosyne* – upright who are right and acceptable,

approved in the correct relationship).” (Galatians 3:21) (While the more popular and recently compiled Greek manuscripts have *ek*, meaning “out of,” rather than *en*, meaning “in,” before the last reference to the Torah, as is found in P46, it really doesn’t make much difference.)

Once again, Paulos has stumbled over his own tongue. The same fellow who was fixated on the irrelevant notion that “*zera*’ – seed” was singular, now can’t remember if there was one promise or many promises. And while “promises” is the correct answer, Paulos has shown a decided proclivity for “promise” singular, which is invalid. But either way, such inconsistencies on something that drives to the heart of his message is incriminating.

For those who may suggest that Paul is annulling his own conclusion that the Towrah is in opposition to its promises, by saying “Not may it become,” please note that the optative mood was deployed to convey one of two ideas, neither of which serve as a refutation of the preceding comment. Paul was either saying that “this opposition was distinctly possible,” or that “he wishes that this opposition wasn’t so.” And both positions are in conflict with the testimony of Yahowah and Yahowsha’.

And yet what follows is far worse. Paulos is stating emphatically that there is no one who is righteous or vindicated in or by the Towrah because the Towrah does not have the ability or power to impart life.

Au contraire, it only by observing and acting upon the Towrah’s guidance regarding *Pesach* and *Matsah* that we become righteous and live. The God of the Towrah is the Author of life, its Designer and Creator. And the God of the Towrah is our Savior, the only one who can absolve our sins.

Paul is once again saying that Yahowah’s Towrah is inept. In direct contradiction to God’s personal involvement and testimony, according to this man, God’s Guidance and example cannot fulfill His Passover and Un-Yeasted Bread promises, delivering life or vindication. But if this is true, nothing was accomplished by the Lamb of God, rendering the crucifixion nothing more than a gruesome spectacle. And who knows why God even bothered with *Matsah*. I suppose He took the day off work, slumbering in the tomb.

If there is no power to prolong life or to facilitate righteousness in the Towrah, why did Yahowah promise these things to Abraham? Why did He save Lot from Sodom? Why did He rescue His children from bondage in Egypt? Why is Yahowsha’s Kingdom equated to the Kingdom of Dowd / David, and why was Dowd declared righteous? Do you suppose that Yahowah is going to model His eternal reign after someone both flawed and dead? Where is Enoch? Where is Elijah? Where is Moseh? Why did Yahowsha’ equate all that was good, valuable, and reliable with Moseh?

Or better question yet, suppose it was actually possible for man to kill God, how does God dying save man? What made Yahowsha' perfect? How could Yahowsha' be perfect if He lied about the Towrah? Was it just a cosmic coincidence that Yahowsha's sacrifice happened to coincide perfectly with Passover, Un-Yeasted Bread, First-Born Child, and Seven Sabbaths in the Yowbel Year of 4000 Yah? What enabled the reunification of Yahowsha's soul with Yahowah's Spirit on the morning of the third day if not the Towrah's promises regarding *Bikuwrym*?

Said another way, if believing a promise to vindicate was all one had to do to be saved, why was Yahowsha' required to become the Passover Lamb and then spend the Shabat fulfilling Unleavened Bread?

Or perhaps you prefer this question: if the God who authored the Towrah cannot be trusted, if He is incompetent and impotent, then why would you believe this man who claims to speak for Him?

Paul's most recent diatribe is part of a long argument, one that started in earnest a half-dozen statements ago. His is a clever ploy, a disingenuous maneuver designed to bypass the Torah, moving directly from an undisclosed promise to our salvation—with nothing in between, including an explanation, a relationship, or a depiction of God's plan. Paul's purpose has been to put a wall around the Torah, telling his audience that they can and must discard it.

But if you toss away the Torah, you discard any chance to know God, to engage in a relationship with Him, or to be saved. It is such a costly decision, it's a shame that so many do it without a thought. And perhaps, just perhaps, that is what Paul and his spiritual advisor wanted.

In direct contradiction of Yahowsha's Instruction on the Mount, Sha'owl is overtly annulling the Torah's power to restore and to prolong life. In direct contradiction to God's Word, he is bluntly proclaiming that no one was considered righteous and thus saved from the time Adam was expelled from the Garden to the time the middleman died. If he's right, Yahowah is wrong, because He called Dowd / David righteous and promised to do the same for every child of the Covenant. For Paul to be right, Moseh is estranged from God. If Paul is correct, the Exodus was a hoax—nothing but a cruel charade. Even Yahowah's prophets were played.

So are we to accept Paul's assessment and thereby believe that the same God who came to earth in the form of a man to save men was so sadistic prior to that time that He conceived a plan in which everyone was destined to fail? Were Yahowah's instructions regarding His seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with Him a complete waste of time? Were the Miqra'ey for naught? And if so, why did Yahowsha' fulfill them?

Perhaps it was Paul who created the monster that became Marcion, rather than Marcion conceiving the legend that became Paul. Marcion just wanted to write Yahowah, Yahuwdym, and Yisra'el out of His canon. Paul wants to demean and demote them.

Despite the claims made in the King James Version, the Latin Vulgate, and the New Living Translation, God's title does not appear in this Greek text once, much less twice. Moreover, there is no basis for a question, much less an answer. But so that you come to appreciate just how divergent these supposed "translations" are from the Greek text, let's begin our review by considering the Nestle-Aland Interlinear: "The then law against the promises of the God. Not may it become. If for had been given law the one being able to make live really from law (not applicable) was the rightness."

Now, compare that to the KJV: "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." Or the Latin Vulgate upon which it was based: "So then, was the law contrary to the promises of God? (*Lex ergo adversus promissa Dei?*) Let it not be so! For if a *lex*/law had been given, which was able to give life, truly justice would be of the *lege*/law." And now, the New Living Translation which contradicts itself: "Is there a conflict, then, between God's law and God's promises? Absolutely not! If the law could give us new life, we could be made right with God by obeying it." The fact that these three translations agree with one another and disagree with the Greek text demonstrates that they are revisions of one another. Publishers are businessmen and they know familiarity sells.

Struggling to make sense of what Paul was trying to portray to his audience has become exasperating, especially since his message has been so un-Godly. Therefore, the time has come to consistently introduce each subsequent statement by providing a scholarly frame of reference. We are going to use the Nestle-Aland 27th Edition McReynolds Interlinear—today's most trusted textual resource—as a handrail in Paul's inverted world. So please consider their rendition of Galatians 3:22: "But closed together the writing the all under sin that the promise from trust of Jesus Christ might be given to the ones trusting."

I don't claim that this is any clearer, but it is more precise and complete. "To the contrary (*alla* – certainly and emphatically by way of a contrast), the (*o*) writing (*graphe* – usually used to designate the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms) imposed restrictions, encircling, trapping, and enclosing (*sugkleio* –has trapped fish caught in a net, restricting and confining, binding and locking up prisoners, hemming them in on all sides, completely shutting up) of everything (*ta pas*) under (*hupo* – because of and under the control of) error and evil (*hamartia* – sin, disinheritance, wandering away from the path, missing the mark,

and wrong-doing) **in order that** (*hina*) **the** (*e*) **promise** (*epangelia* (singular)) **from** (*ek*) **the Faith** (*pistis* – the Belief or Religion) **of Iesou Christou** (IHY XY – placeholders for Yahowsha’ and Ma’aseyah whose association with Yahowah Sha’uwl has severed) **might at some time be passively given to** (*didomi* – the possibility exists that it may be granted without the recipient engaging or without a plan, being bestowed without reference to time to (aorist passive subjunctive)) **the believers** (*tois pisteuo* – the faithful, i.e., the ones who believe Sha’uwl).” (Galatians 3:22)

Beyond his vacillation over whether there were promises, or just one promise (after saying that there were “promises” in 3:21, there is just one “promise” in 3:22), there are six significant problems with this statement. First, *sugkleio* speaks of “netting fish,” and “trapping and imprisoning people, binding and tying them up.” It is from *sun*, “with,” and *kleio*, “to shut a door and withhold something, making access inaccessible.” To be *sugkleio* is “to be devoid of pity,” and “to obstruct the entrance to heaven.” And here, Sha’uwl is saying: “The writing (a.k.a., the written Towrah) closes the door, blocks the entrance, and makes heaven inaccessible, trapping everyone in a net as if they were fish.” He is calling God’s Word “a trap and a prison.” And as bad as that is, he will connect *sugkleio* with “*phroureo* – held in custody as a prisoner” in the next verse, exacerbating this overt denunciation of Yahowah’s Towrah.

Second, the Towrah does not “encircle or enclose” “evil,” but instead protects us from evil, removing it from our souls, literally erasing the stain, while at the same time insulating us from its consequence. The implication here is that the Towrah is a pit or trap into which all evil flows.

Third, since Paul has said that there is no correlation between the unspecified promise / promises and the Towrah, it is irrational to say that the same Towrah exists in order to provide the alleged promise or promises. He is contradicting himself, something Yahowsha’ condemned other Rabbis for doing during His attack on them in Mattanyah 23.

Fourth, there is no “faith of Iesou Christou.” Yahowsha’ did not have or promote a religion. He claimed to be the living embodiment of the Towrah. He was resolutely Towrah observant. He consistently affirmed what Yahowah had previously written. He did not add anything new.

Fifth, with complete knowledge and understanding, “faith” is nonsensical. Yahowsha’ cannot be God and believe. If He requires faith, He is no longer God.

Sixth, the problem with faith is that it is always uncertain, which is why “*didomi* – the possibility exists that it might be passively given to those who do nothing at some time without reference to a plan” was scribed in the aorist passive subjunctive. Who and what are the faithful to believe? If the promise was

singular, and represented the Ma'aseyah, what were the promises? Why weren't the promises recorded in the Towrah? Why trust the verbal, unspecified promises of the God of the Towrah when His written testimony is unreliable? How do the promises save? To whom and to what are the faithful being saved?

How can anyone in his or her right mind place their faith in a man who is quasi-literate, who is constantly contradicting himself, who misrepresents the facts, who is often irrational, and who is demeaning the God for whom he claims to speak?

Since the dearth of evidence in Paul's epistles makes "trust and reliance" impossible, he obviously meant to convey "faith" and "believing" and, thereby, establish his Faith on believing: **"To the contrary, emphatically and certainly, the writing 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."**

Christian translations agree. KJV: "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." LV: "But *Scriptura*/Scripture has enclosed everything under sin, so that the promise, by the faith of Iesu Christi, might be given to those who believe (*ut promissio ex fide Iesu Christi daretur credentibus*)."

Writing their own epistle, the NLT proposed: "But the Scriptures declare that we are all prisoners of sin, so we receive God's promise of freedom only by believing in Jesus Christ." While it is obvious that these renderings diverge somewhat from Paul's script, the task of deciphering the wannabe Apostle is even more difficult than translating him.

So even if we were to limit *sugkleio* to "enclose and restrict," the Torah is not a vessel filled with "error or evil." The Ma'aseyah Yahowsha' had no faith and no religion. And belief is completely irrelevant to our salvation.

Moving on, please consider the difficulty the Nestle-Aland Interlinear had with the following text before reading my attempt to decipher Paul's subsequent message. "Before the but to come the trust under law we were being guarded being closed together for the being about trust to be uncovered." While I'm sympathetic to the etymological reasons why the most respected Greek textual resource consistently renders the term upon which the Galatians debate pivots, *pistis*, as "trust," as opposed to "faith," every word Paul writes dictates that this was not what he intended.

Sha'awl's next derogatory statement actually speaks of the coming of faith, which is tantamount to the formation of his religion:

“But (de) before (pro) this (tou), to come (erchomai – to go, to move, to become, or to happen) the (ten) Faith (pistis – Belief), under (hupo – by, because of, and under the control of) the Towrah (nomou – that which has been assigned to nourish and provide an inheritance (accusative case making it a direct object of the verb)), we were actually being held in custody as prisoners (phroureo – we were being kept as prisoners, confined, strictly controlled, with guards in opposition to us (imperfect passive indicative)), restricted and trapped (sugkleio – bound and imprisoned, netted and confined, locked up and out) to (eis) the (ten) being about (mello – typically the intended or impending future expectation or hope, but this was scribed in the present tense) of the Faith (pistis – Belief, a.k.a., Religion) was revealed (apokalypto – uncovered, disclosed, and unveiled).” (Galatians 3:23)

To say that Sha’uwl and Yahowah didn’t see things the same way would be the understatement of the millennia. *Phroureo* is accurately translated “we were actually being held in custody as prisoners.” However, based upon the compound of “*pro* – before” and “*horao* – seeing,” Paul is inferring that the Towrah’s prisoners were kept in the dark and blind, but now, as a result of his testimony, the faithful are able to see what those incarcerated by God missed.

And yet the overriding problem with all of this, beyond of course demeaning Yahowah and annulling His Towrah testimony, is that Paul never explains the basis of the unspecified promise. There are no conditions. Therefore, faith is wholly ambiguous. As a result, what a person believes becomes irrelevant. There are no rules, no guidelines, no consequences, no right or wrong, no definitions of what is good or bad, and no absolutes or certainties. An individual’s conception of god, their god’s purpose and will, even their god’s means to honor his promises, as well as what these promises might portend for those who believe such a nebulous being, are all undisclosed and thus must be immaterial. The believer is able to imagine their own deity, their own belief system, their own definition of righteousness, and even project their own caveats upon what is expected and what life with their deity might be like. With Paul’s faith, everyone is entitled to their own interpretation of god, of faith, of life, and of salvation. And no one’s interpretation can be any better or worse than another’s. But then, what basis is there to believe anything this little and lowly man contrived? How is it that under such a scenario, he can be right and those who oppose him be wrong?

The answer to this question is actually obvious. Paul’s god has been conceived in Paul’s image. To know Paul is to know “the mediator.” Paul is “the seed.” He is the source of “the promise.” Everything comes to a full stop with Paul. That is why he prefers “promise” to “promises.” Yahowah has been emasculated and Yahowsha’ has been castrated. We have been left with little more than: “but I say...”

But alas, if only that was the sum total of Paul's letters. If he had crafted his religion out of a new and whole cloth rather than removing, re-coloring, and re-weaving threads which had formed the fabric of the Towrah, he would have fooled far fewer people and done far less damage.

Also, since "but before the arrival of the 'trust'" is awkward, and "the arrival of the 'faith'" is a natural fit, this is yet another affirmation that Sha'awl intended *pistis* to convey its present religious connotation—something further advanced by his final clause. Paul's faith was built upon the ruins of the Torah, the only document which can be universally trusted.

And how, pray tell, has "being about faith" been "revealed?" Since we have been told that the testimony which actually revealed and accurately predicted every aspect of Yahowsha' life was wholly opposed to this new faith, where is the substance of Paul's beliefs?

Keep in mind, the Ma'aseyah Yahowsha', who was revealed to us as promised by Yahowah, bears nothing in common with Sha'awl's arbitrary and imaginary conception. Sha'awl does not provide a biography by which to know Yahowsha'. He does not quote Yahowsha'. And Sha'awl has been at war with those who actually knew Him, condemning the Prophets and the Disciples. So I ask you, how has the seed, the mediator, the promise, been revealed?

Most people would recognize that there would be no benefit of believing that Dionysus died for our sins, acting as a mediator to save believers. So since Pauline Christianity is modeled upon Dionysus, having far more in common with his cult than with Yahowsha', and since Paul attributes Dionysus' most famous quote to his Iesus, why would there be any reason for Yahowah to save those who have mistaken Him for a pagan god? Might Yahowah have answered this question when He said that the deceitful and broad way associated with Sha'awl was a plague of death?

Here are the Christian interpretations of Galatians 3:23. KJV: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." LV: "But before the faith arrived, we were preserved by being enclosed under the *lege*/law, unto that faith which was to be revealed." NLT: "Before the way of faith in Christ was available to us, we were placed under guard by the law. We were kept in protective custody, so to speak, until the way of faith was revealed." In this case, the English translations aren't nearly as harsh as the words Sha'awl selected. But, based upon what has and will be said, this accommodation isn't deserved. We are about to meet Paul's "guardians and taskmasters."

Even though the next verse is part of this same paragraph, it began so long ago, a quick review is in order.

“Because if out of the Towrah, the inheritance is no longer from promise, but to the Abram by promise of God, He has forgiven and pleased. (3:18) Then, therefore, why the Towrah? [*Of the transgressions of violations and overstepping, because of the favor and pleasure, it was continued and added to*] Until the seed which might come to whom it has been promised having been commanded by spiritual messengers in the hand and control of a mediator or middleman. (3:19) But now, the mediator, he is not of one, but the god, he is one. (3:20)

Indeed, consequently, the Torah accordingly is against the promises of the god. Not may it become (although it might be, even though I don’t want it to be). For if, per chance, 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. (3:21)

But to the contrary, the writing 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. (3:22) But before the arrival 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 the Faith was revealed.” (Galatians 3:23)



Before we press on, now that the text of the *Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear* is being provided as a handrail with considerable regularity, and now typically in advance of the more complete and accurate amplified translations, I’d like to explain the process deployed in rendering one of Paul’s statements. First, I’ll evaluate it as it appears in a reputable and scholastic presentation like the Nestle-Aland 27th Edition. If there is a pre-Constantine codex, I compare the older version to the more modern text. Then I examine every word under an etymological microscope, even those with which I am totally familiar (so I don’t become complacent), consulting a variety of lexicons and dictionaries, in order that all possible shadings are considered, including tenses, voices, and moods, in addition to word order and the deployment of pronouns, conjunctions, articles, and prepositions. Then I share a more fully amplified rendition of what Sha’uwl wrote, always sharing his choice of words so that curious readers can verify their etymological ancestry for themselves.

Next, I reorder some of the words as is required to transfer the thoughts they convey into the structure of English grammar. At this point, I check verb tenses and other grammatical references a second time, and then complete the translation with an eye on the surrounding text. And as a rule, I try to render each additional statement so that it is as consistent as is possible with the overall message being delineated.

Then, if the etymology of a word exceeds what can comfortably be placed within the sentence itself, or even inside a parenthetical devoted to the word's meanings, without the text being overly verbose and thus confusing, I'll write a separate descriptive paragraph on the most interesting words. And then I strive to share whatever the Spirit reveals to me regarding the statement's veracity and implications, adding those insights into my commentary. Lastly, when a statement is complete, I'll go back and attempt to introduce it in such a way that the transitions are clear and intent is readily evident.

So while I've devoted more than a year of my life to do this as accurately and fairly as possible, this current Pauline argument has been so antagonistic toward Yahowah's Towrah, on my first pass through this material, I simply translated each statement and moved on, hoping that the next line would help modify the previous one. But nothing seemed to help. So in my struggle to deal with writings this hostile to Yahowah and Yahowsha', whom I love and respect, I decided that you were entitled to an independent witness. Therefore, I've consistently provided interlinear translations so that you would not be dependent upon my translations alone. I have long ceased to be impartial. And this is why I have been sharing three additional English bible renditions, recognizing that the case against Paul is made by those who he beguiled.

Initially, my hope was to extricate Sha'uwl from the pit it has now become evident that he dug for himself. But since Paul's letter made that impossible, I have taken sides – and so has God.

The bottom line is: I am very uncomfortable with what Sha'uwl is saying. Therefore, I'm lessening the burden this places on me by exposing you to the translations of others who are not bothered by him. For example, the Nestle-Aland Interlinear presentation of the next line in Galatians reads: “So that the law tutor of us has become to Christ that from trust we might be made right.”

In comparison to that, this almost seems sane: “**As a result** (*hoste* – so then therefore), **the** (*o*) **Towrah** (*nomos* – the allotment which is parceled out to bestow and inheritance) **has come to exist as** (*ginomai* – has become) **our** (*ego*) **disciplinarian** (*paidagogos* – pedagogue who instructs in a particularly pedantic and dogmatic manner using strict, old-fashioned methods, with an overbearing demeanor as slave-trainer of adolescent boys, an enslaving guardian, a custodian

who keeps trainees in custody, a harsh and arcane taskmaster, or controlling supervisor of little children, often of those who were enslaved, striking, smiting, and stinging them) **extending until** (*eis* – to the point of) **Christon** (XPN – placeholder for the Ma’aseyah (but without the definite article it’s obvious that Sha’uwl meant Christon to represent a name, not a title)) **in order that** (*hina* – so that as a result), **by means of** (*ek* – out of) **the Faith** (*pistos* – the Belief or Religion (in the singular genitive, this is a specific characterization of belief system, a.k.a., religion)), **we might, at some point in time, while doing nothing ourselves, be justified** (*dikaioo* – we have the possibility of someday being vindicated, declared innocent, and becoming righteous as a result of being influenced (aorist, passive, subjunctive).” (Galatians 3:24)

The unflattering metaphor which lies at the heart of this sentence provides us with a window into Sha’uwl’s mind. From his perspective, the Torah is a “*paidagogos* – tough disciplinarian lording over us as if we were slaves.” The concept, not surprisingly, was a loanword from rabbinic usage. The term carries a decidedly negative connotation, and is distinguished from a teacher in that the *paidagogos* is only responsible for mundane behaviors, such as the rules regulating conduct, some as trivial as table manners.

Up to this point, Sha’uwl has promoted his case for his Faith by misquoting, truncating, twisting, dismantling, dissolving, and demeaning the Torah. There has been no reason to delve into the realm of Rabbinical commentary, Greek or Roman society, or into the use of slaves. But since Paulos has now gone down this path, we are compelled to reveal pertinent failings.

In the rabbinical mindset, a *paidagogos* “directed the affairs of children,” and was used to describe “slaves who supervised and directed the lives and moral conduct of adolescent boys.” It is from *pais* and a repudiated form of *ago*. *Pais* means: “a child, especially a young boy or adolescent, who is often a servant and slave.” It is in turn derived from *paio*, meaning “to strike or smite, to wound and sting.” *Ago* and its cognate, *agoge*, mean “to conduct training and discipline, to be an attendant or servant, and to lead away,” even to “impel or force, influencing the mind.” This root speaks of “leading someone away to the magistrate at a criminal court.”

Therefore, especially considering the Rabbinic baggage, *paidagogos* is in lockstep with Sha’uwl’s tortured perspective on the Towrah. In his view, God, as the “Taskmaster,” is a “Pedagogue: someone who instructs in a particularly pedantic and dogmatic manner using strict, old-fashioned methods, with an overbearing demeanor, always ready to smite those He has enslaved if they dare step out of line.” Paul is then positioning himself, and his Faith, as less constraining and overbearing, as more modern, more compassionate, more tolerant, more generous, and freeing. Nothing is asked, nothing is expected,

nothing is required, and nothing except the Torah is wrong. But unfortunately, also nothing is accomplished.

If, as Paulos is asserting, Yahowah and His Towrah are antiquated and arcane, the logical extension would be to label His old-fashioned methods the “Old Testament.” And then through similar extrapolation, why not label Paul’s more modern, less judgmental, and more universally tolerant, politically correct and outcome-based approach a “New Testament.”

And speaking of Paul’s influence in the conception of the Christian “New Testament,” a tome his letters dominate, as a result of the faith-based salvation scheme he conceived, a belief system emerged, one where the initiates can only hope that at some undisclosed point in time there is the possibility that something favorable might happen to them. Pretending to step forward, the religious have been taken back to the myths and mysteries of old. It would be a leap of faith into obscurity, uncertainty, and ignorance. To which Yahowah says, **“My people are destroyed for lack of knowing and understanding. Because you have rejected knowledge and understanding, I reject you from being ministers for Me. Since you have forgotten the Towrah of your God, I also will forget your children.”**

The *paidagogos* were not associated with schools, or with learning, but instead with harsh discipline, so the KJV would be wrong with “schoolmaster.” “Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.” LV: “*Itaque lex pædagogus noster fuit in Christo, ut ex fide iustificemur.*” “And so the law was our guardian in Christ, in order that we might be justified by faith.” NLT: “Let me put it another way. The law was our guardian until Christ came; it protected us until we could be made right with God through faith.” There is no basis for “it protected us” in the Greek text.

Even if we were to deprive *paidagogos* of its arcane cultural baggage, we’d be left to resolve a whole new set of issues raised in Sha’uwl’s next sentence. When you start with a bad metaphor, things go from bad to worse. Such is the case with this, “Having come but the trust no longer under tutor we are,” as it was rendered in the Nestle Aland.

“But now (de) having come (erchomai – having happened and become, coming forth and arriving) the (tes) Faith (pistos – the system of belief or religion), no longer (ouketi – not any more) do we exist (eimi – are we placed) under (hypo –under the auspices of) an old fashioned and strict disciplinarian (paidagogos – a pedagogue who instructs in a particularly pedantic and dogmatic manner using harsh, old-dated methods, with an overbearing demeanor, an antiquated taskmaster enslaving children by striking, smiting, and stinging them).” (Galatians 3:25)

In other words, “believers have been liberated from the supervision, control, discipline, and even instruction of the Torah.” There are no rules, no requirements, no directions, from God. He no longer cares what you think of Him, what you believe, how you act, or what you do. Since there is no longer a right way, there are no wrong ways. Every path, so long as it is nebulous and unrestrictive, now leads to Paul’s god.

In Sha’uwl’s religion, Yahowah’s Towrah “no longer exists” as a meaningful guide. In his Faith, man’s fate is no longer linked to the path that God provided. According to Sha’uwl, the Torah is passé; its dominion is over—it is an encumbering and hurtful icon of the past. Goodbye and good riddance.

So let’s see if the most influential Christian translations followed their leader down this ungodly dead end. KJV: “But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.” LV: “But now that faith has arrived, we are no longer under a guardian.” NLT: “And now that the way of faith has come, we no longer need the law as our guardian.”

Since the “schoolmaster and guardian” represent the Torah, according to Paulos, we are no longer living in God’s world. The Almighty is neither teacher nor instructor. There is nothing we can learn from His “*Towrah – Teaching.*” Since He is no longer guiding His children, we cannot follow Him. And because His example is now outdated, we cannot benefit from His work. Yahowah is no longer an influence in our lives. But if that is so, who is?

Paul’s message in Galatians 3:25 isn’t salvageable. For the “*paidagogos – guardian or disciplinarian*” metaphor to work, the one who leads us as little children to our Heavenly Father has to be Yahowsha’—the Word made flesh. But since our salvation cannot be independent of Him, the second half of the statement is invalid. Moreover, Yahowsha’ is inseparable and indistinguishable from the Towrah and from Yahowah, a reality in irreconcilable conflict with Sha’uwl’s new belief system.

The best possible spin that can be put on this is to say that Sha’uwl might be saying that while the Torah may have led us, however harshly, to the point where we could embrace the Faith, its value ends once we have done so. And that means that Yahowah’s life-saving advice is suddenly beneath believers. But how is it that Paul’s Faith can soar above the Word of God?

Beyond this realization, how is anyone going to grow in a relationship with our Heavenly Father without solid food, without devouring the Word of God, without being nourished by God? The fact is, Yahowsha’, Himself, explained His entire life from the perspective of the Torah and Prophets. According to Him, observing what they reveal is the only way to understand and capitalize upon who He is, what He said, and what He did.

While there are many reasons to be troubled by Sha'awl's *paidagogos* metaphor, it isn't one which helps Christendom either. Pastors and priests present themselves, as well as their churches, as if they were still the guardians, supervisors, and teachers" of their flock, as opposed to Yahowsha' having lived that role. So all they have done is substituted themselves for the Torah, and thereby, they have become their own god. It is exactly what Rabbi Akiba, the founder of modern Judaism, did when he empowered rabbis above an unnamed god. As was the case with Paul, so it was with Akiba. One replaced the Towrah with a "New Testament" comprised of his letters, while the other replaced the Towrah with a "Talmud" comprised of his arguments.

Before we press on, a little perspective is in order. Mired in the midst of the third chapter of Galatians, we are discovering that almost nothing Paul has written has been true. And the remainder of what he has scribed is either incomprehensible or irrelevant. Therefore, one has to be ignorant of what Paul wrote, or irrational, to think of Galatians as being inspired by God. By claiming it as such, your god becomes an unknowable, vacillating, inconsistent, unreliable, and incomprehensible mirage.

This next line, removed from this abysmal context, would offer a glimmer of hope had Paul meant *pisteos* to say "trust and reliance" instead of it announcing "the Faith." And while that is what the word meant at the time he wrote this epistle, that connotation isn't permissible in the context of Galatians. As we have come to realize, Paul hasn't provided any evidence for the reader to rely upon. And he has relentlessly assailed the Torah—the world's only source of universal truth.

Still clinging to the original meaning of *pisteos*, while rejecting the original title and name of the Ma'aseyah Yahowsha', the NA reads: "**All for sons of God you are through the trust in Christ Jesus.**" So then more precisely and completely, this is what Sha'awl wrote:

"For (gar – indeed because) all (pas) sons (huios – children) of God (ΘY), you all exist (este – you all are) by way (dia – through and on account) of the (tes) Faith (pisteos – belief system or religion in the singular genitive specific characterization) in (en) Christo Iesou (XPY IHY – placeholders for the Ma'aseyah Yahowsha' which Sha'awl overtly disassociates from Yahowah)." (Galatians 3:26)

Trust is not possible if no evidence is provided to demonstrate that the Ma'aseyah Yahowsha' is the diminished corporeal manifestation of God set apart from Him to serve us, the One who fulfilled a staggering number of exacting prophecies, the One who walked out of the pages of the Towrah, observing and affirming its every letter and word. Proving the case on behalf of Yahowsha' is

one of the prime directives of the Towrah. It is why Yahowah's Word is filled from Bare'syth to Mal'aky with promises depicting what God, Himself, would do for us. But all of that must be rejected, along with the Towrah, for faith to be operative.

But apart from the Torah and Prophets, Yahowsha' is without identity or purpose. The Ma'aseyah's life is a lie and His sacrifices are for naught if He is disassociated from His source. Who is Christo Iesou if not Yahowsha', the One predicted and described in the Torah and Prophets, if not the Ma'aseyah, the One He, Himself, claimed to be?

If Paulos is right, then Abraham, Yitschaq, and Ya'aqob are estranged from the Covenant. In spite of the fact that Yahowah said that the offspring of His Covenant would be numerous, there isn't one.

This, of course, begs the question. If *Bikuwrym* – First-Born Child is rendered inoperative, if responding to the terms and conditions of the Covenant isn't the means to be adopted into God's family, what about Yahowsha'? He observed, upheld, relied upon, and fulfilled the book that Paul has said is devoid of life. So is He, as one would have to surmise by this, dead and estranged from God? There is no mistaking the fact that He, without exception or exclusion, advocated the Towrah, not some new fangled faith.

So in its distinction, Paul's statement has become the foundation of Christianity. Christians have been led to believe that they become God's children through faith in "Christ Jesus" – someone whose accurate title, name, identity, nature, life, purpose, words, and deeds they neither know, acknowledge, nor respect. And since they have substituted all of these things for a character who has more in common with Dionysus than Yahowsha', how is Paulos's new faith any different than the belief systems of the Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, or Romans?

By changing the order, and by rendering "*pistis* – faith," the King James Version has captured Paul's intended meaning: "**For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.**" However, that is not true. We are not all children of God. In fact, most of those Paul preached to, and all of those who subsequently believed his letters, are specifically excluded from God's Covenant family – victimized as many have been by this false prophet.

Our Spiritual Mother enables our adoption into our Heavenly Father's family on "*Bikuwrym* – First-Born Child" based upon our love for Yahowah, our decision to engage in the Covenant relationship in accordance with His conditions, our willingness to answer God's Invitations to Meet with Him, and our commitment based upon what we have come to know and understand to trust and rely upon what He, through the Ma'aseyah Yahowsha', has done to facilitate

the Towrah's promises. But since one cannot love someone they do not know, cannot engage in a relationship they don't realize is being offered, and cannot respond to Invitations they don't think were written to them, what then? Are we to believe that faith based upon ignorance, or worse, denial, has merit?

In reality, it is common for people to place their faith in faulty propositions. The masses have believed fictitious proposals throughout history. But if the promises regarding these things are unfounded, or worse, deceitful, destructive, deadly, and damning, a believer's faith is as meritless as the misconception. So since Paul has discredited and discarded the only source of reliable promises, what is left other than disappointment?

In his attempt to convey Paul's thoughts, Jerome missed this realization as well. LV: "For you are all sons of God, through the faith which is in Christo Iesu. (*Omnnes enim filii Dei estis per fidem, quæ est in Christo Iesu.*)" NLT: "For you are all children of God through faith in Christ Jesus." It's telling that each translation was arranged in the same order, one which flows in opposition to the Greek.

Having dismissed the Towrah and its Covenant, there is no longer any merit to circumcision, which Yahowah had stated was the everlasting sign of His eternal Covenant. And therefore, the NA states: "As many as for unto Christ were immersed Christ put on."

Documented more comprehensively, this becomes: "Because (*gar* – for indeed then) as many as (*hosos* – so long as) to (*eis*) Christon (XPN), you all were actually at some point baptized (*baptizomai* – you all were dipped, immersed, and / or really submerged without process or plan by the actions of another (aorist, passive, indicative)), Christon (XPN) you all clothe or plunge (*enduo* – you all dress and put on; from *en* – in and *duno* – go into or sink into, being plunged (aorist (occurring at some point in time without regard to a plan or process) middle (the subject, you all, are being affected by your own actions) indicative (conveying action the writer wants his audience to believe is real which occurred in the past))." (Galatians 3:27)

Either Paul is unaware of the discrete roles performed by the Son and the Spirit, or he knows them and is being purposefully misleading. But either way, none of this is true.

We are immersed and cleansed by the Set-Apart Spirit, not the Son. And it is our Spiritual Mother who adorns us in Her Garment of Light. We do not clothe the Ma'aseyah. His apparel is irrelevant. Our Spiritual birth from above occurs on "Bikuwrym – First-Born Child," as did Yahowsha's. And this is only after we have availed ourselves of immortality on "Pesach – Passover" and have answered the Invitation to come into the presence of the Spirit's Maternal Light on "Matsah

– Un-Yeasted Bread,” which perfects us so that we are prepared to be adopted. Paul failed to report any of this. And yet God’s Word from beginning to end exists to delineate these profound truths, all of which Sha’uwl swept away with the stroke of a pen.

There are some other issues with this passage. It has become obvious that a second-century scribe, not Sha’uwl, supplied the Divine Placeholder XPN, which would normally be symbolic of “*ha Ma’aseyah* – the Implement Doing the Work of Yahowah.” But without a definite article, it’s readily apparent that the original author wrote “Christon” as if it were a name, and not a title. Further, since the primary purpose of this epistle has been to distinguish Yahowsha’ from Yahowah and from His Word, it would have been counterproductive for Sha’uwl to reconnect them. The placeholders are only meaningful to those who use them to find Yahowsha’s actual name and His Ma’aseyah title written in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms.

But that is only partially true. The Savior’s name is actually “Yahowah.” That is God’s one and only name – the only name He wants to be called, to be known as, and for us to use for all time. Yahowsha’ is an identity designation and a mission statement, telling us that “Yahowah Saves.” By saying that He came in His Father’s name, He said that His name is “Yahowah.”

Lastly, *enduo*, scribed as *enedusasoe*, and rendered “you all clothe or plunge,” as a compound of *en* and *duno*, literally means: “you all should believe that you have at some point in time really taken a plunge and actually sunk in.” That’s insightful, especially considering the leap of faith Sha’uwl is advocating. *Duno* was most commonly used in reference to the “setting sun.” In that Satan’s name is Halal ben Shachar, which conveys “the self-exalting son of the sun,” associating the Ma’aseyah with this is a demonic pun. And it’s troubling because the souls of those advocating Sha’uwl’s scheme “sink into” “*She’owl* – the pit where deceased souls await questioning” and thus judgment.

As has been noted, the verb, *enedusasoe*, was written in the second person, plural, aorist, middle, indicative. The aorist indicative indicates something which the writer wants his audience to believe has actually happened in the past, but something which was not part of any discernible process or plan. And the middle voice signifies that subjects of this verb will have been affected by their own actions – which is taking the plunge into Pauline mythology. Also since *enduo* sometimes conveys the idea of “having clothed and dressed oneself,” in this way too, it would be opposed to having the Set-Apart Spirit adorn us in Her Garment of Light. This may be material because everything up to this point has been decidedly passive, with everything happening to and being done for the faithful, making this change significant. The inference then may be that those who are “immersed into” Sha’uwl’s “faith in Christon (a name which speaks of “the

application of drugs”) “have taken the plunge and have clothed themselves” in his religion.

Sha’uwl has already disparaged circumcision in this letter, saying that it was not required, only to associate it with the Disciple Shim’own, who he condemned. But he is just getting warmed up. Sha’uwl’s animosity towards circumcision will become the dominant theme in this letter before he is finished. And here, baptism is being positioned as a replacement for circumcision, as the rite of passage into Paul’s Faith. But let us not forget, according to God, when He condemned Sha’uwl by name in Chabaquwq / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:16, Yahowah warned us, saying that Sha’uwl’s aversion to circumcision would be part of the false prophet’s poisonous brew.

“Woe to the one who provides, causes and allows his neighbors and companions to drink, thereby associating them with this venomous wrath, but also making them drunk for the purpose of observing their genitals.

You will get your fill of shame and infamy instead of honor and glory. Inebriated, in addition, you also show yourself unacceptable, going round about over the lack of circumcision.

Upon you is the binding cup of Yahowah’s right hand (a metaphor for judgment). Therefore, public humiliation and indignity will be your status and reward (or Paulos in Latin).” (Chabaquwq / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:15-16)

And this was just the conclusion. God told us that Sha’uwl would convey all of these things. Remember...

“Surely, this revelation from God is for the appointed time of the Mow’ed Meetings (in other words when Sha’uwl would have been in Rabbinical school in Yaruwshalaim during Year 4000 Yah (33 CE) while Yahowsha’ was fulfilling the first four Mow’ed). It provides a witness and speaks, pouring out evidence in the end.

Whatever extended period of time is required for this question to be resolved, this shall not be proven false. Expect him in this regard, because indeed, he will absolutely come, neither being delayed nor lingering. (2:3)

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 upright and vindicated 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 his is 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, receiving him will never be satisfied. All of the Gentiles will gather together unto him, all of the people from different races and 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 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?'" (2:6)

"You have deliberately decided upon and conspired at the advice of another to promote a shameful plot to confuse those who approach your temple, ruining and reducing many by separating people from different races and places, and in the process losing your soul." (Chabaquwq / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:10)

Yes, on three occasions now we have had reason to consider Yahowah's testimony regarding Sha'awl. And we, no doubt, will do it again. Nothing cuts through the fog of lies better than God's prophetic testimony. So we will continue to remind ourselves that God despises this man's hideous ploy.

Ever in the dark, and never recognizing any of Paul's ploys, the King James Version published: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." We don't "wear 'Christ,'" and common words like "*baptizomai*" should be translated, not transliterated. But again demonstrating the KJV was a translation of the Roman Catholic Latin text, and not Paul's Greek, we find the same wording in Jerome's Vulgate: "For as many of you as have been *baptizati*/baptized in Christo have become clothed with Christum."

There is no reference to "united" or "new" in the Greek text, and yet the authors of the New Living Translation wrote: "And all who have been united with Christ in baptism have put on Christ, like putting on new clothes." And how did team NLT come up with "new" in the etymology of the verb, *enedusasoe*?

While we can and should be adorned in the Set-Apart Spirit's Garment of Light, we can't and shouldn't attempt to "put on Christ." As the corporeal manifestation of Yahowah, this would be flesh wearing flesh.

Further, if baptism was essential to salvation, why didn't Yahowsha' baptize anyone, including His Disciples? Why isn't it mentioned anywhere in the Towrah?



No longer surprised, Sha'uw'l's next statement isn't accurate either. The NA reads: "Not there is Judean but not Greek not there is slave but not free not there is male and female all for you one are in Christ Jesus."

"No longer (*ouketi*) is there (*eni* – there exists) Yahuwd (*Ioudaios* – Jew; a transliteration of the Hebrew name *Yahuwd* meaning Related to Yahowah) nor (*oude*) Greek (*Hellen*), no longer (*ouketi*) is there (*eni* – there exists) slave (*doulos*) nor (*oude*) free (*eleutheros* – freeborn), no longer (*ouketi*) is there (*eni* – there exists) male (*arsen*) and (*kai*) female (*thelys*), because then (*gar*) all (*pas*) of you (*sy*) exist as (*este*) one (*heis*) in (*en*) Christo (XPΩ – placeholder for the Ma'aseyah (but without the definite article it's being deployed as a name meaning "drugged")) Iesou (IHY – placeholder for Yahowsha' whom Sha'uw'l has disassociated from Yahowah)." (Galatians 3:28)

It is hard not to laugh at Paul's hypocrisy. He has divided the world between Jew and Greek, claiming all of the Greeks for himself. If they no longer exist as a distinct ethnicity, if there is no difference, what was the point? Likewise, he has wallowed in the myth that faith in the promise frees, while observing the Torah enslaves. But how can that be if no one is a slave and no one is free? And in other letters, he will demean women, subjecting them to be lorded over by men, something that makes no sense in a genderless realm.

If there is no longer Yahuwdym, why has Yahowah promised in Yirmayah / Jeremiah 31 to reconcile Yahuwdah and Yisra'el when He returns to restore His Covenant on *Yowm Kippurym* – the Day of Reconciliations in Year 6000 Yah (2033 CE)? And if gender was irrelevant, why does Yahowsha' present Yahowah as our Heavenly Father? Why also is the *Ruwach Qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit depicted as Maternal? Why are we encouraged to value our Father and Mother as the Second Instruction on the Second of Two Tablets Yahowah etched in stone? How does a family like the Covenant materialize and grow without a Mother and Father? How can there be a Son of God without gender? Why did Yahowah tell

us that He created us “male and female?” Why does He disapprove of sex between men?

While our Heavenly Father has but one family, and while we can become His children whether we are natural-born Yahuw'dym or adopted Gowym, there is still a very significant difference from Yahowah's perspective between Yahuw'dym and Gowym, and between Yisra'el and the rest of the world. Most unfulfilled prophecy deals with the reconciliation of Yahuw'dym and Yisra'el with Yahowah.

So just because something rolls off the tongue and sounds accepting and tolerant, doesn't make it so. Yahowah said no such thing, and in fact, He says the opposite.

Paul composed this verse to undermine the value of Yahuw'dym and Yisra'el in Yahowah's ongoing story. He may also have wanted to demean the roles our Heavenly Father and Spiritual Mother play in the Familial Covenant. And he never knew the love of a woman, preferring Timothy's adoration, so it is easy to see why he promoted this peculiar perspective on sexual orientation.

Ironically, in the next chapter, Sha'uwl will contradict himself and say that those who observe the Torah are still enslaved by it – especially those associated with the Torah's Covenant. And as I've mentioned, all of the chauvinism found in the “New Testament” hails from Paul's poison pen, where women are inferior to men. And if that were not enough, he introduces himself as “Paulos, a slave of Christ,” in his letter to the Romans.

The familiar prose of the King James Bible has come to resonate in religious circles: “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” But to the contrary, according to Scripture, there are still Yahuw'dym, Yisra'el endures, there continue to be male and female individuals, and thanks to what Yahowsha' has done, there are those of us who have been freed from man's religious schemes, setting us apart and distinguishing us from those who have not been liberated.

Jerome's Latin Vulgate reads similarly: “There is neither Iudæus nor Græcus; there is neither servant nor free; there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christo Iesu.” Recognizing the popularity of Paul's prose is promoted by the King James, and knowing that familiarity sells, even the adventurous New Living Translation left the lie alone: “There is no longer Jew or Gentile, slave or free, male and female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus.” Yet, to their credit, apart from butchering the Savior's name and title, all three translations accurately presented the words Paul wrote. Now if only Paul's words were accurate.

Some may think that I'm being too critical here, and that Paul's last statement was just a figure of speech, a bit of soaring oratory. And this perspective would be

valid if Paul were a politician, and if Galatians was part of an election campaign rather than a treatise on a new faith-based religion.

Moving from a lack of discernment to a lack of consistency, Sha'awl concludes this line of "reasoning" by contradicting his initial point. If you recall, previously he said that "seed was singular" because it spoke *not* of Abraham's descendants (those pesky Jews), but instead just of Iesou Christou (who was Jewish until Paulos gave him a Greek name). But now, according to Sha'awl, we "all exist as Abraham's seed." This is not something to be dismissed. The singular nature of the seed became the seed of Paulos' faith-based religion. The singular connotation of one seed at the absolute exclusion of many descendants is how this all began. It was how Paul differentiated between the "promise / promises" and the Torah. So while his reasoning has been flawed from the beginning, even if it was valid, he is about to harpoon his own rationale.

His initial clause obviously needs a verb, but the Nestle-Aland was not inclined to speculate on the kind of action Sha'awl was recommending: "If but you of Christ then of the Abram seed you are by promise inheritors."

"But (*de* – then and now) **if** (*ei* – conditionally) **you all** (*sy*) **Christou** (XPY), **then** (*ara* – consequently) **of the** (*tou*) **Abram** (*Abraam* – transliteration of the name 'Abram, meaning Enriching Father) **seed** (*sperma* – descendant or offspring) **you exist** (*este* – you all are) **with respect to** (*kata* – down from, against, or according to) **promise** (*epaggelia* – agreement and announcement (singular)) **heirs** (*kleronomos* – receives of an inheritance)." (Galatians 3:29)

As we have already discovered, *kleronomos*, translated "heirs," is a compound of *kleros* and *nomos*, therefore affirming that the "*nomos* – Towrah" is where we find "the allotment which is parceled out to bestow an inheritance." I say this because *kleros* speaks of a game of chance. It refers to "a lot or stone with a person's name inscribed on it, which along with other names on other stones, was tossed into a jar, shaken, and then selected purely by random as a result of which stone fell to the ground first." So, once again, the addition of *kleros* corrupts the realization that our adoption into Yahowah's Covenant family is predicated upon our choice to respond and not random chance. God's family is not selected by casting of lots, which is akin to divination, something Yahowah says is an abomination.

But the problem is actually much bigger. Since the crux of Paul's argument continues to be a contrived contrast between the Towrah and the promise made to Abram, selecting a word for "heir" based upon *nomos* defeats the purpose and demonstrates a complete disregard for the intelligence of his audience.

The KJV managed to turn a statement into a question: "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise?" Jerome was a

smart fellow, so I'm convinced that he recognized that Paul had just contradicted himself. LV: "And if you are Christi, then are you the offspring of Abraham, heirs according to the promise."

There is nothing akin to "and now that you belong to" in the Greek text, so why is it in the NLT: "And now that you belong to Christ, you are the true children of Abraham. You are his heirs, and God's promise to Abraham belongs to you." In addition, there is also no justification for "the, true, children, of, you, are, his, and, God's, to, (the second) Abraham, belongs, to, or you."

At this point, the second codicil of Pauline Doctrine is in the books. Combined with Sha'uwl's first plank, it is presented here for your convenience and consideration. However, since this is redundant and repulsive, you may want to jump down to the chapter summary and then pick up Paul's trail again as he opens the fourth chapter of Galatians.

"We are Jews by nature and are not from the social outcasts of sinful and heathen races, (2:15) having come to realize without evidence, that by no means whatsoever is man vindicated or made righteous by means of activities associated with the Towrah, if not by faith in Iesou Christou. And we on Christon Iesoun, ourselves, believed in order for us to have become righteous out of faith in Christou, and not by means of acting upon the Towrah, because by means of engaging in the Towrah not any flesh will be acquitted, vindicated, nor made righteous. (2:16)

But if seeking to be made righteous and innocent in Christo, we were found also ourselves social outcasts and sinners, shouldn't we be anxious that Christos becomes a guilty, errant, and misled, servant of sin? Not may it exist, (2:17) because if that which I have actually torn down, dissolved, and dismantled, invalidated and abolished, subverted and discarded, this on the other hand I restore or reconstruct, promoting this edifice, I myself bring into existence and recommend transgression and disobedience. (2:18) I then, because of and by the Towrah's 'law,' myself, actually died and was separated in order that to god I might currently live. Together with Christo, I have actually been crucified. (2:19)

I live, but no longer I. He lives then in me, Christos. This because now I live in the flesh, in faith I live of the god and Christou, the one having loved me and surrendered, entrusting authority to control, influence, instruct, and to betray exclusively and especially of himself for the sake of and because of me. (2:20) I do not reject or disregard the Charity / Grace of the god if because then by the Torah, righteousness as a result Christos undeservedly, for no reason or cause, without benefit, for naught, and in vain, died. (2:21)

O ignorant and irrational, unintelligent and unreasonable, Galatians. To whom were you bewitched, deceived, slandered, and seduced? (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? (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? (3:3) So much and for so long these things you suffered. You were affected and you were vexed, annoyed, and angry, without reason or result, if indeed, really without result. (3:4)

The one, therefore, then supplying you the spirit and causing it to function, operating powerfully in you, out of acting upon the Torah or out of hearing faith? (3:5) Just as Abram believed and had faith in the God so it was reasoned and accounted to Him as righteousness. (3:6) You know, as a result, the ones out of faith, these are Abram's sons. (3:7)

Having seen beforehand then by contrast the writing, that because out of faith makes the people from different races and places right, God, He, before the beneficial messenger acted for Abram, that they would in time be spoken of favorably in you to all the ethnicities and nations. (3:8) As a result, the ones out of faith, we are spoken of favorably, even praised together with the faithful Abram. (3:9)

For as long as they exist by means of doing the assigned tasks of the Torah, they are under a curse, because it is written that 'All are accursed who do not remain alive, persevering with all that is written in the scroll of the Torah, doing it.' (3:10) So with that Torah, absolutely no one is vindicated or justified alongside God. It becomes evident: 'Those who are justified and righteous, out of faith will live.' (3:11) But the Towrah exists not out of faith, but to the contrary, 'The one having done and preformed them will live in them.' (3:12)

Christos bought us back from the evil and hateful curse of the Towrah, having become for our sake a maligning and malicious curse, because it has been written: 'A vengeful curse on all those having hung on wood.' (3:13) As a result, to the people from different races, the beneficial word of Abram might become in Christo Iesou that the promise of the spirit we might take hold, being possessed through faith. (3:14)

Brothers, according to man I say nevertheless a man having been validated with an agreement; no one rejects or actually accepts added provisions. (3:15) But to Abram these promises were said, 'And to the offspring of him.' It does not say: 'And to the seeds,' like upon many. But to the contrary, as upon one, and to the seed of you which is Christos. (3:16) But

this I say, ‘A promised covenant agreement having been ratified beforehand by the God, this after four-hundred and thirty years, having become Towrah does not revoke it so as to invalidate the promise.’ (3:17)

Because if out of the Towrah, the inheritance is no longer from promise, but to the Abram by promise of God, He has forgiven and pleased. (3:18) Then, therefore, why the Towrah? *Of the transgressions of violations and overstepping, because of the favor and pleasure, it was continued and added to* Until the seed which might come to whom it has been promised having been commanded by spiritual messengers in the hand and control of a mediator or middleman. (3:19) But now, the mediator, he is not of one, but the god, he is one. (3:20)

Indeed, consequently, the Torah accordingly is against the promises of the god. Not may it become (although it might be, even though I don’t want it to be). For if, per chance, 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. (3:21) But to the contrary, the writing 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. (3:22) But before the arrival 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 the Faith was revealed. (3:23)

As a result, the Towrah has come to exist as our disciplinarian using dogmatic old-fashioned methods extending until Christon in order that by means of the Faith we might, at some point in time, while doing nothing ourselves, be justified. (3:24) But now having come the Faith, no longer do we exist under an old fashioned and strict disciplinarian. (3:25) For all sons of God, you all exist by way of the Faith in Christou Iesou. (3:26) Because as many as to Christon, you all were actually at some point baptized, Christon you all clothe or plunge. (3:27)

No longer is there Jew nor Greek, no longer is there slave nor free, no longer is there male and female, because then all of you exist as one in Christou Iesou. (3:28) But if you all *are* Christou, then you are of Abram’s seed with respect to the promise heirs.” (Galatians 3:29)

While there have been a few isolated moments of lucidity, confusion has been more prevalent. While we have read things which have not been totally wrong, most of what we have read has been misleading.

In order to set all of this in perspective, based upon Yahowah's own presentation of His nature, His purpose and plan in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, here is how I would categorize the first seventy-four Galatians verses.

Completely Accurate: 0. (0 @ 0%)

Irrelevant: 1.2, 1.13, 1.14, 1.19, 1.21, 2.15. (6 @ 8%)

Insufficient: 1.18, 3.1. (2 @ 3%)

Half Truth: 3.8, 3.16, 3.17, 3.26. (4 @ 5%)

Unintelligible: 1.7, 2.14, 3.20, 3.29. (4 @ 5%)

Inaccurate: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.20, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.16, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19, 2.20, 2.21, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13, 3.14, 3.15, 3.18, 3.19, 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.24, 3.25, 3.27, 3.28. (58 @ 78%)

Therefore, not one of the seventy-four passages presented in the first half of Galatians represents a completely accurate depiction of our potential to form a relationship with God or to be saved by Him. And just 5% were partly accurate, but not necessarily sufficient to advance understanding. So it would be fair to say that nothing that Paul has written thus far in Galatians has been helpful.

While 6% of all verses were unrelated to our relationship with Yahowah, that's only a problem in that Paul has been overly concerned about promoting himself, and on establishing his unassailable credentials as an Apostle. And while a partially accurate statement is acceptable in an ordinary letter, it isn't in Scripture, and there are seven of them in the first half of Galatians.

Prior to having scrutinized Paul's every word, I was inclined to believe that most of the difficult issues associated with Galatians were the result of an inadequate resolution between the Towrah and Rabbinical Law. But upon closer and contextual evaluation, there can be no doubt that Sha'awl's intent has been to dissolve and dismantle Yahowah's Torah. He has left no other option in this regard.

I was surprised to find that so much of Galatians was unintelligible. Either the words in the text were insufficient to register a cogent thought, or the point being made was incomprehensible.

But the fact that 58 of the 74 passages, more than three out of every four statements, fully 78%, are wrong (that is to say they are in conflict with

Yahowah's Word and Yahowsha's testimony) is devastating to Paul's credibility and to the veracity of his foundational epistle.

And when it comes to evaluating the credibility of a letter considered to be "Scripture" by billions, we must also add incomprehensible, insufficient, and irrelevant to this total, increasing that which is unintelligible or useless to 18% of the total.

But in this case, we cannot pin the blame on scribal error or careless transmission. There are no older or more reliable Greek manuscripts than Papyrus 46, in which we find copies of Paul's epistles, including Galatians. Recovered alongside the oldest manuscript copy of Mattanyah, Mark, Luke, Yahowchanan, in addition to Acts in Papyrus 45, both codices are the product of careful and professional scribes. And the most comprehensive dating evaluation concluded that P46 may have been scribed as early as 85 CE, with the most pessimistic evaluations placing it in the early second century.

Moreover, Papyrus 46 is remarkably consistent with modern manuscripts which are based upon majority texts. At least apart from the absence of placeholders in younger manuscripts, as well as in the Nestle-Aland, Papyrus 46 corresponds to the NA27 (Nestle-Aland 27th Edition) almost 95% of the time. So, if we cannot trust the textual accuracy of Galatians, the rest of the "New Testament" becomes highly suspect.

Based upon the evidence before us, and recognizing that we are still in the midst of Paul's letter, we are in a position to make some preliminary conclusions about the epistle to the Galatians. It would be fair to say that nothing Paul has written in Galatians has been completely accurate or useful, and thus it has added nothing to our understanding of Yahowah's Covenant or His plan of salvation. Fully 96% of what we have read has been inaccurate, incomprehensible, or irrelevant.

But to be fair, Galatians is widely considered to be Paul's worst letter. (Although I don't think that is so. There are others which are considerably more deplorable.) So if it was not for the fact that it has been used to say that we should no longer observe the Torah, but instead believe this man's faith-based religion, it probably would have vanished along with Paul's letter to the Laodiceans. If only...