

Questioning Paul
Volume 1: The Great Galatians Debate
...Is Christianity Right or Wrong?

9

Douleia – Bondage

Christianity: Bound to Paul...

Sha'awl's next statement presents Yah's Towrah as public enemy number one. This extraordinarily strange man is within four verses of his crescendo—the ultimate objective of his life's work. We are on the cusp of witnessing the most vulgar message ever spoken in the name of God.

But before we consider Paul's crowning, albeit indicting, achievement, since it is based upon the myth that there are two covenants, with the second one having already been established, let's first consider the truth in this regard. Yahowah's one and only Covenant has not yet been renewed. And when He, Himself, restores it, that affirmation will be predicated upon the wholesale integration of the Torah in our lives – not its repudiation.

Since there is nothing more foundational to knowing God than understanding His Covenant and the role His Torah plays in our lives, let's let God speak for Himself on this critical matter. For if there is but one Covenant, one familial relationship which can be formed between God and humankind, presented and promised in Scripture, and if its renewal and restoration is predicated upon the Towrah, we are precluded from promoting the myth of a “New Testament.” So in this regard, Yah, Himself, said...

“Behold (*hineh* – look, listen, and pay close attention to what follows), **days** (*yowmym* – times) **are coming** (*bow'* – will arrive and will return), **prophetically declares** (*na'um* – foretells, predicts, and reveals) **Yahowah** (יהוה - יהוה - *Yahowah*), **when** (*wa*) **I will cut** (*karat* – I will create, completely establishing and totally stipulating, I will actually make by way of separation (qal stem affirms reality and perfect conjugation speaks of an act which is total, complete, and

indivisible)) **relationally with** (*'eth* – as an eternal symbol on behalf of) **the household and family** (*beyth* – the home) **of Yisra'el** (*yisra'el* – those who strive and contend with, engage, persist, and endure with, are set free and are empowered by God) **and relationally with** (*wa 'eth* – as an eternal symbol on behalf of) **the household and family** (*beyth* – the home) **of Yahuwdah** (*Yahuwdah* – Yah is Abundantly Sufficient, Of Yah, From Yah, and Those Who Are Related to Yah) **a renewing and restoring** (*chadash* – a repairing, and reaffirming) **Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth* – nurturing and engaged relational agreement established on the foundation of *beyth* – family and home, a mutually binding partnership promise, solemn oath, and active alliance, and a participatory pledge based upon a marriage vow which fosters and encourages).” (*Yirmayahuw* / Yahowah Uplifts / Jeremiah 31:31)

The part of this verse which Christians, desperate to justify their “New Testament,” miss is that the renewal and restoration of the “*beryth* – Covenant” isn’t with Gentiles, and thus cannot be with their church. It is, instead, with Yahuwdah and Yisra’el. This promise, therefore, cannot apply to Christians or Christianity. Replacement theology is torn asunder. It’s game over. And further aggravating the problem Christians face, this reconciliation has not yet transpired, therefore a “Renewed” Covenant is premature and a “New” Testament will never occur.

As a result, the only question worth debating in this passage is whether *chadash* should be translated “new” or “renewed,” as both are etymologically acceptable. Is God going to renew and restore, reaffirm and repair, the Covenant presented in the Towrah with Yisra’el and Yahuwdah, or is He going to scrap the Towrah’s definition of this relationship and create an entirely new agreement?

To put this question to rest, you should know that the primary meaning of *chadash* is “to renew, to restore, to repair, and to reaffirm.” Of the ten times this verb is scribed in the Towrah, Prophets, and Psalms, it is translated: “restore and reaffirm” in 1 Samuel 11:14, “renewed and repaired” in 2 Chronicles 15:8, “to repair” in 2 Chronicles 24:4, “to repair and mend” in 2 Chronicles 24:12, “renewed” in Job 10:7, “renew” in Psalms 51:12, “renewed” in Psalms 103:5, again as “renewed” in Psalms 104:30, “repair” in Isaiah 61:4, and “renew and restore” in Lamentations 5:21.

As further affirmation of “renewed and restored” being an appropriate translation of *chadash* in this context, we find that within the prophetic writings of Yirmayah and Yasha’yah, each time Yahowah inspired either man to scribe *chadash*, by rendering it “renewed,” or especially “restored,” we achieve a substantially more enlightening result than translating this word “new.”

These things known, the next line seems to suggest that there will be a new covenant, one different than the one whose terms and conditions were delineated in the Towrah. But is this even possible? Could God do such a thing without seriously contradicting other statements He has made, and in so doing, rendering Himself capricious, and His Word unreliable?

“It will not be exactly the same as (*lo’ ka* – it will not be identical to) the (*ha*) **Covenant (*beryth* – familial relationship, marriage vow, binding agreement, and pledge) **which relationally** (*‘asher*) **I cut** (*karat* – created through separation) **with** (*‘et*) **their fathers** (*‘abowtam*) **in the day, when** (*ba yowm*) **firmly grasping Me** (*hazaq* – I repaired, renewed, and restored them, I established, sustained and supported them, I caused them to prevail and grow, as they were strengthened and encouraged by My power and authority) **in their hand** (*ba yad* – by them taking initiative, engaging, and reaching out), **I led them out** (*yasa’* – I descended, extended Myself, and I served them by guiding them away) **from** (*min*) **the realm** (*‘erets*) **of the crucible of Egypt** (*mitsraym* – a metaphor for human religious, political, economic, and military oppression and divine judgment), **which relationally** (*‘asher*) **they broke, disassociating themselves** (*parar* – they violated and nullified, they frustrated, tore apart, and shattered, and they split away) **from** (*‘eth*) **My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth* – My nurturing and engaged relational agreement established on the foundation of *beryth* – family and home, My mutually binding partnership promise, My solemn oath and active alliance, and My participatory pledge based upon a marriage vow which fosters and encourages), **though** (*wa*) **I** (*‘anky*) **was married to them** (*ba ba’al hem* – I was their husband), **prophetically declares** (*na’um*) **Yahowah** (אֲנִי יְהוָה - יהוה – *Yahowah*).” (*Yirmayahuw* / Jeremiah 31:32)**

This affirms that the original Covenant was honored by God when He “*hazaq* – reached out to His people and when He grasped hold of them to renew and restore them,” “*yasa’ min* – leading them away from” “*mitsraym* – the crucible of religious and political oppression and divine judgment.” But, now, since Yisra’el and Yahuwdah subsequently “*parar ‘eth beryth* – broke their end of the agreement, and disassociated themselves from the relationship, the “*beryth* – Covenant Agreement” must be “*chadash* – reaffirmed, repaired, renewed and restored” to be viable again.

The question now becomes: how is God going to do this without contradicting Himself? And what we find is a solution which is not only marvelous in its implications, but also one which completely destroys the Christian religion generally and Paul’s testimony specifically. Yahowah said:

“Indeed (*ky* – surely and truly) **with this** (*ha zo’th* – in conjunction with these conditions and provisions the) **Familial Covenant Relationship** (*beryth* –

reciprocal partnership, active alliance, and engaged agreement, mutually binding and nurturing promise, solemn oath and participatory pledge, based upon a marriage vow) **which relationally** (*'asher*) **I will cut** (*karat* – I will create and establish through separation) **with** (*'eth* – and alongside) **the House** (*beyth* – household and family) **of Yisra'el** (*yisra'el* – those who strive and contend with, who engage, persist, and endure with, who are set free and are empowered by God) **after** (*'ahar* – following) **those days** (*ha yowm hem* – that time), **prophetically declares** (*na'um* – predicts and promises) **Yahowah** (יהוה - יהי), **I will actually give My Towrah, completely providing and producing My Teaching and Instruction** (*natan 'eth Towrah* – I will reliably bestow and totally devote My Direction and My Guidance as a gift, putting it (here the qal stem affirms that this will actually occur and the perfect conjugation tells us that the gift of the Towrah will be whole and complete, indivisible and uninterrupted throughout time)) **within their inner nature** (*ba qereb* – internally, inside their person, within their core and midst, becoming part of their psychological makeup, thoughts, and emotions).

And (*wa*) **upon** (*'al* – as the Almighty concerning) **their heart** (*leb* – speaking of their source of life, and the seat of love, volition, feelings, attitude, and character), **I will actually write it** (*katab* – I will genuinely engrave and inscribe it (written in the qal relational stem, telling us that we can rely upon this occurring, and in the imperfect conjugation, affirming that it will produce ongoing results throughout time, with the first person singular prefix, saying that God, Himself, will be doing the writing, and with the third person feminine singular suffix, telling us that it is the Towrah, which is a feminine noun, which will be inscribed)).

And (*wa*) **I shall be** (*hayah* – I will always, reliably, and without interruption or exception be (qal stem perfect conjugation)) **God** (*'elohym*) **to and for them** (*la la*), **and** (*wa*) **they** (*hem*), **themselves, shall be** (*hayah* – they will always and reliably exist, eternally receiving the complete benefits of (qal relational stem affirming the genuineness of this promise, and imperfect conjugation which tells us that there will be ongoing and unfolding assistance and advantages associated with being considered)) **to and for Me as** (*la la*) **family** (*'am*).” (*Yirmayahuw* / Jeremiah 31:33)

With this statement, the basis of Christianity and the fulcrum of Paul's argument disintegrate. It would be irrational for Yahowah to establish His Towrah, then annul His Towrah, replacing it with a “New Testament,” only to go right back to His Towrah. So if you are a Christian, now would be a good time to wave goodbye to Paul and to your faith. It was over long before it began.

The insights provided by the depth of meaning inherent in each of these words and unique relational aspects of Hebrew tenses require greater diligence on our behalf, but they are worth the investment of our time, especially in passages like this one. It wouldn't be a stretch to suggest that the affirmations they provide regarding the unfolding and continuous results we can expect from God giving His Torah to us, placing His Instructions inside of us, are as essential to our inclusion in God's Covenant Family as anything ever written.

For example, by interspersing three references to the “*beyth* – house, family, and home” of “*yisra'el* – those individuals who engage and endure with God,” with four references to His “*beryth* – Covenant,” Yahowah has defined the nature of the relationship He wants to establish with us. That is because this “*beryth* – relationship” is based on a “*beyth* – family and home.” Yahowah is our Heavenly Father. The Set-Apart Spirit is our Spiritual Mother. And we are God's children. Our purpose is to “engage and endure with God” as part of His “*am* – family.”

Everything important to Yahowah is separated and thus set apart. This is why the Covenant was “*karat* – cut through the process of separation.” Most people will be excluded from Yahowah's family, because to be included a person must first separate themselves from the world of religion and politics. This concept of “cutting” and “separating” is conveyed through circumcision, which is why God calls it the “sign of the Covenant.”

In the “Towrah – Teaching” Volume of *An Introduction to God*, readers discovered that *Towrah* is Yah's: “*tow* (Strong's #8420) – signed, written, and enduring, *towrah* (8452) – way of treating people, *tuwr* (8446) – giving us the means to explore, to seek, to find, and to choose, *yarah* (3384) – the source from which instruction, teaching, guidance, and direction flow, which *tuwb* (8421) – provides answers which facilitate our restoration and return, even our response and reply to that which is *towb* (2895) – good, pleasing, joyful, beneficial, favorable, healing, and right, and that which causes us to be loved, to become acceptable, and to endure, *tahowr* (2892) and *tohorah* (2893) – purifying and cleansing us, *towr* (8447) – so as to provide an opportunity to change our thinking, attitude, and direction.” As such, there is no more important document.

With regard to the next insightful term, *qereb* (קָרַב) is a noun which depicts the “inner part or inward nature of an individual.” As such, it speaks to our “thoughts and emotions,” which is where Yahowah's Towrah will be placed. Like most nouns, *qereb*'s meaning is derived from its verb form, *qarab* (קָרַב), which is pointed differently, but spelled identically. *Qarab* means “to approach and to come near, to draw near and to enter the presence.” *Qarab* is the operative verb in Yahowah's presentation of the “*Mow'ed Miqra'* – Invitation to Meet” on “*Yowm Kippurym* – the Day of Reconciliations,” whereby we are invited to “*qarab* – come near and approach, coming into the presence of” our Spiritual Mother's

light. The same request is made twice again during “*Sukah – Shelters*,” reinforcing its contribution to our wellbeing. This connection provides an essential clue when it comes to understanding the sweeping panorama painted in this prophetic passage.

Leb, which is the Hebrew word for “heart,” conveys many of the same ideas as its counterpart does in English. We say that someone has a good heart to infer that they are of good character. We say that our heart belongs to someone to infer that we love them. We speak of the heart of a matter to describe its very essence. We say that in our heart we feel a certain way to infer that we have exercised our volition and have made a choice. Our heart is used to describe our attitude, and it is the organ whose beats we monitor to determine if someone is alive or dead. And so it is, especially in this context, that we must read “*leb – heart*” to say all of these things, if we want to understand why Yahowah is writing His Torah upon that which makes us who we are.

The end of this passage deploys parallel poetry to explain the reason God is going to restore and renew His relationship with His Children by giving us His Torah, placing it inside of us, and writing it upon our hearts. Stripping these words to their core, God wrote: “*hayah la la ‘elohym – hayah la la ‘am.*” In English, this reads: “**I shall be (*hayah*) God (*‘elohym*) to and for them (*la la*), and (*wa*) they (*hem*), themselves, shall be (*hayah*) to and for Me (*la la*) family (*‘am*).**”

With the verb tenses more fully developed, God revealed: “**I shall be (*hayah* – I will always, reliably, and without interruption or exception be (qal stem perfect conjugation)) God (*‘elohym*) to and for them (*la la*), and (*wa*) they (*hem*), themselves, shall be (*hayah* – they will always and reliably exist, eternally receiving the complete benefits of (qal relational stem affirming the genuineness of this promise, and imperfect conjugation which tells us that there will be ongoing and unfolding assistance and advantages associated with being considered)) to and for Me as (*la la*) family (*‘am*).**”

This is wholly reciprocal on multiple levels. Those who consider Yahowah to be their God will be considered family by God. Yahowah will serve as God for those who consider Him to be God. Further, while existing as part of Yahowah’s family is a benefit for us, it is presented here as a benefit to and for God as well. Building a family, engaging with His children and helping us grow, is the sole reason our Heavenly Father created the universe. His family brings Him pleasure and causes Him to grow.

When Hebrew words are repeated, as they are here on two occasions with *la la*, it strengthens their meaning exponentially. Typically, *la* serves as a prepositional prefix, and conveys “to” and “for.” It speaks of “approaching

someone,” of “moving toward a goal,” and of “doing something in order to achieve an expected result.” In addition to these thoughts, *la* can be translated: “toward, among, so that, by means of, concerning, on behalf of, and according to.” *La* “draws a connection between correspondence (the Torah) and a relationship (the Covenant).” And in actuality, every aspect of *la* fits this context.

So now that we understand the meaning of these words, what do all of these words mean? To begin, the Covenant Relationship and Yahowah’s Torah Teachings are inseparable. Without the Torah, the Covenant is completely unknown, as are its terms and conditions, rendering it impossible for anyone to participate in a relationship with God. But, and this is the biggest “but” in the universe, it currently remains possible for us to separate ourselves from the Torah, and therefore from its Covenant. In fact, God structured it this way by design.

We were created with “*nadah* – freewill,” which is “an uncompelled opportunity to move in the direction of our choosing:” to God or away from Him, to observe or ignore His Torah, to accept or reject His Covenant, to revere or fear our Heavenly Father, to love or despise Yahowah. And this is why we find that the first two of seven men listed, who along with Moseh, received the Torah on Mount Horeb bore names directly associated with freewill: ‘*Aharown* – enlightened freewill from ‘*aw* – to desire, ‘*ow* – to choose and to prefer, and ‘*owr* – light and enlightenment, and *Nadab* – one who willingly, freely, and of his own volition chooses, from *nadah*.

Since thoughtless volition is nothing more than an exercise in random chance, we were also given a “*nesamah* – conscience.” It enables us to rationally, logically, thoughtfully, morally, and judgmentally evaluate the evidence God has provided in His Torah, thereby, facilitating wise decisions.

And while this has been the state of affairs throughout the millennia, that is about to change. A time is coming when everybody who survives Yahowah’s return will have chosen to live in harmony with the Torah and its Covenant. Therefore, the only thing which differentiates the existing Covenant relationship from its reaffirmation and restoration in the future is that the choice to reject Yah’s Covenant and Towrah will no longer be applicable.

Our current mortal existence affords us the opportunity to choose God based upon His terms and conditions or reject Him and them. Our immortal existence is predicated upon having made the choice to accept the Covenant in accordance with the Torah. But there is a day on our horizon in which the last person will make their decision—that being *Yowm Kippurym* during Armageddon.

God could have avoided religious competition long ago, and mankind’s woes would have been nonexistent. But this could not have occurred without a

consequence so severe, it would have negated the very purpose of our very existence.

The reason Yahowah hasn't yet placed His Towrah inside of us, nor written His instructions on our hearts, is because freewill is sacrosanct. Today, everyone has the ability to choose to know, to love, and to trust God, to ignore God, to reject Him, or to replace Him with a divinity of man's making. If the Torah had been mandated, had it been unrivaled, had it been incorporated into our personalities, there would have been no possible way for any religious alternative to have emerged. And without options, there would have been no choice. Without choice, loving relationships cannot exist. Therefore, while the Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship and Yahowah's Towrah Teachings have been inseparable, it remains possible for us to separate ourselves from them.

This option, which is the choice to reject Yahowah's instructions and to disassociate from Him, has to end for eternal life with God to begin. So once all who will choose to know and respect Yahowah have decided to do so, once all who remain alive on this planet are part of Yahowah's family, there is no need for the bane or pain of religion. And yet, even once everyone has been adopted by Him, even when we have all become eternal and are empowered and enriched by our Heavenly Father, then, more than ever, we will still need His Guidance. The universe becomes ours, as does all of God's power and authority. So, it will be especially important that we understand how to exercise these gifts and wield our power. By giving us His "*towrah* - guidance," by placing all of it within us, by writing it upon our hearts, we will be equipped with the knowledge we will require to exercise our newfound freedom appropriately. And that is wonderful, landscape changing, news. It explains how we will retain freewill throughout eternity, and yet keep from doing something foolish.

Therefore, this explains what will occur upon Yahowah's return during "*Yowm Kippurym* – the Day of Reconciliations" at the end of the Tribulation. It illustrates how God will fulfill His Torah promise to reconcile His relationship with Yisra'el and with Yahuwdym. And it tells us when the Covenant will be renewed, because that is the only day in all of human history in which this transformation, this restoration, can occur without conflicting with God's previous testimony.

This passage also affirms the role of the Torah in our salvation, because it associates the Torah and Covenant with us being included in God's family. And reading between the lines, it reveals how Yahowah's Torah will continue to guide us during the Millennial Sabbath and beyond into eternity. It even explains that the purpose of the Covenant is to establish God's family, so that we can live with our Heavenly Father as His children.

And yet, with all of these affirmations, it is astonishing that Christians routinely mistranslate this passage, truncate it, and remove it from its context, to justify Paul's proclamation of a "new covenant," one based upon faith, one unrelated to the Torah or its God. I dare say, the Christian misinterpretation of this passage ranks among the most debilitating crimes ever perpetrated in the name of religion.

Speaking of this and other crimes, Yahowah revealed the benefit of making His Torah our undisputed and unrivaled instruction manual: **"And (wa) they will not teach or learn (lo' lamad – they will not be trained in nor indoctrinate, instruct or respond to) man's ('iysh – mankind's and individual people's) errant pronouncements, thoughts, thinking, or reasoning (ra' – evil ways and improper principles, bad judgment, false pretenses, and regrettable communications) any longer ('owd – ever again), or mankind's ('iysh) despondency and grief ('ah – his tale of woe) claiming ('amar – saying, boasting, and declaring) to actually know (da'at – to be acquainted with and be aware of the evidence regarding) Yahowah (יְהוָה - יְיָיָז). Because then, indeed (ky – rather surely and truthfully at that time), they all (kol) will actually know and recognize Me (yada' 'owty – they will be familiar with, be aware of, respect, revere, and acknowledge Me, and they will be known to Me), from (min) the smallest, youngest, and least significant (qatan) up to ('ad) the biggest, oldest, and most influential (gadowl), prophetically declares (na'um – predicts and promises) Yahowah (יְהוָה - יְיָיָז). For indeed, then (ky), I will have forgiven (salah – will have pardoned and removed) their sin ('awon – their guilt, liability, and consequence of perversity) and accordingly (wa la) their offenses against the standard (hata'th – their sinfulness and wrongdoing, their propensity and history of missing the way) will not (lo') be remembered (zakar – recalled or mentioned) any longer ('owd – now or ever again)." (Yirmayahuw / Jeremiah 31:34)**

Should you be mentally jumping ahead in time to the Day of Reconciliations (*Yowm Kippurym* in the year 6000 Yah, which will commence at sunset on October 2, 2033), and be wondering about the state of freewill after we bear Yah's Torah and Signature, it will endure, but within a framework which will allow us to enjoy our Heavenly Father's company and explore the universe without doing damage to ourselves or it. By this time, the only souls alive will be those who have previously chosen to rely upon and love Yah, making the freedom to reject, counterfeit, or loathe Him moot.

As a result of this announcement from God, it would be misguided to refer to the Greek eyewitness accounts as the "Renewed Covenant," much less the "New Testament." The Covenant has not yet been "renewed." There will never be a

“new” one. And since it is His Word, I think it’s reasonable to use His instructions in this regard.

Before we return to Paul’s twisted repudiation of Yahowah’s Covenant so that he can create a second covenant of his own, let’s see if we can learn something additional about Yahowah’s most important title by observing it in the language of revelation. The first letter of “*beryth* – Covenant” is Beyt 𐤁, which is contracted from *beyth*, the Hebrew word for “family and home.” This letter was drawn depicting the floor plan of a home with a single entrance. And, as such, it conveyed the idea of providing a singular solution to sheltering and protecting a family.

The second letter, Rosh 𐤃, which was originally pronounced “Resh,” was drawn to reveal the head of a person. As does the word *re’sh* today, the Ancient Hebrew character was symbolic of being the first, best, and foremost, as well as leadership and birth. We are therefore born into the first and foremost family. The human head also focuses our attention on our eyes and ears as means to observe and listen, and our brains as the means to understand.

Turning to the third letter, we find a Yad 𐤄, today’s Yowd, pictured by way of an arm reaching down and out to us with an open hand. It conveyed the ideas of authority and power, as well as engaging productively to accomplish something. As the first letter in Yah’s name, it reveals His willingness to reach out to us and lift us up.

The final character in *beryth* is either a Theth 𐤅 or Taw 𐤆, as these letters were originally one. If Theth, the pictograph was of a woven container, which was used to communicate the idea of being surrounded and enclosed, as well as being transported from one place to another. And if Taw, the character was drawn as an upright pole with a horizontal beam. It spoke of a doorway, of foundational support, and of a sign and a signature – particularly in its Paleo Hebrew form: ✕.

Bringing all of these images together, the picture they paint of the “*beryth* – Covenant” is of a singular doorway into the protected and sheltered home of first and foremost family, and of God reaching out to those of us who observe and listen to His testimony, to His signed invitation.

𐤃𐤄𐤁𐤆

Cognizant of Yahowah’s thoughts and promises regarding His Towrah and its centerpiece, the Covenant, we are better prepared to consider Paul’s contrarian view. He wrote:

“Speak (*lego* – say) to me (*ego*) those (*oi*) under (*hypo* – subject to the control of and submissive to) Towrah (*nomon* – nourishing allocation and allotment which leads to an inheritance; consistently used throughout the Septuagint to translated *towrah*) proposing and deciding (*thelo* – wanting and desiring, wishing and intending) to exist (*eimi* – to be), the (*ton*) Towrah (*nomon* – the source from which instruction and teaching, direction and guidance flow) do you not hear (*ouk akouo* – not you listen)?” (Galatians 4:21)

Before I rearrange the order of the words in the opening clause so that they read better in English, let’s try to make sense of the verbal phrase, *ouk akouo*, literally translated “not you hear.” It was scribed in the second person plural (you all or all of you), present (the action is current and ongoing) active (the subject, or Torah, is performing the action) indicative (the author is indicating this situation is real). So in conjunction with *ouk*, which is both a negative particle, negating the action, and an interrogative, raising a question, the concluding phrase could be trying to say: **“can’t you all hear the Towrah?”** or **“the Towrah cannot hear you all.”**

As for the opening phrase, it seems to flow better with the words rearranged to read: **“Speak to me those proposing and deciding to exist under the control of Towrah,...”** And as such, it is being used to taunt Paul’s adversaries. After all, Paul has never demonstrated the inclination to listen to anyone, much less his foes – not even to God. Therefore, from that mindset, Paul is either questioning the Towrah observant, to suggest that they don’t listen to the Towrah, whereby he is suggesting that his knowledge is superior to theirs, or to say that the Towah is unable to hear, thereby, suggesting that since he has that capacity, he is again superior to God’s Word. And since both approaches are nonsense, that’s the best I can do with this.

If Paul were writing for God, which he obviously wasn’t, he would not have said “speak to me.” Nor would he have begun by suggesting that the Towah observant are “*hypo* – controlled and submissive.” Most important of all, the Towrah was not designed to listen to us, but for us to listen to what God has to say through it. When we “*qara*’ – read and recite” the “*towrah* – teaching” of Yahowah, we “*shamar* – observe” and “*shama*’ – listen to” the Word of God. So once again, Paul had this all wrong.

Even if Paul were writing about Rabbinical Law, his approach would still be wrong. The problem with the Oral Law is that it differs from the Torah. But thus far, there hasn’t been any instruction from Paul in this regard. The former Pharisee has not bothered to delineated the differences between Yahowah’s Torah and man’s traditions.

Therefore, the problem is much deeper than the deplorable writing quality. Affirming this, the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear conveys: “Say to me the under law wanting to be the law not you hear.”

Jerome ignored what Paul wrote, hoping not to destroy the wannabe apostle’s credibility. The Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate therefore says: “Tell me, you that desire to be under the law, have you not read the law?”

The Authorized, and thus official, Protestant version of the “New Testament” proposed this unique spin in the King James: “Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?”

Unable to improve on the KJV’s corruption, the English Standard Version copied it: “Tell me, you *who* desire to be under *the* law, do you not listen to the law?” The “literal” New American Standard Bible could do no better, also claiming Paul wrote: “Tell me, *you* who want to be under law, do you not listen to the law?”

So when all hope of understanding is lost, we can always turn to the New Living Translation for a novel accounting: “Tell me, you who want to live under the law, do you know what the law actually says?” And therein lies the problem. Most Christians don’t know what the Torah says. Therefore, they don’t understand God’s Word, they don’t understand Yahowsha’s sacrifice, and they don’t understand that Paul was contradicting it and Him.

Just two chapters ago, we considered a number of statements Yahowah made about listening which conveyed exactly the opposite message. If you recall, God said: “Listen (*shama*) children to the correct instruction of the Father and pay attention so as to know and understand. For indeed, such teaching and learning is good, beneficial, and helpful. For this reason, I have given you My Towrah. You should not forsake, neglect, or reject it... Focus upon and closely observe (*shamar* – carefully examine, thoughtfully contemplate, thoroughly evaluate and consider) My terms and conditions and live, being restored to life.” (*Masal* / Word Pictures / Proverbs 4:1-2,4)

And then, further assailing Paul’s credibility, Yah proclaimed: “The one who turns away his ear from hearing (*suwr* ‘ozen min shama’ – the one who avoids listening and paying attention 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).” (*Masal* / Word Pictures / Proverbs 28:9)

Now that Paul has taken a rather lame swipe at Yah’s Torah, he is ready to commence his most diabolical attack on its heart and soul – the Covenant. He

begins with a half truth, with a verse which isn't totally inaccurate. But by framing his assault using a corruption of the Torah, Paul has identified the supposed "Law" which he claims "cannot hear," and to which the Galatians were "enslaved." Listen to one of the most successful schemers of all time twist the truth: "It has been written for n/a Abraham two sons had one from the servant girl and one from the free."

"For indeed (*gar* – because), it has been written (*grapho* – it has been inscribed and engraved) that (*hoti*) Abram (*Abraam* – a truncated transliteration of the pre-Covenant Hebrew name 'Abraham, meaning Merciful and Enriching Father) two (*duo*) sons (*huios*) had (*echo* – possessed), one (*heis*) from (*ek*) the slave girl (*tes paidiske*) and (*kai*) one (*eis*) from (*ek*) the free and independent (*tes eleutheros* – freeborn person, unbound, and exempt)." (Galatians 4:22)

In actuality, it is not "written that Abraham had two sons," because from Yahowah's perspective Abraham only had one son. That is why God asked Abraham in *Bare'syth* / Genesis 22:2 to "take your son, your only son, whom you love, Yitschaq, and go to the land of Mowryah..." Ishmael was expressly excluded from the Covenant and demonstrably banished from the Promised Land. Therefore, the "son of the slave girl" should only have been mentioned if Sha'awl had been illustrating these facts—which we shall soon discover is the opposite of his intended purpose.

There are few individuals as important to Yahowah and His Covenant as Sarah or her son, Yitschaq, and yet Sha'awl doesn't even bother to mention them by name. Moreover, Sarah's status as an "*eleutheros* – independent and freeborn individual" was extraneous to her role in the Covenant. She mattered because she was Abraham's wife and Yitschaq's mother. She was so important to the Covenant, when she and Abraham differed on a matter, Yahowah told Abraham to listen to his wife and do what she said. And by contrast, when Abraham asked Yahowah to make an exception on behalf of Ishmael, God said absolutely not. When Sarah laughed at something Yah said, God joined in, telling Sarah to name her son Laughter, which is Yitschaq in Hebrew.

But with Sarah it goes well beyond this. Just look at Yahowah's name – אלהים – whereby the final three letters following Yahowah's outstretched hand represent "Abraham And Sarah," with the Hebrew letter conveying the conjunction "*wa* – and" between them. Yahowah was thereby telling them, and us through them, that they individually as well as their family would be increased and that their home would grow and become secure. Yahowah's favorite place on Earth, Yisra'el, is based upon Sarah's name and means: "Individuals who Engage and Endure with God." Therefore, being married, which is the antithesis of being "*eleutheros* – independent and unbound," is why Sarah matters to the "*beryth* – marriage covenant and family-oriented relationship."

But let's remember, Paul's affections were never directed at women. He would never know or understand the joys of marriage or of raising children. And perhaps that is why Paul imagined those he had beguiled into the Faith becoming his children, for whom he endured birth pangs.

Paul has reprised his "for indeed it has been written," introductory line to deceive his audience into believing that God had an ongoing relationship with both sons. He is doing this so that he can deceive readers into believing that there were two covenants. But there aren't, which is why Paul did not cite any portion of the story which begins in *Bare'syth* / Genesis 17 and is advanced through 21st chapter. He created his own imagined passage and tried to pass it off as if it were Scripture. And he did so because Yahowah's testimony is incompatible with his proposition.

And this was not the only time he would foist this fable. He parades it out again in Romans 9, where he boasted again that "I am not lying," that there are multiple "covenants," with one yielding "children of the flesh," while the other begat "children according to the promise." But in Romans, he would bury himself somewhat differently, writing: "for I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christou for the sake of my brethren," and "but not as though the Word of God has failed, for they are not all Yisra'elites who are from Yisra'el."

The reason for Paul's duplicity in Galatians, as well as in Romans, is that Pauline Doctrine is built upon the following ungodly precepts: 1) God established two covenants, not one. 2) The covenant memorialized in the Torah on Mount Sinai was formed with Hagar and Ishmael rather than with Sarah and Yitschaq. 3) The covenant depicted in the Torah enslaves those who observe it. 4) The verbal promises made to Abraham bypass the Torah. 5) There is no relationship between Yahowsha' and the Torah. 6) Christians become God's children by way of the verbal promise alone. 7) Believing the promise necessitates rejecting the Torah.

Sha'awl's entire argument is erroneous and preposterous, but yet it serves as the foundation of Christianity—a religion set apart from the Torah and its God. He was as Yahowah called him – the plague of death.

Promoting this deadly deception to Evangelical Christians, the New Living Translation lied and said: "**The Scriptures say that Abraham had two sons, one from his slave wife and one from his freeborn wife.**" The authors of this sentence knew that there was no basis for "wife" in the Greek text once, much less twice, but that did not stop them from copyediting something they were passing off as Scripture, doing so in order to artificially elevate Abraham's morality. The reason they are assisting in this way is because Pauline Doctrine is based upon Abram, at the expense, and thus exclusion, of the Torah. It is like Islam in this way.

Sarah was Abraham's wife and Hagar was not. (So that you know, the Hebrew word translated "wife" in most bibles at the end of Genesis 16:3 relative to Hagar is *'isah*, which means "woman.") This distinction, which Sha'uwl has blurred and the NLT has obliterated, is critical because it serves to underscore the importance of marriage and fidelity in Yahowah's Familial Covenant Relationship. The problem obviously wasn't with Hagar's enslaved status, because she was freed, as was her son. At issue, and the reason her son was disqualified from the Covenant, is the simple fact she was not Abraham's wife.

The moral standard Yahowah established with "You should not consistently commit adultery" (Shemowth / Exodus 20:14) is symbolic of His Covenant, and yet it is banished from Pauline Doctrine, and is thus lost on Christians. Also lost on Christians, as a result of their affinity for Paul, is the meaning behind the Second of Seven Instructions Yah etched on the Second of Two Tablets, whereby we are encouraged to highly value our Heavenly Father and Spiritual Mother to live a prolonged life with God in the Promised Land.

Yahowah's Covenant is about marriage, about family, about a husband and wife raising children in a loving and supportive home. So since Sarah was Abraham's wife and Hagar was not, the Egyptian was disassociated and her son was disqualified. But these insights are absent from Paul's letter, allowing, even motivating, the New Living Translation to corrupt Yahowah's symbols.

As for the older Christian witnesses, the Protestants simply copied the Catholics. The Latin Vulgate reads: "For it is written that Abraham had two sons: the one by a bondwoman and the other by a free woman." So the KJV wrote: "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman."

Paul's case against the Torah hinges upon the faulty notion that the conversation Yahowah enjoyed with Abraham at the initiation of the Covenant was completely different than the Torah's commemoration of it, creating a contrived distinction between the promise God announced and God asking that it be written down so that the terms and benefits of His Covenant would be known to everyone.

After foisting this lie, Paul reinforces it before returning to his central ploy. Not only would his faith be based upon an unrecorded and unknown promise, and thus be wholly disassociated with Yahowah's Towrah, Paul's new covenant would be based upon another false premise. So while I recognize that this statement lacks fluidity, it isn't my fault. Paul was evidently learning to write while learning to lie. Consider the Nestle-Aland's Interlinear: "But the indeed from the servant girl by flesh has been born the but from the free by promise."

Removing the extraneous words, and reporting those found in the oldest manuscript more accurately, Sha'awl wrote...

“Certainly (*alla* – nevertheless and to the contrary) [*this affirmation* (*o men* – the indeed; not extant in P46)] **from** (*ek*) **the slave girl** (*tes paidiske*) **according to** (*kata* – by) **flesh** (*sarkos* – physical human body and nature) **has been born** (*gennao* – has been procreated and given birth), [*but that* (*o de* – then this; not found in P46)] **from** (*ek*) **the free and unbound** (*tes eleutheros* – the freeborn person, independent, and exempt) **by way of** (*dia* – through) **a proclaimed promise** (*epaggelia* – verbal announcement and agreement).” (Galatians 4:23)

Both boys were conceived and born the same way, only by way of different mothers. And they were both circumcised (albeit only Yitschaq experienced it in accordance with the Torah's instructions). But the inference here is that if you are Torah observant, then you are a slave. Whereas Paul is attempting to associate his preaching to the promise of freedom, and thereby usurping Yahowah's claim in the First of Three Statements etched on the First of the Two Tablets.

It is instructive to know that while most lexicons include “promise” among *epaggelia*'s definitions, the word's etymology suggests that this rendering is somewhat of a legacy of Paul's argument. In the general sense, the noun *epaggelia* means “announcement.” It was primarily used as a legal term in ancient Greece, and denoted a “summons.” Not surprisingly, it is derived from the verb, *epaggello*, which means “to announce a summons.”

Epaggelia is a compound of *epi*, meaning “upon, by, and before,” and *aggelos* “messenger.” So in our attempt to be accurate, according to our fledgling writer, the freeborn child was literally “by messenger,” and figuratively “by summons or announcement.”

Ever the clever one, Paul's ploy was designed to kill two birds with a single stone. By artificially differentiating the conception of Ishmael through Hagar as “of the flesh” and Yitschaq through Sarah (albeit neither were named) “by way of a proclaimed promise,” Sha'awl was able to disregard the Towrah while demeaning it. He reinforced his view that the Torah enslaved while at the same time denouncing it as being of the flesh, and thus corruptible. This would then lead to him condemning circumcision, which was also of the flesh. So while this is nothing more than a string of half-truths and lies, to Paul's credit they are woven together in a clever way.

Therefore, as is the case with all effective deceptions, just enough of this statement was accurate to give Paul's ploy a veneer of credibility, making the ruse sufficiently beguiling to conceive a new religion. Sarah's solution to God's announcement was to use a surrogate mother (“of the flesh”). But since Yahowah's Covenant is based upon the importance of fidelity in marriage, the

human remedy (as is the case with all religions, not so coincidentally) was not acceptable. The Covenant (which is a mutual vow) would therefore be consistent with God's plan, not with man's plans.

Paul's Christian troubadours scribed the following in support of the false prophet's scheme. The Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate promotes: "But he who was of the bondwoman was born according to the flesh: but he of the free woman was by promise." So then the Authorized Protestant King James Version published: "But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise."

The NLT's recasting of Paul's statement is inaccurate with regard to the Torah (Hagar was not Abraham's wife), and also inconsistent with the Greek text of the epistle. "The son of the slave wife was born in a human attempt to bring about the fulfillment of God's promise. But the son of the freeborn wife was born as God's own fulfillment of his promise."

Being accurate here is actually a big deal, because the Covenant is the most important thing in the universe to Yahowah. Further, the original announcement of the Covenant agreement made with Abraham is found in but one place: the Torah—which is the foundation of God's Word. And even today, it serves as Yahowah's summons to us, one where we are afforded the opportunity to choose to appear before God as His children rather than appear before Him as our Judge.

Now that Sha'uwl has laid the foundation for his faith upon the shifting and desolate sands of deceit, he is set to erect the most beguiling straw man in human history. And since I'm very, very, uncomfortable with (read revolted by) Paul's next statement, let's approach the edifice of his religion by way of the Nestle-Aland's scholastic rendering of the text though the McReynolds Interlinear: "Which is being allegorized these for are two agreements one indeed from hill Sinai to slavery giving birth who is Hagar."

Before I comment, I'd like you to contemplate the Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Evangelical portraits of Christianity's straw man. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, compiled on the authority of his pope, reads: "Which things are said by an allegory. For these are the two testaments. The one from Mount Sina, engendering unto bondage, which is Agar." Sir Francis Bacon's political enterprise on behalf of King James published: "Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar." And the Evangelical paraphrase, mislabeled the New Living Translation, authored the following to tickle the fancy of their target market: "These two women serve as an illustration of God's two covenants. The first woman, Hagar, represents Mount Sinai where people received the law that enslaved them."

Now here is a more literal and complete translation of Sha'awl's Greek text for your consideration:

“Whatever (*hostis* – whoever or anything that) is being (*eimi*) spoken of allegorically (*allegoreo* – a form of speech which should be taken figuratively, an illustrated discussion in which a comparison, illustration, or metaphor are used), these (*autos*) then (*gar*) exist as (*eimi*) two (*duo*) covenants or testaments (*diatheke* – dispositions or promised agreements between parties which settles affairs and facilitates inheritances through a will), one (*heis*) indeed (*men* – surely and by way of affirmation and concession) from (*apo*) Mount (*oros*) Sinai (*Sina* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *Cynay*) into (*eis* – to) subservience, slavery, and bondage (*douleia*), giving birth to (*gennao*) whoever (*hostis*) exists as (*eimi*) Hagar (*Agar* – transliteration of the Hebrew *Hagar*, from *hagah*, meaning to moan).” (Galatians 4:24)

In context, it appears as if Sha'awl scribed: **“Speak to me those proposing to exist under the control of Towrah: can't you hear the Towrah? (4:21) For indeed because it has been written that Abram two sons had, one from the slave girl and one from the free and unbound. (4:22) Certainly from the slave girl according to flesh has been born, from the free by way of a promise. (4:23) Whatever is being spoken of allegorically, these then exist as two covenants or testaments, one indeed from Mount Sinai into subservience, slavery, and bondage, giving birth to whoever exists as Hagar.” (4:24)**

As I read these words, my hands are paralyzed above the keyboard. I want to scream and cry all at the same time. My stomach churns, my heart breaks, and my head is bowed in shame. How is it possible that the world's largest religion was erected upon something so obviously false? Why wasn't this letter discarded as rhetorical rubbish? Why did anyone believe Paul?

Unlike his previous statements, this is neither a credible counterfeit nor a plausible ploy. It is an outright lie—the kind of thing which only fools fools, hoodwinking the ignorant or irrational.

Paul has postured a deception which pierces the heart of God. He has crossed the point of no return and taken Christians back into the wilderness to die. Nothing ever written was as demonic nor deadly.

There is only one covenant, not two. The Hebrew word *beryth* upon which the Familial Covenant Relationship is based is never plural. It was established between Yahowah, Abraham and Sarah, and then affirmed with Yitschaq and Ya'aqob after them. Ishmael (who was freed, incidentally) was expressly excluded from the Covenant, and was banished from the Promised Land, as was his mother (who was also freed).

This singular Covenant begat the Children of Yisra'el. It led to the liberation of the Chosen People during the Exodus. Yahowah's one and only Covenant was memorialized in the Torah on Mount Sinai and serves as the foundation of God's Word. According to Yahowsha', the Torah's presentation of the Covenant delineates the narrow path to a relationship with God and to our subsequent redemption. Yahowsha' said that there is no life apart from the Torah. For it is this very Torah which gives meaning to Yahowsha's life and which dictates the timing of His return. In fact, according to Yahowchanan, Yahowsha' is "the Word made flesh," which is equivalent to calling Him: "the living embodiment of the Torah."

There is no association between Hagar and the revelation of the Torah on Mount Sinai, nor between the Covenant memorialized in the Torah, and being placed into bondage. So what Paul has done by speaking of the Covenant in these terms, by referencing bondage, and by dropping the names Sinai and Hagar, is wrap his overt lie in a corruption of the truth, making it particularly insidious. And in so doing, he established the model Muhammad, Satan's second most effective messenger, would follow. Both religions would be based upon caricatures of Abraham, at the exclusion of the Torah and Yahowah.

Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Mormonism have been made to appear credible by weaving twisted elements of truth through overt distortions of it, and thereby making outright lies appear credible to the unsuspecting and unthinking—to the ignorant and malleable. That is what has occurred here. Shards of this are true, albeit horribly misshapen to suit Satan's agenda.

Scripture has many allegorical elements because Yahowah loves to compose word pictures. There is a Covenant. It was codified on Mount Sinai. And while Hagar and her son were excluded from it, Islam, the Arabic word for "submission," did in fact emerge from them, leading billions into subservience, slavery, and bondage. In their rage, today's Muslims have become the embodiment of Yahowah's prediction when He said about Ishmael's descendents: "They will be wild asses of men. Their hand will be raised against their brother and their brother's hand will be raised against him. And they will live in hostility with the whole world."

Unfortunately for billions of souls, the Christian religion was established upon Sha'awl's allegory, whereby their "Lord Jesus Christ died for them on a cross." It did not matter that the Lord was the Adversary, that this wasn't His name or title, or that God cannot die, because the Torah was now dead and the truth slaughtered, having been replaced by Paul's illusion. Thereby, the purpose and benefits of Yahowsha's sacrifice were annulled. For Christians, as a direct result of Paul, it became sufficient to "believe to be saved." A profession of faith in something that is not true replaced trust in the truth Yahowah had established.

But why were so many people fooled by something which was diametrically opposed to that which God had communicated in His Word? It is preposterous to correlate the Covenant promises memorialized on Mount Sinai with Hagar, or to suggest that God's Word enslaves. The Torah's codification of the Covenant celebrated Yahowah's ability to lead His children—all of us—away from human religious and political oppression, and to freedom.

Before we wrestle with the devastating blunders Paul has articulated, some words about the words. *Allegoreo* didn't need to be translated because the Greek term was transliterated into English. It is from *allos*, meaning "other or another," and *agoreo*, meaning "to address an assembly by speech or in writing." So an allegory is "another way of communicating with people."

Unfortunately, however, Paul is saying that no matter what the allegory or word-picture God was painting in the Torah's depiction of Hagar and her banished child, that it was irrelevant to the point he, Paul, was now making: which is that there are two covenants, with the one codified with Moseh on Mount Sinai leading to slavery. In other words, Sha'uwl is saying: "Regardless of the intent of Yahowah's parable, my interpretation is all that matters." Never mind the fact that the Covenant codified with Moseh was written during the Exodus, when Yahowah was leading the Children of Yisra'el, the descendents of Yitschaq, out of house of slavery and the realm of bondage.

If you believe Paul and rely upon his epistles, you are a Christian. And when you die, your soul will cease to exist as a result of being beguiled by a pathetic lie. If you trust Yahowah and rely upon His promises as delineated in His Word, you are God's child and will live forever with Him. But you cannot have it both ways. To believe Paul is to distance yourself from Yahowah. To trust Yahowah is to distance yourself from Paul. Because of what Sha'uwl wrote, there is no connection between Christianity and the Torah, and thus between Christians and God.

Moving on to the next interesting word, in addition to meaning "covenant," *diatheke* describes "a testament or will used to transfer property to one's heirs." It is from the verb, *diatithemai*: "to arrange one's affairs in such a way that by entering into an agreement they are assured to inherit something valuable." The verb is a compound of *dia*, "by way of," and *tithemi* "that which is set aside and set in place." *Thithemi* also conveys the idea of "having money laid aside to help establish someone," and as a result, it foreshadows the concept of "redemption." So there is nothing wrong with the term. The problem here is that Paul rendered it in the plural and then he built the most deadly of all straw men upon it.

During my first pass through this material, I had hoped to somehow exonerate Paul by suggesting the confusion was between the Sinai desert and

Mount Sinai, but not only is “*opous* – mount” presented before Sinai in the text, every lexicon at our disposal links the Sinai with Mount Sinai/Horeb, and thus with the place Yahowah dictated the Torah to Moseh. Moreover, Paul ends any doubt that he was speaking of Mount Sinai, not the Sinai Peninsula, again in the next verse.

That is not to say there aren't two Sinais. There are, and they are not coterminous. The Sinai Peninsula is a desert sandwiched between the two arms of the Red Sea. The Children of Yisra'el crossed this wilderness en route to Mount Sinai, which is on the other side of the Gulf of Aqaba in Arabia. Hagar, however, was never in one or on the other.

Mount Sinai, also known as Mount Horeb, was the place Yahowah introduced Himself to Moseh, and where He subsequently revealed the Torah to him. But Hagar wandered aimlessly toward Shur before Ishmael was born. Shur, we learn from *Bare'syth* / Genesis 16:7, 20:1, 25:18, and *Shemowth* / Exodus 15:22 was within walking distance of what is today's southeastern border of Israel. That places Shur east of Egypt, east of the Sinai, and east of the Gulf of Aqaba crossing of the Red Sea. It was therefore in northwestern Arabia. Then after Ishmael was born, Hagar and her son were banished to the desert of Paran, which is similarly located.

Rather than associating the wilderness of Sin (a.k.a. the Sinai Peninsula) with Paul's four references to *Sina* (three in Galatians and one in Acts), *Strong's Lexicon* defines *Sina* as “a mountain or rather a mountainous region in the Arabian Peninsula made famous by the giving of Mosaic Law.” They are mostly right, which makes Paul completely wrong.

The *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament* says of *Sina*: “the mountain or mountain range in the peninsula of the same name, between Egypt and modern Arabia.” Unaware that the “peninsula” was and remains part of Egypt today, they would be wrong on both accounts. The Mount Sinai Moseh visited before he entered Egypt, and again after he had left Egypt, was on the eastern side of the Red Sea crossing, and thus not in Egypt but instead on the Arabian Peninsula.

The *Complete Word Study Dictionary* also exacerbates Paul's dilemma, saying that *Sina* refers to “the site of the burning bush.” It is “the name of a peninsula and a mountain range.” In that they go on to associate the location of Mount Sinai within the Sinai Peninsula, they would also be wrong, as there would have been no sea to cross and the Exodus would have stalled in Egypt.

The *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* cites Acts 7:38 which digs Paul into a still deeper hole. It reads: “They are the ones who became the called-

out assembly in the desert with the messenger speaking to him in the Mount Sinai (*Sina*) and our fathers who welcomed the living words given to us.”

But we really didn't need the help of the scholastic tomes to hang Paul. He hung himself. As mentioned, in the very next statement he acknowledges that the *Sina* with which he is associating Hagar's covenant is “Sinai mountain existing in Arabia.” And that is the site upon which Yahowah provided the Torah to Moseh.

So, let's be clear. Paul has proposed two covenants and God has said there is one. Paul wrote that there was a covenant formed with Hagar, and God has said that His Covenant was formed with Abraham and Sarah. Further, Paul has said that the covenant codified on Mount Sinai enslaves us while God has demonstrated that it liberates us. So, since there is an irreconcilable divide between Paul and Yahowah, one of the two must be wrong.

Moreover, consider the preposterous notion of using the Torah's central story to advance a doctrine designed to destroy the credibility of that same Torah. And yet, since the Torah is the only place that Abraham, Sarah, and the Covenant are known, that is exactly what Paul has done.

Now, since I am stating categorically, not allegorically, that Paul, the mother of the Christian Church, is lying, and that his thesis is in direct opposition to God, let's consider God's side of this story. He was opposed to establishing a covenant relationship with Hagar's son: **“Then Abraham said to God, ‘What about Ishmael? Could he exist in your presence?’”** (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:18) **“God said, ‘Absolutely Not.’”** (*Bare'syth* Genesis 17:19) There would be no covenant of any kind with “the son of the slave woman.” Sorry Paul.

The Covenant is singular and eternal. It was established with ‘Yitschaq as opposed to Ishmael: **“Sarah, your wife, shall have a child, bearing your son, and you shall call his name: ‘Yitschaq.’ I will stand up and establish My Covenant Relationship with him—an eternal and everlasting family relationship with his offspring after him.”** (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 17:19) Yahowah's Word and Paul's letter are irreconcilable, as are those who pronounce their faith in Paul's lies.

In direct opposition to Paul's claim that “indeed from Mount Sinai into slavery,” on Mount Sinai, and in His own hand, Yahowah wrote: **“I am Yahowah, your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery.”** (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 20:2)

The following passage obliterates the notion that Paul had poetic license to delete portions of the Towrah he did not like, or add his own commandments: **“With all the words (*debar* – communications and statements) that relationally I instruct you with (*sawah 'eth* – provide by way of direction to you), closely**

observe and carefully consider them (*shamar* – focus upon them). **Do not add** (*yasap* – make any increase or addition) **to them and do not decrease or reduce** (*gara* – subtract from) **them.**” (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 13:1)

As for Paul’s assertion that the Torah had a limited shelf life, Yahowah inspired Yasha’yah / Isaiah to write: **“The grass dries up and the flower withers but the Word (*dabar*) of our God stands and is established (*quwm* – encourages, supports, raises up, and restores) forever (*owlam* – eternally).”** (Yasha’yah / Salvation is from Yah / Isaiah 40:8)

Because of the unchanging nature of God, His Covenant Promise will be honored (which is to say it will be fulfilled even in our future): **“Because I, Yahowah, have not changed, you, the children of Ya’aqob will not perish or be destroyed.”** (*Mal’aky* / Messenger / Malachi 3:6)

Why do Christians believe Paul’s anti-Torah rhetoric when his statements are diametrically opposed to Yahowsha’s? The diminished corporeal manifestation of Yahowah said: **“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 create a division, to dismiss, to invalidate, or to discard (*kataluo* – to tear down, to dissolve, to destroy, to disunite, to subvert, to overthrow, to abrogate, to weaken, to dismantle, or to abolish, dismissing any implication or its influence), but instead (*alla* – to the contrary, emphatically contrasting that to the certainty), to completely fulfill (*pleroo* – to proclaim and complete, conveying the true meaning and thinking, to liberally supply, carrying out, accomplishing, and rendering it totally and perfectly). (5:17)**

Because (*gar* – for this reason then so that you understand) in deed and in truth (*amen* – truly and reliably), I say to you (*lego sy*), until (*hoes* – up to the point that) with absolute certainty (*an*) the heaven and the earth (*o ouranos e ge* – the universe and the surface of the planet) cease to exist (*parerchomai* – pass away, disappearing), not ever under any circumstance shall (*ou me* – there is no way whatsoever, not even so much as a possibility that) one aspect of the smallest letter (*eis iota* – shall a single Yowd, the first letter in Yahowah’s name

and the smallest character in the Hebrew alphabet) **nor** (*e*) **a single stroke of the pen** (*mia keraia* – one of the smallest 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) **might take place** (*ginomai* – happens and occurs, becoming a reality). (5:18)

Therefore (*oun* – indeed and as a result), **whoever may at any time** (*hos ean* – if at any moment anyone introduces a contingency or condition whereby individuals) **dismiss or attempt to do away with** (*luo* – may seek to toss aside, invalidate, or abolish, tearing away or 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 provided the name and will be judicially and legally summoned as** (*kaleo* – he will be referred to and called by the proper name, literally and passively summoned, called to task and designated) **Little and Lowly** (*elachistos* – Paulos in Latin, meaning: small and inadequate, insignificant and insufficient, irrelevant and unimportant, immaterial and inconsequential (*Paulos*, the Latin name Sha’uwl adopted as his own means “*elachistos* – little and lowly)) **by the kingdom of heaven** (*en te basileia ton ouranos* – by, within, among, and with regard to the reign and royal authority of the heavens).

And then (*de* – but by contrast), **whosoever** (*hos an*) **might act upon it** (*poieomai* – may engage through it, making the most of it, attempting to carry out its assigned tasks (aorist active subjunctive)) **and** (*kai*) **teach it** (*didasko* – try to provide and share its instructions, expounding upon it), **this** (*houtos* – these things) **will properly be referred to and named** (*kaleo* – it will be judiciously and appropriately called and designated) **great and important** (*meGas* – 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) The Ma’aseyah Yahowsha’s statement regarding the Towrah is the antithesis of Pauline Doctrine.

And yet God was not done. Yahowsha’ would conclude His Instruction on the Mount with this announcement regarding the connection between the Torah

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

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

This (*houtos*) **then** (*gar* – for this reason) **actually and presently is** (*estin* – exists as) **the Torah** (*o nomos* – becomes the means to being nourished by that which is bestowed to become heirs, existing as the precepts which were apportioned, established, and received as a means to prosper and to be approved, and prescriptions for an inheritance; from *nemo* – that which is provided, assigned, and distributed to heirs to nourish them (nominative)) **and the Prophets** (*kai oi prophetes*): **Under the auspices of freewill, you all should choose at some point in time to enter, personally engaging by moving** (*eiserchomai* – at a moment in time you ought to want to personally act by electing to go in, beginning the journey by choosing to experience (aorist active imperative))

through (*dia* – by way of and on account of) **the narrow, specific, seldom-tread, and exacting door** (*tes stenos pule* – the doorway with strict requirements which is highly restrictive, the passageway which is unpopular and seldom walked, an infrequently-trodden gateway whereby a stand will be taken to enable others to stand, to be firmly established, and to be upheld (note: *stenos* is based upon *histemi* which provides the concluding insights)) **because** (*hoti* – for the reason that namely) **broad, man-made, and crafted to be wide open** (*platys* – molded, malleable, plastic, and easily crafted and plied, a wide and artificial thoroughfare; from *plasso* – formed and molded by man, serving as the basis of plastic) **is the door** (*pule* – is the gate) **and spacious** (*eurychoros* – as encompassing as nations, widely regional, and broadly societal; sharing a base with *eusebeia* – especially religious, speaking of belief systems and their devout and pious practices) **is the way** (*e hodos* – is the path and journey, the popular way through life, the well traveled road and route, the common course of conduct) **which misleads and separates** (*e apago* – that takes away, leading through deception; from *ago* – directs, leads, and guides to *apo* – separation) **into** (*eis*) **utter destruction** (*apoleia* – needlessly squandering and ruining the valuable resource of one’s existence, causing it to perish; from *apollumi* – to be put entirely out of the way, to be rendered useless and to be abolished, coming to an end and ceasing to exist), **and a great many** (*kai polys* – the vast preponderance, an enormous number, and to a very great degree, serving as a superlative of great, many, much, and a large number) **are those** (*eisin* – are actually the ones (present active indicative)) **who are influenced into moving while suffering the consequences of entering** (*oi eiserchomai* – who as a result of being acted upon are affected by taking the first step toward and then going in, manipulated in the process of beginning a journey while experiencing the effect of going out (present middle passive participle nominative)) **through it** (*dia autos* – by way of it).

Certainly (*tis* – it is certain that), **the specific doorway has strict requirements, it is narrow, seldom-tread, and it is an exacting passageway** (*e stenos pule* – the doorway is highly restrictive, the passageway is unpopular and infrequently walked whereby a stand is taken to enable others to stand, to be firmly established, and to be upheld), **and it completely goes against the crowd to the point of persecution** (*kai thlibomai* – it is so totally unpopular the past act influences the future to the point of hardship and harassment, even to oppression and affliction (perfect passive participle nominative)), **the one way** (*e e hodos* – the specific journey through life, the singular route and the path) **which leads, separating those guided** (*apago*) **unto** (*eis*) **life** (*zoe* – vigorous and flourishing living, the fullness of a restored and active existence), **but** (*kai*) **very few** (*oligos* – an extremely small quantity over a very short time) **are those** (*eisin o* – exist the ones) **finding it** (*heuriskomai autos* – presently learning and actively discovering the location of it, themselves experiencing it).” (Mattanyah / Yah’s Gift /

Matthew 7:11-14) Therefore, according to God, the Torah is the source of life, while man's ways lead to death.

Yahowsha's final words to His Disciples echoed this same thought: **“He said to them, ‘These are My words which I spoke to you while I was with you, because it is necessary to (inevitable and logical, beneficial and proper, as part of the plan to) completely fulfill (carry out fully, totally perform, accomplish, proclaim, giving true meaning to, realizing the prophetic promises of) everything that is written in Scripture in the Mosaic Towrah, the Prophets, and the Psalms about Me.’ Then He opened their minds so that they would be intelligent and have the capacity to understand the written Scriptures. He told them, ‘Because, in this way, it is written that the Implement of Yah must undergo and experience suffering and be enabled to arise from being separated the third day. And it should be announced publicly in Yahowah’s name, ‘Change your perspective, attitude and thinking to be forgiven and pardoned for wandering from the path and missing your inheritance,’ to all nations, races, and places, commencing and leading from Yaruwshalaym. You are witnesses to this. And behold, I have prepared and sent you off as Apostles to convey the message of My Father’s announced and promised agreement upon you. But now, you remain in the city until which you are clothed in power and ability from above.”** (Luke 24:44-49) Yahowsha’ and the Torah are inseparable. One is simply the manifestation of the other.

In direct opposition to Paul, Dowd (who most know as David) wrote the following lyrics for a Song in which he proclaimed the value of the Torah: **“Day unto day pours out answers, and night unto night reveals knowledge which lead to understanding. Nothing exists without the Word. Nothing exists when and where the spoken and written message of the voice which calls out is corrupted or negated, becoming unimportant to be heard.”** (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:2-3*)

“Yahowah’s Towrah is wholly complete and entirely perfect, returning, restoring, and transforming the soul. Yahowah’s eternal witness and restoring testimony is trustworthy and reliable, making understanding and obtaining wisdom simple for the receptive.” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:7*) Not only is this the antithesis of Pauline Doctrine, but more than that, if Christians compared this passage to Paul’s epistles, they would reject everything the man wrote.

But Dowd / David wasn’t finished affirming what Paul attempted to belittle. **“Yahowah’s directions for living are right, causing the heart to rejoice. Yahowah’s terms and conditions are morally pure, shining a light toward**

understanding.” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:8*) Dowd didn’t find the Torah to be an unbearable burden as Paul has alleged.

If this is right (and it is), the basis of Paul’s manifesto is wrong. This speaks of God’s purpose, which is to form a relationship with us, and of His promise, which is to make such a thing possible and enduring. Both of which require Him to make us acceptable. So in a way, this is a summation of the Towrah: **“Revering and respecting Yahowah is cleansing and restoring, sustaining and establishing forever. The just means to resolve disputes of Yahowah are trustworthy and reliable, enduring and dependable. They are wholly vindicating, making the recipient to be righteous and innocent.”** (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:9*) So much for Paul’s notion that God’s Towrah never justifies and always enslaves.

“Moreover, your co-worker is admonished and enlightened, being taught by them. And in carefully observing them, there is a great benefit and reward.” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:11*) This was and remains the purpose of the Torah. It’s our Maker’s Operating Manual, telling us through words and pictures how to get the most out of this life and make it to the next. Those who carefully observe what our Heavenly Father had to say will be rewarded, because they will become His children and inherit the universe.

The most debilitating sin became Sha’uwl’s Achilles heel. **“Also, keep your co-worker away from arrogance, not letting this rule over me, then I will be completely prepared and blameless, ready for action, upright, and lacking nothing, and I will be considered innocent, distanced from the great transgression of rebellion.”** (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:13*)

If God is right, Paul was wrong. Observing the Torah is the source of wisdom, renewal, joy, enlightenment, being eternally established in Yahowah’s presence, justification, and innocence, in addition to providing a great reward. All we need be wary of is being arrogant, and thus self-reliant or self-assured, because the key to our redemption is our attitude toward God. If we are self-directed, then we are not in a position to rely upon Yahowah’s provision. In this light, it is especially worth noting that Dowd / David listed “rebellion” as “the great transgression,” something Paul should have considered before he spoke so defiantly against God.

Dowd’s closing line is particularly noteworthy. **“Let the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable and pleasing in your presence, Yahowah, my Rock and my Redeemer.”** (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 19:14*) The best way to accomplish this is to observe the Torah—the very thing Paul told his believers not to do.

Therefore, since Paul's message and Yahowah's are diametrically opposed, there is but one informed and rational conclusion: Paul lied. He was a false prophet. While the issue of whether or not Yahowah can be trusted is life and death to all of us, and is easily answered, it is irrelevant to Paul, because he claimed to speak for the God he contradicted.

This is the end of the line for Sha'awl's credibility. He has proven beyond any doubt that he was not trustworthy, that he was not speaking for God, that his epistle was not inspired and thus is not Scripture, and that he was a complete fraud.

Had Paul not repeatedly made the arrogant claim that he was speaking for God as His authorized apostle to the world, had Paul not claimed that he could not lie, had he not said that his preaching saved those who believed him, or that they were his children, and that they should follow his example, then Paul's errant statements would have been no different than thousands of other misguided religious advocates. But he made these claims, and as a result, Paul's lifeless deceptions were placed in the heart of the book canonized by the faith he conceived. The consequence of his arrogance has been catastrophic.

Now that there is a rational comparison, it should be noted that Yahowah used precisely fulfilled prophecy, brilliantly conceived imagery, a masterfully designed plan and a consistent, multi-faceted, intertwined message, along with the creation of the universe and the conception of life, to prove beyond any doubt that His Word could be trusted. But Paul could neither write intelligently nor credibly recount his own personal history. This contest has not been David versus Goliath; it has been a speck of dust against the Creator of the Universe. So why is it then that nearly two billion Christians believe Paul over Yahowah?

There is no question that Christians have been deceived, or that they are wrong, but the question remains: are they in this horrid position because they are ignorant or because they are irrational, are they apathetic or delusional? Has Paul's faith corrupted their attitude, perspective and thinking to the point that truth no longer matters?

Whatever the cause, their condition cannot be resolved until they are willing to change their attitude, their perspective, and their thinking to reflect that of the Torah—to view our existence and means to salvation from the vantage point of God's Word. But to do so, Christians will have to drain their religious swamp of Paul's delusions; otherwise, the seeds of truth will not take root and grow.

We will continue to plod our way through Paul's letter, recognizing that he was a fallible individual writing on his own behalf. There will be no pretense of Galatians being Scripture. We will credit God when Paul affirms something which is true, and which enhances our understanding of Yahowah and His plan of salvation. And we will expose and condemn Paul when he errs, recognizing that the cost of his corruptions can be counted in the millions, even billions, of human souls.

Sha'uwl's next statement reads: **“So now (*de* – but) Hagar (*Agar*) exists as (*to estin* – is) Mount (*oros*) Sinai (*Sina*) in (*en*) Arabia (*te Arabia* – a transliteration of the Hebrew ‘*Arab*), therefore (*de*), corresponding to (*sustoicheo* – stands in parallel with, is aligned with, and resembles) the present (*te nun*) Yaruwshalaim (*Ierousalem* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *Yaruwshalaim*, meaning source from which guidance regarding reconciliation flows). She is enslaved (*douleuo* – she is subjected to slavery) because of (*gar*) being associated with (*meta* – among) the children (*ton teknon* – the sons and daughters) of her (*autes* – third person singular feminine and thus referring to Hagar).”** (Galatians 4:25)

I am growing weary of trying to make sense of that which is senseless, so other than to make a few obvious points, I'm going to let Paul's devotees have this poison all for themselves.

“Speak to me those proposing and deciding to exist under the control of Towrah: can't you hear the Towrah? (4:21) For indeed because it has been written that Abram two sons had, one from the slave girl and one from the free and unbound. (4:22) Certainly from the slave girl according to flesh has been born, from the free by way of a promise. (4:23) Whatever is being spoken of allegorically, these then exist as two covenants or testaments, one indeed from Mount Sinai into subservience, slavery, and bondage, giving birth to whoever exists as Hagar.” (4:24)

These things are certain. Paul has perverted the concept of “observing the Towrah,” which is to closely examine and carefully consider its Teaching and Guidance,” to become “being under the control of the Torah,” which is “to obey it through compulsion.” Paul is setting up two straw men, the first by contriving an artificial distinction between the birth of Ishmael “being of the flesh” and “being enslaved” and Yitschaq “being free based upon a promise.” Paul is then errantly associating the Towrah's Covenant, which was revealed on Mount Sinai and lived out in Yaruwshalaim, with Hagar and with slavery even though Hagar was freed and banished, and Ishmael was expressly disassociated with that Covenant. And although God says that there is only one Covenant, Paul wants the faithful to believe that there are two – the second being his own. This then leads Paul to say that everything associated with Yahowah – His Towrah, His Covenant, His

Mountain, and His City – enslaves, even though according to God the opposite is true. And it is upon these lies that Sha’uwl conceived the religion of Christianity.

Contradicting God once again, Paul has left no doubt this time. According to this false prophet, the message Yahowah conveyed from Mount Sinai in His Towrah was as counterproductive as was the place where God’s Word was fulfilled: Yaruwshalaim. In Pauline Doctrine, God’s work in these places enslaved humankind. Only Satan would inspire a man to say such a thing.

‘*Arab* has several negative connotations in Hebrew, such as “dark and desolate,” but it also conveys the positive idea of “offering a pledge of pleasing fellowship.” And that is indeed what happened on Mount Sinai (also known as Mount Horeb) in Arabia. And Paul has used it here to take his believers back to the dark and desolate wilderness of lifelessness and ignorance.

Sustoicheo is from *sun*, meaning “with and together” and *stoicheo*, “proceeding to march as soldiers in a row, to walk, and to direct one’s life.” It literally conveys “to be in a series with, to be in the same row or rank, and to stand in the same line.” Figuratively, *sustoicheo* is “used in logical discussions of things which have distinctive features which fit in the same category,” and thus it means “to correspond.” Therefore, in the context of an allegory, the “corresponds” rendering seems the most appropriate. And that means that Paul is associating Hagar, the Covenant memorialized in the Torah on Mount Sinai, and Jerusalem, with slavery when there is no connection between Hagar and the Covenant or the Towrah with being enslaved. But Paul never let the truth get in his way. In fact, the reason that Sha’uwl was opposed “to the present Yaruwshalaim” is obvious: he was rebuked there for his opposition to circumcision.

I would be remiss if I didn’t remind you that *sustoicheo* is related to *stoicheion*, which Sha’uwl used in Galatians 4:3 to demean the Torah, saying: **“And also, in this way, it follows that when we were infants, under the elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology, we were subservient slaves.”**

He deployed *stoicheion* again six verses later, this time in context with “*douleuein* – to be controlled as a slave,” to further demean the Torah when he wrote: **“Certainly on the other hand, not having known or acknowledged god, you were enslaved to nature, not existing as gods. (4:8) But now having known god, but what’s more, having been known under god, how have you returned, changing your beliefs back upon the incapacitating and incompetent, the worthless, belittling, and terrifying elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology representing the inadequate, simplistic, and improperly formed first step which back again**

and again from above you are choosing to be controlled as a slave (4:9) by observing and carefully attending days, and months, and seasons, and years?” (4:10)

It was during our review of these earlier Galatians statements that we discovered that *stoicheo* conveyed a host of derogatory connotations, from “demonic supernatural powers or spirits” to “that which is basic, improperly formed, underdeveloped, and simplistic.” Something which is *stoicheo* is “initial, rudimentary and natural and thus associated with the elements which comprised the universe.” *Stocheion* suggests that “something’s usefulness has come to an end.” It conveys the idea of “a first step” as well as something which is “primitive, underdeveloped, childish, and worldly.” Because *stocheion* is indicative of the “command and control aspects of a military regime,” and of “soldiers following orders, and marching in conformity,” it is the antithesis of freewill.

In reality, everything Paul has written here is wrong. There is one Covenant not two. The Covenant was formed with Abraham and Yitschaq after him, not with Hagar or her son Ishmael, who were specifically excluded from the Covenant and expelled from the Promised Land. And the only reason this Covenant is known to us is because it was announced and memorialized in the Torah which was handed down and recited on Mount Sinai/Horeb. This Covenant commemorated the emancipation of the Yisra’elites from religious, political, and economic oppression, and it provides the means to our salvation. Many of the Covenant’s promises were then fulfilled and enabled by Yahowsha’ in Yaruwshalaym, which is why its name means “the source of reconciliation.” And curiously, Hagar and her son were freed from slavery, making Paul wrong on all accounts.

The things which actually correspond between the Covenant forged with Abraham and memorialized on Mount Sinai with Moseh, and that which was fulfilled in Yaruwshalaim by Yahowsha’, is that all those who rely on Yahowah’s Word are liberated from man’s religious schemes and adopted by God. But Paul is saying the opposite, that the Mount Sinai Covenant codified in the Torah is associated with Hagar, and that it leads to slavery. He is also saying that Yaruwshalaym is no different than Sinai in this regard. Rather than standing for the “Source of Salvation,” in Paul’s twisted mind, Yaruwshalaym is now a coconspirator in the enslavement of humankind. After having pierced Yahowah in the heart, Paul has now poked his finger in God’s eye.

Before we move on, I’d like you to consider the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear and other renditions of Paul’s ongoing thesis. “**The but Hagar Sinai hill is in the Arabia it lines up together but in the now Jerusalem she is enslaved for with the children of her.**” LV: “**For Sina is a mountain in Arabia, which hath**

affinity to that Jerusalem which now is: and is in bondage with her children.” KJV: “For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.” Then the NLT augmented Paul’s words to more accurately convey his blasphemy: “And now Jerusalem is just like Mount Sinai in Arabia, because she and her children live in slavery to the law.”

Based upon this letter, the Christian Church would have nothing to do with the Covenant, with the Torah, with Jerusalem, or with the Invitations to Meet with God. There would now be total separation, known in Scripture as damnation.

Paul’s next statement is nearly incomprehensible, which I suppose is better than being totally inaccurate. So now that he has annulled the work of Yahowah (which is Yahowsha’) in Yaruwshalaim, effectively negating all of the Covenant’s benefits by failing to acknowledge the reasons behind fulfilling *Pesach* – Passover, *Matsah* – Un-Yeasted Bread, *Bikuwrym* – First-Born Children, and *Shabuw’ah* – the Promise of the Sabbath, Paul creates a pretend and opposing Jerusalem to go along with his imaginary and contrarian covenant...

“But (de) the (e) Yaruwshalaim (Ierousalem) above instead (ano – upwards and opposite; from anti – in opposition), free and independent (eleutheros – released, unbound, and exempt) is (eimi – exists) who (hostis) is (eimi) our (emon) mother (meter).” (Galatians 4:26)

Without the *Miqra’ey*, which were fulfilled in Yaruwshalaim by Yahowsha’, there is no way to engage the Set-Apart Spirit in our lives, so a new “mother” was also required. So if we are reading this correctly, Paul’s faithful, after he has suffered birth pangs on their behalf, are born a third time from the “free and independent” “Yaruwshalaim above which is in opposition.”

And the duplicity here isn’t a function of the translation, but instead in the Greek text. Consider the NAMI: “**But the up Jerusalem free is who is mother of us.**” After a steady diet of lies, it would be unreasonable to attempt an interpretation which would make sense of this.

Sha’uwl, and the dark spirit he was serving, came to despise what occurred on Mount Sinai with the revelation of the Towrah, and what occurred in Yaruwshalaim with the fulfillment of some of its most important promises, so, just as they had created their own covenant in opposition to God, they conceived a mythical city, one floating in the sky, that was also opposed to Him. And then to add insult to injury, they demeaned the role of our Spiritual Mother by associating Sarah (a.k.a. the “freeborn”) with their replacement realm, calling her/it our mother. She was now “the Queen of Heaven,” reprising the role of the Madonna and Child in the Babylonian religion.

And if you think I'm pushing the envelope here, consider the NLT: "But the other woman, Sarah, represents the heavenly Jerusalem. She is the free woman, and she is our mother." They are wrong, of course, as was Paul. Posturing the false notion that Sarah serves as our mother was simply part of Paul's ploy to bypass the Torah. Sarah was the mother of one: Yitschaq. Moreover, the NLT just contradicted their patron saint. In the previous verse, Paul associated "Jerusalem" with the "enslavement of children."

Here is the Catholic and Protestant translation. LV: "But that Jerusalem which is above is free: which is our mother." KJV: "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all."

Moreover, the "heavenly Jerusalem" is not yet established. It will be constructed by Yahowah as part of His new heaven and earth at the end of the Millennial Sabbath.

And just when we thought it couldn't get any worse, Paul's Greek deteriorates to the point where we once again need to use the Nestle-Aland Interlinear as a compass to navigate Paul's twisted realm. "It has been written for be merry sterile the not giving birth rip and cry aloud the one not having birth pains because many the children of the desert more or of the having the man." This brings to mind one of my favorite sayings: I know that you think you heard what you believe I said, but I'm not sure that you realize that what you heard is not what I meant. So now for the living embodiment of that conundrum, please consider:

"For indeed (*gar* – for because then), **it has been written** (*grapho*), **'Be glad** (*euphrainomai* – celebrate and rejoice) **infertile** (*steira* – barren and sterile incapable of childbirth) **the** (*e* – feminine singular article (referring to Yaruwshalaim) nominative (conveying to be or to become)), **not** (*ou*) **giving birth** (*tikto* – bearing a child, being productive, growing, or producing), **violently lacerating** (*rhegnymi* – throwing an angry fit, viciously ripping things to pieces, distorting and convulsing while breaking apart) **and** (*kai*) **cry aloud** (*boao* – crying and shouting), **becoming the** (*e*) **not** (*ou*) **suffering birth pains** (*odino* – in great anguish, labor, and physical effort, engaging in long and hard work) **because** (*hoti* – that and namely) **many** (*polys*) **the children** (*ta teknon*) **of the desolate** (*tes eremos* – of the forsaken and deserted, of the solitary and lonely, and of the abandoned and lifeless), **more** (*mallon* – instead and by contrast as an alternative) **than** (*e* – or) **of the** (*tes*) **possessing** (*echo* – holding on to, having, and experiencing) **the man** (*ton andra* – the human).'" (Galatians 4:27)

While that's not decipherable, or even discernible, without a large dose of secret mythos and religious jargon or, failing that, a decoder ring, the citation is allegedly from Yasha'yah / Salvation is from Yahowah / Isaiah 54:1.

Cognizant of the wannabe apostle's reprehensible tactics, it's rather obvious that Sha'awl is trying to fool his audience into believing that Yahowah's prophecy regarding the Set-Apart Spirit was actually about a new replacement covenant. So in our quest for verification, we'll have to go back in time seven-hundred and fifty years and consider what God revealed through a prophet named "Salvation is from Yahowah" to see if we can affirm that Yasha'yah 54 was actually about our Spiritual Mother's enactment of Seven Sabbaths in Yaruwshalaim, following Yahowsha's fulfillment of Passover, Un-Yeasted Bread, and First-Born Children, to demonstrate how this stanza in Paul's ill-conceived thesis twists God's intent.

In that context is always an essential component of understanding, the cited passage follows the most vivid portrayal of Yahowsha's redeeming sacrifice found anywhere in the Torah or Prophets. The last statement of the 53rd chapter speaks of what He did for us on *Pesach* and *Matsah*: **"Yet He, Himself, bore the sin of many, and He interceded for the transgressors."** This leads to a celebration of the healing and beneficial message and its consequence.

"Sing for joy (*ranan* – choose to convey the lyrics of a delightful and happy song in a melodic and rhythmic manner, actually focusing on the joy being expressed (the qal imperative conveys that which is both genuine and is an expression of freewill)), **woman who has not yet given birth** (*'aqar* – female who has not yet experienced motherhood and thus without descendants).

She who has not yet borne a child (*lo' yalad* – she who has not become pregnant and delivered a baby (the qal perfect conveys the actual situation associated with a completed, and thus not ongoing, condition)), **choose to be genuinely serene** (*patsach* – be at peace, without worries or distress, actually electing to be sparkling and happy, gleaming, bright, and cheerful (qal imperative)), **singing and rejoicing** (*rinah* – shouting for joy, expressing elation in having overcome).

And (*wa*) **elect to shine** (*tsahal* – literally choosing to reflect light, shouting that the time is nigh (qal imperative)), **not lingering** (*lo' yachal* – not waiting (qal perfect)).

For indeed (*ky*), **many are the children** (*rab beny* – abundant and numerous, even abounding in influence, is the offspring) **of the dazed, desolate, and destitute** (*shamem* – the devastated and deserted, the destroyed and damned, the stupefied and appalling) **among children** (*min beny* – from and part of the offspring, by means of and because of the sons) **controlled by Ba'al, the Lord** (*Ba'al* – who have become betrothed to the Adversary, who are possessed and ruled by Satan, who are lorded over and owned by the Lord, and who are slaves to their master (in the qal passive participle this is literally done to them)), **says**

(‘amar – answers and promises) **Yahowah** (יהוה).” (Yasha’yah / Salvation is from Yahowah / Isaiah 54:1)

While we will compare Yahowah’s statement to Sha’uwl’s misappropriation of it in a moment, let’s linger long enough to consider what Yahowah predicted would occur as a result of *Bikuwrym* – First-Born Children following His fulfillment of Passover and Un-Yeasted Bread:

“Enlarge (*rahab* – choose to joyfully take advantage of the opportunity to expand and make roomy (in the hiphil imperative, the subject, who is the Set-Apart Spirit, enables the object, who are those who campout with God, to participate in the action)) **your shining and sheltered place, your protected home for the upright** (‘*ohel* / ‘*ahal maqowm* – camping site at the standing place and covered tabernacle of light), **and** (*wa*) **the curtain and shelter** (*yarya’ah*) **of the tabernacle** (*mishkan* – the large home and dwelling place) **continuously spread for them under the auspices of freewill** (*natsah* – outstretch and extend on an ongoing basis so that they can choose (the hiphil stem, imperfect conjugation and jussive mood shows the Set-Apart Spirit constantly facilitating this result on behalf of those who elect to participate)), **not withholding or sparing** (*lo’ chasak* – not holding back (qal imperfect jussive)) **elongating** (‘*arak* – lengthening) **the cords** (*mythar* – the ropes which hold up, enlarge, and secure a tent), **and** (*wa*) **the tent pegs** (*yathed* – stakes used to hold up a tent, holding the cords securely to the ground) **fasten firmly and powerfully** (*chazaq* – strengthen and allow to grow strong) **because, indeed, to the right and on the left** (*yamyn wa sim’el* – right and left hand; speaking of Yisra’elites and Gowym), **you will spread out** (*parats* – you will increase, bearing more children), **and your descendants** (*zera’* – your seed, offspring, and children), **people from different races and places** (*gowym*), **will become heirs** (*yarash*). **And** (*wa*) **the desolate and deserted** (*shamem* – the devastated and destroyed) **towns** (‘*iy*) **they will inhabit** (*yashab* – settle and dwell within, living and staying).” (Yasha’yah / Salvation is from Yahowah / Isaiah 54:2-3)

Our Heavenly Father’s family would be enlarged and would be made even more secure as promised as a result of what He would do and now has done in His beloved city. There was no reason to worry. His promises all come true. And while God goes on to speak of His mercy and faithfulness when it comes to the redemption of His children, and of bringing them back home, He has put us on notice that most people will opt to be influenced by Satan, foregoing His light.

Christian apologists, steeped in the poisonous brew of Pauline Doctrine, will tell you that the self-pronounced Apostle cited this verse to suggest that Sarah, who was once barren, would become fertile, and that as such, she became the mother of the faithful. In their mind, this in turn explains why there are so many Christians, and why they became so powerful, in that Paul’s troubadours saw

themselves as the “children who would be greater in number and status.” But Sarah’s infertility was resolved 1,300 years before Yasha’yah penned these words (which would have made him a prophet predicting the past), and 2,000 years before the fulfillments of Passover, Un-Yeasted Bread, First-Born Children, and the Promise of the Sabbath in Yaruwshalaim enabled this celebration of the Covenant’s growth. Since Sarah had long since experienced labor, not only was she specifically excluded from this prophecy, the birth of Yitschaq was now history. Moreover, Sarah had but one child, and he was the patriarch of the Yisra’elites, not to mention, the designated heir to the Covenant Paul has condemned.

If we distance ourselves from Paul’s polluted mantra, it becomes obvious that the Mother being described in Yasha’yah 54 is someone very special. This prophecy is telling us that following the fulfillment of the first two Invitations to Meet with God by the Suffering Servant (prophetically described in Yasha’yah 53), our Spiritual Mother would give birth to the Covenant’s children on First-Born Children, enriching and empowering them Seven Sabbaths later on the *Miqra’* of *Shabuwa*. God was telling us that the Set-Apart Spirit would adorn us in light, facilitating our spiritual birth into His family.

Specifically, our Spiritual Mother adorns us in a “Garment of Light,” which is suggested in “*tsahal* – let your light shine.” She is responsible for enlightening us as well, illuminating the path to God. She also empowers the Covenant’s children to “*rinah* – sing out the lyrics” of Yahowah’s message to people the world over. And She is the power behind *Yowm Taruw’ah*, where we are called to “joyously proclaim the Way” to God, while also “shouting out a warning” to those headed in the wrong direction. Reinforcing this, on *Shabuw’ah*, *Taruw’ah*, *Kippurym*, and twice on *Sukah*, we are expressly asked to approach the Maternal aspect of God’s Light so that we can enjoy all of the rights and privileges of being part of the our Heavenly Father’s Covenant Family.

As an interesting aside, once we understand the promise and purpose of Yahowah’s Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God, we recognize that each resolves an aspect of our current nature, preparing us for adoption into Yahowah’s family and for camping out with our Heavenly Father. Therefore, those who answer God’s engraved Invitations, and those who observe the seven *Miqra’ey* in accordance with Yahowah’s Towrah instructions, receive the promised benefits.

‘*Ohel*, meaning “covered shelter,” describes “pitching a tent to campout.” It is indistinguishable in the text from ‘*ahal*, “to shine a pure and clear light.” So we have within this word a depiction of how our Spiritual Mother protects Her children. It becomes even more obvious when we recognize that ‘*ohel* is a “dwelling place, a household, and tabernacle.” Addressing this, the next word,

maqowm, and its root, *quwm*, describe the “standing place” where Yahowah “stood up for us so that we could stand with Him.” The Ma’aseyah Yahowsha’ is the living embodiment of *quwm*. And of course, “*maqowm* – the standing place” would be Yaruwshalaim—Paul’s coconspirator along with Sinai in our enslavement.

Also, too affirm the Christian affinity for Paul’s “Lord,” all you have to do is open your favorite “Bible.” No matter the translation, you will find Yahowah’s name replaced by Satan’s (a.k.a. Ba’al’s) title, “the Lord,” 7,000 times.

And fortunately there is a bright side to all of this. One of the benefits of having Paul routinely misquote the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms is that it gives us the chance to spend some quality time reading something which is enlightening and uplifting, not to mention, comprehensible, in the midst of the Pauline rhetorical rubbish. At least it keeps our brains from turning to mush and our souls from withering.

In this light, I am particularly fond of the 5th verse of the 54th chapter: **“For you are married to your Maker. Yahowah of the assembled implements is His name. He is your Redeemer, the Set-Apart one of Yisra’el, called God of all the earth.”**

Therefore, Paul not only misquoted Yasha’yah, he improperly associated Sarah with a prophecy depicting our Spiritual Mother’s fulfillment of the Invitations to Meet with God. In this light, please consider how different Paul’s Greek is from Yasha’yah’s Hebrew:

Sha’uwl: **“For indeed, it has been written, ‘Be glad infertile, the not giving birth, violently lacerating throwing an angry fit, viciously ripping things to pieces while distorting and convulsing, cry aloud, becoming the not suffering birth pains because many the children of the desolate, forsaken and deserted, more than of the possessing the man.’”** (Galatians 4:27)

Yahowah: **“Sing for joy, woman who has not yet given birth. She who has not yet borne a child, choose to be genuinely serene, singing and rejoicing. And elect to shine, not lingering. For indeed, many are the children of the dazed, deserted, and destroyed among children controlled by Ba’al, the Lord,’ says Yahowah (𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤍).”** (Yasha’yah 54:1)

While our intent was to discern what Paul tried to say, and then determine why he said it, the one thing I know for sure is that Yahowah is articulate, and is indeed a profound communicator, and Paul is neither.

Recognizing that Sha’uwl once again misquoted, twisted, and misapplied Yahowah’s Word to infer that he had Divine authority for his blasphemous position, let’s consider how the religious community handled his mistakes. The

Catholic Latin Vulgate reads: “For it is written: Rejoice, thou barren, that bearest not: break forth and cry thou that travailest not: for many are the children of the desolate, more than of her that hath a husband.” The Protestant King James therefore says: “For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband.”

The Evangelical New Living Translation accurately assessed Paul’s intent, but misrepresented his Greek text by attempting a paraphrase of the Hebrew passage instead: “As Isaiah said, ‘Rejoice, O childless woman, you who have never given birth! Break into a joyful shout, you who have never been in labor! For the desolate woman now has more children than the woman who lives with her husband!’” In a moment, I’ll share the Christian interpretation of Paul’s message so that you will be able to more fully appreciate how this lie was woven into the fabric of his faith.

Continuing with the Galatians epistle, please note that the following statement contains a pronoun, a conjunction, a preposition, four nouns, and one lone verb hanging out at the end of the “sentence.” Of these elements of speech, the NAMI composed: “**You but brothers by Isaac promise children you are.**” It’s hard to explain Paul’s point when his words don’t make any sense.

Examining the same words, I concur, that is what the self-proclaimed mother of the Christian faith wrote. Too bad it required Paul to contradict himself. Just a moment ago, he equated the Towrah memorialized on Mount Sinai with Hagar, Ishmael’s mother. But now, he would like you to forget all of that and consider...

“But (de) you (umeis) brothers (adelphos) according to (kata – literally down from or opposite of) Yitschaq (Isaak – a transliteration of the Hebrew Yitschaq, meaning laughter) of promise (epaggelia – of announced declaration or agreement) children (teknon) you are (eimi).” (Galatians 4:28)

Even if Paul hadn’t mangled and denounced the Towrah’s Covenant, this wouldn’t be true. The only promises that matter are the ones Yahowah made to Abraham, all of which He recorded for our benefit in His Towrah. Yitschaq was himself a beneficiary of those engraved vows, just as are we.

And last time I checked, Yitschaq had two children—twins as it turns out, not hundreds, thousands, millions, or billions of children. One of his two sons, his first born, Esau, Yahowah despised—so that’s not an appealing option. Although in this regard, Sha’uwl and Esau share the distinction of being the only two individuals Yahowah calls out by name to demean.

Yitschaq’s second son, Ya’aqob, became Yisra’el, and thus he represents the nation and the race Sha’uwl has been denouncing. Ya’aqob was the father of the

twelve tribes known collectively as “Yisra’el.” And yet Galatians has established, and Thessalonians will affirm, that Jews and Israel were Paul’s mortal enemy, so Ya’aqob isn’t a viable option either. Therefore, even the details which comprise Paul’s attempted recasting of Yahowah’s message are inaccurate, inappropriate, and contradictory. As such, his argument was designed to fool those prone to be religious, the ignorant and the irrational.

Even metaphorically, the *Gowym* who are adopted into Yahowah’s family aren’t Yitschaq’s children, but instead we are the product of our Heavenly Father and Spiritual Mother. And this adoption process is only possible when we accept the terms and conditions of Yahowah’s Covenant, the one memorialized in the Torah, something Paul rejected as have Christians after him. And thus, Sha’uwl’s statement is wholly fraudulent.

We find the following in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate: “Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.” Which was then reflected in the King James: “Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.” And then this was augmented in the NLT to convey: “And you, dear brothers and sisters, are children of the promise, just like Isaac.” It was a case of *money see, monkey do.* Unwilling to admit the “announced promise” is contained in the Torah, and that the “assured agreement” was the “Covenant,” each religious tome parroted Paul’s inaccurate and uninspired drivel.

Since nothing more need be said with regard to exposing Christians to the fact that Paul should not be trusted, let’s move on to his next line. The Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear proposed the following: “But as indeed then the by flesh having been born pursued the by spirit thusly also now.” Perhaps if I was insane, like Paul, or demon-possessed, this would make so much sense it would appear inspired. But since I’m not, this is the best I can do...

“**Otherwise** (*alla* – on the contrary, nevertheless, or certainly) **just as** (*hosper*) **at that time** (*tote* – then) **this** (*o*) **accordingly** (*kata*), **flesh** (*sarx* – the physical body) **having given birth** (*gennao* – having been born) **pursued, persecuted, and expelled** (*dioko* – hastily pressed forward, putting others to flight, running over them and driving them away, harassing and oppressing) **this** (*ton*) **according to** (*kata* – down from) **spirit** (IINA) **and so it continues** (*kai houto* – also likewise it follows) **even now** (*nyn* – at the present time).” (Galatians 4:29)

Let’s be honest in our appraisal. This “sentence” is incomprehensible. So rather than attempt to comment on what Paul actually wrote, let’s consider the Roman Catholic interpretation of his words. Jerome ventured: “But as then he that was born according to the flesh persecuted him that was after the spirit: so also it is now.” I wouldn’t know where to begin if asked to “translate” this.

The King James appears to be taking a racist approach, suggesting that Yahowah's Jews were persecuting Paul's Christians: "But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now." While there was a very limited history of Jews harassing Jews, there is no indication that Jews persecuted Gentiles.

As we have come to expect, the authors of the New Living Translation embraced this potentially anti-Semitic slant and made the most of it: "But you are now being persecuted by those who want you to keep the law, just as Ishmael, the child born by human effort, persecuted Isaac, the child born by the power of the Spirit." While I can't quarrel with the realization that this may well encapsulate Paul's intent, it isn't even remotely close to what he actually wrote.

There is no association between "to observe" and "to keep" or between the "Towrah" and "law." There is no correlation between the "Covenant" and "Ishmael," and both "Ishmael" and "Isaac" were conceived "by the human effort" of Abraham. Further "Isaac" was not "persecuted," nor was Yitschaq "born by the power of the Spirit." So while Ishmael is said to have teased Yitschaq, that's a world away from "*dioko* – persecution." Moreover, since *dioko* means "to persecute by hastily pursuing someone, to oppress and harass them, and thereby cause the victim to flee and ultimately be expelled," it's the wrong verb to apply to the intermittent taunts Ishmael launched in Yitschaq's direction, especially since it led to Ishmael's, not Yitschaq's, expulsion from the Promised Land. So no matter how Paul's message is interpreted, it is consistently wrong. And speaking of mistaken...

"Otherwise (*alla* – on the contrary, nevertheless, or certainly) what (*tis*) says (*lego*) the Writing (*e graphe*), 'Throw out and expel (*ekballo* – cast, drive, and send out) the (*ten*) slave girl (*paidiske*) and (*kai*) the (*ton*) son (*huios*) of her (*autes*) [not (*me* – the first of the two negations is not extant in P46)] for (*gar* – because then) will not receive (*me kleronomeo* – will not gain possession or inherit through a chance throwing of lots; from *kleros* – to cast or draw lots) the son (*o huios*) of the slave girl (*tes paidiske*) with (*meta*) the son (*tou huios*) of the free (*tes eleutheros* – free, unrestrained and not bound).'" (Galatians 4:30)

Once again, Paul's attempted citation of the Torah was garbled and inaccurate. But so that we have another perspective from which to consider his misquotation of Genesis 21:10, let's turn to the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear and consider what they have published: "But what says the writing: Throw out the servant girl and the son of her not for not will inherit the son of the servant girl with the son of the free."

Jerome's Latin Vulgate reads: "But what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the

son of the free woman.” So we should not be surprised that the KJV conveys the same thing: “Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.” Other than confirm that Paul was attempting to quote the Torah, the NLT’s rendering is very similar: “But what do the Scriptures say about that? ‘Get rid of the slave and her son, for the son of the slave woman will not share the inheritance with the free woman’s son.’”

The Torah passage Sha’uwl cited begins similarly, but ends differently. Most importantly, it is in Sarah’s voice, not God’s: “**And (wa) she said (‘amar) to (la) Abraham** (‘Abraham – from ‘ab – father and *raham* – enriching and merciful), **‘Banish (garas – remove and expel) the female servant (ha ‘amah – the maid) and also this one, accordingly, her son (ha zo’th wa ‘eth ben), for (ky – indeed) the maid’s son (ha ‘amah ben), he will not be an heir (lo’ yarash – he will not receive an inheritance) along with (‘im) my son (beny), Yitschaq (Yitschaq – Laughter).”**(*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 21:10)

But Galatians reads: “**Throw out and expel the slave girl and the son of her for will not receive by lots the son of the slave girl with the son of the free.”** Therefore, why do you suppose Paul removed “**And she said to Abraham**” from the beginning of this sentence? After all, he was positioning Sarah as the “Mother of the faithful” so her words should have carried Divine authority. But, more importantly, why did Paul corrupt the ending of the sentence, changing what Sarah said: “**and also this one, accordingly, her son, for the maid’s son, he will not be an heir along with my son, Yitschaq?**” Pretending to quote the Towrah, Sha’uwl concluded: “**for will not receive by lots the son of the slave girl with the son of the free.**”

Beyond the fact that it is inappropriate for the creation to misquote the Creator, it’s obvious that he misappropriated and misrepresented God’s statement because he wanted the passage to fit his thesis. So when Sarah didn’t differentiate between “the son of the slave girl and the son of the free,” Sha’uwl changed the text to create the illusion that he had a Divine sanction for his faith.

What’s so deeply troubling about all of this is that Sha’uwl knew that this particular passage was one of many which affirm that there was no covenant established with Hagar or Ishmael. They were banished into the desert, and were separated from God and from the Children of Yisra’el. Thus the basis for Sha’uwl’s adversarial covenant, the one allegedly memorialized on Mount Sinai with Hagar, which enslaves us, is torn asunder.

It is, therefore, once again evident that Paul was playing his audience for fools, banking on the hunch that they were too poorly informed and too irrational to connect these things and thereby rebuke him. And as it turns out, his

assessment was accurate. So perhaps this explains one of the reasons Sha'awl spurned Jews. They knew the Torah and would have held him accountable for twisting it. Recognizing that his ploy wouldn't prevail before an informed audience, Paul marketed his ideas exclusively to Gentiles who didn't know any better. It is one of the reasons there are so few Jewish Christians today.

Before we move on, I'd like you to consider something. If we were to put aside the big picture for a moment where Paul's message has been the antithesis of Yahowah's, how can anyone believe that this poorly written and illogical letter is Scripture, the inspired and inerrant Word of God? All one has to do is compare Paul's quotations to the original source and it becomes obvious that they are inconsistent and inaccurate. And by definition, inaccurate is not inerrant, thereby, destroying the most important percept of the Christian faith.

If you are a Christian, your options to resolve this problem are limited. They include blaming the source of inspiration. That is to say, you can accept the fact that Paul wasn't inspired by the Spirit who revealed the Torah. But that means Paul didn't speak for God, and was thus a liar.

You can also blame scribes, thereby, claiming that they changed Paul's words. But this justification is devastating, because only Papyrus 75, which covers part of Luke and most of Yahowchanan / John, is more reliable. And it was written one hundred years after Papyrus 46, which documented all of Galatians in the late first-, or early second-century. So if scribal error significantly changed the text of Galatians over the course of thirty to fifty years, then nothing in the so-called "Christian New Testament" could be considered remotely reliable, save perhaps isolated portions of Yahowchanan. As such, the entire foundation of Christendom crumbles.

The only other option is to side with Marcion, and believe that God, Himself, was so incompetent and senile that He could no longer remember what He said and, therefore, was no longer relevant. Worse, that God, if He was still alive, came to realize that His original plan was so hopelessly flawed that He needed to have someone correct it for Him. But how is that possible since the Ma'aseyah affirmed every aspect of Yahowah's Word and plan, and Paul has alleged that his message is the same as Yahowsha's? Besides, if God authorized Paul to contradict Him, and change His message and plan of salvation, why is Paul quoting from the failed plan which has been annulled?

Considering the options, it's little wonder Paul based his "faith" on "believing him." Those who are informed, and who are willing to think for themselves, will overwhelmingly conclude that he was untrustworthy. Removed from a religious context where the faithful will believe most anything, Paul's thesis isn't the least bit credible.

Returning to the Towrah, so that we might come to appreciate what Sha'awl was hoping his religious audience would ignore, we read: **“God (‘elohym) said to (‘amar ‘el) Abraham (‘Abraham – Merciful and Enriching Father), ‘Do not show a distressed or troubled outward appearance regarding (‘al ra’a ba ‘ayn ‘al) the young man who went astray (ha na’ar – the teenager who was a lost sheep). And regarding the maid (wa ‘al ‘amah), everything which (kol ‘ashar) Sarah (Sarah – meaning to Engage and Endure, Contend and Strive) says to you (‘amar ‘el), listen to what she says (shama’ ba qowl). Indeed (ky), through Yitschaq (ba Yitschaq – by Laughter), your offspring (zera’ – descendants and family) will be invited to approach (qara’ la – will be called out and welcomed, summoned to meet).”** (Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 21:12)

Qara’, which means “to call out, to invite and to summon, to meet and to greet,” as well as “to read and to recite,” serves as the basis of *Miqra’*, the name Yahowah selected to describe His Called-Out Assemblies – telling us that they are “Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God.” And the *Miqra’ey* in turn serve as the basis of the *ekklesia*—or Called Out.

In this simple and direct statement, Yahowah undermined the whole of Pauline Doctrine. Hagar was excluded from Abraham’s family and from Yahowah’s Covenant negating the crux of Sha’awl’s argument which claimed that the Towrah’s Covenant was enslaving because it was based upon the “slave woman.” Further, to suggest that the Towrah accurately records a conversation where Yahowah intervened between Abraham and Sarah, but did not record the promise Paul alleges was the basis of his faith, is preposterous.

Also, since Paul makes women subservient to men, his credibility in doing so is undermined by God asking this man to listen to his wife. But most revealing of all, Yahowah told us that it would be through Yitschaq that the children of the Covenant “would be called out, invited to approach, and welcomed” by God. And this means that it is the promises actually recorded in the Towrah, especially those associated with the *Miqra’ey*, that apply, not Paul’s imagination.

This was followed by Yahowah’s affirmation that Ishmael was sent away, and thus excluded from the Towrah’s ongoing narrative and Covenant: **“And also (wa gam – so then besides), accordingly (‘eth), the son of the maid (ben ha ‘amah), concerning pagans of different races (la gowy – to approach other places and nations, expressly Gentiles, and thus the heathen, uncultured, and pagan), I will put him (sym – I will appoint, list, place, and set him) because (ky) he’s your descendant (huw’ zera’).”** (Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 21:13) To be consistent then, the Gentile church, born out of Paul’s letters, would be the descendants of Ishmael. They were and still embody every aspect of *gowy*.

While Yahowah was resolute regarding the exclusion of Hagar and Ishmael, He, Himself, was not harsh. Per His instructions, Abraham responded quickly and decisively, but he didn't send the maid and child out into the desert to die. They were freed, thereby, negating another plank in Paul's ploy.

“Getting up early (*shakam* – taking action at daybreak), **Abraham** (*‘Abraham* – Merciful and Enriching Father) **in the morning** (*ba ha boqer* – at daybreak) **obtained and grasped hold of** (*laqah*) **a loaf of bread** (*lechem*) **and a skin of water** (*wa chemeth mym*), **and he gave them to** (*wa natan ‘el*) **Hagar** (*Hagar* – meaning to Flee), **placing them on her shoulder** (*sym ‘al shekem*) **along with the boy** (*wa ‘eth ha yeled*) **and he sent her away** (*wa salah*). **Then she walked** (*wa halak*) **and she wandered in error** (*ta’ah* – she went astray, deceiving herself, staggering around without understanding) **in the desert wasteland** (*midbar* – in a place devoid of the word) **of Beersheba** (*Ba’er Sheba’* – Well of the Sevenfold Oath).” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 21:14)

Directly contradicting Sha’uwl’s testimony, Hagar and Ishmael were freed. They were no longer slaves and therefore could not represent the concept of being enslaved. Furthermore, they were sent away many centuries before Yahowah dictated His Towrah Teaching on Mount Sinai, expressly disassociating them from the Covenant He codified therein.

Excluding both mother and son from the Covenant’s promise of eternal life in God’s family was one thing, but robbing him of his earthly life would have violated the oath Yahowah made to his father. **“And she walked** (*wa halak*), **settling down opposite him** (*yashab la min*), **about as far away as you could shoot an arrow from a bow** (*neged rashaq ka tachah qesheth*), **then she said** (*ky ‘amar*), **‘I do not want to be a witness** (*‘al ra’ah*) **at the death** (*ba maweth*) **of the boy** (*ha yeled*).’ **So sitting opposite him** (*wa yashab min neged*), **she raised her voice** (*nasa’ ‘eth qowl*) **and wept** (*wa bakah*).” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 21:16)

It is a bit strange, seeing that Ishmael was a taunting teenager, that his survival instincts and his will to live were surpassed by his mother. It does not speak well of his work ethic or character. And in this regard, since Yahowah said that Ishmael’s descendents “would be wild asses of men, their hand raised against their brother and their brother’s hand raised against them while living in hostility against the whole world,” that Islam’s every flaw was being manifest before our eyes. But nonetheless, adjacent to a spring, today’s troubadours of trouble gave up.

Aware of the boy’s plight, God did not send him back to Abraham or Yisra’el. He simply did as Abraham had done—He had an envoy provide for him.

This messenger offered some encouragement, and then sent mother and son on their way.

“Then the Almighty heard reports of (*wa shama* ‘*elohym*) the sounds of the teenage lost sheep (*‘eth qowl ha na’ar* – the voice associated with the young man who had gone astray), and summoned a messenger of the Mighty One (*wa qara’ mal’ak ‘elohym*) to Hagar (*‘el Hagar*) from the spiritual realms (*min ha shamaym*). And he said to her (*wa ‘amar la*), ‘What concerns you, Hagar (*mah la Hagar*)? You have chosen not to be respectful (*‘al yare*’), but indeed (*ky*), to the Mighty One (*‘el ‘elohym*) have come audible reports of (*shama*’) the young man’s voice who has gone astray (*ha na’ar qowl*) wherever he is around here (*ba ‘asher huw’ sham*).” (*Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 21:17*)

Unlike His encounters with Abraham and Sarah, Yahowah didn’t meet with Hagar or Ishmael. They would not enjoy a familial covenant relationship with God. The Almighty sent a messenger – and a troubled one at that.

This rather harsh spiritual being went on to say: **“Stand up (*quwm*), lift up the lost teenager (*nasa’ ‘eth ha na’ar*), and with your strong and resolute hand (*wa hazaq ‘eth yad* – with your harsh, hard, and severe hand) upon him, indeed (*ba ky*), I will cause him (*sym* – I (the spiritual envoy said) will appoint him and place him) to approach many pagans of different races seeking status (*la gowy gadowl* – to move toward other relevant places and important nations, expressly Gentiles, and thus the heathen, uncultured, and pagan).”** (*Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 21:18*) While we are not told the identity of this spiritual envoy, considering what he said, who he was speaking to, and what he ultimately achieved through Muhammad, Ishmael’s descendent, we have every reason to suspect that this was Satan.

And: **“Then the Almighty (*wa ‘elohym*), He existed against (*hayah ‘eth*) the lost young man who went astray (*ha na’ar* – the teenager who was a wayward sheep) and so he became boastful and exalted (*gadal*). Settling down in the desert (*wa yashab ba ha midbar* – so inhabiting the lifeless place devoid of the word), he existed (*wa hayah*) hunting and fighting as a great archer (*rabah qashath*).”** (*Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 21:20*)

The story of the Covenant was just beginning, but the story of Ishmael was over, at least in relationship to God, His Towrah, and His Covenant. The next time we hear of Ishmael, we discover that he was specifically excluded from inheriting any portion of Abraham’s estate. Then we learn that Esau earned Yahowah’s wrath for having married one of Ishmael’s daughters. From that point, the bastard child fades into oblivion, only to be resurrected by Muhammad to serve Allah and Islam.

Paul knew all of this. He knew that there was no covenant established with Hagar or her son. He knew that Hagar wasn't associated with the revelation of the Torah on Mount Sinai. And that is why it was so unconscionable for him to state otherwise.

I suppose that Paul's parting salvo on the mythical second covenant might be valid if it were prophetic, and not historic, and you darted six centuries ahead in time, and associated Ishmael with Islam.

“Therefore (*ara* – so then [as found in P46 as opposed to *dio* in the NA]), brothers (*adelphos*), we are not (*ou eimi*) children (*teknon*) of slave girl (*paidiske*), to the contrary (*alla*), the free (*tes eleutheros*).” (Galatians 4:31) In reality, neither Sarah nor Hagar conceived again. But a religion was conceived from these words—one which would be astonishingly anti-Semitic and ardently opposed to the Torah.

Regarding this concluding statement, the NAMI offered: **“Therefore, brothers not we are of servant girl children but of the free.”** Jerome embellished his Latin Vulgate with: **“So then, brethren, we are not the children of the bondwoman but of the free: by the freedom wherewith Christus has made us free.”** Surprisingly, the KJV removed the reference to “Christus:” **“So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.”**

Rather than simply consider the New Living Translation's rendition of this passage, a more comprehensive view seems appropriate. Interpreting and trumpeting Paul's blasphemous manifesto, these Evangelical Christians wrote:

“Tell me, you who want to live under the law, do you know what the law actually says? The Scriptures say that Abraham had two sons, one from his slave wife and one from his freeborn wife. The son of the slave wife was born in a human attempt to bring about the fulfillment of God's promise. But the son of the freeborn wife was born as God's own fulfillment of his promise.

These two women serve as an illustration of God's two covenants. The first woman, Hagar, represents Mount Sinai where people received the law that enslaved them. And now Jerusalem is just like Mount Sinai in Arabia, because she and her children live in slavery to the law. But the other woman, Sarah, represents the heavenly Jerusalem. She is the free woman, and she is our mother. As Isaiah said, ‘Rejoice, O childless woman, you who have never given birth! Break into a joyful shout, you who have never been in labor! For the desolate woman now has more children than the woman who lives with her husband!’

And you, dear brothers and sisters, are children of the promise, just like Isaac. But you are now being persecuted by those who want you to keep the law, just as Ishmael, the child born by human effort, persecuted Isaac, the child born by the

pursued, persecuted, and expelled this according to spirit and so it continues even now. (4:29) Nevertheless, what says the Writing, ‘Throw out and expel the slave girl and the son of her for will not receive by lots the son of the slave girl with the son of the free.’ (4:30) Therefore, brothers, we are not children of slave girl, to the contrary, the free.” (4:31)

According to Protestant Christianity: “the allegory of Hagar and Sarah was written to persuade us (along with the Galatians) not to follow the ‘Judaizers’ into slavery with Hagar and Ishmael.” This comes courtesy of the Baptist Church. And yet, Scripture says that at Yahowah’s insistence, Hagar was freed, and Ishmael was never a slave. Therefore, if this is what Paul meant to say, he chose the wrong examples.

From a site operating under the acronym CCEL.org (Christian Classics Ethereal Library at Calvin College), and under the heading, “Sermons from Galatians,” we find: “It is important to note that Paul does not deny the actual historical narrative, but he simply uses it in an allegorical sense to illustrate his point for the benefit of his readers who are tempted to go under the burden of the law.” Yet in fact, Paul’s hypothesis contradicts every aspect of the Torah’s presentation of Hagar, Ishmael, the Covenant, and Mount Sinai, and thus represents a complete “denial of the actual historical narrative.”

They write: “Our threat today might not be from Judaizing teachers, but from those who would have us turn away from Christ, such as voices in the world and false religions.” For example, they might follow Christian preachers and come to believe the false religion of Christianity.

The Sacra Eloquia provided this twist: “The Apostle Paul, like Morpheus in the film *The Matrix*, had been a slave to his former religion of Judaism. And the Judaizers wanted the Galatians to be slaves as well.” In actuality, it appears that Paul never escaped religion, and stepped from one into another.

The Lectionary Studies of the New Testament provided this perfectly prepared presentation of Pauline Doctrine: “By the use of the Hagar-Sarah illustration Paul makes his strongest argument: forward in the Christian life, or backward to Jerusalem and Mount Sinai. The message is that the Torah enslaves and condemns us. Yet the Judaizers argue that only those who submit to the Sinai covenant share in the promised Abrahamic blessings and thus Gentile believers must submit themselves to the Mosaic Law if they are to share in Isaac’s blessings, as opposed to being cast out with Ishmael.” As is the case with Paul, this is wrong from beginning to end. And yet, in these words we find the religious script unveiled which has been deployed to pit Christianity against the Torah, against Yahowah, its author, against His one and only Covenant, against His Seven Invitations, against the Ten Statements He etched in stone, and lest we

forget, against Yisra'el and Yahuwdym – His Chosen People. And it is a plot whose mythological origins are rooted in Paul's letter to the Galatians.

Spreading the Light Ministries Network under the heading "Sermons," protests: "Paul illustrates the difference between believers who rest in Christ only and Judaizers who trusted in the law, by a comparison taken from the story of Isaac and Ishmael." But Paul's story isn't "from" the account of Yitschaq and Yshma'el, but is instead a corruption of it. Moreover, there is no comparison or association whatsoever between the banishment of Hagar and the Covenant memorialized in the Torah. Further, Yahowsha', Himself, consistently told those interested in knowing Him and understanding what He came to accomplish that they must ground their perspective in the Torah.

The Christian organization says: "He tells the Galatians that they are making a big mistake by falling away from the truth." And yet, according to Yahowah, and thus, Yahowsha', the Torah is the truth.

"These things Paul said are an allegory, besides being literal and historical." It's hard to believe that the proponents of this plot are so stupid that they don't recognize that Paul wasn't calling his version "allegorical," but instead Yahowah's, and that Paul's thesis was neither literal nor historical.

"Hagar represents the Mosaic Law, slavery." This is only true in Paul's twisted mind and in the hearts of those sufficiently ignorant and irrational to believe him. Yahowah says just the opposite.

Spreading the Light Ministries Network protested: "Mount Sinai represents Jerusalem under slavery to Rome and the Jews...who are under the curse of the Law." The only association between Mount Sinai and Jerusalem is that one predicts, explains, and leads to the other. They are linked, not in "curses" or "slavery," but in being steps along the path to our salvation. The Torah's Covenant promise was honored on Passover, Un-Yeasted Bread, First-Born Children, and the Promise of the Sabbath in Yaruwshalaim—the Source of Reconciliation.

The Bible Study Guide to Galatians suggests: "Paul uses the story of Hagar and Sarah as a picture of the relationship between God and man. Paul tells the Galatians that Hagar represents the covenant given on Mt. Sinai, which is the law that the Jews pride themselves on keeping. In so doing, Paul warns us about complying with the Judaizers." The opposite of this is actually true. Abraham, and through him, Yitschaq and Ya'aqob (who became Yisra'el) represent the Covenant between Yahowah and His family, not Sarah. And Hagar was specifically disassociated from the Covenant centuries before it was codified in the Torah on Mount Sinai. Further, the "law that the Jews pride themselves on

keeping” isn’t the Towrah, which means “Teaching,” but instead, Jewish Oral Law, know as Rabbinical Law, which has now been codified in their Talmud.

Bereft of the notion that “proof” requires “evidence,” McGarvey and Pendleton’s Commentary published: “Paul proves that Christians are not required to keep the Jewish Sabbath or festivals of Judaism even though the Judaizers insisted upon them.” The only thing Paul has proven is that his Greek is impoverished and that he feels no qualms about contradicting God. Equally uninformed, McGarvey and Pendleton as anti-Semites want Christians to believe that the Sabbath, Passover, Unleavened Bread, FirstFruits, Seven Sabbaths, Trumpets, Reconciliations, and Shelters are the customs of “Judaizers” rather than being Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God.

M&P wrote: “Paul imagines that the Galatians are seeking the instruction of the Judaizers, as they had once sought him.” While Paul has a vivid imagination, there is no evidence for “Judaizers,” much less that the Galatians actually sought Paul’s instructions. To the contrary, the text of the epistle indicates that the Galatians rejected Paul and his message. (If only the rest of the world had as well.)

Reading Galatians through glasses fitted at a Christian bookstore, McGarvey and Pendleton wrote: “And Paul, knowing the passion of the Judaizers for allegory, meets them with their own weapon, and presents his case argumentatively and logically.” Nothing Paul has said has been logical, albeit his rhetoric has been plenty argumentative. There is no indication that Rabbis used allegory. It is Yahowah who has a passion for parables, metaphors, and word pictures. And they are not “weapons,” but instead teaching aids. But by saying this, these Christians have demonstrated their disdain for God.

Further, they have demonstrated that Christianity renders its victims unable to think. Anyone who has read this passage in Greek understands that Paul specifically differentiated the allegorical meaning of the story, whatever it may have been, from his personal interpretation of it. Paul didn’t say that the two covenants were allegorical, but instead said “these then exist as two covenants.” And while Paul is undeniably “argumentative,” he is the antithesis of “logical.”

From an organization called “From Pentecost to Patmos,” we find confusion between religious rhetoric and sound argument: “Paul’s thesis, presented in Galatians chapter 4, verses 8-31, provides a series of arguments for his conviction that justification comes by faith alone, and he contrasts this with the improperly motivated zeal of the Judaizers.” This begins well. Galatians is “Paul’s thesis.” And therein lies the problem. Paul’s thesis and Yahowah’s message differ on every essential issue.

Pentecost to Patmos' insistence that "justification comes by faith alone" is invalid according to God. But it is true that faith operates alone, without evidence or support. Whereas trust, which is based upon knowledge and understanding, requires a foundation of supporting evidence.

The longest, most errant, and yet most unapologetically Christian, comparison between Genesis 17:15-21 and Galatians 4:21-31 is found on a Presbyterian site. A pastor on behalf of the "Orthodox Presbyterian Church," wrote the following anti-Semitic rant: "The Judaizers [in actuality, Jews have a history of seldom, if ever, attempting to convert anyone to their way of thinking] entered the Galatian churches [there is no reference to a "church" in these Greek manuscripts, but instead an *ekklesia*, referring to the Called Out], which were primarily Gentile [while this excuse is ubiquitous, the content of Galatians demonstrates that the audience was aware and fond of the Torah, meaning that they were mostly Yahuw'dym, not Gowym], and argued that true believers ["true believer" is an oxymoron, moreover, God wants us to know and understand so that we can trust and rely upon the truth He revealed in His Torah] had to be engrafted into the lineage through circumcision and obedience to the Law of Moses." This misses the symbolism of circumcision. And it misconstrues "observance" with "obedience." Observance leads to knowing and understanding. Obedience leads to submission. Further, the "Law of Moses" is akin to calling the prophecies Yahowah revealed to Yasha'yahuw the "Edicts of Isaiah." Moseh was simply the scribe who wrote Yahowah's teaching unto a scroll. It is a wonder these theologians don't attributed the Declaration of Independence to the calligrapher.

Failing to appreciate the difference between "stating" and "demonstrating," the Presbyterian pastor exclaimed: "But Paul demonstrates that the Mosaic Law itself has come to an end with the coming of the true seed, Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the end of the Law." Paul does make this claim, but by doing so, he directly contradicts Yahowsha's position on the Torah. Therefore, since Yahowsha' said that He did not bring an end to the Torah, Paul proved that he was wrong and should not be trusted.

"But sadly the Galatians had begun to buy into the Judaizers' argument. [Galatians only hints at the nature of Paul's foe and the arguments they proposed.] They had already capitulated and were being told to observe the fasts and festivals of the Jewish calendar. [Wrong again. There are no fasts, and the festivals are Yahowah's and dated on His calendar, not a Jewish one.] But we are no longer slaves to the Law of Moses, and are no longer regulated by its commandments." If the Torah isn't guidance for liberation, then Yahowah is a liar and Yahowsha' fulfilled Passover and Unleavened Bread in vain. Under this condition, there would be no freedom from human oppression nor vindication from sin.

I was appalled not long ago to see the Presbyterian Church release a stunningly immoral and inaccurate press release following their General Assembly against Jews and Israel and in favor of the Muslims who were terrorizing them. And now, I understand the source of their anti-Semitism. “So Paul turns the Judaizers use of the Old Testament against them.” Calling the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms the “Old Testament” demonstrates that Christians have remained mired in Paul’s and Marcion’s polluted rhetoric. Scripture, according to Yahowsha’, begins with the “Torah,” and it concludes with the “Prophets.” Further, Paul misquoted and misapplied Scripture. And that means that Paul used the “Old Testament” against himself.

According to Orthodox Presbyterian Church: “Paul tells them that the Covenant made at Mt. Sinai where the Law was mediated through Moses in the presence of the angels was a covenant of slavery and bondage.” There are no “angels” in Scripture, and the Torah was not “mediated through Moses.” To mediate is “to intervene.” Yahowah spoke for Himself. More importantly, Yahowah as Yahowsha’ acted on His own behalf. Further, the explicit purpose of the Torah is to detail the role Yahowah played in the liberation of the children of Yisra’el from the crucible of human religious and political oppression and bondage in Egypt, leading them to a life of freedom in the Promised Land. Yahowah’s seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet delineate this same path for the rest of us.

“Paul’s gospel is not related to Hagar, the Judaizers are.” Paul can be blamed for many things, but “gospel” isn’t among them. He used *euangelion*, meaning “healing messenger and beneficial message.” “Gospel” is a Christian myth based upon pagan nomenclature.

This same Presbyterian entity demonstrated its ignorance when they postured: “The message of the Torah is one of slavery.” According to Paul, this is true, but not according to Yahowah. Therefore God’s Torah instructions and man’s religious teachings on this foundational issue are diametrically opposed. How is it then that Christians remain oblivious to this conflict? Search as I might, I was unable to find a single theologian who even attempted to reconcile this catastrophic problem.

The Christian apologist, having skipped the lecture on the Instruction on the Mount at seminary school, wrote: “Since the city of Jerusalem had become a symbol for the Mosaic Covenant, when that Covenant/Law came to an end, so did all the hopes that were rooted in that city, including the land and temple.” Yaruwshalaim is the symbol of salvation, not the symbol of the Covenant. And according to Yahowah, His Word is eternal, never ending. As such, the hope of reconciliation, and the return of Yahowsha’, will occur on the Mount of Olives just east of the Temple Mount in the one and only Yaruwshalaim.

Presbyterian Christians have separated themselves from Yahowah, from His Torah, from God's Path home, from Yaruwshalaym the source of reconciliation, and thus from the Promised Land, symbolic of heaven. "No longer for the Christian is Jerusalem, the land of Israel, and the law of Moses the center of our hope. The Christian's hope is not to be found in whether or not a nation today called Israel locates itself in the Middle East, or if they are able to slaughter enough Arabs to take over the city of Jerusalem, or if they are able to take control of the temple Mount and rebuild the Temple. These things are all vain hopes. They are Jewish empty dreams. They are simply the confused dog chasing his shadow in the yard." While it's hard not to envision Yahowah's anguished expression at the trial of the Christian pastor who scribed these words, it would do these fellows a world of good to read the Prophets sometime.

"Rather the Christian has become heirs of the realities, not the shadows. Let the Jews continue to place their hopes in the shadows which have come to an end. Amen" And yet, Christianity remains mired in the myths of Mystery Babylon, confused by Satan's shadows, his counterfeits. "Amen," indeed.

For Paul's thesis to be true, for the Torah to be an agent of enslavement, and for it to be annulled, Yahowah, the God who created the universe and conceived life, the author of the Towrah and architect of the plan of salvation delineated therein, would have to have come to the conclusion that He was wrong and that He was incapable of resolving man's condition. As a result, He would have had to recognize that Paul was superior in intellect and ability to Himself, and to His human manifestation, Yahowsha'. Then, God would have had to have asked Paul to correct Him, and to solve these problems a different way. If you believe that is what occurred, that Paul had the authority and ability to correct God, congratulations, you are a Christian.

LE: YY 09-13-2013