

*Pharmakeia* – Poisoned

Have You Ingested Paul's Poison?

We've come to a place I could never have imagined. Once upon a time, I had expected that errant translations and misinterpretations of Galatians had been responsible for Christendom promoting the myth that the Torah had been annulled. But in actuality, Paul, himself, has been responsible for this deadly delusion. He has gone well beyond simply relegating the Torah to a bygone era. He has assailed the Covenant codified therein, calling it a source of slavery, rather than liberation.

Paul has hung himself with his own words. And if that were it, so be it. But unfortunately, Paul's noose was woven into a net which has ensnared billions of Christian souls. And for that reason, we will press on, unraveling his trap.

As we turn the page and open the fifth chapter of Galatians, Sha'awl remains fixated on the distinction between the liberty he promises and the servitude he has associated with observing the Torah. And in the context of having made Yahowah's Covenant man's mortal enemy, the concluding clause is exceptionally demeaning, even for Sha'awl.

**“This (te) freedom (eleuthera – liberty) of ours (ego) being Christos (XPΣ – Divine Placeholder for the Ma'aseyah (without the definite article, the errant name *Christos* is a better grammatical fit than the title “the Implement Doing the Work of Yah”) it freed (eleutheroo – liberated, exempt, and unrestrained) you all are directed to stand firm (steko – you must persist steadfast). Therefore (oun – then), also (kai), not again (me palin) in yoke (zygos) of subservience and slavery (douleia – bondage and subjugation) you are held based upon a grudge against you all (enechomai – are submitting based upon hostility toward you all, burdening, opposing, and controlling you all, forcing you to surrender to someone who bears ill-will, is resentful, violent, and quarrelsome).”** (Galatians 5:1)

There is a rather complex grammatical situation occurring in the initial clause which can only be appreciated through close scrutiny of the cases, moods, and pronouns. “Christos,” for example, was written in the nominative case which conveys “to be” or “to become,” thereby, renaming the subject, in this instance, the reader, so that they become Christos. *Eleutheroo* was written *eleutherosen*, in the third person singular, conveying “it,” and then scribed in the past tense using the aorist indicative. This requires a rendering of “it freed,” but what was “it?”

The associated verb, *steko*, was written *stekete*, in the second person plural, making it “you all” or “all of you,” and then in the present tense imperative mood which expresses a command. This communicates: “you all are directed to stand firm.” And yet that command is rather “a-Paul-ling.” You see, the self-proclaimed apostle wrote that “Christos it freed.” Then he commands believers “to stand firm” in this false realization. And while separating Yahowsha’ from Yahowah and the Towrah is Sha’uwl’s *modus operandi*, it is the exact opposite of what actually occurred since, as the Ma’aseyah Yahowsha’ observed the Towrah as an example for the rest of us to follow.

Because the rest of Sha’uwl’s statement is equally deplorable, let’s consider the Nestle Aland McReynolds Interlinear interpretation of it before we dig any deeper: “In the freedom us Christ freed stand then and not again in yoke of slavery be held in.” You’ll notice these scholars ignored much of the prevailing Greek grammar and then translated the verb *enechomai* inadequately, perhaps even inaccurately. According to the ten most respected lexicons, its primary meaning is “to bear a grudge against someone and to violently control, harass, and burden them against their will in a hostile fashion.” It speaks of “the hatred and resentment which flows from being ensnared and entangled in a trap, and thus having to surrender and submit to a hostile foe.”

And keep in mind, Sha’uwl has relentlessly sought to identify this “yoke of slavery” which “ensnares, burdens, and controls” its victims as being Yahowah’s Towrah. So now this is personal. Paul has gone so far as to slander God and demean His character.

To remove any doubt that *enechomai* was properly translated, and that Sha’uwl inappropriately associated its perverse connotations with Yahowah, and His influence over humankind from this preposterous Pauline perspective, the most respected lexicons render it: “to bear a grudge against someone, to be resentful and hostile, to burden and harass someone violently, to control and subjugate others, and to ensnare and entangle them in a trap.” Also recognize that this verb was written as *enechesoe*, in the second person plural, present passive imperative. The passive voice signifies that “you all” (from the second person plural) are being acted upon by a verb which is in this case quite maniacal. And

since the imperative mood is used to express a command, Sha'awl is saying that our forced submission is the intended result of God's announced declaration.

Therefore, the opening stanza of the fifth chapter of Galatians actually conveys: **“This freedom and liberty of ours being Christos, it freed, so you all are directed to stand firm. Therefore, also, not again in yoke of subservience and slavery, you are held based upon a grudge against you all, controlling you and forcing you to surrender to someone who bears ill-will, is resentful, violent, and quarrelsome.”** (5:1) That was hard to write, much less read.

So, based upon Paul's attitude, and the nature of his insane and inverted thesis, it wasn't much of a stretch for the New Living Translation to suggest: **“So Christ has truly set us free. Now make sure that you stay free, and don't get tied up again in slavery to the law.”** Paul's intent is obvious. Therefore, as a thought for thought paraphrase, the NLT nailed it.

By comparison, the KJV was a bit slow on the uptake: **“Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.”** At least the King James accurately reflected one aspect of *enechomai* with “entangled.” And it was even a slight departure from the Latin Vulgate which is rare. Jerome wrote: **“Stand fast and be not held again under the yoke of bondage.”**

Galatians continues to be as painful as it is pernicious. This is blatantly “I Paul” am more credible and important than God. What you are about to read is a lie...

**“You pay attention** (*ide* – you (no second person singular) look right now, listen and see, noticing this), **I** (*ego*), **Paulos** (*Paulos* – transliterated Paul, whom Strong's called “the most famous of the Apostles;” the name is of Latin origin meaning Lowly and Little), **myself, say** (*lego* – I individually assert, declaring) **to you all** (*umin*) **that** (*hoti* – because) **if** (*ean* – on the condition) **you may be circumcised** (*peritemno*), **Christos** (XPΣ – being the Ma'aseyah (but without the definite article, *Christos* is a better grammatical fit than the correct title “the Implement Doing the Work of Yah”) **for you** (*umas*) **nothing** (*oudeis* – totally worthless and completely meaningless, annulling the possibility and negating the idea that) **will be helpful** (*opheleo* – will provide assistance or benefit, will be useful or valuable).” (Galatians 5:2)

According to this statement, to believe Paul's word, you must reject God's Word. Yahowah said the opposite. **“You pay attention, I, Paulos, myself say to you all that if on the condition that you may be circumcised, Christos is totally worthless and completely meaningless, not in the least bit helpful or useful for you.”**

Since this is blasphemous in the extreme, with Paulos saying, “if you follow Yahowah’s guidance in the Towrah, you cannot be saved by Yahowsha’,” let’s examine the three verbs carefully. The first one, “*lego* – I say,” pits Paul against Yahowsha’: “the ‘*logos* – word’ made flesh.” It was written in the first person singular, present active indicative. So, even though the pronoun “I” or “myself” is designated in the verb, Sha’uwl added “*ego* – I” separately, in addition to his personally chosen name, “Paulos,” to emphasize that he alone was the source of this “declaration, narration, command, assertion, and report.”

The present tense indicates that “Paulos,” as the writer, was portraying his statement as being currently valid and remaining so into the future. In the active voice, the verb confirms that Sha’uwl was the sole source, and solely responsible for this assertion and for its consequence. The indicative mood attests to the fact that Paul wanted his audience to believe that what he was portraying was completely accurate. As such, he has negated the notion that he was speaking *for* Yahowsha’. Paulos, in speaking for himself, is annulling the purpose of Yahowsha’s life, making it impossible for anyone who believes him to be saved.

“*Peritemno* – you may be circumcised” was written as *peritemnesoe* in the second person plural, present passive subjunctive. The passive voice combined with the subjunctive mood signifies that there is somewhere between a possibility and a probability that the subject is being acted upon, suggesting in this case that Sha’uwl wanted us to believe that those who are Towrah observant may have been either hoodwinked or compelled into being circumcised.

Moving on to the next word, at first blush, it appears as if *oudeis*, rendered “nothing,” was misused in this text. It is actually an adjective (meaning that it should be modifying the noun “Christos”), not an adverb, coloring the nature of “*opheleo* – will be helpful.” *Oudeis* is defined as “the negation of a noun,” as “no one, nothing, and nobody,” all of which are rather demeaning when associated with Yahowsha’. But, as hard as this may be to believe, everything Yahowsha’ said and did is completely “negated,” making Him a “nobody” and His sacrifice for “nothing” when Yahowah’s Towrah instructions regarding His Covenant generally, and circumcision, specifically, are ignored, or worse, rejected.

Similarly, *oudeis* conveys the idea that a noun, in this case a misnomer for “the Ma’aseyah,” is “in no respect valid, totally worthless, of no account whatsoever, and completely meaningless,” all of which is true when “Christos” is disassociated from God’s Word as Sha’uwl has done.

Oddly, noting that *umas*, designating the pronoun “you,” was rendered in the personal (referring to a person) second person plural (and thus “all of you” or “you all”) accusative (marking it as the direct object of the verb), “*opheleo* – will be helpful” was written in the third person singular, denoting “it will not provide

assistance or benefit.” Therefore, to properly convey Sha’uwl’s convoluted citation into English, we need to move “*umas* – you” from between “Christos” and “*ouden*” (as it appears in the Greek text), to the end of the sentence, as I did for you in the statement’s summation.

While I don’t want to sound like a boring fourth grade grammar teacher, you should know that rendered in the future active indicative as *ophelesei*, the concluding verb conveys the notion that “its negated benefit will not actually be accomplished in the future” by the subject, who is “Christos.” And the future negated benefit is defined as: “being of help, assistance, or value, being useful or profitable, and being advantageous.”

It should be noted here that as an Yisra’elite / Jew, and as the son of a Pharisee, Sha’uwl would have been circumcised eight days after he was born. So by writing this sentence, Paul is either saying that his rules don’t apply to him (as was the case with Muhammad and is the case with most politicians and religious leaders), or he is publicly announcing that Yahowsha’s life and Yahowah’s Towrah are of no value to his Faith. I’ll let you ponder whether one or both of these realities is actually true.

Before we consider Yahowah’s position on circumcision, here is a consortium of English translations for your consideration. NAMI: “Look I Paul say to you that if you might be circumcised Christ you nothing will benefit.” LV: “Behold, I Paul tell you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.” KJV: “Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.” NASB: “Behold I, Paul, say to you that if you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no benefit to you.”

In this case, the NLT has actually moderated what Paul has said: “Listen! I, Paul, tell you this: If you are counting on circumcision to make you right with God, then Christ will be of no benefit to you.” While Paul wrote that you have no hope of salvation if you are circumcised, the evangelical text softened that considerably to suggest that circumcision isn’t beneficial when it comes to salvation.

Since I am bereft of words when it comes to Pauline commentary, let’s ponder Yahowah’s position on circumcision as it was articulated in the Towrah. God’s message is so unambiguous and unwavering, there is no reason to interrupt Him with my commentary. He said...

**“And (*wa*) I will stand up and establish, restoring and fulfilling, accomplishing and confirming (*quwm* – I will ratify and affirm (written in the hiphil stem, whereby the subject (God) is causing the object (Abraham and his offspring) to become established and stand upright)) with (*’eth*) My Familial Covenant Relationship (*beryth* – My family and household agreement (feminine**

singular, suffixed in the first person singular gender inclusive “My Covenant”) as **a means to recognize Me and as the source of understanding with regard to an association between Me** (*byn* – as the way to understand this association with Me) **and (wa) between you, to help you observe, think, and respond** (*byn* – for you to examine, consider, understand, and reply appropriately to this relationship), **and between your offspring, so that they might be observant and responsive** (*wa byn zera’* – and with your seed, your extended family, encouraging them to explore and comprehend by making connections) **after you** (*‘achar* – following you), **regarding and on behalf of (la – concerning) their dwelling places and generations** (*dowr* – their protected households and extended families, elevating and elongating their lives), **for an eternal and everlasting** (*‘owlam* – always enduring and eternally existing) **Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth* – familial association (feminine singular)), **to literally be and to actually remain** (*la hayah* – to genuinely exist yesterday, today, and tomorrow (scribed in the qal relational stem denoting reality and in the infinitive construct giving the verb the qualities of a noun)) **approachable as your (la) God** (*‘elohym*) **and (wa) for your offspring to approach** (*la zera’* – your seed and descendants to come near) **after you** (*‘aharown* – until the very last of you).” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:7)

“**And (wa) God Almighty** (*‘elohym*) **said** (*‘amar* – promised) **to** (*‘el* – as God to) **Abraham** (*‘Abraham* – Loving, Merciful, and Enriching Father), **‘So (wa) as for you** (*‘eth ‘atah* – regarding you), **you should actually and continuously observe** (*shamar* – you should carefully consider, diligently and consistently paying especially close attention to the details so that you understand, genuinely care about, revere, and literally keep your eyes focused upon (scribed in the qal stem which addresses that which is literal and relational, and in the imperfect conjugation which conveys the idea that this close examination is to be ongoing, continuing throughout time so as to always explore)) **My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth-y* – My mutually binding familial agreement, My household promise, My relational accord, My marriage vow based upon home and family (feminine singular, scribed in the construct form, eternally binding, connecting, and associating the *beryth* – covenant with *shamar* – you should carefully observe; written with the first person singular suffix: “My” – telling us that the Covenant is God’s)), **you** (*‘atah*) **and (wa – in addition to) your seed** (*zera’* – your offspring (singular construct)) **after you** (*‘achar* – following you) **throughout (la) their generations, dwelling places, and eras of time** (*dowr* – their families, related births, and lives (plural construct)). (*Bare’syth* / Genesis 17:9)

**This one and only** (*ze’th* – this particular, singular, unique, and specific (feminine singular)) **Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship of Mine** (*beryth-y*

– mutually binding familial agreement of Mine, My household promise, this relational accord of mine, My marriage vow based upon home and family (feminine singular and written with the first person singular suffix, thereby reminding us that this one and only Covenant is God’s), **which relationally and beneficially** (*‘asher* – by way of making a connection, developing an association, benefiting and blessing) **you should actually and continuously observe** (*shamar* – you should carefully and literally consider, you should diligently and consistently pay especially close attention to the details so that you genuinely understand, care about, and revere what you witness throughout the whole fabric of time and that by focusing upon this you are kept safe and secure (qal stem and imperfect conjugation)) **between Me** (*byn* – for the purpose of coming to know and understand Me as a result of being perceptive, prudently considering the insights which are discernible regarding Me) **and between you** (*wa byn* – to cause you to be aware and to understand, making connections), **and between** (*wa byn* – for the purpose of coming to know and relating to) **your offspring** (*zera’* – your seed (singular construct)) **following you** (*‘achar* – after you), **for you to actually circumcise** (*muwl* – so that you literally cut off and remove the foreskin of the penis (scribed using the niphath stem which is used to convey the voice of genuine relationships where the subject, which is “you,” receives the benefit of the verb, which is circumcision, and the infinitive absolute, which intensifies the action)) **accordingly your every** (*l-cm-kol*) **male for them to remember** (*zakar* – masculine human individual who recalls and remembers (singular and absolute)). (*Bare’syth* / Genesis 17:10)

**And** (*wa*) **you all shall cut off and separate** (*muwl* – you shall circumcise (scribed in the niphath stem which is used to convey the voice of genuine relationships where the subject, which is “you” expressly as a parent, receives the benefit of the verb, which is circumcision, in the perfect conjugation designating that this instruction and resulting action should be considered whole and complete, and in the consecutive thereby associating it with our *basar* – flesh)) **your foreskin’s** (*‘aralah* – the fold of skin covering the conical tip of the masculine genitalia) **association with** (*‘eth*) **the flesh** (*basar* – the physical body and animal nature). **And** (*wa*) **this will exist** (*hayah* – this was, is, and forever will be (scribed in the qal perfect, signifying the relationship is genuine and unchanging) **as** (*la*) **the sign to remember** (*‘owth* – the example to visually illustrate and explain, the symbol and standard, the pledge and attestation of the miraculous nature (singular, as in one and only sign, construct form, linking the sign to the...)) **the Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth* – mutually binding familial agreement, household promise, relational accord, marriage vow based upon home and family (feminine singular, scribed in the construct form, eternally associating the *beryth* – covenant with *‘owth* – the sign of *muwl* – circumcision)) **between Me for the purpose of making a connection** (*byn* – for

the purpose of coming to know and understand Me as a result of being perceptive, prudently considering the insights which are discernible regarding Me) **and between you, promoting understanding** (*wa byn* – to cause you to be aware and to comprehend the association). (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 17:11)

**And** (*wa*) **a son** (*ben* – a male child) **of eight** (*shamonah* – from *shamen*, meaning olive oil, which is symbolic of the Spirit, of light, of being anointed, and of being rooted in the land and living a long time) **days** (*yowmym*), **you shall circumcise** (*muwl* – you shall cut off and separate his foreskin (scribed using the niphthal stem denoting a relationship which is genuine and indicating that parents benefit from doing as God has requested, and in the imperfect conjugation which tells us that this must continue to occur over time and that it is designed to produce ongoing results)) **with regard to your** (*la*) **every** (*kol*) **male** (*zakar* – masculine individual; from *zakar*: to commit to memory, to remind, and to remember) **to approach throughout** (*la*) **your dwelling places and generations** (*dowr* – your protected households and extended families, elevating and extending your lives), **those naturally born** (*yalyd* – those naturalized as a member of an extended family through natural childbirth) **in the home** (*beyth* – into the household and family (singular absolute)), **and also** (*wa*) **those really wanting to be** (*kasap* – those deeply desiring, strongly yearning, and passionately longing to be) **acquired and included** (*miqnah* – purchased and obtained (speaking of adoption)) **of** (*min*) **every** (*kol*) **son** (*ben* – male child) **of foreign lands** (*nekar* – of places where they are not properly valued and appreciated) **who relationally** (*'asher* – by way of making a connection) **are not** (*lo'*) **from** (*min*) **your seed** (*zera'*). (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 17:12)

**He** (*huw'* – third person masculine singular pronoun, addressing fathers) **must absolutely circumcise him, definitely cutting off the foreskin** (*muwl muwl* – he must cease what he is currently doing, he must turn him around to face the opposite direction, to ward off threats to his wellbeing by changing his priorities while making a binding promise (scribed with the niphthal stem denoting the genuineness of this relationship while stressing the benefit accrued to the parent, in the infinitive absolute which intensifies the importance of the act, and in the imperfect conjugation, telling us that this instruction on circumcision will endure uninterrupted throughout time)) **of the naturally born** (*yalyd* – naturalized as a member of an extended family through natural childbirth) **in your home** (*beyth* – into your household and your family (singular construct)) **and also** (*wa*) **those really wanting to be** (*kasap* – those deeply desiring, strongly yearning, and passionately longing to be) **included** (*miqnah* – acquired, purchased, and obtained) / **as well as those who are acquired** (*miqnah* – purchased through adoption and included) **with your money** (*kesep* – your precious metals; born out of a deep longing and love for adoption).

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

**And** (*wa*) **the uncircumcised** (*‘arel* – the stubborn and unresponsive, the untrusting and un-reliant, those who neither listen nor observe, and therefore, the forbidden who are not set apart) **male** (*zakar* – man who fails to remember to do this) **who relationally and beneficially** (*‘asher* – who by association and by way of a blessing) **is not** (*lo’*) **circumcised** (*muwl* – willing to change his direction and priorities and make this binding promise) **with regard to** (*‘eth*) **the flesh** (*basar* – physical, human, and animal nature) **of their foreskin** (*‘aralah*), **those souls** (*nepesh* – speaking of what makes us unique individuals, alive, aware, and conscious) **shall be cut off, be excluded, and banished** (*karat* – shall be severed and cut out, shall be uprooted from the land, shall die, perishing, shall be destroyed, ceasing to exist) **from** (*min*) **Her** (*huw’* – speaking of our Spiritual Mother’s Covenant) **family** (*‘am* – people who are related biologically and through language).

**By way of association** (*‘eth*), **they violated and broke, disassociating themselves from** (*parar* – they nullified the agreement, revoking its promises, tearing asunder and thwarting its benefits, splitting away and injuring themselves in the process by severing) **My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth-y* – My mutually binding familial agreement, My household promise, My relational accord, My marriage vow based upon home and family (feminine singular, scribed in the construct form, connecting and associating the *beryth* – covenant with God’s *‘am* – family; written with the first person singular suffix: My – reminding us that this specific and unique Covenant is God’s to give or not give as He so chooses)).” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 17:14)

There can be no doubt; according to Yahowah circumcision and the Covenant are related and inseparable. A “New Covenant” of any kind, much less one where circumcision is considered counterproductive, is therefore a nonstarter. Don’t

believe anyone who tells you otherwise, and that includes Paul. Also, if someone condemns “the flesh,” calling it evil, as Paul is wont to do, please note that Yahowah’s Covenant was cut with us in the flesh – and there is nothing God prizes more highly.

Therefore, our Heavenly Father is serious about circumcision. So we should be as well. His statements are as enlightening as they are unequivocal. And especially relevant is *‘arel*, a word which when fully amplified explains the nature of those who are uncircumcised. Those who do not embrace this, the fifth and final Covenant requirement, are considered: “stubborn and unresponsive,” they are “untrusting and therefore un-reliant” because they “do not listen and refuse to be observant,” so as a result, they are “forbidden” because they are “not set apart” unto God.

Rather than Sha’uwl’s “if you might be circumcised, the benefit of Yahowsha’ is nullified,” God said: “if you are not circumcised, your soul will be cut off and separated from My family because you have broken and nullified My Familial Covenant Relationship.” Therefore, those who believe Paul must reject Yahowah, who just happens to be God. Or we can trust Yahowah, which means rejecting Paul. The truth is undeniable: this man’s positions are the antithesis of God’s relative to the Covenant.

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

But as for those who ignore Yahowah’s Covenant, who reject it, or try to change it, they will endure the cutting and divisive side of *karat*. They shall be “cut off” and thus separated from Yahowah’s Family. They will be “excluded” from His Covenant. And they will be “banished” from His Home. Those who choose not to sign their acceptance of Yahowah’s Covenant by way of circumcision, those who are unwilling to “*muwl* – change their direction and priorities,” will be “*karat* – uprooted” from the Promised Land – a metaphor for Heaven. They will “*karat* – die” and their souls will “perish, ceasing to exist.”

Second, while “*muwl* – circumcision” is a physical act in the flesh, our “*nepesh* – souls” are everything but physical. The *nepesh* represents our “consciousness.” So while it is an essential part of our animal nature, as all animals have a “*nepesh* – soul, a unique personality and an awareness of our environment,” this consciousness has no physical properties. It has no mass and it

is not matter. And yet, by failing to be circumcised in the flesh, our soul dies, because it is expressly excluded from Yahowah's Covenant Family. Therefore, the choices we make in our mortal, material bodies influence whether or not we are elevated to a spiritual status.

Third, circumcision is not the means to reconciliation. But it can be a barrier to salvation. While not all of those who are circumcised will be adopted into God's family, men and boys who have not been circumcised will be excluded.

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

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

The implication here is something no Christian or Muslim, both who claim that the Towrah was inspired, seem willing or able to acknowledge. Most believe that it does not matter if their faith is in compliance with God's instructions, because they have been led to believe that He knows the content of their heart. Contradictions, therefore, become irrelevant. To them, God is God no matter what you call Him. To them, Friday prayers and Sunday worship are perfectly acceptable. Jihad and Grace are both embraced by the faithful, and many paths are thought to lead to God. Sure Christmas and Easter are pagan, but since that is not what they mean to the celebrant, they believe that their god will be understanding. For them, mercy invokes a level of capriciousness which they do not see as inappropriate. Their god wouldn't reject them for getting some of the details, well actually almost everything, wrong.

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

Fifth, the "*nepesh* – souls" of those who do not rely upon God's instructions "*karat* – die, they perish and cease to exist." Throughout Scripture, this is the prevailing outcome for the vast preponderance of human souls. At the end of most people's mortal lives, when they die, they will cease to exist, because their souls

will simply perish. But this is not a penalty or a Divine punishment. In fact, Yahowah has little to do with this eventuality. It is by “*karat* – disassociating from” God that this fate occurs because eternal life with God is predicated upon us associating with Him in the specific manner He has delineated. If we don’t accept His terms, if we don’t avail ourselves of the path He has provided, then our souls, disconnected from the source of life, perish, which means that an individual’s consciousnesses will simply cease to exist.

Most all religions, but most especially Christianity and Islam, seek submission among their adherents by threatening eternal suffering and fiery tortures in hell for all of those who don’t acquiesce to their edicts. But not a person among such believers pauses to think that if their god actually said “love me and agree with me or I’ll see to it that you suffer forever,” such a spirit would not be lovable. In fact, a god who would make such statements would be sadistic. And that is why there is an alternative fate awaiting souls which is neither heaven nor hell, neither a reward nor a punishment. And yet, since such an outcome is neither something to be coveted nor feared, since ceasing to exist cannot be used effectively to threaten masses of people into submission, religious leaders almost universally deny the fact that God has such a provision.

That is not to say that there isn’t a place of eternal separation—there is. But there are no fires blazing or physical tortures perpetrated therein. She’owl is a lightless place which exist only in the dimension of time. And it is only for Satan, fellow demonic spirits, and for those who lead others astray by associating with them. This is the place of separation, filled with the most outspoken and notorious religious, political, economic, and military advocates. It is for those who victimize others, oppressing them, and leading them away from the Towrah and its Covenant.

While eternal separation from God is a penalty, having one’s soul perish is not. Each individual is given the gift of life and freewill. Everyone can do with them as they please. If a person chooses to avail themselves of Yahowah’s Covenant, to walk away from Babylon and to walk to Him along the path He has provided, God has promised eternal life, merciful forgiveness of sins, adoption into His family, empowerment, and enrichment.

But those who choose instead to ignore Yahowah’s provision, to rely on a different scheme, to alter the deal He has cut with us, or simply reject it, they will be ignored by God and remain unaltered by His Covenant promises. It’s ashes to ashes and dust to dust. Such souls don’t know God and God does not know them. For them, death will be the end of life.

The sixth lesson we can learn from this Towrah presentation brings us back to Sha’owl. Circumcision is the fulcrum upon which those who rely on

Yahowah's Word move in a different direction than those who believe the self-proclaimed "Thirteenth Apostle." In Acts, the moment we are introduced to Paul, we learn that he was preaching against circumcision. As a result, he was called to Yaruwshalaim by the actual Apostles to explain his departure from Yahowah's Covenant instructions. They told Paul that he was wrong, so in his initial letter, the one he wrote to the Galatians, Paul demeaned Yahowsha's Disciples, especially Shim'own, Yahowchanan, and Ya'aqob (Yahowsha's brother, who was renamed "James" to flatter an English king). In Galatians, Paul ruthlessly attacks the Towrah, demeans the Covenant, and then denounces circumcision, inferring that God's plan "enslaves" and is a "curse," "incapable of saving anyone."

Therefore, Christians have a choice. They can trust Yahowah, or they can believe Paul. Their claims are diametrically opposed and irreconcilable.

It is also instructive to know that we can't blame this conflict between Yahowah and Paul on scribal error. These specific passages from *Bare'syth* / Genesis on circumcision are not only extant among the Qumran scrolls, they are unchanged. There isn't a single discrepancy between the Dead Sea Scrolls, dating to the second century BCE, and the Masoretic Text from *Bare'syth* 17:12 through the end of the chapter. And on the other end, we have a complete copy of Paul's letter to the Galatians dating to the late first century CE.

Moreover, the preposterous notion that Paul didn't write Galatians, a book he claims to have written, a book which is universally attributed to him, a book which provides the most sweeping panorama of his life, and a book which serves as the most direct rebuttal to the Disciples regarding his animosity toward circumcision, the Covenant, and the Torah, does not exonerate Paul. He is equally opposed to circumcision, the Covenant, and the Torah in Acts and in Romans.

And that means that the conflict between Yahowah and Paul cannot be resolved. If you side with Paul, you will invalidate the benefits of the Covenant. You will be excluded from God's family. And your soul will cease to exist. And that is why the choices we make in the flesh, while we retain our physical and animal nature, are so important.

The seventh lesson we can learn from God's definitive statement is not to trust English bible translations. Yahowah actually said: **"And (wa) the uncircumcised and unresponsive ('arel) male who fails to remember this (zakar), who relationally and beneficially ('asher) is not (lo') circumcised and changed (muwl) with regard to ('eth) the flesh (basar) of their foreskin ('aralah), those souls (nepesh) shall be cut off, be excluded, and be banished, ceasing to exist (karat) from (min) Her (huw') family ('am). By way of association ('eth), they violated and broke, disassociating themselves from**

(*parar*) **My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship** (*beryth-y*)." (*Bare'syth* 17:14)

While not as revealing or complete, the *Roman Catholic Vulgate* was accurate up to the point of identifying whose family a soul would be excluded from. "The male whose flesh of his foreskin shall not be circumcised, that soul shall be destroyed out of his people: because he hath broken my covenant." Not only is the pronoun "Her" scribed independently in the Hebrew text via *hy*, "'am – family" was suffixed in the third person feminine singular, reinforcing the fact that it is "Her family." Also, the reference to "his people" suggests banishment from the villages and land of Yisra'el rather than from the "*beryth* – Covenant," yet another feminine noun.

The *King James Version* reads identically, and thus promotes the same myth. It is one which would reinforce the ability of the church to excommunicate those whom they opposed.

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

Simply stated, as a sign of our desire to participate in Yahowah's Covenant, males are to be circumcised. The covering of the male genitalia responsible for consummating a marriage and producing children is to be "cut off and separated"—set apart. Our Heavenly Father's Covenant is about bearing children and building a family set apart from the world of corrupt institutions by way of a monogamous marriage relationship. Yahowah does not want anyone to miss these points.

In that seven long chapters have come and gone since we reviewed Yahowah's prophetic pronouncements regarding circumcision, and since Christian apologists errantly protest that *Bare'syth* / Genesis only pertains to Yisra'el (which incidentally is based upon Sarah's name and means "individuals who engage and endure with God"), let's reconsider Yahowah's position on

Gentile circumcision as it was articulated through the prophet Yachezq'el / Ezekiel. That discussion begins by acknowledging the role the Towrah plays in our lives...

**“And (wa) Yahowah (יהוה) said to me (‘amar ‘el – shared with me), ‘Son of man (ben ‘adam – child of Adam), place upon your heart (sym leb), look with your eyes (ra’ah ba ‘ayn), and listen with your ears (wa shama’ ba ‘ozen), accordingly, to (‘eth) everything (kol) which, relationally and beneficially (‘asher – as a blessing), I (‘any) have spoken (dabar – have communicated orally and in writing using words) with regard to (‘eth la) all of (kol) the clearly communicated and inscribed prescriptions for living (wa chuwqah – the written arrangements regarding life and abiding; from choq – the shared and nourishing thoughts associated with an allocation of something from one who is set apart which is designed to cut us into a relationship) in Yahowah’s Family Home (beyth יהוה – the household, temple, and tabernacle of Yahowah).’**

**And so with all of (wa la kol) His Towrah teachings (Towrah towrah – His Towrah instructions, His Towrah guidance, and His Towrah directions (scribed in the singular as a specific and unique title and then in the plural as a word to indicate that the Towrah is comprised of many teachings, directions, and instructions)), therefore indeed (wa), you should choose to place them on your heart (sym leb – you should decide to set and examine them in your core (qal stem indicating a literal reading is preferred, perfect conjugation telling us that this should be done without reservation, and consecutive form indicating volition)) in order to approach the entrance (la mabow’ – so that you gain entrance into) the Family and Home (ha beyth – the house and household, the temple and tabernacle) with regard to (ba) every (kol) stage of the journey (mowtsa’ – step along the way) to this set-apart place (ha miqdash – the separated and dedicated sanctuary).” (Yachezq’el / God Grows / Ezekiel 44:5)**

By stating that He wants us look at and listen to everything He has communicated to us regarding His inscribed prescriptions for living in His home and being part of His family, in addition to placing everything God wrote in His Towrah on our hearts, Yahowah is encouraging us to go beyond looking at and listening to what He has said and written. He wants us to accept His instructions, to embrace His guidance, and to incorporate His directions into the fabric of our lives. He wants us to love and cherish what He has promised as much as we love Him for who He is and what He has done. Those who do these things, who go beyond listening to God and reading His Word, and who embrace the terms and conditions of the Covenant, will be invited to live in Yahowah’s Family Home forever. This is God’s relational plan which leads to our salvation. It is the journey which leads us home.

Recognizing that most would ignore, or worse, reject, these instructions, is what caused Yachezq'el to pen the following words on behalf of Yahowah...

**“And you shall say to** (*wa 'amar 'el*) **the rebellious and contentious** (*mary* – the revolting and embittered who resist My position and guidance, and those displaying animosity who are insubordinate and opposed), **regarding** (*'el* – to and about) **the House of Yisra'el** (*beyth yisra'el* – the home of those individuals who strive, engage, and endure with God), **this is what** (*koh*) **My Foundation, the Upright Pillar, Yahowah** (*'edon* 𐤏𐤃𐤏𐤃), **says** (*'amar*): **‘The greatest of all of your** (*rab la min kol*) **detestable abominations** (*tow'ebah* – your repulsive, loathsome, immoral, and abhorrent practices) **in the House of Yisra'el** (*ba beyth yisra'el* – home of those individuals who strive, engage, and endure with God) (44:6) **is your inclusion of** (*bow'* – bringing in) **the male offspring** (*ben* – sons) **of foreigners** (*nekar* – strangers) **who are uncircumcised** (*'arel* – stubborn and forbidden, unobservant and unresponsive) **of heart** (*leb*) **and uncircumcised** (*wa 'arel* – unobservant, unresponsive, and forbidden) **of flesh** (*basar* – body) **to exist** (*hayah*) **in My Sanctuary** (*ba miqdash* – in My Home, from *qadash* – purifying place which is set apart) **to defile and profane it** (*la halal huw'* – to desecrate and pollute it, treating Him with contempt (written with the third person masculine singular suffix this refers to “Him,” serving to unify Yahowsha' and the Temple)) **along with** (*'eth*) **My Home and Family** (*beyth* – House and Household), **in your coming near and approaching** (*ba qarab*) **My finest oil, bread, and My chosen blood** (*cheleb lechem wa dam* – symbolic of His fulfillment of *Pesach* and *Matsah*).

**And also** (*wa*) **they broke** (*parar* – they severed, violated, and nullified, you revoked, frustrated, and thwarted) **My Familial Covenant Relationship** (*beryth*) **by way of all your detestable abominations** (*'el kol tow'ebah* – all of your repulsive, loathsome, and abhorrent acts of idolatry), (44:7) **and** (*wa*) **by not observing, closely examining and carefully considering** (*lo' shamar* – by not focusing upon being aware of, paying especially close attention to and contemplating) **the requirement and responsibility** (*mishmereth* – function and purpose, the expression, condition, and accountability) **of My Set-Apart Ones** (*qodesh* – set apart ones includes God's Home, His Temple, the Children of the Covenant, Yahowsha', and the Set-Apart Spirit in addition to Yisra'el, the Shabat, and the Miqra'ey).

**And you were appointed** (*wa sym* – and you were put in place and established) **to** (*la* – to approach, to come near, and to) **observe** (*shamar* – to closely examine and carefully consider) **My conditions and requirements** (*mishmereth* – My purpose, expression, and terms) **in** (*ba*) **My Set-Apart Home** (*miqdash* – My Set-Apart Sanctuary and Place) **for you to draw near** (*la* – on your behalf for you to approach).' (44:8) **Thus says** (*koh 'amar* – this is what is

communicated by) **My Foundation, the Upright Pillar** (*'edon* – the Upright One of the Tabernacle), **Yahowah** (יהוה): ‘Every (*kol* – completely all) **foreign male** (*nekar ben* – non-native son) **who is uncircumcised** (*'arel* – stubborn, unhearing, and forbidden) **of heart** (*leb*) **and uncircumcised** (*'arel* – stubborn and forbidden) **in the flesh** (*basar*), **he shall not come to or be included inside** (*lo' bow' 'el* – he shall not arrive at or be brought to) **My Set-Apart Home** (*miqdash* – My Set-Apart Sanctuary and Place) – **this concerns the approach of** (*la*) **every non-native son** (*nekar ben* – foreign male) who is in the midst (*'asher ba tawek*) **of the Children of Yisra'el** (*beny Yisra'el* – sons who engage and endure with God).’” (Yachezq'el / God Grows / Ezekiel 44:6-9)

That was unequivocal. If a man is not circumcised, he is expressly excluded from God's home and thus from heaven. And therefore, when Sha'awl wrote that being circumcised nullified the work of Yahowsha', he lied. The opposite is true. Circumcision, as this statement affirms, is one of the requirements of the Covenant, one of the five conditions, as is being observant, that we must embrace if we want to participate in this relationship with God. But circumcision is the only one which is also a responsibility in that Yahowah asked parents to perform this on behalf of their sons. And make no mistake, this instruction was expressly written for *Gowym* – Gentiles, and thus to Paul's audience. And that leaves no doubt that Yahowah's anger is directed toward a Jew who personally invited uncircumcised Gentiles to heaven. And no one in human history is more infamous for doing this very thing than Sha'awl.

Therefore, considering Yahowah's position on this particular topic, and Paul's, it would be inappropriate to spin Galatians to infer anything other than Paul is overtly opposed to God and to His Covenant. Satan's Apostle is not only assailing God's instructions regarding circumcision, Paul's position states that if you rely on God's Word you cannot be saved.

—

Continuing to assail Yahowah's Covenant, whose sign remains circumcision, and God's Torah, whose living embodiment is Yahowsha', the man who considered his testimony more vital than the Almighty's, according to the NAMI ineloquently opined: “**I testify but again to all man being circumcised that debtor he is whole the law to do.**” Let's be perfectly clear so that no one is misled: this is Paul's testimony, not God's.

“**So then** (*de*) **once again** (*palin* – furthermore, repeating myself), **I testify** (*martyromai* – I solemnly declare as a witness, I affirm, insist, and protest) **to**

**every (pas) man (anthropos) being circumcised (peritemno) that (hoti) he actually is (eimi) obligated (opheiletes – in debt and required) to do and perform (poieomai – to work, toil, and carry out the assigned tasks of) the entire (holos – all of, the whole, total and complete) Towrah (ton nomon – the nourishing allotment which leads to an inheritance; used throughout the Septuagint to convey Towrah – the Source of Teaching, Guidance, Instruction, and Direction).”** (Galatians 5:3)

There are only five requirements in the whole of the Towrah, and they all pertain to participation in the Covenant. Everyone is free to accept these conditions, reject them, or ignore them. But for those who act upon them, the rest of the Towrah exists to liberate, enlighten, and empower these Children of God. The best example of this is Dowd (errantly known as David). He responded to the terms of the Covenant as they were presented in the Towrah, and God responded by vindicating the man who violated much of His Towrah’s guidance on how we should live our lives among men. So the very fact that Yahowah calls Dowd “righteous,” a “man after His heart,” demonstrates that Paul’s premise is wrong.

In that this is an important distinction, since Yahowah called Sha’uwl the “plague of death,” since God affirmed that Dowd was “righteous,” let’s contrast what we have been reading to Dowd’s testimony to determine why one flawed individual was despised and the other was loved.

The following lyrics represent the initial sixteen verses of the one-hundred-seventy-six which comprise Dowd’s ode to the Towrah...

**“Enjoyable, favorable, and blessed (‘ashry) is the Way (derek) to becoming innocent, perfect, and entirely blameless (tamym) by walking (halak) in (ba) the Towrah (Towrah) of Yahowah (Yahowah).**

**Properly guided (‘ashery) are those who are saved and preserved (natsar) by His enduring and restoring testimony (‘edah). They genuinely seek to have a relationship with Him and His witness (darash) for all (la kol) time (dowr).**

**Therefore (‘ap), they do not carry out (lo’ pa’al) that which is harmful or wrong (‘eowlah) by walking in His ways (ba derek halak).**

**You (‘atah), Yourself, provided and ordained (sawah) Your precepts, these instructions which You have entrusted to us, encouraging us to respond appropriately to You (piquwdym) so that they would be diligently examined and carefully considered (la ma’od shamar).**

**So that (‘achalay) my path through life (derek) would be properly prepared and firmly established (kuwn), approaching by (la) observing (shamar) Your truth, Your consistent, never changing, enduring, and reliable testimony (‘emeth).**

**Then ('az), I will not be ashamed (bowsh) by (ba) looking at (nabat) all of (kol) God's ('el) terms and conditions as they relate to Your binding covenant contract (mitswah).**

**You, I will publicly acknowledge and thank, expressing my gratitude while professing Your attributes (yadah) directly in an upright attitude (ba yashar leb) when (ba) I learn and properly respond to (lamad) Your righteous and vindicating (tsadaq) means to resolve disputes (mishpat).**

**According to ('eth) Your clearly communicated and inscribed prescriptions of what we should do in life to live (choq), by being observant (shamar), I will not be forsaken by You. I will never be neglected or disassociated from You ('azab), not for one hundred (me'ah) eternities ('ad).**

**In what way (ba mah) can a young man (na'ar) keep his path pure so as to be acquitted (zakah 'eth 'orah)? By being observant, closely examining and carefully considering the associations in (ka) Your Word (dabar).**

**In all my heart and with all my being (ba kol leb), I seek to form a relationship with You, seeking to learn more about You (darash). You do not want me to be misled or stray (shagah) from (min) the terms and conditions of Your relationship agreement (mitswah).**

**In my heart (ba leb), I have genuinely treasured (tsaphan) Your instructions and promises ('emrah) so that (ma'an) I will not fail to reach You as a result of going astray and missing the way, nor by my wrongdoing or guilt (lo' chata' la).**

**Yahowah (Yahowah), You ('atah) have knelt down in love to bless and provide divine favor (barak). Teach me so that I respond properly to (lamad) Your clearly communicated prescriptions of what I should do to live (choq).**

**With my lips and in my spoken words (ba saphah), I consider and proclaim from the written text (caphar / cepher) all of (kol) the means used to achieve justice, resolve disputes, and exercise sound judgment (mishpat) which come from Your mouth (peh).**

**In the Way (ba derek) of Your Witness regarding our restoration ('eduwth), I am pleased and delighted, enjoying the ensuing relationship (suws), as if (ka) before all of the Almighty's abundance, God's sufficiency and substance ('al kol hown).**

**Concerning Your precepts and directions (ba piquwdym), I will choose to meditate on them and speak of them (syach). And (wa) I will choose to consistently observe so that I understand (nabat) Your ways and Your path through life ('orah).**

**Concerning Your clearly communicated and inscribed prescriptions of what I should do to live (*ba choq*), I find them fun, even enjoyable (*sha'a'*). I will never overlook or ignore (*lo' shakah*) Your Word (*dabar*).” (*Mizmowr / Song / Psalm 119:1-16*)**

Dowd loved the Word of God, especially His Towrah, and wrote songs to extol its virtues. Yahowah loves Dowd, calling him “righteous.” Sha’uwl hated the Word of God, especially His Towrah, and wrote letters to demean and discard it. Yahowah despises Paul, calling him the “plague of death.” And that leaves us with only one question: why is this comparison so difficult for Christians to understand?

In order to control his audience, Paul wants the faithful to believe that he is the foremost authority on the Torah as well as the world’s leading expert regarding salvation. And in the case with his most recent proclamation, the myth he is promoting is that if someone does anything Yahowah asks, they have to do everything He asks, or they are dead men walking. But as we just noted with Dowd, that clearly is not the case.

In this regard, the third condition for those desirous of participating in the Covenant relationship with God is that we walk to Him along the path He has provided to make us perfect. This path comprised of seven invitations to meet with God is presented in the heart of the Towrah, in the book aptly named “*Qara* – Invitation to be Called Out and Meet. Yahowah offers His remedy for our inadequacies immediately after formalizing the Covenant with Abraham. And along His Way, Yahowah does all of the work so that nothing other than attendance is required of us. This was the very purpose of Yahowsha’.

But that is not to say that Paul’s myth, one born out of a hatred for God, isn’t persuasive. Christians the world over and throughout time have been deceived by Sha’uwl’s arrogance into believing that “the problem with the Torah is that its restrictive and antiquated rules require perfection.” But let’s say for the sake of argument that Paul was right: how can disobeying everything God request endear a person to the One making those recommendations? And that is precisely what Paul is insisting upon. The self-proclaimed messenger of god wants Christians to reject God’s entire Towrah – all of it from beginning to end. Now, I ask you: who do you suppose inspired him to say such a thing?

Paul is wrong and he knows it. He was aware that the Ark of the Covenant was unavailable, and that according to Yahowsha’ the Temple itself would soon be destroyed. He also recognized that the people were under the yoke of Roman law. So, Paul knew that there were many things which were prescribed in the Torah which could not be done. Therefore, salvation could not have been a matter

of doing everything the Torah prescribed, but instead understanding its prescriptions sufficiently to trust Yahowah's remedy.

Seeing religion among the rubbish, the NLT again interpreted Paul correctly, which of course put them in opposition to God. "I'll say it again. If you are trying to find favor with God by being circumcised, you must obey every regulation in the whole law of Moses." Nowhere does God state that men "find favor" with Him as a result of being circumcised. Circumcision is prescribed as "the sign of the Covenant," not the symbol of salvation or reconciliation. Moreover, for the vast preponderance of people, circumcision isn't a choice, but instead something done to them when they are eight or fewer days old. Not a single newborn in human history has said or thought: "I want to have someone cut off the end of my external plumbing so that I can earn favor with God?" And as a result, Paul's animosity against circumcision is misplaced.

For consistency sake, here are the Roman Catholic and Protestant versions of Paul's poison. The LV reads: "And I testify again to every man circumcising himself that he is a debtor to do the whole law." And the KJV says: "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law."

The operative term in this next statement from Satan's Apostle is *apo*. It "describes the separation of something from an object which it was previously united but is now disjoined." In this case, Sha'awl is speaking of the purported separation of "Christou from the Towrah." So now, addressing those who had chosen to follow Yahowah's Torah instructions regarding circumcision, the Devil's advocate testified:

**"You have invalidated and rendered inoperative** (*katargeo* – you have put an end to, made inactive and useless, and abolished the purpose and function of) **the separation of** (*apo* – the movement away and disassociation of) **Christou** (XY – a Divine Placeholder for the Ma'aseyah (but without the definite article, the errant misnomer, *Christou*, is a better grammatical fit than the correct title meaning "the Implement Doing the Work of Yah") **whosoever** (*hostis*) **is in unison with** (*en*) **the Towrah** (*nomos* – the nourishing allotment with enables an inheritance).

**You all having been declared righteous** (*dikaioo* – you having been acquitted, put right, and vindicated) **with the** (*tes*) **Charis / Gratia / Graces** (*Charis* – a transliteration of the name of the Greek goddesses known as the *Gratia* or Graces in Roman mythology), **you all have fallen away and have been forsaken** (*ekpipto* – you have become inadequate and have descended from a higher place to a lower one, you have bowed down and prostrated yourselves)." (Galatians 5:4)

Sha'awl was a man on a mission. Too bad it involved promoting pagan deities and demeaning the only actual Deity on behalf of the Adversary.

The Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear renders the Greek text somewhat differently, albeit the resulting message is no less inaccurate: “You have been abolished from Christ who in law are made right the favor you fell out.” This is perhaps more incomprehensible than the more literal and exacting presentation of the same words.

But as you probably anticipated, this poorly expressed thought has been interpreted by Christendom to say: “For if you are trying to make yourselves right with God by keeping the law, you have been cut off from Christ! You have fallen away from God’s grace.” To the contrary, it is only by observing the Torah that we come to know the Implement Doing the Work of Yahowah, and that we come to understand the work He performed. This in turn enables us to rely upon His merciful gift. Those who disassociate the Torah from Yahowsha’ separate themselves from Yahowah. Therefore, the New Living Translation has become an agent leading the faithful away from God.

But they were not the first to commit this heinous crime. There was a long line of false witnesses before them, starting with Paul. The Latin Vulgate reads: “You are made void of Christo, you who are justified in the law: you are fallen from Gratia.” The King James Version parroted this thought by publishing: “Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.” It is interesting, however, that not one of these variations has properly translated “*katargeo* – you have invalidated and rendered inoperative” in the initial sentence, and most either ignored or misstated the meaning of “*apo* – the separation of.” But it’s Paul’s grammar that is to blame for the variant renderings of the second sentence.

Considering the onslaught of lies that preceded it, in context, Paul is now saying that, since the Towrah cannot save anyone, only those who accept his Faith have hope. Even if his premise was true, and it is not, accepting it would not lead to this conclusion. Proving one thing wrong does not demonstrate that another thing is right, even if there were only two options available to humankind. Therefore, Paul has compounded the problem, moving from deceitful statements to logical fallacy.

“**Because** (*gar* – for then, because, and indeed) **we** (*emeis*) **in spirit** (*IINI* – a Divine Placeholder used to convey *ruwach* – spirit) **out of** (*ek*) **faith** (*pistis* – originally conveyed “trust and reliance” but migrated as a result of Sha’awl’s epistles to mean “belief”) **hope** (*apekdechomai*). **Righteousness** (*dikaiosyne* – being acceptable, virtuous, and innocent) **we hope for** (*elpis* – we expect and await patiently).” (Galatians 5:5)

If nothing else, Sha'awl has defined his use of *pistis* for us. With “faith” there is never anything beyond “hope.” The faithful are left to hope that their religion is right. They never know.

The NAMI suggests that Paul said: “We for in spirit from trust hope of rightness we await.” LV: “For we in spirit, by faith, wait for the hope of justice.” And the KJV edits the “Apostle’s” words this way: “For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.”

While faith is counterproductive, the Spirit indwells those who come to know, trust, and rely upon Yahowah. But the instant the Set-Apart Spirit takes up residence in us; we are purified, and thus instantly become right with God. This isn’t something that we “hope for,” or “eagerly anticipate,” but instead enjoy.

Even more confused than Paul, and completely missing the purpose of the Spirit, the NLT conveys: “But we who live by the Spirit eagerly wait to receive by faith the righteousness God has promised to us.”

Since this is literally life and death, it is worth repeating. We not only obtain the cleansing benefits of the Spirit immediately upon being born anew from above, but nothing comes to us by way of “faith.” Yahowah’s “promises” are knowable because they are all memorialized in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. And we know that we can trust them because they are all enveloped in prophetic predictions which have proven to be accurate. As such, those who know the Torah are in a position to trust Yahowah and rely upon His provision. Those who don’t understand God’s Word are relegated to faith, while those who understand God’s Word recognize that faith is irrelevant.

Using the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear as a handrail in this upside down, backwards, and twisted realm of Paul’s mind, we find: “In for Christ Jesus neither circumcision some is strong nor uncircumcision but trust through love operating.”

Or, more precisely: “[*For* (*gar* – indeed because then) omitted from P46] **In** (*en*) **Christo Iesou** (XPΩ IHY – Divine Placeholders for the Ma’aseyah (the Implement Doing the Work of Yahowah) and Yahowsha’ (Yahowah Saves); but since this epistle has disassociated Yahowsha’ from Yahowah and the Ma’aseyah from the work of the Towrah, it’s misleading in this context to connect that which Paul has severed) **neither** (*oute*) **circumcision** (*peritome*) **is someone** (*ti*) **is capable, powerful, and mighty** (*tis ischuo* – is able, competent, strong, or healthy) **nor** (*oute* – neither) **un-circumcision** (*akrobystia* – a word Paul made up comprised of “*akron* – the uttermost part of” and “*posthe* – penis”), **on the contrary** (*alla*), **through** (*dia*) **faith** (*pistis* – belief) **love** (*agape*) **operating** (*energeo* – functioning and working).” (Galatians 5:6) (Papyrus 46 renders

“*energeo* – working” in the genitive participle rather than the nominative, and therefore, it modifies the noun, “*agape* – love,” not “*pistis* – trust.”)

This is to say that everything God conveyed in the Torah and Prophets regarding His Covenant and its sign, circumcision, was a complete lie. Even the Christian Christ Jesus was not Torah observant. Everything He said during the Sermon on the Mount was untrue. He did not fulfill the Torah’s promises because He loved us, because the Torah had been abrogated and it had no influence anyway. His crucifixion on *Pesach* was pure happenstance, as was the reunification of His soul with the Set-Apart Spirit on *Bikurym*. He was wrong when He said that we could come to know Him through the Torah and Prophets. Even worse, knowing was actually irrelevant. Ignorance was bliss. Just believe Paul and hope that he was right to contradict God.

It is impossible to trust and rely upon someone known only by name (and an errant, meaningless name at that). In this regard, Paul’s representation of “Christo Iesou” is inferior to MTV’s presentation of a rock star, because with their videos, the fan gets to listen to the performer’s lyrics. But both breed an ignorant and irrational fascination with a celebrity the audience knows only by genre. They don’t know the star, they don’t have a relationship with him, and he has none with them. “Jesus Christ Superstar,” indeed.

Should Paul have been saying that “our faith expressing itself in love” was the means to our salvation, as the NLT claims, then he would have been wrong on all accounts. Our redemption is predicated upon relying upon Yahowah’s demonstration of His love for us as proposed in His Towrah. “For when we place our faith in Christ Jesus, there is no benefit in being circumcised or being uncircumcised. What is important is faith expressing itself in love.” KJV: “For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.”

Christian apologists will no doubt protest that it’s time to give Paul a break. After all, they believe that he was preaching about “faith expressing itself in love.” What could possibly be wrong with that? The problem is that rejecting our Heavenly Father’s advice, which is what Paul is asking, is the opposite of loving God. And placing one’s faith in Pauline Doctrine, which is what Paul is demanding, is the opposite of knowing God.

Here then is a summary of the Devil’s Advocate’s most recent assault on the truth. These are the most deceitful, destructive, deadly, and damning words ever written:

**“This freedom and liberty of ours being Christos it freed, so you all are directed to stand firm. Therefore, also, not again in yoke of subservience and slavery you are held based upon a grudge against you all, controlling you and**

forcing you to surrender to someone who bears ill will, is resentful, violent, and quarrelsome. (5:1)

You pay attention, I, Paulos, myself say to you all that if on the condition that you may be circumcised, Christos is totally worthless and completely meaningless, not in the least bit helpful or useful for you. (5:2) So then, furthermore, repeating myself, I testify, insist, and protest to every man being circumcised that he actually is obligated to do and perform the entire and complete Towrah. (5:3)

You have invalidated and rendered inoperative, abolishing the purpose of the separation of Christou whosoever is in unison with the Towrah. You all having been declared righteous, and having been vindicated with the Charis / Gratia / Graces, you all have fallen away and have been forsaken. (5:4) Because indeed, we in spirit out of faith hope. Righteousness we await patiently. (5:5) In Christo Iesou neither circumcision is someone is capable, powerful, and mighty nor uttermost part of the penis, on the contrary through faith love operating.” (5:6)

✠✠✠

I suppose one would have to be a Christian to believe or even understand this: “**You were running well who you hindered in the truth not to be persuaded.**” (Courtesy of the Nestle-Aland 27<sup>th</sup> Edition McReynolds Interlinear)

A verbatim rendering looks more like this: “**You were running** (*trecho* – you were trying and were progressing) **well** (*kalos* – in a fine moral way that was pleasing). **Who or what** (*tis*) **you** (*umas*) **it prevented and impeded** (*egkopto* – it hindered, offended, and troubled, it thwarted, delayed, and detained, it cut into, knocked and severed; from “*en* – in, by, or with” and “*kopto* – to cut, strike, smite, or beat”) **of the truth** (*te aletheia* – of the validity which is in accord with the facts and corresponds to reality) **not** (*me* – so that not) **to be persuaded, to obey, and to follow along faithfully** (*peithos* – to be convinced, influenced, and converted, to agree, to mind, and to conform)?” (Galatians 5:7)

First, we know that this has nothing to do with “objective truth,” because the Galatians epistle has been neither “objective,” nor “truthful.” Paul has lied about everything from his name to his calling, from his personal history to his ongoing testimony. So the issue here is that Sha’uwl was so convinced that he was smarter and more persuasive than everyone else, the realization that the Galatians had rejected him and his message was inconceivable and unacceptable. As an extraordinarily insecure individual, Sha’uwl imagined his personal foes sneaking

in behind him to undermine his influence and credibility. And for this crime, he would stop at nothing to squelch them.

Second, based upon his words alone, it is now obvious that Sha'awl was completely irrational, clinically insane, and borderline illiterate. It is a wonder this poorly written letter, filled as it is with inaccuracies and contradictions, errant citations and logical fallacies, wasn't tossed into the trash by the first Galatian to read it. And perhaps it was. It is Sha'awl's personal copies of his letters that were enshrined in the Christian New Testament, not the ones he sent away. But it's a bigger wonder altogether that billions of people henceforth have been beguiled into believing that this verbal diarrhea is the word of the God who created the universe. By any reasonable standard, the writing quality on display in this letter is as retarded as the message presented therein is perverted.

Let's turn to the charter members of the Pauline fan club to see how they deciphered Sha'awl's message. The Catholic Vulgate promoted: "You did run well. What hath hindered you, that you should not obey the truth?" The inclusion of "obey" is telling, especially considering the oppressive rule of cleric and king under the dominion of Roman Catholicism. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Protestant potentate, King James, relished that notion as well. The KJV reads: "Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?" It is ironic that Paul insists that the problem with the Towrah is that it condemns if not obeyed perfectly and yet he has a tizzy fit when he is not obeyed.

But "obey" is not a term that the pro-democracy, evangelical Christians promoting the New Living Translation felt comfortable advocating. So they insist Paul actually said: "You were running the race so well. Who has held you back from following the truth?"

I have suggested before that Paul's epistles might have had some value had he actually presented some evidence which could be evaluated to persuade rational people to trust Yahowah's Word and Yahowsha's deeds (as opposed to disassociating and demeaning them). But there is no evidence delineated in this letter. So how does one come to know "the objective truth" if it isn't shared? His singular citation from Yahowsha' was erroneous, as were all of his quotations from the Torah and Prophets. And more recently, he has created a completely incongruous and revisionist history of the Covenant.

It's no wonder the Galatians wandered away from Paul. While his preaching may have been more compelling than his writing, the emotional charge of impassioned oratory only lasts a short while. Adolf Hitler comes to mind as a modern analog in this regard. Having studied Hitler's *Mein Kampf* for the purpose of comparing it to Muhammad's Qur'an and Hadith in order to demonstrate how similar Nazism and Islam actually are, I have examined der Fuehrer's speeches

for the purpose of understanding how delusional egomaniacs like Paul manage to spellbind their audiences with an emotional mix of racist drivel and an unfounded sense of hope in their fanaticized future. Having looked into the faces of thousands of Germans while Hitler was passionately lying to them, I came to realize just how susceptible people are to deceptions which tickle their ears—telling them what they want to hear.

But to this particular point, Hitler’s written and spoken messages were remarkably similar with regard to their conclusions, but not with regard to the volume of rhetoric underpinning them. And I suspect that the same thing is true with Paul, that his preaching was even thinner on support than were his letters. So long as the impassioned orator was in their midst playing to their emotions, the Galatians listened and were thus perceived to be “running well” and “following along” in Paul’s parlance. But the moment he left, and when informed rational individuals pointed out the flaws in his reasoning and the inconsistencies in his message, the air came out of their religious balloons, and they floated back down to earth, dismayed that they had been so easily deceived. And perhaps this is the actual reason behind why the Galatians tracked Sha’uwl down and tried to stone him.

Since the choice Paul has given us is to believe him and reject God, or reject him and trust God, a rational and informed individual would have every incentive to dismiss Paul based upon this letter. And in all likelihood, this letter is much better supported than was his preaching. In this regard, next we find:

**“The (*e*) enticing persuasion (*peismone* – solicitation and inducement) not from (*ouk ek*) the one (*tou*) providing a name (*kaleo* / *kalountos* – summoning and calling by name) to you all (*umas* – to all of you).”** (Galatians 5:8)

Other than their preference for the secondary connotation of *kaleo* and their reluctance to acknowledge when “you” was scribed in the plural form, the Nestle-Aland Interlinear is in accord, not that it helps: **“The persuasion not from the one calling you.”**

Since that isn’t any clearer, let’s turn to the father of translations, the Latin Vulgate for elucidation: **“This persuasion is not from him that calleth you.”** Other than introduce the flourish of Elizabethan English, the KJV copied the Catholic text: **“This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you.”**

So, clearing all this up for us, the NLT authored: **“It certainly isn’t God, for he is the one who called you to freedom.”** Even for them, this is a stretch. How can the New Living Translation present itself as a “translation” when they supplied ten of fourteen words without textual support and only rendered the definite article *tou* accurately? Even with “called,” *kalountos* was scribed in the

present tense, not in the past tense. If you own a NLT, you may want to return it because it is defective.

While God's Word stands forever, one of the things that it stands for is freewill, and thus the freedom to choose to reject God and His Word as Sha'awl and Christians have done. But fortunately for them, the Galatians chose God and rejected Paul. But since the source of the "enticing persuasion and inducement" and the identity of the individuals who "provided a name" were unspecified, we don't know what was said to undermine the Devil's witness. So other than acknowledging that Paul was miffed that someone was exposing him, interpreting this beyond that is a fool's folly.

At least, his next line is comprehensible. "**Little** (*micros*) **yeast** (*zyme*) **whole** (*holos*) **of the** (*to*) **batch** (*phyrama* – a lump of clay or dough which is mixed, kneaded, and grows) **it yeasts** (*zymoo* – ferments or leavens)." (Galatians 5:9)

But while this reads sensibly, in this context, the message is devastating. The only thing which we could possibly attribute to a "little yeast" in this section of Galatians is Paul's disdain for circumcision in verses two, three, and four. So he is saying that those who observe even a small part of the Torah are completely corrupted by it.

Here we find that the Nestle-Aland's rendition of this verse is essentially identical: "**Little yeast whole the mixture yeasts.**" The Latin Vulgate went into interpretive mode with "corrupteth": "**A little leaven corrupteth the whole lump.**" Other than altering the word order, KJV toed a more literal line: "**A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.**" And consistent with their custom, the NLT authored their own bible with: "**This false teaching is like a little yeast that spreads through the whole batch of dough!**" And in this case, their errant translation created an accurate interpretation of Paul's intended message.

But while Paul's statement is comprehensible (albeit condemning in this context), it doesn't add to our comprehension. Therefore, in order that you might appreciate the distinction between unsupported, errant, and poorly worded, human opinions and Godly instruction, let's consider what Yahowsha' had to say about yeast. At the very least, we will learn something valuable in the process. This message, which was spoken and recorded in Hebrew by Yahowsha's Disciple (meaning "one who learns") Mattanyah (meaning "Yah's Gift"), who was an eyewitness, is now presented for your consideration translated out of Greek into English...

**"And** (*kai*) **of the Pharisees** (*ton Pharisaios* – the religiously conservative rabbis) **and** (*kai*) **Sadducees** (*Saddoukaios* – worldly-minded, liberal political leaders) **having come to pressure and test Him, asked Him** (*proserchomai peirasontes eperotesan auton* – having approached to examine and trap Him,

interrogating Him, they requested of Him) **to show a sign from heaven or the sky** (*semeion ek tou ouranou*). (1)

**So then** (*o de*) **the One having answered, said to them** (*apokritheis eipen outois* – the One having previously responded, providing a reply [which they had not considered in the Torah and Prophets which He had authored], spoke to them), **‘Having become evening** (*epias genomenes*), **you say, beneficial weather** (*legete eudia*), **for indeed the sky reddens** (*purrasei gar o ouranos*). (2)

**And in the morning** (*kai proi omeron*), **stormy weather** (*cheimon*), **for the sky is fiery red, becoming threatening, gloomy, and overcast** (*gar pyrrazo stugnazon o ouranos*).

**So this shows** (*to men*) **the appearance of the atmosphere** (*prosopon tou ouranou* – the face, person, and presence of heaven) **you recognize and know how to judge and interpret** (*ginoskete diakrinein* – you are familiar with and understand how to evaluate carefully, thinking judgmentally, making a proper distinction), **and yet the miraculous signs of this occasion, opportunity, and period of time you are incapacitated** (*ta de semeia ton kairon ou dunasthe* – but for the signs of these moments in the history of time you are incapable and powerless). (3)

**A worthless and wicked adulterous generation** (*genea ponera kai moichalis* – a race and age of related people who are evil and morally corrupt, even disloyal, untrustworthy, lustful, and treacherous) **seeks a sign** (*epizetei semeion* – desires and wants a miracle), **but a miraculous sign** (*kai semeion*) **will not be given to it** (*ou dothesetai aute* – will not be produced and experienced by it), **except for** (*ei me* – if not) **the sign of Yownah** (*to semeion Iona* – the miraculous symbolism of *Yownah* (meaning Dove, and thus symbolic of reconciliation through the Spirit of God)).’ **Then He left them behind and He went away** (*kai katalipon autous apelthen* – so He abandoned them, neglecting them because He could not relate to them, and He ceased to exist for them, passing away).” (Mattanyah 16:1-4)

You have to love God’s sense of humor. The religious and political establishment had dispatched some of their own to interrogate and trap God. They requested a miracle, a sign from heaven, even though the miraculous manifestation of heaven was standing right before them. So Yahowsha’, the living embodiment of the Torah and Prophets, told them that He had already done so, predicting His arrival long ago. Then He coined the old sailor’s adage, “Red sky at night, sailor’s delight. Red sky in the morning, sailor’s warning,” to make a point. It showed that they could interpret the appearance of the atmosphere but could not recognize the very face, person, and appearance of heaven. They knew from the sky what the next few hours would bring, but could not deduce from the

Torah and Prophets that God had appeared in their midst and right on schedule. He even specified the miracle that would be produced by heaven in their midst. Like Yownah (Jonah), He had come to warn them about the futility of their religious and political institutions while providing the means to reconcile their relationship with Yahowah.

And just like Yownah, Yahowsha's miracle would transpire over three days and three nights. He would arrive in Yaruwshalaim to celebrate Passover with His Disciples before the sunset beginning the 14<sup>th</sup> day of 'Abyb in year 4000 Yah, a Thursday in 33 CE by our reckoning. On Friday, which was a continuation of *Pesach*, He would serve as the perfect Passover Lamb as His Spirit returned to Yahowah. Then as the sunset, commencing the *Miqra'* of *Matsah*, Friday evening, and thus the beginning of the *Shabat*, His soul entered *She'owl* to remove the yeast of religious teaching and political indoctrination from our souls. It remained there throughout the most important Sabbath, or Saturday in our corrupted parlance, in all of human history. And then on the first day of the week, before sunrise, once liberated from *She'owl*, Yahowsha's soul and Yahowah's Spirit were reunited in a celebration of the Invitation to be Called Out and Meet with God of First-Born Children. He remained in Yaruwshalaim on a day we call "Sunday" until late in the afternoon, when He would be shown talking with some fellows on the road to Emmaus. Three days and three nights, just as had been the case with Yownah. And during them, God would perform the ultimate miracle: enabling His flawed creation to become immortal and perfect children adopted into His Covenant family.

It is interesting to speculate, but I suspect that if God walked into the Vatican today, the Roman Catholic royalty wouldn't recognize Him, and they'd most likely question Him, just as was done two-thousand years ago. The same would be true with any Christian church, Muslim mosque, or political statehouse. The Creator is largely unknown to His creation.

It is also interesting to consider that since Yahowah revealed everything we need to know about Him, prophetically presenting His purpose and plan in His Torah and Prophets, those who are unwilling to look for Him there will not recognize Him or His timing when He returns on *Yowm Kippurym* – the Day of Reconciliations in year 6000 Yah – October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2033 on our pagan calendars.

The difference between God's teaching and Sha'uwl's proclamation is stunning. So the ultimate communicator continued by encouraging us to carefully consider religious rhetoric and political propaganda so that we can turn away from it, distancing ourselves from their corruptive culture. And you'll notice, having walked away from the religious and political establishment as a result of their inability to understand, He approached those who were still receptive and willing to learn...

**“And having come to the Disciples / Learners (*kai elthontes oi mathetai* – so then having approached those who were students, eager to learn and willing to follow), **crossing to the other side** (*eis to peran* – with reference to the opposite side), **they were bothered by having forgotten to bring a loaf of bread** (*epelathonto artous* – they neglected and overlooked selecting, receiving, and grasping hold of a loaf of bread). (5)**

**So then (*o de*) Yahowsha’ (IHY – a placeholder used by Yahowsha’s Disciples like Mattanyah and in the Septuagint to convey Yahowsha’, meaning Yahowah Saves) **said to them** (*eipen autois*), **‘Pay attention and understand** (*orao*). **So now (*kai*) you all should carefully consider, watch out for, be alerted to, and turn away from** (*prosecho apo* – all of you should beware of and guard yourselves against, and distancing and separating yourself from) **the yeast** (*tes zyme* – the leavening fungus and culture of pretentious hypocritical teaching) **of the Pharisees** (*ton Pharisaios* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *parash*, meaning to separate, to pierce, and to scatter; a conservative, overtly religious order of rabbis who observed their Talmud) **and (*kai*) Sadducees** (*Saddoukaios* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *sadah*, meaning to lie in wait and to lay waste; a worldly-minded, liberal political party who promoted the notion of an enlightened aristocracy, rejected religious laws, and promoted their own manifest destiny).” (Mattanyah 16:5-6)**

By saying this, Yahowsha’ illuminated an extraordinarily profound truth – one of the most important things in all of the universe for us to understand. The corruption He removed from the souls of the Covenant’s children on the *Miqra’* of *Matsah* was the culture of religious teaching and political pontifications. The moment you understand this, you can appreciate why Yahowah asked us to walk away from religion and politics before engaging in His Covenant. And you realize the purpose of the “*Miqra’* – Invitation to be Called Out and Meet” of “*Matsah* – Un-Yeasted Bread.” The Covenant and the Invitations are seen working in harmony to achieve the desired result which is a relationship with God instead of pursuing the religion of men.

However, even for those who walked in Yahowsha’s footsteps, these lessons would not come easily. They would have to be prompted to think before they would understand. The same is true with us today.

**“But then (*de oi*) reasoning and conversing among themselves** (*dialogizomai en eautois*), **they said by way of engaging in the discussion** (*legontes oti*), **‘We neither acquired nor received any bread** (*artous ouk elabomen*).’ (7)

**So having known this (*gnous de o*), Yahowsha’ said (*eipen*), **‘What kind of thinking and reasoned discussion is this amongst yourselves** (*ti dialogisesoe***

*en*), **those lacking confidence and conviction** (*eautois oligopistos* – those whose trust and reliance is comparatively lacking; from *oligos*, meaning to have little and diminished, *pistis*, conviction in the truth, trust, and reliance) **just because** (*oti*) **you don't possess any bread** (*artous ouk echete*)? (8)

**You are still unwilling to think** (*oupo noeite* – even now you are not able to direct your mind and be perceptive and judgmental, to reflect rationally and consider evidence logically so as to comprehend and understand, to ponder and then reach a valid determination). **And you do not even remember** (*oude mnemoneuete* – neither do you recall, contemplate, or properly respond to) **the five loaves of bread for the five thousand** (*tous pente artous ton pentakischilion*), **and then how many baskets you received** (*kai posous kophinous elabete*), (9) **nor the seven loaves of bread** (*oude tous epta artous*) **for the four thousand** (*ton tetrakischilion*), **and how many baskets you collected** (*kai posas opuridas elabete*).” (Mattanyah 16:7-10)

In other words, pay attention, observe the evidence, think, and learn to trust what God has revealed. If you want to understand, you will have to pay attention and engage your brain. So let's do that very thing and see what we can learn.

**“How is it that you did not think so as to understand** (*pos ou noeite*) **that it was not concerning loaves of bread** (*oti ou peri arton*) **when I said to you** (*eipon umin*), **“You all should watch out for, be alerted to, and turn away from** (*prosecho apo* – all of you should beware of and guard yourselves against, and distancing and separating yourself from) **the yeast** (*tes zyme* – the leavening fungus and culture of pretentious hypocritical teaching) **of the Pharisees** (*ton Pharisaaios* – a transliteration of the Hebrew “*parash* – to pierce and scatter”; a conservative, overtly religious order of rabbis who observed their Talmud) **and** (*kai*) **Sadducees** (*Saddoukaios* – a transliteration of the Hebrew “*sadah* – to lie in wait and to lay waste”; a worldly-minded, liberal political party who promoted the notion of an enlightened aristocracy, rejected religious laws, and promoted their own manifest destiny)?” (11)

**Then, at that moment** (*tote*), **they put the pieces together, using their intelligence to understand** (*ounekan* – they drew connections in their minds, bringing the facts together, and they came to comprehend, clearly perceiving, gaining insight, realizing, and recognizing) **that namely** (*oti*) **He had not implied** (*ouk eipen*) **to be on guard against or turn away from** (*prosechein apo*) **the leavening yeast in bread** (*tes zymes ton arton* – the fungus which grows in a loaf of bread), **but instead** (*alla* – to the contrary), **to separate from** (*apo* – to disassociate from, leaving and walking a distance away from) **the doctrines and teachings** (*tes didaches* – the instructions, explanations, and content of the discourse) **of the Pharisees** (*ton Pharisaaios* – the religious rabbis) **and** (*kai*)

**Sadducees** (*Saddoukaios* – worldly-minded, liberal political leaders).” (Mattanyah / Yah’s Gift / Matthew 16:11-12)

There are few symbols more important than yeast, few days more essential than Unleavened Bread, and few lessons more meaningful than knowing that religious and political doctrines corrupt our souls. Fortunately, once they were chided, the disciples came to recognize by making all of the appropriate connections what politicized Christians fail to understand—even unto this day. There is an indivisible connection between the Covenant and the Invitations to Meet, between the Towrah and Yahowsha’s life, between the delineation of the path to God and its enablement on behalf of the Covenant’s children.

Just as yeast is a metaphor, the seven Miqra’ey are signs, all designed to help us recognize the path God has provided home. As we look at these signs then, let us not fall into the same trap Yahowsha’s disciples initially did, of being focused upon the mundane rather than the spiritual, and of not trusting Yah to do everything He has promised and more. Let us dig beneath the surface as we continue to explore what Yahowah is really teaching us through His Word. Let’s come to appreciate the promise of Un-Yeasted Bread, knowing that Yahowsha’s soul saved us from the consequence of yeast (as a metaphor for religious and political doctrines) on this day.

☩

Leaving the realm of Godly instruction and returning to the poison of Paul’s pen, we find this incomprehensible diatribe:

**“I (*ego*) have been persuaded to coax and convince you, winning you over (*peitho eis umas* – I have been entrusted on your behalf to win you over, inducing and seducing you to listen and obey) in (*en* – with) the Lord (*kurio* – the supernatural master who owns people, controls slaves, and possesses spiritually, a.k.a., Satan) because (*oti*) nothing (*oudeis* – no one) different (*allos* – other than this) may you all regard or ponder, potentially holding as a belief (*phroneo* – may you all of possibly place your faith in, acknowledge as an opinion, demonstrating a favorable attitude regarding [aorist subjective in P46 versus future active indicative in the NA27]).**

**So now (*de*) the one (*o*) stirring you up and causing you great distress, confusing you (*tarasso umas* – troubling and agitating you, bewildering and mystifying you) will undergo and endure (*bastazo* – will experience and bear) the (*to*) judgment (*krima* – sentencing, condemnation, and punishment) whoever this individual (*ostis ean*) may be (*e*).” (Galatians 5:10)**

Thus far all of the verbs pertaining to Paul's foe continue to be exclusively singular, and thus they cannot be "Judaizers" as Christians protest. And since Paul has already told us who contradicted his preaching in this region, and has told us who he believes stands "convicted and condemned," we don't have to speculate as to the identity of Paul's foe. It is the Disciple and Apostle Shim'own Kephas, more commonly known as "Peter." You may recall: **"But when Kephas came to Antioch, I was opposed and against his presence. I stood in hostile opposition because he was convicted and condemned** (*kataginosko* – judged to be guilty, to lack accurate information, and to be devoid of understanding; from "*kata* – opposed to and against" and "*ginosko* – knowing" and thus ignorant)." (Galatians 2:11)

In the case of the final verb in Galatians 2:10, *e* is the third person singular present active subjunctive of *eimi*, "he may be." And since "*ostis* – this individual" was masculine singular, the third person singular of *e* must be "he." The present tense infers that this individual is presently agitating the Galatians, and there is no assessment of when or if he will stop troubling them—at least from Sha'awl's jaundiced perspective. The subjunctive mood of the verb indicates uncertainty, thus conveying the idea that Paul wants Yahowsha's most trusted Disciple to endure condemnation and punishment no matter who "he might be." If it was an accurate assessment, and it's not, it would make Galatians 2:11 a case of premature evisceration.

There are a couple of reasons Shim'own Kephas would be the least appropriate person on earth with whom to feud. First, Yahowsha' said that upon the Rock's understanding, He would build His "*ekklesia / miqra*" – Invitation to be Called Out and Meet" with God. And second, the conclusion of Yahowchanan's eyewitness account is devoted entirely to the proposition of Yahowsha' asking Shim'own Kephas to tend His sheep, to feed them and to protect them from predators—from wolves in sheep's clothing.

The scholars associated with the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear believe Paul said: "I have been persuaded to you in master that nothing other you will think the one but troubling you will bear the judgment who if he might be." Since that is even more difficult to understand, let's consider Jerome's Vulgate: "I have confidence in you in the Lord that you will not be of another mind: but he that troubleth you shall bear the judgment, whosoever he be." The KJV reports: "I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be." While that isn't what Paul wrote, and we can't say for certain if it is what Paul meant, at least it makes sense. And along these lines, the paraphrase known as the NLT authored: "I am trusting the Lord to keep you from believing false teachings. God will judge that person, whoever he is, who has been confusing you."

Bringing this cluster of concerning and confusing passages together we read:

**“You were trying, running, and progressing well, in a fine way that was pleasing. Who or what you it prevented and impeded, it offended and was beaten of the truth not to be persuaded, to obey, and to follow along faithfully? (5:7) The enticing persuasion and soliciting inducement not from the one providing a name to you all. (5:8) A little yeast whole of the batch it yeasts. (5:9) I have been persuaded to coax and convince you, winning you over in the Lord because nothing different other than this may you all regard or ponder, potentially holding as a belief. So now, the one stirring you up and causing you great distress, confusing, bewildering, and mystifying you will undergo and endure the judgment, condemnation, and punishment, whoever this individual might be. (5:10)**

☩

As we press on to Sha’uwl’s next statement, we once again need to call on the Nestle Aland McReynolds Interlinear to get the lay of the land. **“I but brothers if circumcision still I announce why still am I pursued. Then has been abolished the offense of the cross.”**

**“But now (*de*), I (*ego*), brothers (*adelphos*), if (*ei* – on the condition) **circumcision** (*peritome*) **nevertheless still** (*eti* – yet and still in addition) **I preach** (*kerysso* – I announce and proclaim in an official capacity, I urge and persuade), **why and for what** (*ti*) **further** (*eti* – besides and yet) **am I pursued and persecuted** (*dioko* – am I oppressed and harassed, made to flee and run, put to flight and driven away; from “*deilos* – timid and fearful” and “*diakonos* – executing the commands of another”)? **As a result** (*ara* – then therefore perhaps it is possible), **invalidated** (*katageomai* – abolished and annulled, rendered useless and impotent, inactivated and rendered inoperative) **this (to) offending trap and scandalous stumbling block** (*skandalon* – obstacle which causes sin, ensnares, and is offensive) **of the (tou) crucifixion** (ΣΤΡΩΥ – Divine Placeholder from *stauros-staurou* indicating that the Upright One, the Upright Pillar upon which Yahowsha’ was affixed, the Central Beam of the Tabernacle, and the blood-smeared Doorway of Passover are all Divine symbols).” (Galatians 5:11)**

I am convinced based upon his rhetoric that Paul did not personally deploy the Divine Placeholders that are now found throughout the oldest scribal copies of his letters. I think that they were added in the scriptorium in Alexandria, Egypt to make his epistles appear similar to the Septuagint and the popular eyewitness accounts written by Yahowsha’s beloved Disciples. So rather than ΣΤΡΩΥ

serving to depict the Upright One affixed to Passover's Door, Paul meant to convey the gruesome spectacle made infamous by Roman crucifixions.

While “why and for what further am I pursued and persecuted” is the most sensible rendering of *ti eti diokomai* clause at the end of the first sentence, recognizing that it was scribed in the first person singular, present passive and indicative, Sha'awl wasn't being persecuted, but instead was pursuing his alleged foes. Further, he wasn't “still preaching circumcision” and never had done so, eliminating any reason for him to be harassed for not stopping what he had never started.

And yet this contradictory and hypocritical introduction is the easy part of this passage to decipher linguistically. There is nothing “offensive, scandalous, or ensnaring” associated with Mount Mowryah's “ΣΤΡΩΥ – Upright Pillar.” What happened on the Doorway to Heaven serves as the first step in Yahowah's path home. The fulfillment of Passover was not a “trap,” a “stumbling block,” or an “obstacle,” but instead the Way God provided to save us. Yahowsha's *Miqra* of *Pesach* sacrifice was neither a “sin” nor a “temptation.” The “ΣΤΡΩΥ – Upright Pillar” is the embodiment of one of the Torah's most essential promises, because it enables the Covenant's children to live forever—just as it did forty Yowbel earlier with Abraham and Yitschaq. No “ΣΤΡΩΥ – Upright Pillar,” no eternal life as death retains its sting.

Nothing Sha'awl or anyone could say or do could ever “*katageomai* – invalidate, abolish, or render inoperative” the value of what Yahowsha' achieved by enduring the punishment of the Upright Pillar on Passover. Although to be perfectly honest, by disassociating Yahowsha' from Yahowah, His life from the Towrah, and Passover from God's plan of salvation, Sha'awl has effectively rendered God's Word moot—at least for all of those who believe him. What Sha'awl has written has been scandalous and offensive, creating a stumbling block which has caused billions of souls to fall needlessly short of Heaven's Door.

Passover apart from the Torah is nothing more than a gruesome and deadly scene—one unrelated to life. Unleavened Bread is meaningless to those who do not understand its purpose, which is to remove the culture of religion and politics from our souls, redeeming us. Sha'awl has concealed, corrupted, contradicted, and condemned these truths which comprise the lone, narrow path to life everlasting, in our Heavenly Father's home.

This known, I still have a question. Why was the self-proclaimed messenger of god “running away, timid and fearful of the commands of another?” Was his god “impotent” and “incapacitated?” Or perhaps this question: does Paul want us

to believe that he is so important that his negative personal circumstances actually annul and invalidate Yahowsha's sacrifice?

As a reminder, if we were to use the Nestle-Aland Interlinear as a guide, we would understand Sha'uwl to have said: "I but brothers if circumcision still I announce why still am I pursued. Then has been abolished the offense of the cross." Consulting with those who felt at liberty to copyedit and interpret Paul, we find the Roman Catholic Vulgate proclaiming: "And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? Then is the scandal of the upright pole [later changed to *crucis/cross*] made void." The KJV's rendition states: "And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? Then is the offence of the cross ceased." Methinks we need more interpretation and copyediting, so let's turn to the novelists at the NLT: "Dear brothers and sisters, if I were still preaching that you must be circumcised—as some say I do—why am I still being persecuted? If I were no longer preaching salvation through the cross of Christ, no one would be offended." In actuality, most everyone is offended by the truth.

After having endured an onslaught of horrendous writing, a dearth of reasoning, and a pitiful attitude, we are now subjected to verbal diarrhea as revolting as the worst found in the Qur'an.

"**And also** (*kai*) **how I wish** (*ophelon* – if only it would be possible it would be my desire) **that** (*oi*) **they might castrate and emasculate themselves, suffering amputation** (*apokoptontai* – they may cut off their own penis, arms, legs, and testicles (rendered in the aorist subjunctive in Papyrus 46 rather than future indicative in the NA27), **those troublemakers among you who stir you up to rebel** (*anastatoo umas* – those disseminating religious error or political seditions, unsettling you (rendered *anastatountes* (present active masculine plural))." (Galatians 5:12)

By moving from a singular foe to multiple antagonists, perhaps Sha'uwl was being inclusive and counting Ya'aqob and Yahowchanan among his rivals. But if I understand this correctly, according to Paul, circumcision was too brutal to endure, so he would prefer castration. Yet I suppose that it is ironic in a way. Yahowah told us in His Towrah that He "*karat* – cut" His "*beryth* – Covenant relationship" with Abraham, separating him from religion and to Himself, which is why circumcision became the sign of this Familial Covenant Relationship. So now Sha'uwl would like to amputate those who advocate participation in the Covenant.

Sanitized and scholarly, the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear portends: "Would that also will cut off themselves the ones upsetting you." Even Jerome was hesitant to convey the full force of what his patron saint had scribed. "I would

they were even cut off, who trouble you.” And as is their custom, the KJV simply left bad enough alone: “I would they were even cut off which trouble you.” Then while the NLT translated the operative verb accurately, they grossly misrepresented Paul’s intent: “I just wish that those troublemakers who want to mutilate you by circumcision would mutilate themselves.” But you have to give them credit for creative thinking. A politician who has just tripped on his own tongue would love these guys.

Unfortunately, Paul’s statement gets even worse for those considering Papyrus 46, the oldest witness to his letter, where “*ara* – I pray” is written in place of “*ophelon* – how I wish.” In addition to conveying “prayer,” *ara* describes “an earnest request to impose an evil, malicious curse.”

Therefore Galatians 5:12 actually reads: “**And also how I wish and pray for a malicious curse, that they might castrate and emasculate themselves, suffering amputation of their penis and testicles, those troublemakers among you who stir you up to rebel by disseminating religious error and political seditions.**” (5:12)

As such, I invite you to compare Paul’s recital on behalf of his Lord to Muhammad’s on behalf of Allah. Qur’an 5:33 reads:

*Noble Qur’an:* “The recompense of those who wage war against Allāh and His Messenger and do mischief in the land is only that they shall be killed or crucified or their hands and their feet be cut off on the opposite sides, or be exiled from the land. That is their disgrace in this world, and a great torment is theirs in the Hereafter.”

*Pickthal:* “The only reward of those who make war upon Allah and His messenger and strive after corruption in the land will be that they will be killed or crucified, or have their hands and feet on alternate sides cut off, or will be expelled out of the land. Such will be their degradation in the world, and in the Hereafter theirs will be an awful doom.”

*Yusuf Ali:* “The punishment of those who wage war against Allah and His Messenger, and strive with might and main for mischief through the land is: execution, or crucifixion, or the cutting off of hands and feet from opposite sides, or exile from the land: that is their disgrace in this world, and a heavy punishment is theirs in the Hereafter.”

Prior to reading Paul’s words in the original Greek, I had thought that Qur’an 5.33 was the most repulsive verse ever written in the name of God. And while Muhammad’s words are a bit more graphic, the spirit behind Paul’s message is worse, so it appears that I owe Muslims an apology.

Leaving the Qur'an and returning to the Christian "New Testament," we find that according to the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear, which dutifully reflects Paul's actual word sequencing, Satan's messenger reported: "You for on freedom were called brothers alone not the freedom into opportunity to the flesh but through the love slave to one another."

Or would you prefer, the man who despised circumcision, preferring castration, said:

**"For** (*gar* – because) **you** (*umeis*) **upon** (*epi*) **freedom** (*eleutheria* – freedom) **you all were named and were called** (*kaleo* – you all were summoned and invited by the name) **brothers** (*adelphos*). **Only** (*monon* – just) **not** (*me*) **in the** (*ten*) **liberty** (*eleutheria* – freedom) **to** (*eis* – to the point of or in reference to) **the starting point of the original violent attack** (*aphorme* – the beginning or base of operations for a pretext for an opportunistic assault, as an excuse for the original impetuous to harm through separation; a compound of "*apo* – separation" and "*horme* – to impetuously assault while inciting savage violence") **of the** (*te*) **flesh** (*sarx*). **To the contrary** (*alla* – nevertheless), **through** (*dia* – by) **of the** (*tes*) **love** (*agape*) **you all are slaves** (*douleuo* – all of you serve and are controlled by) **each other** (*allelon* – one another)." (Galatians 5:13)

I'm really beginning to despise this man. He has told believers that they are free of the Towrah and from its enslaving god, but they are not free to return to the Towrah, which was the source of this violent assault against humanity. According to Sha'awl, mankind "does not have the liberty to return to the starting point" where this walk with God known as the Covenant began. Even worse, the original opportunity God provided was now being presented as "violent, impulsive, impetuous, vehement, and savage," according to the man who just prayed that his rivals be castrated and mutilated. And the sadistic fellow who just one sentence ago wished savage acts of violence to be perpetrated upon the bodies of his brothers, and a man who built his reputation by brutalizing the first followers of The Way, tells those who are not his brothers to "be love slaves to one another" as opposed to being God's coworkers, following the examples of Noah, Abraham, Moseh, Dowd, Yahowsha', Shim'own, and Yahowchanan.

And while God is Spirit, according to the self-proclaimed "Apostle," Yahowah's plan is "of the flesh." As such we are witnessing hypocrisy and psychosis on a grand scale.

But to his credit, the Devil's Advocate has just come full circle and reprised his use of *stoicheion* in Galatians 4:3, when the Lord's witness wrote: "**And also, in this way, it follows that when we were infants, under the initial elementary teachings and rudimentary principles representing the first steps of religious mythology** (*stoicheion*), **we were subservient slaves.**" Therefore, according to

Sha'awl, the Torah is the one place man cannot go, because its vision was inadequately and improperly developed when compared to the liberties he has taken.

In a way, it's a shame that Christians are unaware of the clever scheme Paul and Satan conceived to lure them away from God. While schizophrenic and sadistic, it is breathtakingly bold.

Unfortunately, the only way to make any sense of this verse is to scramble the order of the words, which is what Jerome has done: “For you, brethren, have been called unto liberty. Only make not liberty an occasion to the flesh: but by charity of the spirit serve one another.” By inadequately translating “*aphorme* – the violent and impulsive starting point (a.k.a. the opportunity), they missed out on Paul's cleverness.

Following the Catholic's lead, the King James Authorized Version presents: “For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another.” Francis Bacon, the occultist at the helm of the KJV translation, was more than clever enough himself to have appreciated the irony of Paul's ploy.

Operating in their own universe, the NLT contrived: “For you have been called to live in freedom, my brothers and sisters. But don't use your freedom to satisfy your sinful nature. Instead, use your freedom to serve one another in love.” In that these folks claim that Paul was inspired by their god and was writing Scripture, their interpretation surely takes precedence over my own.

There was a small shred of truth in Sha'awl's last statement. The faithful are slaves to one another. They congregate together, serving each other the same deadly and enslaving concoction of religious lies.

Next, the perverted and savage sadist, who just prayed for the mutilation of his brothers, offered this fantasy which the scholarly Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear scribed as: “The for all law in one word has been filled in the you will love the neighbor of you as yourself.” Or more literally, the man who hated Yahowsha's Disciple and who despised the Towrah they observed, the very same guy who a moment ago condemned his foes and advocated amputation, wrote:

“**Because of this then** (*gar o*) **all** (*pas* – the entirety of) **the Towrah** (*nomos* – the nourishing allotment which enables an inheritance; used throughout the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew word “*towrah* – source of instruction, teaching, direction, and guidance”) **in** (*en*) **one** (*heis*) **word** (*logos*) **has come to an end** (*pleroo* – has been completed and finished) **in** (*en*) **the** (*to*) **you loving** (*agapeseis*) **of the** (*ton*) **nearby neighbor** (*plesion* – friend and a fellow

countryman who is close by) [*of you (sou)* was omitted from P46] **as (os) yourself (seauton).**” (Galatians 5:14)

Once again, it’s obvious that Paul can’t count. Even in the Greek text he used six words.

In Papyrus 46, we find that the generic “*agapao* – to love” was rendered in the aorist instead of the future tense as *agapesai*. If it is correct, that “a previous act of you loving continues to provide the desired effect.” As such, if not for the second person singular pronoun, “you,” it would indicate that the “Torah was fulfilled because of a prior commitment to love, one which still prevails.” But set in this context where the “Towrah” is finished, we’d be giving Paul too much credit by suggesting that this was his intent.

Instead, the man who never knew the love of God, a wife, or children, now wants us believe that he is an expert on such things. And even though a critic might complain and say that Paul was a pro when it came to loving himself, the verbose self-adulation which emanates from insecure individuals like Paul is nothing but a mask to hide their personal self-loathing.

But one thing is for sure, Sha’uwl wasn’t an expert on anything pertaining to Yahowah or His Word. Beyond the fact that the Towrah will not come to an end until its every promise and prophecy is completely fulfilled, and until the universe no longer exists, “loving one’s neighbor isn’t even remotely a summation of it, much less its fulfillment. Moreover, the primary purpose of the Towrah and its Covenant is to encourage us to love Yahowah. Loving our neighbor does not even compare to its benefits.

Yahowah’s most earnest request is that we: **“Hear, O Yisra’el, Yahowah is our God. Yahowah is one. And you should choose to love Yahowah, your God, with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your might. And these words which I am instructing you today, they should be part of your inner nature. And you shall teach them diligently to your sons and talk of them in your homes.”** (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 6:4-7)

Yahowsha’ also favored this version. When asked ““Teacher, what is the greatest instruction in the Torah,”” He quoted this statement from His Towrah.

This was the first time, but not the last time Sha’uwl would err on this subject. In his letter to the Romans, he wrote: **“Owe nothing to no one, except love one another, for indeed loving another completes and brings an end to (*pleroo*) the Torah (*nomon*). Because the not committing adultery, not murdering, not stealing, not lusting and coveting, and also whatever other commandments are in the Word, this is summed up in the coming to love the nearby neighbor as yourself.”** (Romans 13:8-9) It’s okay, you can scream and

yell and vent your frustration at Paul for writing “and also whatever other commandments are in the Word.” I did. His attitude is appalling.

I’m sure that you noticed that Sha’uwl left some of the Instructions Yahowah provided off of his list. Do you suppose that this was because he didn’t know them or because he didn’t want his audience to know that he was guilty of violating them?

The answer to that question is found in the Statements Paul omitted. So let’s turn to *Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 20 and see what the messenger of god failed to disclose.

**“And (wa) God (‘elohym – the Almighty) conveyed (dabar – communicated, spoke, and wrote, provided instruction and direction with) all of (kol) these statements using words (dabar – words and statements), providing perspective (‘eleh – from a relatively close vantage point) in our presence (‘eth – in association with us and in proximity to us), saying (‘amar – explaining, claiming, answering, counseling, warning, and promising): ‘I am (‘anky) Yahowah (יהוה), your God (‘elohym – the Mighty One (suffixed in the second person singular)), who relationally (‘asher – and who as a favor) brought you out and delivered you (yatsa’ – I descended to serve you, extending Myself to guide you, doing everything which is required to lead those who respond away) from the realm (min ‘erets – out of the land and region) of the crucible of Egypt (mitsraym – the smelting furnace where metals are refined and tested (a metaphor for judgment and oppression)), out of the house (min beyth – from the home, household, family, and place) of slavery (‘ebed – servitude, bondage, worship, and working for one’s salvation). You shall not exist with (lo’ hayah la – you shall not be moving towards) other (‘aher – someone else’s, different, extra, or additional) gods (‘elohym) in relation to (‘al – near, before, or in proximity to, or in addition to) My presence (paneh).”** (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 20:1-3) Sha’uwl served the Adversary who wanted to be God. And Sha’uwl has painted Yahowah as an enslaver, not as a liberator.

**“You should not ever do anything which associates yourself with (lo’ ‘asah la – you should never attend to, act upon, engage with, or profit from, you should never conceive or fashion on your behalf (qal imperfect – conveying a literal interpretation and ongoing implications)) a carved image or idol (pesel – a religious icon or object of worship representing any god), or any (kol) visual representation of something (tamunah – likeness, appearance, picture, drawing, painting, or form which depicts or resembles anything), which is (‘asher) in (ba) the heavens above (samaym min ma’al – the spiritual realm on high including the sun, moon, planets, and stars above), or (wa) which is (‘asher) on (ba) the earth (‘erets – land and ground, even the material realm) below (tahath), or (wa) which is (‘asher) in (ba) the waters (mayim) beneath the land (tahath ‘erets).**

**You should not ever bow down and worship them or speak for them** (*lo' hawah* – you should never prostrate yourself in obeisance and homage to them, show any allegiance to them, or promote their message because doing so will influence you), **and** (*wa*) **you shall not serve them** (*lo' abad* – you should not work or labor in their cause as their ministers, nor should you submit to them in servitude, neither should you act upon them or engage with them).

**For indeed** (*ky* – because and emphasizing this point), **I** (*'anky*), **Yahowah** (𐤎𐤏𐤗𐤍), **your God** (*'elohy*), **am a zealous and jealous God** (*qana' el* – a God who is desirous of exclusivity in a relationship, a God who is emotionally passionate and extremely protective of those He loves), **counting and reckoning** (*paqad* – literally taking stock of and actually recording, assigning, and depositing) **the perversity and sin of twisting and distorting** (*'awon* – the depravity of perverting and manipulating, deviating from the way, the guilt and punishment derived from delusion and depravity, the liability for unfaithfulness and wrongdoing) **of the fathers** (*'ab*) **upon** (*'al*) **the children** (*ben* – sons) **concerning** (*'al*) **the third and the fourth generations** (*silesym wa 'al ribea'*) **of those who genuinely hate and are hostile to Me** (*sane'* – of those who actually abhor, detest, and loathe Me, literally striving maliciously against Me, shunning Me).

**But** (*wa*) **I will genuinely act and actually engage to literally prepare, perform, and produce** (*'asah* – I will actively effect and appoint, offer and celebrate, and I will demonstrate by doing what is required to deliver on behalf of those who respond) **unmerited and unfailing mercy, unearned favor, and undeserved kindness** (*checed* – steadfast and loyal love, a totally devoted and affectionate relationship, faithfulness and goodness) **on behalf of** (*la'* – to enable the approach of) **thousands** (*'eleph*) **who move toward Me and love Me** (*la 'ahab* – who form a close and affectionate, loving and friendly, familial relationship with Me as a result of being concerned about Me and therefore come to know Me) **and also** (*wa* – in addition) **who approach Me by closely observing and carefully considering** (*la shamar* – who enter My presence by becoming observant and actually focusing upon, thoroughly examining, and thoughtfully evaluating) **My terms** (*mitswah* – the conditions of My Covenant, My authoritative directions and instructions which serve as prescriptions for My relationship agreement).” (*Shemowth* / These are the Names / Exodus 20:4-6) Sha'uwl wanted his rival spirit idolized and worshiped, and more than anything, he hated Yahowah. He wanted his followers to adore him, not God. He promoted the pagan Graces over Yahowah's mercy. And Sha'uwl's primary message was to ignore, even reject, the terms of Yahowah's Covenant.

**“You should never deceive or delude** (*lo' nasha'* – you should not ever deploy clever tricks to enrich oneself by indebting others, and never beguile

people, causing them to miss the Way / *lo' nasa'* – you should never lift up or bear, you should not ever actually support or advance, nor literally forgive or tolerate, nor promote yourself) **through the** (*'eth* – with or by way of the) **name or reputation** (*shem*) **of Yahowah** (יְהוָה), **your God** (*'elohym*), **advancing worthless and lifeless deception** (*la ha showa'* (errantly transliterated *shav'*) – deploying that which advances devastating dishonesty, nullifying one's existence, leading to emptiness and nothingness, deceitful and lifeless lies which are ineffectual, futile, and ruinous).

**For indeed** (*ky* – because), **Yahowah** (יְהוָה) **will never forgive or leave unpunished** (*lo' naqah* – will not purify or pardon, acquit or free from guilt, exempt from judgment and sentencing or release) **those who** (*'eth 'asher* – in accordance with that which they associate) **consistently deceive, actually beguile, and habitually delude** (*nasha'* – use clever trickery to continually mislead / *nasa'* – advance, lift up, or promote themselves) **in association with** (*'eth* – through) **His name** (*shem* – renown and reputation) **to promote and effect** (*la* – to advance accordingly) **vain and ineffectual lies which lead to lifelessness and destruction** (*showa'* – devastating deceptions which nullify our existence leading to emptiness, worthlessness, and nothingness, deceitful, desolate, futile, and ruinous vanity).” (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 20:7) Sha'uwI made his reputation hunting down and punishing those who pronounced Yahowah's name. And as the troubadour of lifelessness, his every word has been deceitful.

**“Remember** (*zakar* – recall, reflect upon, recognize, and be earnestly mindful) **that the Sabbath** (*'eth ha shabat* – the seventh day, the time of promise where our debts are settled so we can settle down with Him based upon the oath) **day** (*yowm*) **is set apart** (*qadash* – is separated unto God for purifying and cleansing and thus special (piel stem (where the object endures the action) infinitive construct (serving as a verbal noun))). (20:8)

**Six** (*shesh* – speaking of that which is bleached white or adorned in fine linen) **days** (*yowmym*) **you can actually and continuously work** (*'abad* – you can engage in labor (qal stem and imperfect conjugation)) **and** (*wa*) **you can genuinely act upon in the totality of** (*'asah* – you can do all of, prepare and produce the full extent of, fashion and finish, advance, assign, and accomplish, institute, and celebrate (qal stem perfect conjugation)) **all of** (*kol* – the entirety of) **your service of representing the Messenger and proclaiming the Spiritual Message** (*mala'kah* – your usefulness as a spiritual envoy; from *mal'ak* – spiritual messenger and heavenly envoy). (20:9)

**But** (*wa*) **the seventh** (*shaby'y* – the solemn promise which fulfills and satisfies those who listen and are observant of the role of the seventh) **day** (*yowm*), **the Sabbath** (*ha shabat* – the seventh day, the time of observance, of rest and reflection, and of ceasing and desisting from ordinary labor to consider the

promise to settle all disputes and settle down) **of** (*la* – associated with so as to approach) **Yahowah** (יהוה), **your God** (*'elohym*), **you should never actually engage in** (*lo' 'asah* – you should not habitually do, consistently prepare or produce, and you should not consistently fashion or finish, advance or assign, accomplish or act upon (qal stem imperfect conjugation)) **any part of** (*kol*) **the work of God's Representative and Messenger** (*mala'kah* – from *mal'ak*, the ministry and mission of the heavenly envoy, the Divine endeavors and labor of God's corporeal manifestation) **yourself** (*'atah*), **your son** (*ben*), **your daughter** (*bat*), **your male and female servants and staff** (*'ebed wa 'amah* – your employees and those men and women who work for and with you), **your means of production** (*behemah* – your animals and beasts of burden), **as well as** (*wa*) **those visitors** (*ger* – foreigners) **who relationally** (*'asher*) **are in your home, property, or community** (*ba sa'ar* – are inside an area enclosed by a door or gate, a household, assembly, city, or nation). (20:10)

**For indeed** (*ky* – because) **in six** (*shesh* – symbolic of mankind being bleached white and purified on the sixth) **days** (*yowmym*), **Yahowah** (יהוה) **acted and engaged, preparing and producing everything associated with completing** (*'asah* – totally fashioning, instituting, advancing, accomplishing, doing, celebrating, and attending to the full extent of (qal stem perfect conjugation)) **accordingly** (*'eth*) **the heavens** (*ha shamaym* – the spiritual realm) **and the earth** (*wa ha 'erets* – the material world), **and the seas** (*wa ha yam*), **and all** (*kol* – everything) **which relationally** (*'asher*) **is in them** (*ba*).

**And** (*wa*) **He became completely settled** (*nuwach* – He rested after settling all unresolved issues) **during** (*ba*) **the Almighty's seventh** (*ha shaby'y 'al* – God's solemn promise which fulfills and satisfies those who listen and are observant of the role of the oath of the seventh) **day** (*yowm*).

**Therefore** (*ken* – consequently, this is true and correct), **Yahowah** (יהוה) **blessed and adored** (*barak* – knelt down and lowered Himself to greet those He had created, and did everything to lift them up on (piel perfect)) **everything associated with this day** (*'eth ha yowm*), **the Sabbath** (*ha shabat* – the seventh day, the time of observance, of rest and reflection, and of ceasing and desisting from ordinary labor to consider the promise God has made to settle our debts and settle us in His home), **setting it apart** (*qodesh* – separating it from others, dedicating it to separation, cleansing, and purifying).” (20:10) (*Shemowth / Names / Exodus 20:8-11*) Sha'uwI has expressly denounced Yahowah's Sabbath, telling his audience that observing it does not earn favor with God.

**“You should choose to carefully consider, view as worthy, enormously valuable, and significant** (*kabed* – I want you of your own volition to elect to respect and honor, and to perceive as awesomely impressive, intensely relevant, extremely great, and massively important, even glorious so as to influence and

engage (written in the piel stem revealing that our Heavenly Father and Spiritual Mother are influenced by and respond to our perceptions of them, and in the imperative mood which expresses either a command, an intent, or an exhortation which is subject to volition)) **accordingly the symbolism of** (*'eth* – that which is represented by) **your Father** (*'ab* – biological, adoptive, or heavenly father) **and** (*wa*) **that which is represented by your** (*'eth* – the symbolic nature of your) **Mother** (*'em* – biological, adoptive, or spiritual mother) **for the purpose of** (*le'ma'an* – for the intent of) **continuously lengthening** (*'arak* – choosing of your own volition to constantly elongating and always prolonging, growing and continuing (written in the hiphil stem, imperfect conjugation, and paragogic nun ending)) **your days** (*yowm*) **within and upon the Almighty's** (*'al*) **land** (*'adamah* – ground; from *'adam*, the name of the first man created in God's image with a *nesamah* – conscience) **which relationally and as a blessing** (*'asher*) **Yahowah** (יהוה), **your God** (*'elohym*), **has actually given to you** (*natan la* – has literally produced, provided, and genuinely bestowed freely to you as a gift (qal participle)).” (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 20:12) Dissolving and dismantling Yahowah's Towrah in the process of corrupting God's adoption process so as to diminish the size of God's covenant family is the antithesis of highly esteeming our Heavenly Father and Spiritual Mother.

And lastly, Sha'uwl neglected: **“You should never respond and testify** (*lo' anah* – you should not ever question, answer, or make a declaration) **against** (*ba*) **your neighbor** (*rea'* – countryman, friend, companion, or associate) **as a deceptive or misleading** (*seger* – false, conniving, clever, mistaken, vain, or unreliable) **witness** (*'ed* – source of evidence by way of testimony).” (*Shemowth* / Names / Exodus 20:16) Sha'uwl was the most dishonest and deceptive witness in human history. It's little wonder he skipped over the sixth of the seven Instructions on the second of two tablets.

So that was telling. Paul's preaching was overtly hostile to six of Yahowah's ten most essential statements. But that's not even the end of the bad news. He committed adultery by entering into a covenant with Satan. His preaching and letters are responsible for the death of over a billion souls. By dispensing with the Towrah, he stole the most valuable thing in the universe: the hope of salvation. And that leaves “coveting,” which is what made Sha'uwl susceptible to Satan in the first place. But even if we were to replace God's list with Paul's, the Devil's Advocate not only didn't love his neighbors, he attacked them savagely and wanted the best of them mutilated.

Returning to Galatians 5:14, here is what the English translations had to say. The Catholic Vulgate published: **“For all the law is fulfilled in one word: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.”** In the Protestant King James, we find: **“For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as**

thymself.” And the New Living Translation proposed: “For the whole law can be summed up in this one command: ‘Love your neighbor as yourself,’” They were all wrong, because Paul was wrong.

But alas, we have returned to incomprehensible. The words actually read: **“But (de) if (ei) each other (allelon – one another) you all bite (dakno – you chomp on with your teeth, you harm and lacerate, wounding and irritating) and (kai) you eat up (katesthio – you all devour and consume, you exploit and destroy), you see (blepo – you all watch out) not (me) under (hypo) one another (allelon – each other) you might be consumed (analoos – you may be destroyed and eaten up).”** (Galatians 5:15)

And yet, don’t take my word on the fact that his diatribe isn’t Scripture. The Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear published: **“If but one another you bite and you eat up see not by one another you might be consumed.”** Nearly 1,700 years ago, Jerome blended a host of Old Latin texts together to render: **“But if you bite and devour one another: take heed you be not consumed one of another.”** The Protestant Christians composing the KJV could do no better, so they promoted: **“But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.”** This pearl of wisdom was then buffed and polished by the NLT to say: **“But if you are always biting and devouring one another, watch out! Beware of destroying one another.”**

Since commenting on this cannibalistic drivel would be a waste of time, let’s simply summarize this interlude in Sha’uwl’s ongoing assault on God’s Word:

**“But now, I, brothers, if conditionally circumcision nevertheless still I preach, why and for what further besides am I pursued and persecuted, made to flee timid and fearful at the commands of another? As a result, therefore perhaps it is possible, invalidated and annulled this offending trap and stumbling block which ensnares and is offensive of the crucifixion. (5:11)**

**And also how I wish and pray for a malicious curse, that they might castrate and emasculate themselves, suffering amputation of their penis and testicles, those troublemakers among you who stir you up to rebel by disseminating religious error and political seditions. (5:12)**

**For you upon freedom you all were named and were called brothers. Only not in the liberty to the point of the starting point of the original violent attack of the flesh. To the contrary, by of the love you all are slaves of each other. (5:13) Because of this then all the Towrah in one word has come to an end and is finished in the you loving of the nearby neighbor as yourself. (5:14) But if each other you all bite and you devour, you all watch out, not under one another you might be consumed.” (5:15)**

As we move past mutilation and cannibalism into the second half of the fifth chapter of Paul's epistle to the Galatians, we find our wannabe apostle differentiating between the "flesh" and the "spirit." This will become a major theme in his letters, one designed to further demean the sign of the Covenant.

Thankfully, the wording gradually improves. Regrettably, the message does not. And that is because the source of Sha'awl's inspiration remains the same. This begins with Paul acknowledging that he was conveying his opinions.

Although that is not entirely accurate. What follows would have resonated with the Greeks in Paulos' audience because it reflects the Platonic and Socratic spiritual mysticism of Gnosticism. They believed that the material world, which they referred to as "the cosmos" or "the flesh," was created by the Demiurge, a "practitioner of public works" who fashioned the evil associated with the physical universe. Paul's association of "*stoicheion kosmos* – the rudimentary principles representing the basic elements of the universe in the world's religious mythology" with the Author of the Towrah was evidence that he was headed in this direction. His contrasting presentation of "the flesh" versus "the spirit" is proof, as is his fixation on "enslavement" versus "liberation."

In the Gnostic faith, the Demiurge was malevolent and enslaving – just as Paul has been seen depicting the God of the Torah. Growing out of the consciousness of man, "the One" who was Spirit usurped the power and authority of the Demiurge. This "Monad," using Plato's terminology, represented "the Good Spirit" who came to reign above the original, but now old and arcane, Demiurge. The "Spiritual One," consistent with Paul's presentation, is the "*dunamis* – power" which is found through contemplation, is revealed through rhetoric, and is accepted through faith.

As a result, in Gnosticism, just as is the case in Paulos' letters, the Creator should be shunned so that the spiritual world of "the One God" can be embraced, enlightening, emancipating, and saving all those who believe, achieving a oneness with the Deity. Personal poverty (achieved by donating one's wealth to the cult's spiritual guides), sexual abstinence (as opposed to marriage and family), and helping other initiates (being slaves to one another in Paul's words) were hallmarks of the Gnostic religion.

Believers were told that the flesh was evil and that the one true God had no association with the physical world. So when the secret knowledge of the spiritual

realm was revealed and accepted, the faithful could rise up, transformed by believing the promises made by the One's messengers.

It is interesting to note that the English word "demiurge" is from a Latin transliteration of the Greek word *demiourgos*, meaning "public worker," which is manifest in Paul's "works of the Torah" theme. Also revealing, the oldest known pictorial depiction of a Gnostic deity is a lion-faced serpent whose head was superimposed on the sun, and who was flanked by images of the moon and stars. Making matters worse, not only was this depiction found in Mithraic literature, the body of the snake superimposed on the sun forms an inverted cross. It is from a similar image that Constantine, an initiate in the cult of Mithras, created Roman Catholicism.

In Gnosticism, mystical experiences led the faithful to direct participation with the divine. Sufficient for salvation was an acquaintance with the One through spiritual doctrine presented in the faith's scriptures...

**"But (de) I say (lego – I speak, I narrate, and I tell the story, I communicate, providing meaning, I report, I convey, I imply, and I infer (the present tense portrays the narrative as current and ongoing, the active voice makes Paulos responsible for the implications of his words, and the indicative mood reveals that the writer wants the reader to accept the assertion as true)) in spirit (IINI / pneumati – the Divine Placeholder is a symbol for the ruwach (however, since Sha'awl's spirit bears no resemblance to the Ruwach Qodesh of Yahowah, the lowercase spirit is appropriate)), you are all commanded to advance (peripateisoe – you must go about and regulate the conduct of your life; from "peri – concerning" and "pateo – advancing" (with the imperfect tense [from P46], Paulos is portraying the process as a state of being which began in the past without any assessment of its completion, the active voice reveals that the subject is advancing, while the imperative mood expresses a command)).**

**And so (kai – also) the desire and passion of lustful craving (epithymia – the forbidden strong impulse, longing, and evil coveting) of the flesh (sarx – physical body) deny (ou – negating a proposition), lest (me – if not) you may come to an end (teleo – you might be finished, reaching a terminus or conclusion (the aorist tense conveys at some time, the active voice reveals that this conclusion is a result of the reader's actions, and the subjunctive mood expresses a mere possibility))."** (Galatians 5:16)

This is a perfect presentation of Gnosticism. Paul finally got something right. Too bad he was advocating on behalf of a false religion.

Since the oldest extant copy of Galatians was written by a professional scribe in Alexandria, Egypt, we know that he would have been schooled in the application of Divine Placeholders from having read and made copies of

Yahowchanan's and Mattanyah's eyewitness testimonies (by far the most popular Greek texts). It is therefore likely that the scribe of Papyrus 46, written thirty-five to eighty years or more after Galatians was originally penned by Sha'awl, replaced his Greek words with these Divine Placeholders so that his letters would harmonize with the revered eyewitness accounts. Harmonization, which is the process of creating consistency in the presence of diversity in style and substance, was the most common way scribes intervened in the text. And while Divine Placeholders were ubiquitous, since *Ruwach Qodesh* is the Torah's terminology, it would have been an abomination to Sha'awl. Moreover, because Sha'awl's Gnostic spirit is the antithesis of Yahowah's Spirit, it would be inappropriate to dignify his spirit with an uppercase "S."

The Nestle Aland McReynolds Interlinear published the following rendition of Paulos' Gnostic inspiration: "I say but in spirit walk around and desire of flesh not not you might complete." Jerome's Latin Vulgate, like the more recent Nestle Aland 27<sup>th</sup> Edition, correctly renders *pneumati* in lowercase: "I say then: Walk in the spirit: and you shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh." Ad-libbing a bit, the KJV wrote: "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh." Authoring their own epistle, the Greek "scholars" working on behest of the New Living Translation imagined that Paul meant to say: "So I say, let the Holy Spirit guide your lives. Then you won't be doing what your sinful nature craves." I suspect that these Christian institutions were all desirous of hiding the Gnostic leanings of their religion's founder.

That leads to this, another referendum on Gnosticism:

**"For indeed** (*gar* – because then), **the** (*e*) **flesh's** (*sarx* – the physical nature of the body's) **desires and passions against** (*epithumeo kata* – forbidden impulses, evil longings and impulsive lusts are in opposition to) **the spirit** (*tou ΠΝΣ / pneumatos* – Divine Placeholder for the *Ruwach* (however, since Sha'awl's Gnostic spirit bears no resemblance to the *Ruwach Qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit of Yahowah, the lowercase spirit is appropriate)), **and so then** (*de*) **the spirit** (*to ΠΝΑ / pneuma*) **in opposition to** (*kata* – against) **the flesh** (*tes sarx* – that which is physical), **because** (*gar* – for) **of these** (*houtos*) **one another** (*allelon*) **it is hostile and adversarial** (*antikeimai* – it is opposed and adverse) **in order to** (*hina* – as a result) **negate** (*me*) **what** (*hos*) **conditionally** (*ean* – when) **you might presently propose and want** (*thelo* – you all may currently desire and enjoy, taking pleasure in the opinions of what) **of these** (*houtos*) **to possibly behave and do** (*poieomai* – you all might perform an assigned task)." (Galatians 5:17)

If you are wondering if Paul could have been this blatant regarding his endorsement of Gnosticism over the Towrah, the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear isn't any more forgiving: "The for flesh desires against the spirit the

but spirit against the flesh these for one another lie against that not what if you might want these you might do.”

But we can always rely on the King James to dignify Paul: “For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.” Not a word of this is true. God did not make our bodies to be opposed to the Set-Apart Spirit, but instead designed us so that we could accept the *Ruwach Qodesh*. As such, body, soul, and Spirit are complementary, celebrating life in harmony with Yahowah’s design. And God never negates His purpose by interfering with freewill. Christians treating Paul’s letters as if they were Scripture is proof of this. Therefore, the Authorized King James Version is wholly errant.

For consistency sake, here is the Latin Vulgate’s take on this passage: “For the flesh lusteth against the spirit: and the spirit against the flesh: For these are contrary one to another: so that you do not the things that you would.” It’s strikingly similar to the KJV, which is telling considering the incomprehensible nature of Paul’s Greek.

Turning a convoluted sentence into a mini drama, the NLT authored the following theory: “The sinful nature wants to do evil, which is just the opposite of what the Spirit wants. And the Spirit gives us desires that are the opposite of what the sinful nature desires. These two forces are constantly fighting each other, so you are not free to carry out your good intentions.” I suppose you’d have to ask them what they meant by us “not being free to carry out our good intentions.” After all, I had thought that Paul had meant to say that our intentions were of the flesh, and thus both bad, and in opposition to the spirit.

Since it is apparent that Sha’uwl is pitting “the spirit” against “the flesh” in pristine Gnostic fashion, I’d like to point out a hole in his reasoning. According to Yahowchanan, Yahowsha’ is “the Word (*logos*) made flesh (*sarx*).” And may I remind you, there is a “spirit” opposed to God’s Word (and thus His Towrah) and to Yahowsha’: Satan. With this in mind, and from this perspective, let’s consider the Devil’s Advocate’s case in favor of his “spirit,” and against Demiurge represented by the *Towrah*.

**“But (*de*) if (*ei* – on the condition) in spirit (*IINI* / *pneumati*) you all are not guided (*ou ago* – you are not led and carried), you are (*eimi* – you exist) under the control of (*hypo* – subject to) the Towrah (*nomon* – nourishing allotment which facilitates an inheritance).” (Galatians 5:18)**

The circle is complete. According to Sha’uwl his spirit’s guidance is good and liberating while the Towrah is of the flesh and is controlling. But at least by putting his spirit in opposition to the Word of God, we now know for certain that Paul’s spirit is demonic.

The facts in this case are clear. Our Spiritual Mother is introduced early in the Towrah, initially in *Bare'syth* / Genesis one. She plays a starring role throughout God's testimony. The "*Ruwach* – Spirit," as Her title affirms, is "*Qodesh* – Set Apart" from Yahowah. That means the "*Ruwach Qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit" is part of the Author of the Towrah. The Spirit and Yahowah can, therefore, never be in opposition because the Spirit and Yahowah are one and the same.

Therefore, in his continued hatred of God's Word, Paul wants Christians to believe that the only way to walk in the spirit is to walk away from the Towrah – when the opposite is true. And Paul also wants Christians to associate "the flesh" with "the Towrah" and "the spirit" with "his Faith."

Therefore, all of the comparisons between "the flesh" and "the spirit" which follow are specifically designed to read like a campaign speech. Sha'awl's wants Christians to view his rival's Torah from the bleakest and most derogatory perspective while considering his advocacy for "change we can believe in" through the rose-colored glasses of faith. And as is the case with politicians, Sha'awl will not only lie with most every stroke of his poisonous pen and movement of his putrid lips, but as a hypocrite, he, himself, is opposed to the position he extols.

Since Jerome was familiar with the fact that the Septuagint universally translated "*towrah* – teaching and guidance" using *nomos*, his rendering of this statement was contrived to support of Paul's assault on God's Word: "**But if you are led by the spirit, you are not under the law.**" Not surprisingly, the KJV played along: "**But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.**" The Christian NAMI knows better, but it did not seem to matter: "**If but in spirit you are led not you are under law.**" And from this the NLT extrapolated: "**But when you are directed by the Spirit, you are not under obligation to the law of Moses.**" It is no wonder Christians are lost souls.

Because we cannot remove the following list from this context, where God's Towrah is presented as being of the flesh, the most impoverished qualities attributable to the human experience are now being associated with the Torah by its Adversary. And you'll notice, this continues to read like Gnostic scripture...

**"But now (de) evident, clearly seen, and widely known (phaneros – manifest and apparent) are (eimi) the works and assigned tasks (ta ergon – the job and result) of the flesh (tes sarx – of the physical realm (now being used as a metaphor for the Towrah)) which indeed (hostis – whatever) exist as (eimi) sexual promiscuity (porneia – immoral fornication), impure materiality (akatharsia – decayed flesh which is filthy, unclean, and worthless and wasteful), sensuality (aselgeia – licentiousness and lewdness, unrestrained lust and debauchery),..."** (Galatians 5:19)

The only reason this Pauline list of things associated with the flesh was “*phaneros* – clearly evident and widely known” is because this audience was far more familiar with Gnosticism than they were with the Towrah. And here, “*ta ergon tes sarx* – the works of the flesh” is being presented in parallel with “*ta ergon tes nomos* – the assigned tasks of the Towrah.”

If you recall, in his first reference to the “Old System” in Galatians 1:4, Paulos used *poneros*, instead of the closely related, *porneia*, to demean Yahowah’s Towrah, writing: **“He might possibly gouge or tear out (*exaireo*) us (*emas*) from (*ek*) the (*tou*) past inflexible and unrelenting circumstances of the old system (*aionos* – the previous era, the long period of time in history operating as a universal or worldly system; from *aei* – circumstances which are incessant, unremitting, relentless, invariable, and inflexible) which (*tou*) had been in place in the past (*enistamai*) which is disadvantageous and harmful (*poneros* – which is wicked and worthless, evil and faulty, immoral and corrupt, annoying and mischievous, laborious and criminal, unprofitable and useless, unserviceable and malicious, malevolent and malignant) down from and in opposition to (*kata*) the desire, will, and intent (*to thelema*) of the (*tou*) God (ΘΥ).”**

In this case, “the God” is “the One” of Gnosticism, and the “laborious, disadvantageous, and harmful” “Old System” is from its Demiurge. Therefore, we should not be surprised to see *porneia* appear first in Paul’s list because the most prevailing trait of the Gnostics was their disdain for sexual impropriety.

While *akatharsia* is often translated “immorality,” that is not what the word actually means. It is a far more Gnostic than that, because as a derivative of *akathartos*, it is a compound of *a*, serving as a negation of “*kathairo* – being clean and pure.” It speaks of the “worthlessness of that which is material,” and most dramatically of “decaying flesh.”

Even *aselgeia*, rendered “sensuality,” has deeper Pauline overtones. In that he is associating the Towrah with the flesh because of circumcision, note that based upon its etymology, *aselgeia* literally means “incontinent.”

Ever the hypocrite, Paul wallowed in his personal lasciviousness in chapter 7 of Romans. Further, by his own admission, he knew nothing of the love of a woman, much less the beauty of loving and romantic sensuality between husband and wife. Further, anyone who has ever read the Song of Solomon knows that God isn’t opposed to sensuality. After all, He designed the object of our affection and brought us together for this purpose.

As we are beginning to witness, Pauline Doctrine is overly fixated on the avoidance of sexuality, as opposed to relational fidelity. Yahowah doesn’t want us to commit adultery, because it corrupts the exclusive nature of His Covenant. Paul

simply wants Christians to abstain from the loving marriage it was predicated upon.

Additionally, Sha'owl has obscured the role of “*Qodesh* – Set-Apart, Purifying, and Cleansing” *Ruwach* – Spirit in Yahowah’s redemptive process. She is the Torah’s remedy for our immorality. Moreover, the most immoral thing a person can do is what Paul has done: deceive others in the name of God.

These renderings are somewhat consistent, save the wide variations in definitions. NAMI: “Evident but are the works of the flesh which is sexual immorality, uncleanness, debauchery,…” LV: “Now the works of the flesh are manifest: which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury,” KJV: “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,” NLT: “When you follow the desires of your sinful nature, the results are very clear: sexual immorality, impurity, lustful pleasures,”

Considering Paul’s devotion to the Greek and Roman goddesses of Charity and Grace, his condemnation of Shim’own, his enmity toward the Disciples Yahowchanan and Ya’aqob, his hostility toward the Covenant, his animosity toward Yahowah’s Towrah, his desire to mutilate his rivals, his opposition to marriage, and his willingness to contradict the Word of God, this also oozes hypocrisy:

“...**the likeness manifesting what can be observed** (*eidololatria* – typically rendered idolatry and worship of idols, but based upon its etymology, it is an “*eidolon* – image or likeness” “*eidos* – representing the external and outward appearance or manifestation” of *eidō* – that which can be seen, perceived, discerned, and observed”), **the use and administering of drugs** (*pharmakeia* – use of medicines, poisons, sorcery, witchcraft, black magic, and seductive deceptions), **hatred and hostile antagonism** (*echthra* – enmity toward one’s foes or opposition, discord and feuds, animosity), **strife and dissension** (*eris* – conflict, contentious variance, discord, arguing, debate, wrangling, and quarrelling), **deep devotion and jealousy** (*zelos* – earnest concern, enthusiastic zeal, warm support expressed through emotional feelings, ardor, the excitement of the mind, and indignation), **the desire to make sacrifices** (*thumos* – that vital source which moves us which wells up from within, boiling with passion and intense desire, which can lead to anger, rage, or wrath; from *thuo* – to make a sacrifice), **selfish ambitions** (*eritheia* – hostile rivalries, specifically electioneering while running for office), **discord and division** (*dichostasia* – standing apart, taking another stand, dissension and disunity; from “*dis* – a second” “*stasis* – stand”), **the freedom to choose for oneself** (*hairesis* – the option to chose or hold a divergent opinion, separatist teaching, factions and diversity, selecting a religion using heretical tenants; from “*haireomai* – to prefer, choose and accept for oneself, to vote or elect”),...” (Galatians 5:20)

I continue to be fascinated by etymological investigation. And here we find pure gold in *eidololatria* because it is based upon “*eidolon* – image or likeness,” which in turn is derived from “*eidōs* – representing the external and outward appearance or manifestation,” of which “*eidō* – that which can be seen, perceived, discerned, and observed” provides the basic meaning. Yahowah created humankind “in His image, in His likeness.” And therefore, God can be perceived through the image and likeness of man. Further, Yahowsha’ is the external and physical, and therefore corporeal manifestation or appearance of Yahowah. We can observe Him, discern His nature, and see His purpose by closely examining and carefully considering the Towrah. Therefore, “the likeness manifesting what can be observed” is from the Towrah and thus evil according to Sha’uwl.

And even if we buy into the commonly rendered religious connotation of “*eidololatria* – idolatry,” we find Paul’s faith based upon “Faith in the Gospel of Grace,” noting that the Charis, known as the Gratia in Rome, were the Greek goddesses of licentiousness. So while Yahowah is unabashedly opposed to all forms of idolatry, including the memorialization of the names of false gods, Paul has based his religion on “Grace,” a transliteration of the Roman *Gratia*.

Moving on to the second term in this the second installment of derogatory concepts Paul is associating with Yahowah’s Towrah, we find *pharmakeia*, from which we get the English word “pharmacy.” Its primary meaning is “to administer drugs,” and “to provide medicines.” Since there is no reason to believe that the Spirit is opposed to medicine, we must assume that Paul meant “the use of illicit, mind-altering drugs, or that he was against the use of potions in the practice of magic. And yet, he has told us that he was demon-possessed and Yahowah revealed that Sha’uwl **“would cause his companions to drink, thereby, associating them with his poisonous antagonism and wrath”** in Chabaquwq / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:15, because of Sha’uwl’s fixation on **“observing the male genitalia.”**

Third, Yahowsha’ was extraordinarily “*echthra* – hostile” to the government and religious leaders of His day, so being “antagonistic” and “indignant” towards clerics and their false teachings cannot be inappropriate. But it is the epitome of hypocrisy for Sha’uwl of all people to criticize displaying “enmity toward one’s foes” or “engaging in feuds.” He has picked a fight Yahowah, Yahowsha’, and His Disciples. Apart from the Qur’an, it would be hard to find a religious text filled with so much “animosity.”

And fourth, speaking of the Qur’an, Paul’s Galatian epistle is similarly “*eris* – quarrelsome and divisive.” So if “arguing, discord, and contentious variances” are wrong, so is Paul.

Fifth, *zelos* is most often used in a positive sense. It defines the “fervor and passion” Yahowsha’ desired, but found lacking, in the Laodicean Assembly—the very people who lacked the Spirit. *Zelos* speaks of “pursuing a mission with great zeal and to warmly embrace a loved one.” So, since Yahowsha’ considers *zelos* to be a good thing, methinks Paul was ad-libbing here. Moreover, Yahowah expressly states on the first of the two tablets He etched in stone that He is “jealous.” So if Paul’s right, God is wrong.

Sixth, and along these lines, like *zelos*, *thumos*, which speaks of “that which motivates us from within,” also supports a dichotomy of connotations. But when we examine its root, *thuo*, which means “to make sacrifices,” an etymological investigation leads us to the realization that Sha’uwl was opposed to Yahowah’s “desire to make the sacrifices” needed to fulfill His Towrah promises.

Seventh, Muhammad was the only person in all of human history who rivaled Paul in his pursuit of “*eritheia* – selfish ambitions which led to hostile rivalries.” Sha’uwl, in particular, spent much of his time campaigning against Yahowsha’s Disciples, presenting himself as being superior to those He chose and taught.

Also, since the primary meaning of *eritheia* is “electioneering and the process of running for an elective political office,” by using it, Paul is demonstrating his hostility to representative government and democracy. And this position is further reinforced in the 13<sup>th</sup> chapter of Romans, where Paulos orders the faithful to submit to governmental authority – an abomination from Yahowah’s perspective considering the repulsive nature of Rome. Further, *eritheia* defines Paul, a man fixated on rehabilitating his public image.

Eighth, *dichostasia*, translated “discord and division,” is predicated on a compound of “*dis* – a second” “*stasis* – stand.” So it was okay for Sha’uwl to propose a New or Second Covenant without Divine sanction, but it’s not okay for someone else to take another stand against him. But just on the face of it, “*dichostasia* – standing apart through dissension and disunity” summarizes most everything we have read thus far.

And ninth, that brings us to *hairesis*, which literally means “choice.” It defines the act of “choosing” and is thus foundational to “freewill.” Based upon *haireomai*, it means “to select for oneself, to prefer, to choose, to vote, and to elect.” From Yahowah’s perspective, freewill is unassailable. And from Paul’s, believers are to have no choice in the matter of their religion. So once again, we find similarity between Galatians and the Qur’an which makes the same claim.

If you dig a bit deeper, most lexicons eventually define *hairesis* as what we have thus far found throughout Galatians: “forming a divergent opinion, selecting a religious faith, becoming part of a sect, false or separatist teaching, and religious tenets.” The remaining definitions describe what Christianity has done with

Galatians: “choosing a form of religious worship, making decisions which result in a diversity of religious factions, and taking people as captives.”

In this case, the lexicons are more instructional than English bibles. But, for consistency sake, here is the list of notable translations. NAMI: “...**idol service, magic, hostilities, strife, jealousy, furies, selfish ambitions, divisions, sects...**” LV: “**Idolatry, witchcrafts, enmities, contentions, emulations, wraths, quarrels, dissensions, sects,**” KJV: “**Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,**” And last but not least, the NLT: “**idolatry, sorcery, hostility, quarreling, jealousy, outbursts of anger, selfish ambition, dissension, division,**”

While he has gotten far more wrong than right, the Gnostic listing of things Paul believes are associated with the “flesh,” and therefore with the Demiurge who authored the “Towrah,” continue with:

“...**envious corruption** (*phthonos* – jealous destruction; from “*phtheiro* – to corrupt and destroy”), **drunkenness** (*methe* – intoxication), **public partying** (*komos* – a festive assembly featuring feasting and merrymaking), **and (kai) that (ta) similar to (homoios) this (houtos) which (hos) I previously spoke (prolego) to you (umin) inasmuch as (kathos – when) I said before (proepo) that (oti) the likes of such (oi ta toioutos – this kind) carrying out and committing these practices (prasso – preoccupation with such experiences), the reign and kingdom (basileia) of God (ΘΥ), they will not inherit (ou kleronomeo – they will not receive or gain possession of from father to child).**” (Galatians 5:21)

The problem with “*phthonos* – jealous destruction and envious corruption,” at least in the midst of Paul’s initial letter, is that the envy Satan has for Yahowah has cause Sha’uwl to corrupt God’s testimony throughout this epistle. And Sha’uwl’s jealousy toward Yahowsha’s Apostles has prompted him to destroy their credibility and message.

“*Methe* – intoxication” is only a problem because in Chabaquwq / Embrace This / Habakkuk 2:5, Yahowah accuses Sha’uwl of being “**an intoxicating man of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal,**” revealing that “**whomever is open to the broad path associated with Sha’uwl**” will discover that “**he and his soul are like the plague of death.**”

*Komos*, translated “public partying,” is a problem for another reason. It actually describes “a festive assembly featuring feasting and merrymaking.” It is therefore synonymous with the Hebrew word, *chag*, which Yahowah uses to describe the nature of His seven Invitations to Meet, calling them “Festival Feasts.” Paul may be a kill joy, but God likes to party.

In Paul's defense, *komos* was associated with the festival honoring Bacchus, the counterfeit for Yahowsha', whose annual winter celebration was renamed "Christmas." But, as with most of what Paul has to say, his lack of specificity is his curse. Moreover, Sha'uwl quoted Bacchus during his conversion experience.

When we bring this list together with its conclusion we have a serious problem. By saying that those who demonstrate these behaviors "will not inherit God's kingdom," Paul has increased Yahowah's list of unforgivable sins from two (don't promote false and lifeless dogmas in Yahowah's name and don't belittle our Spiritual Mother) to fourteen. Not only does he lack the authority to limit Yahowah's mercy, many of the things on Paul's list, God encourages. And there isn't a single item on Sha'uwl's list which is also found among the Ten Statements Yahowah etched in stone. This dichotomy is especially relevant in the context of Paul repeatedly associating the Towrah with the flesh, and thus his list with the Towrah.

Turning to the translations, we find this in the NAMI: "...envies, drunkenness, carousing, and the like these that I say before to you just as I said before that the ones the such practicing kingdom of God not will inherit." LV: "Enviess, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like. Of the which I foretell you, as I have foretold to you, that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God." KJV: "Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." NLT: "envy, drunkenness, wild parties, and other sins like these. Let me tell you again, as I have before, that anyone living that sort of life will not inherit the Kingdom of God." Just as Sha'uwl has repeatedly associated the Torah with "the flesh," he has also disassociated "inheritance" from the Torah. His parting line was therefore designed to reinforce this aspect of his thesis: the Torah of the flesh (i.e., circumcision, Hagar, and slavery) precludes inheritance.

So that there is no misunderstanding, God has said that those who do not observe His Towrah, those who do not embrace the terms of His Covenant, those who do not attend His seven annual Invitations to Meet, those who deceptively promote lifeless teachings, those males who are not circumcised, and those who do not rely on Him to free them from the religious and political culture of man, will be excluded from His home. Dowd violated many of the things on Paul's list, and he is in heaven.

Before we move on to the spiritual side of Gnosticism, here is a review of the things Paulos says will restrict a believer's entry into heaven: **"But now evident, clearly seen, and widely known are (*eimi*) the works and assigned tasks of the flesh which indeed exist as sexual promiscuity, impure materiality, sensuality, (5:19) the likeness manifesting what can be observed, the use and**

**administering of drugs, hatred and hostile antagonism, strife, dissension, and quarrelling, deep devotion and jealousy, the desire to make a sacrifice, selfish ambitions and hostile rivalries, discord and division, taking another stand, the freedom to choose for oneself, (5:20) envious corruption, drunkenness, public partying, and that similar to this which I previously spoke to you inasmuch as I said before that the likes of such carrying out and committing these practices, the reign and kingdom of God, they will not inherit.” (5:21)**

But how can that be if faith in the Gospel of Grace cures all ills? To be considered rational, Paul can either claim that our behavior is irrelevant to our salvation, as he has done previously, or claim that we are saved based upon it, as he is doing here, but cannot have it both ways.

With his almost entirely errant list of damning behaviors out of his system, Paul sponsors a list of attributes he associates with the spirit of his faith—one which must favor hypocrisy (at least based upon this letter).

**“But (de) the (o) fruit (karpos – harvest and result) of the (toe) spirit (ΠΝΣ / pneumatos) is (estin): love (agape – an appreciative attitude resulting from a conscious evaluation and choice, familial affection and devotion, good will, benevolence, and fellowship festival feasts; from “agapao – welcoming and affectionate, entertaining and pleasing”), happiness (chara – gladness and joy), peace (eirene – harmony and tranquility), patience (makrothymia – forbearance and longsuffering), mercy from an upright implement (chrestotes – productive kindness, moral and upright goodness, and a useful and honest beneficial attempt to do what is right; from “chrestos – a fit and merciful implement”), being good through generosity (agathosyne – being pleasant and kind, being right and upright, being salutary and distinguished), faith and belief (pistis – originally conveyed “trust and reliance” but migrated over time as a result of Sha’awl’s epistles to mean “belief and faith”),...” (Galatians 5:22)**

Was it not Paul who told the Galatians that they should be as he was? And yet his attitude and mannerisms were the antithesis of the characteristics he attributes to his spirit. Moreover, fruit is a physical product, not a spiritual one.

At the same point in His Instruction on the Mount where Yahowsha’ spoke of the “wolf in sheep’s clothing” who would lead many away from the Towrah, He presented an in depth analysis of the nature of trees and the fruit they produce. And He was emphatic, especially unequivocal, saying that good fruit is never found on a bad tree, just as bad fruit never grows on a good tree. Therefore, the presence of the fourteen rotten lemons Sha’awl has hung before us thus far, preclude him from consideration as a worthy source. God does not grade on a curve. So the presence of “love, happiness, and peace” in this second list, does not

exonerate him. The little he got right, serves only to make the bad fruit he has offered seem more appealing.

*Chrestotes* is a term that should give Christians shivers. It is based upon *Chrestus*, the title Shim'own Kephas and the three most credible Roman historians of this day associated with Yahowsha', not Christos, which speaks of the "application of drugs." The proper Greek translation of Yahowsha's title, "*Ma'aseyah* – Implement Doing the Work of Yahowah," is "*Chrestus* – Merciful and Useful Implement."

In this light, other attributes associated with *chrestotes* are instructive. It describes "a merciful, compassionate, kind, and forgiving attitude which is expressed honestly and morally by someone who is steadfastly upright." *Chrestotes* speaks of someone who "as a tool or implement is engaged in that which is useful and beneficial because he or she is doing that which is right." It "combines moral perfection and honesty with usefulness and effectiveness, all under the auspices of loving kindness." *Chrestotes* conveys the idea that the "Upright One's mercy generously and fortuitously provides the gifts of redemption and reconciliation." Even in common profane Greek, it was only used to "characterize persons who were "honest, upright, respectable, worthy, useful, kind, merciful, loving, and pure morally, and whose works were beneficial and productive."

You may have noticed that the last two spiritual accoutrements are listed prominently among Gnostic attributes "generosity" and "faith." But as is the case when we compare Yahowah's list of the ten things He is most concerned about with Sha'awl's, there is no commonality.

But if we are to believe that these attributes systematically represent the Spirit of God, then based upon Galatians, we can be certain Paul did not represent the same Spirit. And while that may sound harsh, even judgmental, there is no denying that Paul's letter is hateful, not loving. He is unhappy, not glad. His words are divisive, not tranquil. He is impatient, as opposed to being calm or restrained. Most of Paul's words have not been useful or beneficial, but instead debilitating and destructive. His false testimony regarding the Torah has been the antithesis of being upright, especially in his portrayal of the Covenant. As a result, most of what we have read cannot be trusted or relied upon. Simply stated, Paul was the antithesis of what he presented as being good.

But as we noted a moment ago, not everything he wrote was misleading. And this passage is a good example of that so let's celebrate this refreshing change of scenery. For example, *agape's* etymology helps illuminate the path to the "*beryth* – familial covenant relationship" Yahowah seeks to establish with us. *Agape* denotes "an appreciative attitude in the context of familial affection and devotion

which results from making a choice following a conscious process of evaluation.” It even embodies the “Festival Feasts,” and it was therefore used by the first followers of The Way to describe their participation in Yahowah’s seven annual Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God.

But for there to be love, there must be choice. And for choice to be genuine, not compelled or capricious, there must be options and evidence to evaluate. And that is why freewill remains mankind’s most inalienable God-given right, and why the Towrah is God’s most valuable gift. It is also the reason that God didn’t stop Paul from writing, or Christians from immortalizing him.

But Paul has this backwards. The attitude and choice of *agape* is what comes before the Spirit enters our lives. Using the evidence Yahowah has provided in His Towrah, we are encouraged to revere and respect Yahowah sufficiently to want to become part of His family, and ultimately love Him as our Father. That is why the Great Instruction reads: **“And you should choose to love Yahowah, your God, with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your might. And these words, which I am instructing you today, they should be part of your inner nature. And you should teach them to your sons and talk of them in your homes.”** (*Dabarym* / Words / Deuteronomy 6:5-7)

If we were to summarize Yahowah’s instruction regarding the fruit of the Set-Apart Spirit, Her influence in our lives would include: providing spiritual birth from above into God’s family. This enables us to become our Heavenly Father’s children, live in His home, and inherit all that is His to give. Our Spiritual Mother adorns us in Her Garment of Light which shelters and protects us from the sting of death and the consequence of sin. Her Garment of Light makes us appear perfect in Yahowah’s eyes and enables us to exist in His presence. The Set-Apart Spirit enlightens us by nourishing us in the Word of God, and interpreting it for us, so that we might know our Father better. The *Ruwach Qodesh* is responsible for empowering us, enabling us to be effective and courageous, convincing witnesses on behalf of Yahowah and His message. And our Spiritual Mother facilitates our communication with our Heavenly Father, turning our humble pleadings into a compelling stream of consciousness before God.

Both manifestations of Yahowah—the Son and Spirit—work together. As a result of what God has done and is doing through His Son and Spirit, those of us who have chosen to know Yah and to love Yah by closely observing His Word, and who have chosen to rely on Yahowah’s path, have been saved from ourselves—from human oppression and bondage, from death and separation.

Similarly, “*chara* – happiness” isn’t a product of the Spirit, but instead the result of coming to know Yahowah and being part of His family. Also, the Set-

Apart Spirit does not bring “*eirene* – peace” between men, as is implied in Paul’s list. She, like the Son, brings division. And while the Son also brings division among men, it is His role, not the Spirit’s, to bring “reconciliation” between individual men and women and Yahowah.

*Pistis*, however, has served as the fulcrum of Paul’s deception. While it originally meant “trust and reliance,” it was translated “faith and belief” in Galatians 5:22, because the content of Paul’s epistles, and his legacy, allow no other rational option. Before Paul corrupted the word and made it synonymous with his religious beliefs, *pistis* presupposed “coming to know the evidence so as to become convinced,” and then “relying upon that which you understand.” As such “*pistis* – trust and reliance” has to precede the indwelling of the Spirit. It is something which is required of us. But since nothing is required for “*pistis* – faith and belief,” it can operate in the vacuum of reason and evidence that we find in this epistle. But, to be clear, there is no correlation between faith and the Spirit as Paul is suggesting.

As it relates to this verse, these four translations aren’t so much inaccurate as incomplete. NAMI: “The but fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long temper, kindness, goodness, trust,...” LV: “But the fruit of the Spirit is, charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity,” KJV: “But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith,” NLT: “But the Holy Spirit produces this kind of fruit in our lives: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness,”

It’s hard not to shout “hypocrite” when Paul, of all people, promotes a word most often translated “meekness and humility.” But nonetheless, Sha’uwl’s list of spiritual fruit continues with:

“...**gentleness, meekness, and humility** (*prautes* – considerate friendliness), **self-control over one’s sexual appetite** (*egkrateia* – temperance, being self-sufficient relative to controlling passions), **with regard to** (*kata* – down from, in accord with, and against) **the such** (*ton toioutos*) **there is no** (*ouk estin* – there exists no) **Towrah** (*nomos* – the nourishing allotment which leads to an inheritance).” (Galatians 5:23)

Sha’uwl is saying that the “fruit of the spirit” is incompatible with the Towrah. And so long as you recognize the demonic nature of Paul’s spirit, he is right.

But there is a benefit of Sha’uwl coming full circle once again and returning to the Towrah. He began listing derogatory insults to slander the Towrah and now has said that everything he considers spiritual, and thus good, is in opposition to the Towrah. He has, in essence, cast Yahowah’s Towrah in the corrupt material role of the Gnostic Demiurge while associating his Faith with the Gnostic “One.”

At some point, inadequacy becomes errancy. Consider the NAMI: “...gentleness, inner strength against the such not there is law.” LV: “Mildness, faith, modesty, consistency, chastity. Against such there is no law.” KJV: “Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.” NLT: “gentleness, and self-control. There is no law against these things!”

The lesson to be learned from Paul’s lists is that if they are right, then Paul is wrong. His letters ooze the “activities of the flesh,” and they seldom reflect the “fruit of the spirit.” So regardless of the fact that his categorization of attributes is overwhelmingly wrong, the only unassailable conclusion is that Paul is a fraud on a massive scale—quite similar to Muhammad.

Here is the next installment of Gnosticism for your consideration:

**“But the fruit of the spirit is: love, happiness, peace, patience, mercy from an upright implement, being good through generosity, faith, (5:22) gentleness, meekness, and humility, self-control over one’s sexual appetite, with regard to such there is no Towrah.” (5:23)**

The oldest witness of Sha’uwl’s next statement expressly differentiates the Towrah from Christou, confirming this heinous albeit obvious aspect of Pauline Doctrine.

**“But (*de*) the ones (*oi*) of the (*toe*) Christou (XY – Divine Placeholder for Useful Tool, Upright Servant, and Ma’aseyah (the Implement Doing the Work of Yah); but since this epistle has disassociated the Ma’aseyah from the Towrah, it’s misleading to connect that which he has severed) the (*ten*) flesh (*sarx* – the physical nature) has been crucified (ΕΣΤΑΝ) with (*syn*) the (*tois*) sufferings and passions (*pathema* – misfortunes and impulses, calamities and afflictions) and (*kai*) the (*tais*) deep desires and longings (*epithymai* – lusts and cravings, coveting and angry responses).” (Galatians 5:24)**

This would be news to Yahowsha’ because He saw Himself as the living embodiment of the Towrah. He is the Towrah in the flesh.

Yahowsha’s crucifixion was irrelevant apart from Him as the Passover Lamb enabling the Towrah’s promise to make us immortal. And His sacrifice on this day has nothing whatsoever to do with our sufferings, our passions, our misfortunes, our impulses, our desires, or our longings. Not only are passions, desires, and longings considered appropriate in a loving family, the only suffering that mattered on Passover was that of the Lamb of God.

Paul’s statement here in Galatians is understood similarly to the one he made in Colossians 2:14, which is cited by Christians to infer that “the Torah (represented by the flesh) was nailed to the cross.”

Since Sha’uwl’s proclamation suffers from some linguistic inadequacies, let’s see how the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear renders it. “The ones but of the Christ Jesus the flesh crucified with the sufferings and the desires.” The placeholder XY was written instead of Χριστοῦ/*Christou*, and Ἰησοῦ/*Iesoe* isn’t found in the text of the oldest witness, not even by way of a placeholder. Further ἐσταύρωσαν/*estaerosan* was rendered ΕΣΤΑΝ.

In this regard, the King James is actually more accurate than the Nestle-Aland. They got one of these three things right. KJV: “And they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.” But it was only because the Protestants copied the Catholic Vulgate: “And they that are Christi have crucifixerunt/crucified their flesh, with the vices and concupiscences.” And should you have wondered how English bibles came upon the word “crucifixion,” now you know. As for “concupiscences,” you are on your own.

Having published a handful of books on the oldest Greek manuscripts, Phil Comfort ignored them when he authored the NLT: “Those who belong to Christ Jesus have nailed the passions and desires of their sinful nature to his cross and crucified them there.” There is no reference to “Christ Jesus” or “cross” in the Greek manuscripts scribed before the rise of Constantine—and he knows it.

Of course, it is true that the “Ma’aseyah’s flesh had been affixed to the Upright Pillar” to honor the promise of Passover, but that wasn’t remotely close to what Sha’uwl was saying. And the fulfillment of Passover only resolved the consequence of religious and political rebellion which is death. Our perversions were actually redeemed the following day, during the *Miqra’* of *Matsah*. Yahowsha’s soul went to *She’owl* to pay the penalty so that we might receive His gift of perfection—all in accord with the Towrah and its Covenant.

Contrary to what Sha’uwl wrote, our “flesh” still exists. Our mortal bodies still suffer pain, and we all endure misfortune. While our “deep desires,” “longings,” and “angry responses,” when appropriate, are good things, even our cravings persist. Therefore, if the New American Standard Bible’s rendition of this verse is accurate, then Paul is wrong once again: “Now those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires.”

Moving on to Sha’uwl’s next statement, since “*kai* – and or also” is omitted from P46, since Paul didn’t write “*en* – in” once, much less twice, since the placeholders for *Ruwach* are side by side, and since “στοιχωμεν – *stoichomen* – advances in a line” was rendered in the plural, present, active tense, the Nestle-Aland Interlinear isn’t even remotely accurate. “If we live in spirit in spirit also we might walk.” So while admittedly less unintelligible, this is at least a little more consistent with the original text:

**“If (ei) we live (zao) for spirit (IINI / pneumatī), for spirit (IINI / pneumatī) we march in a line (stoichomen – we proceed to advance in a row, and we live in conformity, and we behave by imitating).”** (Galatians 5:25)

The use of *stoichomen*, a cognate of *stoicheion*, in this context is a bit of a problem. First, it speaks of “soldiers following their leader in a militaristic regimen, never stepping out of line,” which is reminiscent of “Onward Christian Soldiers marching off to war.” And while that depicts the submit and obey realm of religion which is devoid of freewill, it also represents the command and control structure a spiritual envoy like Satan would have known. Yahowah’s spiritual envoys, messengers, and representatives following orders in a militaristic regimen devoid of freewill. But this is not the realm man was designed to live in nor similar to the realm we are headed to. Yahowah gave us the gift of freewill, one that we all currently enjoy. And even with the presence of the Set-Apart Spirit, we do not live in conformity, but still enjoy the full benefits of freewill.

And even if we were to jettison all of *stoichomen*’s inappropriate baggage, and consider it to mean “live in conformity,” we have to ask ourselves: conformity to what? And the answer, according to Paul, is to “behave by imitating” him.

Also troubling, *stoicheion* was used twice in Galatians and once in Colossians to describe the “demonic powers associated with the fundamental elements of religious mythology,” so this is conflicting, taking believers to that which Paul has condemned.

Jerome’s conclusion as manifest in the King James reads: “If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.” The LV clearly supplied the text: “If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.” And the NLT simply marched the thought a little farther down the field: “Since we are living by the Spirit, let us follow the Spirit’s leading in every part of our lives.”

Thankfully, we have arrived at the last verse of the fifth chapter. Now if only this was the last chapter and last of his letters.

**“Not (me) we might come to exist (ginomeoa) vainly boastful (kenodoxos – glorifying ourselves without reason, being conceited, while sharing opinions which are baseless), one another (allelous) provoking and irritating (prokaleomai – calling forth to challenge others to combat), each other (allelous) jealous and envying (phthonoentes – corrupt and defiled).”** (Galatians 5:26)

*Kenodoxos* is a tough word to translate. It is comprised of *kenos*, meaning “empty and vain,” which either means “failed or egotistical,” and also “devoid of truth,” and *doxa* which conveys “opinions, conclusions, and judgments,” but also “brilliant splendor” and “praise.” So, does it mean “failed judgment,” “devoid of

light,” “undeserved egotistical appraisal,” or “baseless opinions?” Our lexicons suggest that *kenodoxos* means “proud or glorifying without reason, conceited, boastful, or falsely enlightened.” In that it defines “a person who is void of real worth but who wants to be admired by others,” it is hard not to see the self-absorbed author of Galatians in *kenodoxos*. So why is he opposed to it?

After all, it would be hard to find a letter containing more “irritating,” more “combative,” or filled with more “provocative” rants than Galatians. So if these things no longer exist for those who “live in the spirit,” this epistle does not conform either.

Not that I understand it any better, the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear suggests Paul said: “No we might become empty splendor one another provoking one another envying.”

If the KJV is right, based upon his letter, Paul would be the poster child for wrong: “Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another.” But it’s not the Protestant’s fault; they just copied the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate: “Let us not be made desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another.” NLT: “Let us not become conceited, or provoke one another, or be jealous of one another.” In other words, let’s not act like Paul.

As is our custom, let’s give Sha’uwl the last word:

**“This freedom and liberty of ours being Christos it freed, so you all are directed to stand firm. Therefore, also, not again in yoke of subservience and slavery you are held based upon a grudge against you all, controlling you and forcing you to surrender to someone who bears ill will, is resentful, violent, and quarrelsome. (5:1)**

**You pay attention, I, Paulos, myself say to you all that if on the condition that you may be circumcised, Christos is totally worthless and completely meaningless, not in the least bit helpful or useful for you. (5:2) So then, furthermore, repeating myself, I testify, insist, and protest to every man being circumcised that he actually is obligated to do and perform the entire and complete Towrah. (5:3)**

**You have invalidated and rendered inoperative, abolishing the purpose of the separation of Christou whosoever is in unison with the Towrah. You all having been declared righteous, and having been vindicated with the Charis / Gratia / Graces, you all have fallen away and have been forsaken. (5:4)**

**Because indeed, we in spirit out of faith hope. Righteousness we await patiently. (5:5) In Christo Iesou neither circumcision is someone is capable,**

powerful, and mighty nor uttermost part of the penis, on the contrary through faith love operating. (5:6)

You were trying, running, and progressing well, in a fine way that was pleasing. Who or what you it prevented and impeded, it offended and was beaten of the truth not to be persuaded, to obey, and to follow along faithfully? (5:7) The enticing persuasion and soliciting inducement not from the one providing a name to you all. (5:8) A little yeast whole of the batch it yeasts. (5:9)

I have been persuaded to coax and convince you, winning you over in the Lord because nothing different other than this may you all regard or ponder, potentially holding as a belief. So now, the one stirring you up and causing you great distress, confusing, bewildering, and mystifying you will undergo and endure the judgment, condemnation, and punishment, whoever this individual might be. (5:10)

But now, I, brothers, if conditionally circumcision nevertheless still I preach, why and for what further besides am I pursued and persecuted, made to flee timid and fearful at the commands of another? As a result, therefore perhaps it is possible, invalidated and annulled this offending trap and stumbling block which ensnares and is offensive of the crucifixion. (5:11)

And also how I wish and pray for a malicious curse, that they might castrate and emasculate themselves, suffering amputation of their penis and testicles, those troublemakers among you who stir you up to rebel by disseminating religious error and political seditions. (5:12)

For you upon freedom you all were named and were called brothers. Only not in the liberty to the point of the starting point of the original violent attack of the flesh. To the contrary, by of the love you all are slaves of each other. (5:13) Because of this then all the Towrah in one word has come to an end and is finished in the you loving of the nearby neighbor as yourself. (5:14) But if each other you all bite and you devour, you all watch out, not under one another you might be consumed. (5:15)

But I say in spirit you are all commanded to advance. And so the desire and passion of lustful craving of the flesh deny, lest you might come to an end. (5:16) For indeed, the flesh's desires and passions against the spirit, and so then the spirit in opposition to the flesh, because of these one another it is hostile and adversarial in order to negate what conditionally you all might presently propose and want of these to possibly behave and do. (5:17) But if in spirit you all are not guided, you are under the control of the Towrah. (5:18)

**But now evident, clearly seen, and widely known are (*eimi*) the works and assigned tasks of the flesh which indeed exist as sexual promiscuity, impure materiality, sensuality, (5:19) the likeness manifesting what can be observed, the use and administering of drugs, hatred and hostile antagonism, strife, dissension, and quarrelling, deep devotion and jealousy, the desire to make a sacrifice, selfish ambitions and hostile rivalries, discord and division, taking another stand, the freedom to choose for oneself, (5:20) envious corruption, drunkenness, public partying, and that similar to this which I previously spoke to you inasmuch as I said before that the likes of such carrying out and committing these practices, the reign and kingdom of God, they will not inherit. (5:21)**

**But the fruit of the spirit is: love, happiness, peace, patience, mercy from an upright implement, being good through generosity, faith, (5:22) gentleness, meekness, and humility, self-control over one's sexual appetite, with regard to such there is no Towrah. (5:23)**

**But the ones of the Christou the flesh has been crucified with the sufferings, passions, the deep desires, and longings. (5:24) If we live for spirit, for spirit we march in a line, behaving by imitating, living in conformity. (5:25) Not we might come to exist vainly boastful sharing opinions which are baseless, one another provoking and irritating, each other jealous and envying)." (5:26)**

LE: YY 09-16-2013