

Echthros – Despised Adversary

The False Prophet...

The third chapter of Sha'awl's letter to the Galatians reached a bitter conclusion, but its demon-possessed and psychotic author was not yet satisfied. He remained committed to denouncing the Torah as his fourth stroke against God commenced. Word by word Paul would build his case for Faith. It would be so simple, it would appeal to a child.

“So (*de* – but) I say (*lego*), as long as (*epi* – upon / *hosos* – as much / *chromos* – time) the (*o*) heir (*kleronomos* – one who receives an inheritance by lot) exists as (*estin*) a small child (*nepios* – an infant or baby, childish, immature, uneducated, and undisciplined), he is no different than (*oudeis diaphero* – he is no more valuable than) a slave (*doulos*), belonging to (*on* – being) the lord and master (*kurios* – the ruler and owner one who controls and has possession) of everyone and everything (*pas* – of all).” (Galatians 4:1)

Recognizing slaves are owned, and thus do not own, and that slaves are subject to lords, so they do not act as lords, given the opportunity to render *on* as “belonging to” or “being,” I made the obvious choice. And yet as you shall soon discover, most every English bible translation, holding a jaundiced view of the “Lord,” opted to advance an oxymoron.

More importantly, those who speak for God write: “Yahowah said...” Those advancing their own agenda in opposition to Him write: “But I say.” And those who speak for Him don't suggest that His Torah enslaves, or that God acts like a “lord, controlling everyone.”

Inspiring the political slogan that swept Barak Obama into power, Paul has laid his foundation for “Change we can believe in.” Too bad the wannabe apostle and president sought to lord over everyone, leading them in the wrong direction.

Realizing also that this statement is an adjunct to what we have just read, Sha'awl is attempting to say that while the “small child is an heir” to the promise there is “no benefit” “so long as the child remains” “enslaved” to the “Lord” of

the Torah. He is inferring that if believers were to reject the Torah and accept his “Pauline Promise” on faith that they would be free to grow. And yet since the terms and conditions associated with our growth are delineated in only one place, the Torah’s depiction of the Covenant remains indispensable.

But in the end, it all comes down to a simple choice: do you believe Paul or do you trust Yahowah? God tells us to cling to His Torah as if our lives depended upon it, and Sha’uwl has told us to discard it so that we might be free. If Yahowah is trustworthy, Paul is not. If Yahowah is reliable, Paul is His adversary.

Most Christians would interpret this “verse” as demarking the change between “being held in bondage to the Law” and the “freedom given to those who place their faith in the Gospel of Grace.” For them it is thus the transition from the “Old Testament” to their “New Testament,” with the latter being vastly superior, less demanding, and infinitely more accommodating.

Christian apologists would also say that Paul’s letters provide the nourishment “New Testament” children need to grow once they are free of the Torah and its mean-spirited Lord. But in reality, Paul never provides the nutrition (defined as God’s Word) required to grow, preferring instead to dish out his own personal brand of poison. Truth is upended and inverted, because according to Yah, His Torah’s pivotal story is the liberation of His children from human bondage so that those who accept His Covenant might become His heirs.

Paul’s Greek was so lacking that a handful of words had to be added to the text to resolve the grammatical deficiencies of this sentence. For example, in the Nestle-Aland, we find: “I say but on as much as time the inheritor infant is nothing he differs of slave master of all being.” Yet since the King James Version was a translation of the Latin Vulgate, these deficiencies were irrelevant. It reads: “Now I say, That the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all.” Even as Yahowah’s child, we are not “lord of all.” Moreover, being Yahowah’s “servant” is something to aspire to, not disdain. However, it is evident that Jerome’s Vulgate inspired the English bible: “As long as the heir is a child, he differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all.”

As if they felt authorized to write their own letter, the New Living Translation magically transformed Paul’s meager, inadequate, and errant suggestion into: “Think of it this way. If a father dies and leaves an inheritance for his young children, those children are not much better off than slaves until they grow up, even though they actually own everything their father had.”

Before we move on to the next plank, there is something curious about *kurios*. It was translated “the lord and master” in this passage because that is the word’s primary meaning. It could have also been rendered “owner,” which while accurate, would have been an uncommon depiction. *Kurios* is from *kuros*, which

means “supremacy in the sense of being powerful, strong, and authoritative.” When the Disciples used it in reference to Yahowah or Yahowsha’, it was always represented by a Divine Placeholder, which stood for “Yahowah” or the “Upright One” respectively, consistent with how the same placeholders were deployed throughout the Septuagint. And yet on those 667 occasions, “new testament” translators have universally ignored their established symbolism and have printed “Lord” instead. In the relatively few times in which *kurios* was written out, as it is here, it is rendered “lord,” with a lower case “l” 54 times, as “master” 11 times, and as “sir” 6 times by these same religious publications. And yet, *kurios*’ primary meaning, which is “owner,” is only found once in the most popular English translations.

Since Sha’uwl’s Greek remains wanting, let’s continue to reach out to the Nestle-Aland for help. “**But under governors he is and managers until the purpose of the father.**” Considering this synopsis, it appears as if Paulos is attempting to combine his first two codicils. According to the wannabe apostle: those who observe the Torah are subservient to a Taskmaster, therefore the Torah which imposed this condition was designed for obsolescence. Then if we are to believe the Nestle-Aland, “the purpose of the father” wasn’t expressed by His earlier contrivances, even though God clearly authored those arrangements. So why, if we are to take this translation of Paul seriously, would our Heavenly Father conceive a plan that was opposed to His will?

“Certainly (*alla* – but yet and by contrast with an adversarial implication), he is (*eimi*) under the auspices of (*hypo*) foremen who control the workers (*epitropos* – the manager or governor in charge over laborers (plural)) and (*kai*) administrators (*oikonomos* – managers of an estate who have legal authority over an inheritance; from *oikos*, household, and *nomos*, a nourishing allotment to become an heir (plural)) until (*achri*) the (*o*) previously appointed time set (*prothesmia* – the period prearranged, established, and fixed beforehand; from *pro*, before, and *tithemi*, to arrange and set in place) of the (*tou*) Father (ΙΙΡΣ).” (Galatians 4:2) The intent is now obvious.

Epitropos, rendered “foremen who control the workers,” is a compound of *epi*, “by,” and *tropos*: “a manner, way, or fashion.” It speaks of “those who are in control,” whether they are “managers, foremen, political officials, or even governors.” It is another way of saying that the Torah’s God is authoritarian and controlling and that His approach is burdensome and laborious. These mischaracterizations are designed to make Paul and his Faith appear preferable.

He continues to deploy one derogatory metaphor after another to besmirch the Towrah and its Author. Since he first foisted *paidagogos*, “enslaved leader of boys” or “taskmaster,” in Galatians 3:24, this approach has become curious to say the least. Wouldn’t this positioning of the God of freewill and empowerment as

controlling, stunting the growth of His children, make Sha'owl Yahowah's adversary? In his tortured attempt to make the Torah appear passé, the author of the Christian New Testament is steadfastly undermining his own credentials.

Even in this sentence, the *epitropos*, “foremen,” and *oikonomos*, “estate administrators,” are strange bedfellows. The first reference is to those who on behalf of the political authority direct and control common laborers, and the second describes property and money managers hired by a homeowner. They are incompatible concepts, and neither are appropriate in reference to the Torah, even when trying to belittle it.

Especially troubling, Paul is attempting to say that the Torah was a temporary administrator, but both *epitropos* and *oikonomos* are plural. And yet there is only one Torah, so this was clearly a gaffe in reasoning. And while there is more than one source of Rabbinic Law, we can't use this as an excuse because the “foremen” and “managers” are working on behalf of the “Father” at the end of the passage, and there is no association between Rabbinic Law and our Heavenly Father.

To their credit, the New American Standard Bible accurately conveyed Paul's message, but unfortunately, the resulting rendering promotes the idea that the Father appointed a time in which His initial foremen and managers would become obsolete. NASB: “But he is under guardians and managers until the date set by the father.” The only rational, albeit inaccurate, conclusion is that Paul was saying that God planned for the Torah to be outmoded and superseded. But if that's true, then neither Yahowah, the Torah, nor Yahowsha' can be trusted because they said that every aspect of the Torah would remain in effect for as long as the universe exists. So, this passage once again pits Paul against God and against reason. It is becoming increasingly difficult for an informed and rational person to believe him.

The KJV rendition of this passage mistranslated “*epitropos* – foremen” and “*oikonomos* – household managers”: “But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father.” And they did so because the Authorized King James Bible was nothing more than an English translation of the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate: “But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed by the father.”

Since there is no basis for “they have to obey their” or “until they reach whatever” in the Greek text, the NLT is little more than a flight into the realm of fantasy. “They have to obey their guardians until they reach whatever age their father set.” Further, “Father” was rendered with a Divine Placeholder, meaning that ΠΡΣ was meant to be capitalized and represent our Heavenly “Father.”

Moving on, we find that Paul's word choices in this next statement are far more damaging than in the previous one, so let's begin our review with the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear. "Thusly also we when we were infants under the elements the world we were having been enslaved." These folks, as we have seen, while slavishly accurate grammatically, have taken great liberty in their renderings of the words, themselves. But translating *stoicheion* as "elements," completely subverts its intent.

To be fair, most every Pauline advocate is stumped by the selection of *stoicheion*, rendered *stoicheia* here in the accusative plural. And that is perhaps why it was timidly and inadequately translated "elements" in the NA interlinear. The provocative term was often acknowledged in Plato's writings and is ubiquitous in the philosophy and cosmology of Greek antiquity, especially among the Stoics. Specifically, *stoicheion* was used to "differentiate between the cults of the elements, those being earth, water, air, and fire, and the celestial bodies, all of which were worshipped as deities through Hellenistic syncretism." *Stoicheion* is, therefore, a pagan religious term, and would have been read as such by enlightened Greeks, especially when deployed in conjunction with "*kosmos*" in a religious text.

This is a problem of unfathomable magnitude because Paul is using it to describe, or more specifically, to mischaracterize Yahowah's Towrah – a book which universally denounces religion, especially the worship of the elements and celestial bodies. But now Sha'awl wants us to believe that God's Torah is advocating what it condemns. This is not unlike his claim in Romans 7 that the Towrah was the source of his personal perversion s.

In that *stoicheion* is the most dishonest and disdainful criticism Paul has wielded against God's Word, and especially His Towrah, since he called His "old system malicious" in Galatians 1:4, before we consider an amplified translation of Galatians 4:3, we are best served by coming to grips with why the word was selected and what it actually meant. And toward this goal, let's turn to the lexicons at our disposal.

The *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, as the name implies, is a Christian publication. They are, therefore, committed to defending Paul even if they have to incriminate themselves in the process. So after conveying the perspective presented in quotations three paragraphs ago, they opined: "It is much disputed whether *stoicheia* (Galatians 4:3 and 4:9) is to be understood within this syncretistic context [of pagan mythology], and resolution of the question depends on whether Paul has picked up a catchword used by his Galatian adversaries. If this is the case, then the false teachers demonstrate not only a Judaizing tendency (Galatians 5:1-4), but also a Hellenistic syncretistic tendency that included

worship of the cosmic elements and observance (Galatians 4:10) of the special dates and festivals.” One lie has simply led to many others.

Should you be curious, syncretism is defined as the “combination of different forms of belief or practice.” In this context, it specifically refers to the “incorporation of pagan mythology into Christianity” by the Roman Catholic Church “to make the subsequent religion more popular and appealing.” All three so-called “Abrahamic religions,” Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, are guilty of syncretism, but Christianity and Islam are nothing but syncretistic – more religious myth than inspired testimony. And while Christianity and Islam run afoul of their monotheistic claims with their Trinity and Satanic Verses, it is the festivals, religious rites, and symbols of the Babylonian, Egyptian, Greek, and Roman mythologies that were incorporated into the more modern religions, allowing the myths associated with many gods to reside in their one god.

Along these lines, “Judaizers” were invented by Paul. They are as mythical as today’s “Palestinians.” There is no mention of them anywhere in history. Apart from the psychotic recesses of this man’s mind, and in the minds of those he beguiled, they do not exist. And as we know, Paul has identified his foes, and they are the Disciples Shim’own, Ya’aqob, and Yahowchanan.

More twisted still, “Judaizing” is a complete misrepresentation of what it means to be Torah observant. Yahowsha’ and His Disciples closely examined and carefully considered the Towrah and encouraged everyone to do the same regardless of race, time, or place. And while they were not “Judaizing” with this approach, if they had been, then Yahowsha’ was a “Judaizer.” So by proposing this argument, Christians strike a fatal blow against their religion.

In reality, Judaizer is a straw man, a debate fallacy whereby the presenter, rather than refuting the merits of his opponent’s case, creates an imaginary foe who is easier to defeat. But all that proves is that the presenter, in this case Paul, is both incompetent and deceptive.

Also, if it is true that “Paul picked up a catchword used by his Galatian adversaries” then he was not inspired by God, thereby, once again undermining the foundation of the Christian religion. Further incriminating this approach, if historians were to define Jews with a single word, their designation would be “monotheistic.” The last thing anyone an informed and rational individual would ascribe to Yahuwdaym would be the promotion of deifying the sun, moon, planets, and stars. And yet that is what Paul, and with Christian scholars following his lead, who are proposing to justify the incorporation of *stoicheion* into this letter.

To their credit, and to their religion’s shame, the Christian theologians who contributed to the *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* acknowledged that Paul was using *stoicheion* to renounce the Torah. And in doing so, they showed

their bias for many of Sha'awl's most egregious mischaracterizations, writing: "More likely Paul uses this term, known to him from (Stoic) popular philosophy, on his own initiative to designate collectively both the Jewish Torah, which the false teachers understood as a path to salvation and advised the Galatians to follow at least in part (Galatians 5:3), and the previous Gentile piety of the Galatians (4:3 and 4:8). He considered both to be manifestations of that power presently enslaving human beings (4:3, 4:5, 4:8), a power that nonetheless appears "beggarly" compared to the *huiiothesia* [adoption] of verse 5, such power was the basis of human religious existence before Christ." If this assessment is accurate, God is a liar.

This is as good a time as any to affirm that Christian theologians readily acknowledge that Paul was attacking the Torah, just as they are doing here. And they view such denunciations as valid, even though it means repudiating the testimony of the God Paul claims inspired him. So, like Paul, they perpetuate the myth of a "Jewish Torah," using "Jewish" as a pejorative term, because accurately labeling it "Yahowah's Towrah" would make it obvious that their religion was in opposition to God and His Word. In an informed and rational world, this argument alone would be sufficient to negate the veracity of the religion.

But even in the midst of their religious chicanery, there is nugget of truth. The "teachers" Sha'awl has been opposing, "understood" that "the Torah" represented the "path to salvation." The Disciples, or "Taught Ones," therefore "advised the Galatians to follow" the Towrah's teaching, instruction, and guidance. It is what Yahowah said, it is what Yahowsha' taught, so we should not be surprised it is what the Disciples Shim'own, Ya'aqob, and Yahowchanan conveyed. Everyone was singing the same song except Sha'awl. And this means that in Paul's world, a "false teacher" was anyone who shared God's Word and therefore undermined his words.

Then affirming the depravity that maligns the soul of Christendom, the lexicon refers to Yahowah as "that power presently enslaving human beings," a "power that nevertheless appears 'beggarly' compared to adoption" into Paul's religion. They have ingested the poison and it has rendered these theologians as adverse to God as was their mentor.

If this were not bad enough, these same Christian clerics, after admitting that Paul wrote *stoicheia* to besmirch the Torah, calling it the "essence of pagan religious philosophy," reveal that Paul uses the word again to present the "elemental spirits" in Colossians 2:8 and 2:20. These evil spirits "undoubtedly make use of the terminology of the false teachers in Colossae, in whose mystery-oriented philosophy such spirits might have played a significant role." To which they conclude speaking of *stoicheion*, "according to Stoic doctrine, the *elements*

will perish in the final conflagration,” signifying Paul’s ultimate triumph over God, I suppose.

Now that we know that *stoicheia* was used in Greece to describe the “religious pagan cults that grew out of the ‘elements’ of earth, water, air, and fire as they interacted with the deified celestial bodies,” and that Paul equates it with “mystery spirits,” let’s examine the text of Galatians 4:3...

“And also (*kai*), in this way, it follows that (*outos* – thus) when (*ote* – as long as and while) we (*ego*) were (*emen* – existed as) infants (*nepios* – small children and babies) under (*upo*) the (*ta*) elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology (*stoicheion* – simplistic and basic initial precepts of the supernatural powers associated with the cults of the earth, water, air, and fire, and the deification of the sun, moon, planets, and stars) of the (*tou*) universal system (*kosmos* – worldly order, global disposition, arranged structure, or government constitution of that arrangement), we were (*emeoa*) subservient slaves (*doulos* – controlled, enslaved, and subject to obligations).” (Galatians 4:3)

Sha’uwl, who unleashed his “children” metaphor way back in Galatians 3:7, is now exploiting **“as a result of the Faith, we can come to exist as Abram’s children.”** This was in opposition to becoming Yahowah’s children by responding to His Covenant. The proposition was advanced again with the first of several references to an “inheritance” beginning in Galatians 3:21-23: **“For if, per chance, had the Torah been given the power or ability to impart life, certainly in the Torah would be the righteous. (3:21) But to the contrary, the Writing enforced restrictions, completely shutting the door on inheritance, imposing evil in order that the promise out of the Faith of Iesou Christou might be given to believers. (3:22) But before the arrival of the Faith, under the control of the Towrah, we were actually being held in custody as prisoners, restricted and trapped like fish in a net, until the bringing about of the Faith was revealed.” (3:23)**

It was then that Sha’uwl introduced the first of his four Towrah substitutes, beginning in Galatians 3:24-25: **“As a result, the Towrah has come to exist as our disciplinarian using dogmatic old-fashioned methods extending until Christon in order that by means of the Faith we might, at some point in time, while doing nothing ourselves, be justified. (3:24) But now having come the Faith, no longer do we exist under an old-fashioned and strict authoritarian.” (3:25)**

This childish metaphor was augmented by: **“So I say, as long as the heir exists childish and immature, he is no different than a slave, belonging to the lord and master who owns and controls everyone and everything. (4:1)**

Certainly, he is under the auspices of foremen who control the workers and administrators until the previously appointed time set of the Father.” (4:2) Which brings us to the current extrapolation of this theme: **“And also, in this way it follows that when we were infants, under the elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology, the simplistic and basic initial precepts of the supernatural powers associated with the cults of the earth, water, air, and fire, and the deification of the sun, moon, planets, and stars of the world, we were subservient slaves.” (4:3)**

In this context, as these passages flow out of Galatians three and into the fourth chapter with its jarring climax, we have only one viable alternative with regard to the “*paidagogos* – disciplinarians,” “*kurios* – the lord and master,” “*epitropos* – the controlling foremen,” and “*oikonomos* – the administrators of the inheritance” relative to the “*stoicheion* – rudimentary principles of religious mythology.” Paul has deployed them to describe and demean Yahowah and His Torah.

This known, in Galatians 4:3, *kosmos* sounds familiar because it has been transliterated from Greek to become the English word “cosmos.” So while it is often translated “universe, earth, or world,” *kosmos* more accurately represents things as different as: “an arranged constitution, a decorated adornment, an estranged people who are hostile to God, and a new world order, speaking of a system of political or religious governance.” It can be translated “universal system or global dispensation.” *Kosmos* is from *komeo* which conveys the idea of “administrative control and the disposition of power” – which speaks to Paul’s intentions. Beyond this, some lexicons state that *komeo* is “a temperamental, self-absorbed personality intent on transferring custody or possession of individuals, carrying them away from one person to another.” It even describes the idea of “trying to take back and recover something which was previously thought to be one’s own.” So lurking under the surface there are a plethora of Satanic notions associated with *kosmos*—a word which appeared innocent at first blush.

And as we now know, there is nothing innocent associated with Paul’s use of *stoicheion* (pronounced stoy·khi·on) in this context. No matter how it is translated, it is very, very troubling when associated with Yahowah’s Torah. I say that for six very specific reasons.

First, *stoicheion*, translated “elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology” in Galatians 4:3, is used again in Colossians 2:20. There, the New Living Translation says that the Ma’aseyah “has set you free from the supernatural powers (*stoicheion*) of this world,” thereby making the *stoicheion* “demonic spirits.” And in this Colossians passage, Paul then asks, “So why do you keep on following the rules of the world as such?” Therefore, by juxtaposing his use of *stoicheion* in his first letter with his last epistle, it becomes obvious that

Paul wants the faithful to believe that the Torah is comprised of “demonic religious mythology.”

But that’s not the end of the disparaging associations. *Stoicheion* also affirms that Paul wants Christians to believe that the Torah may have been nothing more than a derivative of the “initial rudimentary and natural elements which comprised the universe,” and was therefore “of the world,” as opposed to being from God. Another belittling connotation of *stoicheion* suggests that Paul was implying that the Torah’s usefulness had come to an end, in that it was just “the first step,” and a “primitive, underdeveloped and childish” step at that. This is in conflict, however, with the fact that Yahowah and Yahowsha’ say that Passover is the first step toward inheriting eternal life, and that each of the remaining six steps travel through the Torah.

Yet another unflattering definition of *stoicheion* is derived from its root. *Stoicheo* speaks of “soldiers marching off (as in away from the Torah) from one place to another (as in from the “Old Testament” to the “New Testament”). *Stoicheo* is somewhat reminiscent of Yahowah’s depiction of His “*malak* – spiritual messengers” being “*saba* – relegated to a command and control regimen where they follow His orders.” In this light, *stoicheo* describes “soldiers in orderly ranks, with each combatant simply following the leader, and with everyone moving in a structured line.” It conveys the idea of “existing in conformity” with the instructions they have been given. There is no hint of freewill in *stoicheion*, thereby undermining the purpose of creating humankind or of providing us with the Torah, which was to provide the information we would require to engage in a relationship with Yahowah.

However, as a fallen spiritual messenger, *stoicheion* does accurately describe the only condition Satan knows—the one he rebelled against. So now Yahowah’s Adversary is having his messenger ascribe the condition he despised to the Torah, hoping that believers will swallow Sha’uwl’s poison, and like lemmings, plunge to their death. In this regard, the root meaning of *kosmos* may come into play. Remember *komeo* conveys the idea of “administrative control and the disposition of power,” speaking of “a temperamental, self-absorbed personality intent on transferring custody or possession of individuals, carrying them away from one person to another.” More telling still, it describes the idea of “trying to take back and recover something which was previously thought to be one’s own.” Therefore, it is beginning to look like someone has let their guard down, letting us peek behind the veil.

But there are more disparaging connotations. When we investigate *stoicheion*’s etymological history, we find that it is akin to *sustoicheo*, meaning “to march in a line, one person following the other, all acting and looking the same.” Paul will use this very word, translated “corresponds to,” in Galatians

4:25, to associate Yaruwshalaym with the Torah in a derogatory fashion, stating that both enslave. Words which share a common root with *stoicheion* describe Sha'uw'l's nature and tactics and include: “*sustasiastes* – one who revolts and joins an insurrection,” “*sustatikos* – introduce something,” “*sustauroo* – to crucify someone or something,” “*sustello* – to abridge, diminish, shorten, and enshroud so as to terminate or conceal,” “*sustenazo* – to audibly express suffering,” “*sustratiotes* – to be a soldier,” “*sustrepho* – to twist something so as to change its intended meaning,” and “*sustrophe* – to be a disorderly and rebellious individual acting in a coalition or conspiracy inappropriately blending things together in a poorly disclosed and hidden combination” so as to get people to: “*suschematizo* – conform, following the example set by another, and thereby change their mind, attitude, and perspective.” In a word, we have Sha'uw'l.

As we learned a moment ago, Greek philosophers used *stoicheion* to describe what they considered to be the four rudimentary and essential elements which comprised the universe: earth, water, air, and fire. As such, the *Complete Word Study Dictionary, New Testament* states the inescapable: “In Galatians 4:3, Paul calls the ceremonial ordinances of the Mosaic Law worldly elements.” And in truth, we must strike “ceremonial ordinances” from this conclusion, because there is no such distinction being made by Paul, leaving us with the stark reality that the man who claimed to be speaking for God was alleging that the book Yahowsha' said defined His life was of the world, and therefore not of God.

If we could separate this statement from this epistle, removing it from the third and fourth chapters of Galatians, and Paul's ongoing onslaught against the Torah, then we could make the case that *stoicheion kosmos* was selected to assail the pagan traditions and festivals associated with worshiping the elements of the earth, in addition to the sun, stars, moon, and planets. But unfortunately, since Paul's criticism has been focused singularly on demeaning the Torah, and not against pagan worship prevalent in Galatia at the time, there is no basis for such an interpretation. Paul has called the “old and arcane system” of “laws” that comprise Yahowah's Towrah everything from “harsh to enslaving,” from “perverted to cruel,” from “incapable to obsolete,” so why not “pagan and worldly.”

Paul's use of *stoicheion* in Colossians eliminates any chance we might otherwise have to strip the Greek word of its derogatory mythological and religious connotations. While it can convey “fundamental teachings,” and “elementary doctrines,” this definition simply transfers the problem we are wrestling with to the Colossian's epistle. If *stoicheion* conveyed “a fundamental teaching,” we'd have to ask ourselves why we are told by Paul in Colossians that his Iesou wanted to lead us away from it. And if *stoicheion* was the Torah's

“elementary doctrine,” why would such enlightenment be considered as a source of authoritarian control that stunts our growth here in Galatians?

Also interesting with regard to the “*paidagogos* – taskmasters,” “*epitropos* – foremen,” “*oikonomos* – household managers,” and “*kosmos stoicheion* – arranged constitution of religious mythology,” we find that all four Greek terms were rendered in the plural. This suggests that Paul may well have been trying to associate the Torah with Rabbinic Law—inferring that both of these things enslave us. But even for the sake of argument, if we were to assume that worldly religious systems and Jewish Law were similar enough to group them together and justify the consistent use of the plural forms, since it’s evident that these things were never valid, nor ever associated with God, they don’t fit within the context of something previously appointed by the Father. And that leaves us with Paul associating the Torah with all six of the disparaging aspects of *stoicheion*—none of which are good.

What I don’t understand is how Christians have come to accept Paul’s inverted portrayal of the Torah. God’s Word describes our Heavenly Father’s relationship with man, details the liberation of God’s children, and articulates the path to our freedom. So how do they construe this to be about “enslaving” us? As unbelievable, inaccurate and counter intuitive as Sha’uwl’s upside down and revisionist world has become, it’s hard to understand why billions of people believe that his perspective is correct.

But we do know that the most important early catalyst for Pauline deception occurred when Marcion inappropriately elevated Paul’s epistles to scriptural status, and as a result, this troubled man’s letters were ultimately included in the Latin Vulgate. And here with regard to Galatians 4:3, Jerome provided a somewhat faithful, albeit grossly inadequate, translation of Paul’s errant statement: “So we also, when we were children, were serving under the elements of the world.” The KJV copied them with: “Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world:” Based upon this context, it is highly unlikely that Paul used *stoicheion* to convey “elements.”

From this, the NLT extrapolated: “And that’s the way it was with us before Christ came. We were like children; we were slaves to the basic spiritual principles of this world.” The liberty these translators have taken with Paul’s text is breathtaking. Compare this to: “**And also in this way, it follows that when we were small children under the universal arranged constitution of religious mythology, we were slaves.**” They have fanned the flames of Paul’s blasphemy.

However, while the words were grossly mistranslated, especially “and that’s the way it was with us before Christ came,” and their “basic spiritual principles,” the message was not misrepresented. Based upon the evidence, the Christian

Church has correctly interpreted these passages to say that Paul thought that the Torah was elementary and childish, a crude first step, and a cruel taskmaster which oppressed and enslaved all those who observed it. According to Paul, and thus the Church, the Torah was poorly conceived and it had a negative influence on people's lives. Apart from ignorance, there is no escaping this ungodly conclusion, one which puts Paul and the Church in direct opposition to God. Yet since the religious institution and its founding father claim to have derived their authority from God, if God cannot be trusted, they are unreliable. If you are a Christian, let that sink in.

If the Torah had been designed to last for a limited and preordained time, why did God tell His children to observe it forever? If the Torah no longer mattered after the arrival of the Ma'aseyah, why did the Ma'aseyah quote it so often? If the Torah's influence came to a close with the "birth of Christ," why did He observe it? Was it merely a coincidence that Yahowsha' fulfilled the *Miqra'ey* of *Pesach*, *Matsah*, and *Bikwrym* in the precise manner described in the Torah and on the days established therein? Or if it became obsolete after His sacrifice in 33 CE, why did He tell us that while the world exists, not one jot or tittle of the Torah would be passed by until it was entirely fulfilled?

While this may be among the most important questions you have ever contemplated, my words pale in comparison to Yahowsha's farewell message to His Disciples. These are among the most important words ever spoken:

“Now He said to them (*de lego pros autos*), ‘These words of Mine (*outos o logos*) which I spoke to you while (*ego os laleo pros ou*) I was with you (*on sun su*), because (*hoti* – namely by way of identification or explanation) **it is necessary to (*dei* – inevitable and logical, beneficial and proper, as part of the plan to) **completely fulfill** (*plerooenai* – carry out fully, totally perform, accomplish, proclaim, giving true meaning to, realizing the prophetic promises of) **everything** (*pas* – all) **that is written** (*ta grapho*) **in** (*en* – in unison with and with regard to) **the Towrah** (*to nomo*) **of Moseh** (*Mouseos* – a transliteration of the Hebrew Moseh, meaning to draw out, altered to conform to Greek grammar by a scribe), **the Prophets** (*propetais* – those who proclaimed and foretold God's message), **and the Psalms** (*psalmois*) **about** (*peri* – because of, with regard to, on behalf of, and concerning) **Me.**” (Luke 24:44) God just told us the way to understand Him. Are you listening?**

“Then He fully opened their minds (*dianoigo nous* – He explained and enabled the proper attitude and way of thinking, completely facilitating reasoning) **so that they would be intelligent and have the capacity to understand** (*syniemi* – to bring things together and make the proper connections to be enlightened, clearly perceive, gain insight, and comprehend) **the Writings** (*graphas*).” (Luke 24:45) God has told us the proper way to think, so that we might know Him and

understand what He is offering. This is reminiscent of that found in Psalm 19, where we read: **“Yahowah’s Towrah is complete and entirely perfect, returning and restoring the soul. Yahowah’s testimony is trustworthy and reliable, making understanding and obtaining wisdom simple for the open-minded.”** (*Mizmowr* / Song / Psalm 19:7)

Yahowsha’, speaking Hebrew, continued to address His Disciples...**“He said to them, ‘Because** (*hoti* – namely by way of explanation) **in this way** (*houto* – thus it follows), **it is written** (*grapho*) **that the Implement Doing the Work of Yahowah** (XN – placeholder for Ma’aseyah, from *Chrestus*, meaning Upright Servant and Useful Tool) **must undergo and experience suffering** (*pascho* – be afflicted because it is sensible) **and rise up amidst** (*anistamai* – to establish by taking stand in one’s midst; a compound of *histemi*, to stand and establish, and *ana*, into the midst, amidst, among, and between) **out of** (*ek*) **lifeless separation** (*nekros*) **the third day.”** (Luke 24:46) He was speaking of His fulfillment of the *Miqra’ey* of *Pesach*, *Matsah*, and *Bikuryim*—the three most important days in human history. This is the way to salvation that Sha’uwl is demeaning.

So that you are not misled by this statement, Yahowsha’ previously defined the Hebrew word translated *nekros* as “separation” from the father in His parable of the prodigal son, which is recorded in Luke 15:11-32. Therefore, He was predicting His reunification with His Father on “*Bikuwrym* – First-Born Child,” not a bodily resurrection from a corpse. In this light, *anistamai* speaks of His soul “rising up” from She’owl and “into the midst” of the living.

After telling His Disciples that His life and sacrifice could only be understood from the perspective of acting upon what was written in the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, God said...

“And it should be announced publicly (*kerysso* – proclaimed in a convincing manner to persuade and warn, to herald, publish, and pronounce with authority) **upon** (*epi*) **His** (*autos* – His [not “My,” and thus in Yahowah’s]) **name** (*onoma*), **‘Change your perspective, attitude and thinking** (*metanoeo*) **to be forgiven and pardoned from** (*aphesis* – to be released and liberated from) **wandering from the path and missing one’s inheritance** (*hamartia* – the consequence of being mistaken; from *a*, not and *meros*, being assigned an allotment with regard to one’s destiny), **to all** (*pas*) **nations, races, and places** (*ethnos* – ethnicities), **commencing and leading** (*archomai* – first beginning) **from** (*apo*) **Yaruwshalaym** (*‘Ierousalem* – transliteration of the Hebrew name Yaruwshalaym, the Source of Salvation).” (Luke 24:47)

“*Metanoeo* – change your perspective, attitude, and thinking,” a translation of the Hebrew *suwb*, is an extremely important concept. Unless and until we are willing to reject religion, and view the Ma’aseyah Yahowsha’ from the

perspective of the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, thinking differently by making the appropriate connections, there is no way to find, much less understand, the path to God.

Also please note that Yahowsha' asked His Disciples to publicly announce that His life was best understood from the perspective of fulfilling the Torah and that by following this way one would be forgiven, to "*pas ethnos* – to every ethnicity, to every race and nation," thereby undermining Paul's principle claim.

“You are witnesses to (*martyrs* – those with firsthand experience and knowledge who can testify to ascertainable facts regarding) **these things** (*houtos*).” (Luke 24:48) Thereby affirming that the Disciples were privy to information and experiences which led to understanding missed by the wannabe “Apostle” Sha’uwl.

And speaking of being mistaken, since neither Abraham nor faith have been mentioned, but God the Father and His Towrah have, Yahowsha' is now revealing to His Disciples that Yahowah's promise can be found in the place Paul would later demean and discard. Based upon this testimony alone, the basis of Pauline Doctrine must be rejected...

“And behold (*kai idou* – now pay attention), **I, Myself, have prepared and sent you off as Apostles to convey the message** (*ego apostello* – I, Myself equipped you to deliver the word, being sent forth) **of My Father's** (*mou ΠΠΣ*) **promise** (*epaggelia* – to vow and an agreement to do something beneficial which leads to the assurance of approval and reconciliation) **upon you** (*epi su*).

But now (*de*), **you remain** (*su kathizo*) **in the city** (*en te polis*) **until the time when** (*heos os*) **you are clothed** (*enduo* – dressed [speaking of the Spirit's Garment of Light]) **in power and ability** (*dynamis*) **from** (*ek*) **above** (*hypsos* – heaven on high).” (Luke 24:49)

This occurred right on schedule, on the *Miqra'* of *Shabuwa'*, when the Set-Apart Spirit descended upon the Covenant's children in Yaruwshalaym – enriching and empowering them – just as Yahowah promised in “*Qara'* – Called Out,” the central book of His “Towrah – Teaching. And with this fulfillment, the last of the Covenant's promises were honored by God. Those who answer His Invitation to be Called Out and Meet with Him on “*Pesach* – Passover” become immortal. The beneficiaries of “*Matsah* – Un-Yeasted Bread” are perfected, becoming vindicated and righteous in our Heavenly Father's eyes. This leads to “*Bikuwrym* – First-Born Children” where God's now immortal and innocent sons and daughters are adopted into His Covenant Family. Then because He wants us to grow, and because He wants us to share what we have come to know, we are enriched and empowered by the Set-Apart Spirit on “*Shabuwa'* – Promise of the

Sabbath.” This is Yahowah’s message to us. It is the very essence of Yahowsha’s life. It is the reason we exist and the reason the Towrah was written.

And yet with these words, everything Paul has written has been torn asunder. There should never have been a debate between believing Paul’s “Gospel of Grace” and trusting Yahowah’s Torah. Rather than speak for the Ma’aseyah Yahowsha’ as Sha’uwl has claimed, He has consistently contradicted Him. If Paul had personally experienced the Ma’aseyah Yahowsha’, if his mind had been open to the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms the way the Disciples’ had been, he would never have written Galatians.

Since the Christian position is ludicrous in light of Yahowsha’s testimony, we have but two options relative to Paul and his letter. If what we are reading is what Paul actually wrote, if the text of his letter has been faithfully preserved, then Paul is to be condemned for leading billions of people away from God. His words and God’s Word are diametrically opposed. But if what we are reading has been corrupted in transmission, if every early copy of Paul’s letter differs substantially from what he actually said, then Paul may be redeemable, but his epistles are not. For the Christian religion, that is a lose-lose proposition.

Before we move on to the next claim, here is a quick review of what Paul has written thus far in the fourth chapter about the alleged “Faith of Abram.”

“So I say, as long as the heir exists childish and immature, he is no different than a slave, belonging to the lord and master who owns and controls everyone and everything. (4:1) Certainly, he is under the auspices of foremen who control the workers and administrators until the previously appointed time set of the Father.” (4:2) And also, in this way, it follows that when we were infants, under the elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology, the simplistic and basic initial precepts of the supernatural powers associated with the cults of the earth, water, air, and fire, and the deification of the sun, moon, planets, and stars of the universal system and world order, we were subservient slaves.” (4:3)

✠✠✠✠

Had this next incomplete sentence been rendered carelessly, independent of Paul’s dissertation, and also estranged from his subsequent conclusion, for the first time ever his message might have been somewhat accurate, even generally consistent with God’s own testimony. In the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear, it reads: **“When but came the**

fullness of the time delegated out the God the son of him having become from woman having become under law...”

Amplified by our lexicons, and reordered to accommodate the transition into English, the same words reveal...

“But (de) when (hote) came (erchomai – arrived) the fullness (to pleroma – the complete contents) of the (tou) unspecified time (chromos – indefinite occasion), the God (o ΘΣ) sent out (exapostello – out of being set apart and dispatched the messenger with a message on a mission) the (ton) Son (YIN) of Him (autos), having come to exist (ginomai – having become and having originated) from (ek – out of) a woman (gune – an adult female), having come to exist (ginomai – having originated and being) under (hypo – through, as an agent of, under the auspices of, by the means of, subject to, or because of) [the] Towrah (nomon – nourishment which facilitates an inheritance; used throughout the Septuagint to translated the Hebrew noun towrah, meaning teaching and guidance (written in the singular accusative case, making “Towrah” the direct object of the verb)...” (Galatians 4:4)

The “*pleroma* – fullness or complete contents” of time has not yet occurred. Yahowah’s Covenant story takes place over seven-thousand years – not over four thousand. And God does not like to be shortchanged. Further, His timing is precise, not “*chromos* – unspecified, occurring on some indefinite occasion.”

That said, “*exapostello* – separated and sent out” is an accurate depiction of the origin and purpose of Yahowsha’. Comprised of *ek*, “out of and away from,” and *apostello*, “one who is prepared, equipped, set apart, and sent off as a spiritual messenger,” we discover that Yahowsha’ is “out of God, set apart from Him, and sent off, prepared and equipped” to serve us.

The “Son” of God did not, however, “*ginomai ek* – come to exist out of, originating from” a woman. As part of Yahowah, Yahowsha’ has always existed, which is to say He could not have been born. And that is why Yahowah was so precise in His prediction through Yasha’yah (Isaiah) in the 9th chapter, saying **“To approach us, a child is born. For us to approach, a Son is given.”**

Hypo, translated “under,” could have been rendered “by means of,” thereby making this portion of Paul’s statement accurate. Yahowsha’, as the corporeal manifestation of Yahowah and His Towrah, came into our world “*hypo* – as a result of and because of” the Towrah. But He was not “*hypo* – under” the Towrah in the sense of being subservient or subjugated – no one is. And yet, based upon what has come before and what follows, this is clearly Paul’s implication. Moreover, this verse plays off of Galatians 4:2, because “when came the fullness of the unspecified time...” and “until the previously appointed time set by the Father” are parallel concepts. And sandwiched in between them, Galatians 4:3

now clearly conveys Paul's conclusion that the Torah is an inadequate first step which enslaves us.

While that is an insurmountable problem for Pauline Doctrine and thus Christian credibility, there is another. It is important to know that the woman who bore the child was a descendant of King David, that she felt that she wasn't qualified, that she was willing to be used by God in this way, and that she was a virgin, but that's it. So may I suggest that the unnamed Miryam (Mary) is being inaccurately presented as the source of Yahowsha's existence the same way Abram was inappropriately presented as the source of our salvation. But worse, as we shall soon discover, Paul will try and contrast her with Hagar, the slave of Abraham's wife. And while there is no rational comparison that can be made between these women, Paul, ever the clever one, will hang his theory on the idea that Sarah, who is also an unnamed woman in his thesis, can become the mother of freeborn children by way of the promise made to her husband, whereas Hagar represents slavery to the Torah. So, by going from "woman" to "woman," Paul bypasses the Torah and the role of our Spiritual Mother.

In their quest to garner religious favor for their king, the theologians who crafted the King James Bible wrote: "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." Then, the New Living Translation, reflecting the perspective of modern Christianity, turned what could have been construed as an affirmation of the Torah into a disparagement of it based upon the way they translated *hypo*: "But when the right time came, God sent his Son, born of a woman, subject to the law."

In the spirit of disclosure, I had thought that theological animosity for Yahowah's Torah was why they rendered *hypo* as "subject to" as opposed to "because of, for the reason of, through, as an agent of, under the auspices of, or by the means of" the Torah. But upon further thought, the NLT may well have accurately reflected Paul's intended disdain for the Torah based upon the surrounding context.

So in this case, the NLT is probably right with regard to intent, even if wrong with regard to the word's etymology. This realization in turn invalidates what would otherwise have been Paul's first partially accurate statement. After all, being "subject to the law" makes it sound as if He was controlled and enslaved by the Pauline "taskmaster."

Apart from Sha'awl's letter to the Galatians, and consistently errant phraseology, there were elements of this clause which would otherwise affirm that Yahowah has a plan, one which was described in the Torah, and one which is being unfurled on a specific timeline. According to Bare'syth / Genesis, the Greater Light would enter our world during the fourth millennia of human history

as a sign associated with the Mow'ed Meetings. He would be set apart from God and arrive as the seed of woman to bruise Satan's schemes. And as the Lamb of God, upon Mount Mowryah, He would serve as Yahowah's substitute to free mankind from the sting of death, while facilitating and enabling the promise of Passover.

And while that is completely true, nothing is more beguiling than hiding the truth by placing a lie on top of it. It is how counterfeits are made. It is the reason frauds prevail. When you see threads of truth woven into an improperly conceived tapestry, you are witnessing Satan's finest work. This will become obvious with the completion of the sentence.

In this light, those who believe that Paul could not have been a false prophet because some of what he wrote was true, one rough-cut and unfinished rock in a pigsty is hardly the standard borne by those who serve Yah. And also, such thinking fails to appreciate how deceivers operate and how religions achieve their goals. As I have shared before, no one would be fooled by a counterfeit bill if it didn't appear very much like the real thing. And yet, while the bogus bill shares many, if not most, of the same strokes as the legitimate one, it is completely worthless – even illegal.

Along these lines, some Christian apologists posture the notion that it is unfair to label Paul “anti-Torah” because there are places where he speaks favorably of the Torah in other letters. But if so, all that would prove is that the man who felt no compunction regarding contradicting God was willing, when the circumstances required, to contradict himself. So how is it that Paul's willingness to negate his own thesis suddenly makes him credible?

Striving to make his delusions believable by associating his conclusions with God's Word, Sha'owl continues to lead unwary souls to She'owl. In the words of the McReynolds Interlinear: “that the ones under law he might buy out that the adoption as son we might receive back.” This, of course, infers that we were all “subject to the law,” which is invalid no matter how Paul's words are interpreted. The Towrah exists because of us, to serve us, not the other way around. It frees us from submission and subjugation.

This also infers that we were redeemed from the Towrah instead of by the Towrah, thereby misrepresenting the entire purpose of the Towrah. And if that weren't bad enough, the Towrah's Covenant is the sole means to our adoption into Yahowah's family. This then becomes impossible to capitalize upon when the Towrah is discarded.

Lastly, by saying that we “might be received back,” Paul is inferring that we were once God's children but somehow became estranged. And that means that

God cannot be trusted to protect His family. It means that His Covenant isn't everlasting and that His promises aren't reliable.

But should you want a more reliable translation, this is my best effort...

“...in order that (*ina* – for the purpose and result of) **the ones** (*tous*) **under** (*hypo* – by means of or subject to) **Towrah** (*nomon* – nourishing allotment which provides an inheritance; used universally throughout the Greek Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew Towrah to translate *towrah* – teaching and guidance)), **he might redeem** (*exagorazomai* – he may make use of the opportunity to ransom, possibly working to buy back) **in order to** (*ina*) **the son set** (*ten uiothesian* – a Pauline term based upon an assumed compound of *huios* – son and a derivative of *tithemi* – to set or place) **we might receive back or obtain from** (*apolambano* – we may receive what is sought and due; from *apo*, to be set apart, and *lambano*, to be taken by the hand, therefore sometimes translated take aside, lead away, or welcome back).” (Galatians 4:5)

Uiothesian, rendered “son set” is a word Paul made up and only he uses. Typically “translated” as “adoption” in Christian bibles, this represents the first of three deployments. The second and third installments of *uiothesian* are found in Romans, where Paul contradicts himself and God by asking: **“Who are the Israelites to whom the son set (*uiothesian*) and the glory and the covenants and the giving of the Torah and the service and the promises.”** (Romans 9:4) According to God there is only one Covenant and the Yisra'elite role in it is something He makes well known. But by associating them with it, Paul has contradicted himself. And in the third instance, *uiothesian* was used in Romans 8:23 to associate **“son set”** with **“the redemption of our body,”** as if our flesh was being adopted and not our soul.

Since this all flows out of the same misguided rant, to properly appreciate his ploy, Sha'awl has now proposed: **“So I say, as long as the heir exists childish and immature, he is no different than a slave, belonging to the lord and master who owns and controls everyone and everything. (4:1) Certainly, he is under the auspices of foremen who control the workers and administrators until the previously appointed time set of the Father. (4:2) And also, in this way, it follows that when we were infants, under the elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology, the simplistic and basic initial precepts of the supernatural powers associated with the cults of the earth, water, air, and fire, and the deification of the sun, moon, planets, and stars of the universal system and world order, we were subservient slaves. (4:3) But when came the fullness of the unspecified time, the God sent out the Son of Him, having come to exist, originating from a woman, having come to exist under Towrah (4:4) in order that the ones under Towrah, he might buy back in order to the son set we might receive back and obtain from.”** (4:5)

So now let's be clear: we were not "bought back, obtained, or received from" the Towrah, but instead from our own perversions and the corruptive nature of religion. Further, the recipients of this merciful gift are adopted into the Towrah's Covenant, where Yahowah makes His children immortal, perfect, enriched, and empowered so that we can grow and thrive.

Yahowsha', the Son, loved His Towrah, observed His Towrah, taught His Disciples His Towrah, answered His Towrah's Invitations, and embraced the conditions of His Towrah's Covenant. His Towrah was the mechanism He used to ransom us and adopt us during the *Miqra'ey* of *Pesach*, *Matsah*, *Bikuwrym*, and *Shabuw'ah*. Therefore, Yahowsha's response to His Towrah and Sha'uwl's statements regarding it are polar opposites.

As usual, the New Living Translation isn't a translation, nor is it even a paraphrase. It is so divergent from the Greek text that it is more akin to a novel. "God sent him to buy freedom for us who were slaves to the law, so that he could adopt us as his very own children." The authors of this publication appear as if they have never read the Exodus account whereby the Children of Yisra'el were freed from slavery. The Towrah did not enslave them. It was His gift to them on *Shabuw'ah* – celebrating the promise of seven and the *Shabat*.

The KJV is no closer to the text: "To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." In actuality, and thankfully, we are still subject to the Towrah. According to God, it has not been repealed. And that's fortunate for us, because it provides the narrow path to life.

As we approach this next claim, we find yet another discrepancy between more modern Greek manuscripts like the 16th century *Textus Receptus* and the 20th century *Nestle-Aland*, with P46, the oldest witness to Paul's letters. The clause "of the Son" does not follow the placeholder for Spirit in the late 1st-century codex. In this light, the Spirit, like the Son, is set apart from Yahowah, not from Yahowsha'. The Spirit and Son are parallel manifestations of the Father, not sequential.

Reprising his selection of *exapostello*, this time Paul unwittingly associates its meaning with our Spiritual Mother's role in the adoption process...

"But (de) because (hoti – that) you are (este – you exist as, represent, and correspond to) sons (huios – male children) sent out (exapostello – prepared, set apart, and dispatched the representative of) the god (o ΘΣ), the (to) spirit (ΠΙΝΑ) into (eis) the hearts (tas kardias) of us (emon) shouts (krazo – cries out, screams, or croaks), 'Abba (abba – a transliteration of the Aramaic word used to address one's father)'—the (o) Father (ΠΙΠ – a placeholder for the Hebrew 'ab)." (Galatians 4:6)

In the order the words appear in the text of the modern manuscripts of the letter, at least according to the McReynolds Interlinear, the same statement reads: “Because but you are sons delegated out the God the spirit of the son of him into the hearts of us shouting abba the father.”

In Paul’s native Aramaic, this is the delightful expression spoken by sons and daughters as they gazed up into their father’s eyes. Paul, himself, however, would not know this pleasure, as he was sent off to Rabbinical school as a young boy. And Sha’uwl never married, and thus never experienced the joy of being a parent. All of this I think contributed to his less-than-ideal temperament.

That said, this passage misrepresents the reasons God sent the “*Ruwach Qodesh* – Set-Apart Spirit.” She covers our souls with a Garment of Light and does not invade our hearts. She does not speak for us either; She speaks to us when we are engaged studying Yahowah’s Word. And as our Spiritual Mother, Her relationship with Yahowah cannot be defined as “father.” Further, Yahowah’s chosen language is Hebrew, not Aramaic. The Spirit would never actually say “*abba*,” but instead “*ab*.” And this error would not have been worth mentioning had Paul not switched languages to that of the Babylonians and Assyrians here to make his point. By doing so, he has belittled the language of the Torah, and thus its voice. And that was his intent.

Considering the vitriol Sha’uwl has unleashed against God’s Word, a relentless assault which began with his opening paragraph and will reach its crescendo in Galatians 4:24, it would be naive to dismiss the associations he has positioned as anything other than his attempt to bypass the Torah. In this light, the unnamed “**originating from a woman, having come to exist under Towrah**” in verse 4:4 will soon be compared with the “**slave woman**” of 4:23 who bears children who are enslaved to the Torah. The “adoption” process in 4:5 is being established to capitalize on the “children of promise” in 4:28, again bypassing the Torah. The awkward and invalid reference to the “Spirit” in 4:5 is an attempt to associate our Spiritual Mother with Sarah, just as Sha’uwl will do again in 4:27-31. And by having the Spirit speak to the Father in Aramaic, Sha’uwl not only dismisses the Hebrew Scriptures, but also associates the Spirit and Mary with one of the most distinguishing aspects of the Babylonian religion; that of the Madonna and Child and the Mother of God.

Unfazed by the fact that Paul did not include the phrase “of the Son” in this sentence, the NLT misrepresents the Galatians message once again. “**And because we are his children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, prompting us to call out, ‘Abba, Father.’**” The verb “*krazo* – shouts out” was singular in the text, meaning that it’s the Spirit who “cries out,” as opposed to “us being prompted to call out.” Further, the Spirit speaks to the Father for us, rather than

prompting us to speak to Him. The KJV wrote: “And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.”

Yahowah sent His Spirit, the very same Spirit who indwelt Yahowsha’, making Him the Son of God and making us the sons of God. Moreover, those who are cognizant of the Set-Apart Spirit’s role in our lives recognize that She neither “cries, croaks, nor shouts,” but instead elevates the caliber of our communications so that we understand God when we recite His Word and listen to Him and so we are articulate when we talk to others about our Heavenly Father.

One of the reasons that *Ruwach* is consistently rendered by a placeholder in the eyewitness accounts scribed by Yahowsha’s Disciples is that *pneuma*, the Greek word for “spirit,” is a neuter noun. To appreciate the nature and role of the *Ruwach Qodesh* (Set-Apart Spirit) in our lives, we must first come to recognize that She represents the maternal aspects of God. Our Spiritual Mother is set apart from Yahowah to cover and protect us in Her Garment of Light. She cleanses and purifies us of sin, nurtures us in the Word, and enlightens our path. And it is by way of our Spiritual Mother that we are born anew from above, and thereby adopted into Yahowah’s Covenant family. She does not, however, say “*abba* – daddy.”

Similarly, when “Son” is used in reference to Yahowsha’ being the “Son of God,” a placeholder is consistently used in all of the late first through mid fourth-century manuscripts written by Yahowsha’s Disciples. And yet in Paul’s next statement, and as represented by Papyrus 46, Upsilon Iota Sigma (YΙΣ) was used twice, with both referring to an individual becoming the “son or child” of God. But that’s not right since we are not divine. Therefore, the most reasonable explanation for this mistake is that a scribe, knowing that his peers routinely used the Divine Placeholders for “Son,” replaced *huios* with YΙΣ. And if the scribe of Papyrus 46 felt at liberty to replace *huios* with YΙΣ in Galatians, nothing would have stopped him from changing Iesou, Christos, and Kurios to their respective placeholders in order to make Sha’uwl’s letter appear similar to Mattanyah’s and Yahowchanan’s testimony. Therefore, since the Divine Placeholders associate Yahowah with the Ma’aseyah Yahowsha’, a relationship Sha’uwl has sought to sever, this scribal legacy suggests that Paul did not use them.

This next thought, in this context, also affirms that Paul had indeed positioned his previous statements to infer that Yahowah’s Torah was something from which we had to be freed in order to be saved. In the Nestle-Aland’s preferred Interlinear, it reads: “So that no longer you are slave but son if but son also inheritor through God.”

“So as a result (*hoste*) you no longer exist as (*ouketi eimi*) a slave (*doulos*), but to the contrary (*alla*) a Son (YΙΣ). But now (*de*) if (*ei*) a Son (YΙΣ) and

(*kai*) **an heir by chance** (*kleronomos* – receiver of an inheritance through casting lots) **through** (*dia*) **a god** (ΘΥ).” (Galatians 4:7)

Beyond the fact that this was a wholly inappropriate use of Divine Placeholders, and the implications of this reality for the credibility of Paul’s letters, *kleronomos* has ghastly connotations. It is based upon *kleros* and *nomos*, with “*kleros* – the casting or drawing of lots in a game of chance” modifying “*nomos* – the Towrah’s nurturing allotment which provides an inheritance.” Nothing with God is per chance. That is what makes Him trustworthy. Chance, however, is akin to faith.

Beyond this, we were not slaves to the Torah, making Sha’uwl’s premise posterous. God’s Word is the means to our liberation.

According to God, we were freed from the oppression of human religious, political, economic, and military schemes, and thus from the consequence of our rebellion and corruption by the Torah. The Familial Covenant Relationship memorialized in the Torah is the agreement which codifies our adoption process. And the seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God provide the means to obtain that goal. The Torah consistently tells us that as Yahowah’s children we will inherit all that is His. This, along with the enjoyment of His company, encapsulates the benefits of the Covenant.

The King James rendering of the seventh verse reads: “**Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.**” And yet, we are called to be servants, because it is an honor to serve with Yahowah. After all, Yahowsha’ considered Himself to be a servant and was predicted in Yasha’yah / Isaiah to be the “Suffering Servant.”

Continuing to advance Paul’s slavery mantra, the New Living Translation published: “**Now you are no longer a slave but God’s own child. And since you are his child, God has made you his heir.**”

Unfortunately, the slave reference harkens back to the dark days of Galatians 3:10-12, 3:24-25, and 4:1-5, and thus ties all of these verses together. By doing so, any possibility of disassociating the Torah from the source of enslavement no longer exists.

The best way to understand Paul’s thesis, which claims that we must be “freed from the Torah’s curse of slavery” to become “adopted heirs,” is to consider his rhetorical progression. He begins by calling the Torah a curse. “**For as long as they exist by means of doing the assigned tasks of the Torah, they are under a curse, because it is written that ‘All are accursed who do not remain alive, persevering with all that is written in the scroll of the Torah, doing it.’** (3:10) **So with that Torah, absolutely no one is vindicated or**

justified alongside God. It becomes evident: ‘Those who are justified and righteous, out of faith will live.’ (3:11) But the Towrah exists not out of faith, but to the contrary, ‘The one having done and preformed them will live in them.’ (3:12) Christos bought us back from the evil and hateful curse of the Towrah, having become for our sake a maligning and malicious curse, because it has been written: ‘A vengeful curse on all those having hung on wood.’” (3:13)

Then he claims that the Torah is an instrument of death, saying that there is no life in it or inheritance from it. **“Indeed, consequently, the Torah accordingly is against the promises of the god. Not may it become (although it might be, even though I don’t want it to be). For if, per chance, had been given the Torah the power and ability, the capacity and resources, to impart life, certainly in the Torah would be the righteous and vindicated. (3:21) But to the contrary, the writing imposed restrictions, completely shutting the door on heaven, imprisoning everything under error and evil in order that the promise out of the Faith of Iesou Christou might be given to believers.”** (3:22)

He then associates the Torah with enslavement, and the Ma’aseyah with freedom, as if the Torah and Ma’aseyah were not only unrelated, but actually opposites. **“But before the arrival of the Faith, under the control of the Towrah, we were actually being held in custody as prisoners, restricted and trapped like fish in a net, to the bringing about of the Faith was revealed. (3:23) As a result, the Towrah has come to exist as our disciplinarian using dogmatic old-fashioned methods extending until Christon in order that by means of the Faith we might, at some point in time, while doing nothing ourselves, be justified. (3:24) But now having come the Faith, no longer do we exist under an old-fashioned and strict disciplinarian.”** (3:25)

According to Paul, adoption and inheritance required being freed from the enslavement of the Torah. **“So I say, as long as the heir exists childish and immature, he is no different than a slave, belonging to the lord and master who owns and controls everyone and everything. (4:1) Certainly, he is under the auspices of foremen who control the workers and administrators until the previously appointed time set of the Father. (4:2) And also, in this way, it follows that when we were infants, under the elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology, the simplistic and basic initial precepts of the supernatural powers associated with the cults of the earth, water, air, and fire, and the deification of the sun, moon, planets, and stars of the universal system and world order, we were subservient slaves.”** (4:3)

Reinforcing the foundation he had laid, Paul restates that abandoning the Torah is a precondition for adoption. **“But when came the fullness of the**

unspecified time, the God sent out the Son of Him, having come to exist, originating from a woman, having come to exist under Towrah (4:4) in order that the ones under Towrah, he might buy back in order to the son set we might receive back and obtain from. (4:5) But because you are sons sent out the god, the spirit into the hearts of us shouts, ‘Abba’—the Father. (4:6) So as a result you no longer exist as a slave, but to the contrary a Son. But now if a Son and an heir by the chance casting of lots through a god.” (4:7)

Based upon these statements, it would be a fool’s folly to assume that Paul was lampooning Rabbinical or Roman Law as opposed to Yahowah’s Towrah. Moreover, since it is universally accepted that the Galatians were Gentiles, the fact that they were never “under or subject to” Rabbinical Law is proof in itself that Sha’uwl wasn’t condemning his people’s religious traditions or Oral Law. So while it is bone-chilling to recognize that Sha’uwl—Christianity’s founding father—has committed Scriptural and Spiritual suicide by criticizing the Torah, what’s particularly distressing is to consider how many souls he has taken with him.

Sha’uwl told his audience that all they needed to do was believe him. But then, one or more of Yahowsha’s Disciples, or someone they had taught from Yaruwshalaym, spoke to the Galatians about the role the Torah plays in establishing a relationship with God, in helping us come to know Yahowah, and understand His plan of salvation. They would have done what Yahowsha’ did, which is to explain everything He stood for from the perspective of the Torah, so that His sacrifice could be understood, trusted and relied upon. But when the insecure Sha’uwl got word of this—that God’s Word had been elevated over his own—he panicked, and went into attack mode. As is the case with all insecure individuals, he slandered his opponents, which at this point included God, and elevated his status by saying that he was the ultimate truth-teller—the one who could be believed.



Now that Paul has laid the foundation of his thesis – “the Torah enslaves” – we are confronted with a trilogy of statements whereby the enslaved are associated with “nature,” with “false gods,” with “the inadequate initial constitution,” and with “the observance of special days, months, and years.” Therefore, bereft of a transition away from Paul’s belittlement of the Torah, and in the midst of his crusade against God’s Word, we are compelled to at least consider the probability that Paul is now associating some very unsavory things with Yahowah’s Scriptural foundation.

The next three pronouncements advance a singular thought. Here is the first of them through the eyes of the Nestle-Aland's McReynolds Interlinear: "But then indeed not having known God you were enslaved to the in nature not being gods." Or if you prefer...

“Certainly (*alla* – to the contrary and by way of contrast) **on the other hand** (*men* – indeed) **then** (*tote*) **not having known, perceived, or acknowledged** (*ouk oida* – not having been aware of) **god** (ΘN), **you were enslaved** (*douleuo*) **to** (*tois*) **nature** (*physis* – the laws of the physical and natural world; from *phuo* – your birth and how you were begotten) **not existing as** (*me ousin* – not being or corresponding to) **gods** (*theois* – deities).” (Galatians 4:8)

Oh my, how much farther into the slime of this man's mind are we going to sink? God did not design us to be slaves, ergo, we were not begotten as slaves to nature. Not knowing God does not enslave us, nor does just being aware of God liberate us.

And if that were not sufficiently asinine, Yahowah's Covenant children do not become "*theois* – gods," making many divinities. And just because "gods," as in multiple divinities, sounds similar to "god's" as in belonging to the one and only God, Paul wrote *theois*, which is the plural form.

My former business partner, speaking of someone like Paul, said: "You can fix a lot of things, but you cannot fix stupid." And that is what we are dealing with here.

Also, while pagan gods and goddesses were often associated with nature, the Greek and Roman religions practiced in Galatia were considerably more sophisticated. So with this statement, Paul was demeaning the intelligence of his audience which would have done nothing but irritate them.

But that's a lot better than irritating God. If you recall, Sha'awl deployed "*stoicheion* – elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology" in Galatians 4:3 the same way he used "slave to nature" in his previous statement. So now, making sure that his audience would also make this same connection, he wrote...

“But (*de*) **now** (*nyn*) **having known** (*ginosko* – having become personally familiar with) **god** (ΘN), **but** (*de* – and or) **more** (*mallon* – instead, to the contrary, or by contrast), **having been known** (*ginosko* – having been recognized and understood) **under** (*hypo*) **god** (ΘY), **how** (*pos*) **have you returned, changing your beliefs** (*epistrepete* – you changed your ways, your faith, your religion, and your opinions, reversing course) **back** (*palin* – again and again repetitively) **upon** (*epi*) **the** (*ta*) **incapacitating and incompetent** (*asthenes* – feeble and weak, powerless and infirmed), **and** (*kai*) **worthless, belittling, and**

terrifying (*ptochos* – lowly and little, destitute and impoverished; from *ptoeeo* – to terrify and to diminish and *pipto* – to fall, crouching in submission before dying) **elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology** (*stoicheion* – simplistic and basic initial precepts of the supernatural powers associated with the cults of the earth, water, air, and fire, and the deification of the sun, moon, planets, and stars representing the underdeveloped, inadequate, simplistic, and improperly formed first step) **which** (*ois*) **back again** (*palin* – repetitively) **and again from above** (*anothen* – from heaven and for a very long time) **you are choosing** (*thelete* – your are desiring and taking pleasure in, wanting) **to be controlled as a slave** (*douleuein*)...” (Galatians 4:9)

Just a moment ago, Paul was telling believers that they had become gods, but now they are incompetent and worthless. However, while this may sound like another contradiction, remember that Paul has consistently portrayed Yahowah as impotent and inadequate.

So that you don't think that I'm being unfair to Paul, the Interlinear associated with the Nestle-Aland 27th Edition renders the same statement: “**now but having known God more but having been known by God how you returned again on the weak and poor elements to which again from above to slave you want.**”

Beginning at the beginning, considering the fact that most people's written expressions convey vastly more information than their verbal proclamations, and recognizing that Sha'awl has consistently misquoted and contradicted Yahowah, there is no chance whatsoever that anyone came “to know God” based upon his preaching. The same is true of his writing, even today, and as a result, God does not know a single Pauline Christian. So Paul had this wrong.

Beyond this, “*mallon* – more” is inappropriate in the context of the Covenant. What's most important is us coming to know God and then, once we know Him, the next most important thing is to understand what He is offering so that we can respond accordingly. It is only then that God reciprocates and comes to know us as His children. However, the last thing we should desire is for Him to know us better than we know Him. The more closely we examine Him, the better He looks, but the same is not true for us. The entire purpose of the Set-Apart Spirit's Garment of Light is to replace the darkness in our souls with His Light so that as our Father, He sees Himself in us. So Paul had this wrong.

We can quit our job, we can move to a different state or country, we can change political allegiances, we can even divorce our spouse, but we cannot disown our children. The same is true with God. So while each of us are given the opportunity to ignore, reject, or accept the Covenant, should we embrace its terms and conditions, we are Yahowah's sons and daughters forever. That is His

promise, a vow memorialized among the Covenant's benefits. So when it comes to the revolving door to heaven, Paul had this wrong as well.

Paul is, of course, suggesting that when the Galatians believed him they were saved, but by rejecting him they were doomed. His pivotal term is intriguing in this regard. *Epistrepte*, which was translated "have you returned, changing your beliefs," is a compound of "*epi* – upon or against" and "*strepho* – to turn on one's self, no longer caring for oneself by changing one's mind." It is defined by various lexicons as "to change faith or religious beliefs toward true worship and obedience." So since God is opposed to religion, since God does not want to be worshipped, and since He places no value in faith, Paul is once again wrong. And it only gets worse from here.

In Galatians 4:1 through 4:5, Paul not only directly associates *stoicheion* with the Towrah, he demeans the Torah by calling it childish, enslaving, controlling, works based, overbearing and thus oppressive, in addition to being mythological: **"So I say, as long as the heir exists childish and immature, he is no different than a slave, belonging to the lord and master who owns and controls everyone and everything. (4:1) Certainly, he is under the auspices of foremen who control the workers and administrators until the previously appointed time set of the Father. (4:2) And also, in this way, it follows that when we were infants, under the elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology, the simplistic and basic initial precepts of the supernatural powers associated with the cults of the earth, water, air, and fire, and the deification of the sun, moon, planets, and stars of the universal system and world order (*stoicheion*), we were subservient slaves. (4:3) But when came the fullness of the unspecified time, the God sent out the Son of Him, originating from a woman, having been under Towrah (*nomos*) (4:4) in order that the ones under Towrah (*nomos*) he might buy back in order to the son set we might receive back and obtain from."** (4:5)

So in Galatians 4:9, after all of these derogatory comments, and after establishing this connection between "*stoicheion* – **religious mythology**" and the "*nomos* – **Towrah**," Paul calls Yahowah's Testimony "*asthenes* – **incapacitating and incompetent**" as well as "*ptochos* – **worthless, belittling, and terrifying.**" In this regard, Paul could not have been more wrong.

But that was insufficient. He went on to claim that the "**religious mythology**" to "**which they had returned again and again**" came "**from above**," as in from God in heaven. And that by "**choosing**" God's "**elementary teachings**," they were "**deciding to be controlled as a slave...**" The opposite is true.

And this is also true: to Sha'awl the Torah remains an enslaving object of scorn to be rejected.

A man on a mission, Sha'awl ripped the heart and life out of the Torah, rejecting the *Shabat*, the *Miqra'ey*, and the *Yowbel*: “Days you keep watch and months and seasons and years.” He is repudiating Yahowah’s instructions to keep the *Shabat*, the seventh day, special. And in this way, God’s promise and plan become unknown. Worse, he is denouncing Yahowah’s instructions to observe the *Mow’ed Miqra’ey* at their designated times in the spring, summer, and fall seasons, meeting with God in the first, third, and seventh months of the year. By so doing, there is no hope of salvation. And finally, the reference to years is designed to negate the observance of the *Yowbel*, designating the time when debts are forgiven and slaves are freed. As a result, Paul’s devotees remain clueless regarding the Towrah’s purpose and the date of God’s imminent return. For Christendom, Paul’s statement was devastating and irrecoverable. All Christians would die.

Those reading along referencing an English bible or even the Nestle-Aland Greek rendition of Paul’s epistle may have noticed that the ninth verse appears to conclude the sentence with a question mark, leaving us to believe that the tenth verse is independent of the ninth’s diabolical hypothesis. However, Papyrus 46 corrects the first word of what would otherwise have been the next sentence, changing “*paratereisoe* – you are observing and attending” to “*paraterountes* – by observing and attending,” thereby combining these thoughts. In so doing, Sha'awl’s statement goes from bad to worse because he is saying that we choose to be controlled and enslaved by Yahowah’s Towrah by observing and attending the *Shabat*, the *Miqra’ey*, and the *Yowbel*.

Therefore, corrected to reflect the oldest extant codex, this same concluding statement reads:

“...by observing and carefully attending (*paraterountes* – by closely examining so as to be present, by taking a stand being perceptive through careful consideration, by paying unremitting attention to, by looking for benefit in by attending; from *para* – from, beside and near and *tereo* – to carefully attend), days (*hemera*), and (*kai*) months (*menas* – using moon phases), and (*kai*) seasons (*kairos* – appropriate or opportune occasions, proper or specific times), and years (*eniautos* – annual solar cycles or eras)?” (Galatians 4:10)

According to Paul, by observing Yahowah’s “days,” His “months and seasons,” and His “years,” and therefore by accepting Yahowah’s Invitations to Meet with Him and attending His Feasts is one of the ways God enslaves and controls humankind. It was the next logical step in Sha'awl’s thesis. Having

separated the Ma'aseyah from the Torah, he is now separating mankind from God.

More deceitful, deadly, destructive, and damning than any words ever written, those Paul scribed 1,963 years ago have precluded billions of souls from knowing Yahowah. Christians do not observe the Shabat, attend the Miqra'ey, or understand the Yowbel – and thus cannot engage in a relationship with God and cannot be saved. They do not know what these days, months, seasons, and years represent. Most find them despicable.

Paul's message was translated by Jerome in the Latin Vulgate to say: "But then indeed, not knowing God, you served them who, by nature, are not gods. But now, after that you have known God, or rather are known by God: how turn you again to the weak and needy elements which you desire to serve again? You observe days and months and times, and years."

Copying the Catholics, the Authorized Protestant King James Version said something fairly similar: "Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years."

The NLT's liberal interpretation is more in keeping with Christianity's antagonism for the Torah, and especially Yahowah's instructions regarding His Sabbath, Invitations to Meet, and Yowbel Redemptive years. "Before you Gentiles knew God, you were slaves to so-called gods that do not even exist. So now that you know God (or should I say, now that God knows you), why do you want to go back again and become slaves once more to the weak and useless spiritual principles of this world? You are trying to earn favor with God by observing certain days or months or seasons or years."

While the New Living Translation is dead wrong, they have accurately conveyed Sha'uw'l's intended message. He is obviously demeaning the heart of the Torah: Yahowah's Sabbath (where we learn that we cannot work for our salvation), His seven Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God (where we are freed from death, our sins are forgiven, we are adopted into the Covenant, and are enriched and empowered), and His Redemptive Year of God's Lamb (where souls are freed and debts are forgiven). So in his first denunciation of specific aspects of Yahowah's Word, the wannabe Apostle has renounced the essence of God's plan of reconciliation and salvation.

On my first pass through this material, I was focused on translating one verse at a time, and thereby lost sight of the context within which these thoughts were encapsulated. And at that time, I was predisposed to render each of Paul's

statements as consistently with Yahowah's overall message as the words themselves would allow. So I evaluated this trilogy of verses as if Paul was assailing pagan traditions and festivals, especially those observed by the Persians, Romans, and Greeks, whereby they worshipped gods predicated upon the natural and physical world.

And while I will share where that thought process led, as it is always beneficial to understand the nature of religious counterfeits, I must now admit that my "*metanoeo* – attitude, perspective, and thinking has changed" based upon a more contextual, careful, and complete review of Paul generally and Galatians specifically. Based upon what he has said thus far in Galatians 2:16 through 4:7, and what he will say in verses 4:21 through 4:31, the inescapable conclusion is that all of this represents a singular doctrinal statement. According to Paul: "the Torah enslaves and must be rejected."

Here then is a summation of this devastating trilogy of Pauline statements. And while I understand that we have gone over this before, second only to properly conveying the meaning of the words themselves, context provides the basis for understanding:

"So I say, as long as the heir exists childish and immature, he is no different than a slave, belonging to the lord and master who owns and controls everyone and everything. (4:1) Certainly, he is under the auspices of foremen who control the workers and administrators until the previously appointed time set of the father. (4:2) And also, in this way, it follows that when we were infants, under the elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology (*stoicheion*), we were subservient slaves. (4:3) But when came the fullness of the unspecified time, the god sent out the Son of him, originating from a woman, having been under Towrah (*nomos*) (4:4) in order that the ones under Towrah (*nomos*), he might buy back in order to the son set we might receive back and obtain from. (4:5) But because you are sons sent out the god, the spirit into the hearts of us shouts, 'Abba'—the Father. (4:6) So as a result, you no longer exist as a slave, but to the contrary a Son. But now if a Son and an heir by the chance casting of lots through a god. (4:7)

Certainly on the other hand, not having known or acknowledged god, you were enslaved to nature, not existing as gods. (4:8) But now having known god, but what's more, having been known under god, how have you returned, changing your beliefs back upon the incapacitating and incompetent, the worthless, belittling, and terrifying elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology representing the inadequate, simplistic, and improperly formed first step which back again and again from above you are choosing to be controlled as a slave (4:9) by

observing and carefully attending days, and months, and seasons, and years?” (4:10)

As affirmation of this abomination, Paul first introduced the concept of our “inheritance,” in Galatians 3:18, whereby he disassociated the Torah from God’s “promise to Abraham to forgive us.” Subsequently, Paul asked, “So why then this Towrah?” clearly referring to the Word of God, as he would have no reason to explain the origin of human edicts. By the 19th verse, Paul spoke of the Towrah existing only “until the prescribed Messenger’s arrival” – the opposite of what the Messenger, Himself, said.

Then in the second half of the 21st verse, the man with the audacity to contradict God’s Word while claiming to be His Apostle, claimed that no one has been made right with God based upon the Towrah, which further undermined any attempt to pin the blame for man’s enslavement on worldly schemes. “Scripture” remained the subject of the 22nd verse, where Paul used *hypo* to speak of **“but to the contrary, the writing imposed restrictions, completely shutting the door on heaven, imprisoning everything under error and evil,”** just as he used *hypo* in the first three verses of the fourth chapter to speak of us being childish slaves under the control of oppressive authority figures—themselves apparently representing the Torah’s tendency to enslave.

So it was in the midst of this that we were confronted with Galatians 3:25, **“But now having come the Faith, no longer do we exist under an old fashioned and strict disciplinarian,”** whereby a direct comparison was made to Galatians 4:1-3: **“So I say, as long as the heir exists childish and immature, he is no different than a slave, belonging to the lord and master who owns and controls everyone and everything. (4:1) Certainly, he is under the auspices of foremen who control the workers and administrators until the previously appointed time set of the Father. (4:2) And also, in this way, it follows that when we were infants, under the elementary teachings and rudimentary principles of religious mythology, we were subservient slaves.” (4:3)** Therefore, Sha’uwl’s “lord and master” is the “Towrah,” effectively destroying any chance we had of redeeming his testimony by subsequently disassociating the “foremen,” “managers,” “mythological region,” or “enslavement” from being associated with the Torah.

Stroke by stroke, word by word, Paul is building his case against Yahowah, His Word, and His plan of reconciliation and salvation. And he will stop at nothing, including demeaning the Disciples, misquoting Scripture, contradicting Yahowsha’, and twisting God’s Word, to establish himself and his doctrine. It is Paul versus God and all of His witnesses and prophets. If Paul hasn’t become the Adversary, he is, at the very least, his messenger.

Men are enslaved by other men and their religious and political schemes, not by nature or by God. Moreover, Yahowsha' did not come to liberate anyone from the Torah, but instead to fulfill the Torah's promises and thereby provide eternal salvation.

We come to know Yahowah through the Towrah and the Prophets, and yet Paul has only presented mutilated snippets of five verses thus far from them—all of which he has twisted. And there is no reason to assume that his preaching (at least in content) would have been any better than his writing.

Coming to know Yahowah as He presents Himself in the Torah, results in God coming to know us. Yahowah doesn't, however, know those who don't know Him. Respecting Yahowah and His revelation results in being valued sufficiently by God to be adopted into His family. But those who don't revere God enough to study His Word (a.k.a., the Towrah) are excluded from His family.

Those who don't know and understand the Towrah remain particularly susceptible to Paul's doctrinal delusions. And that poses a particularly difficult problem for Christians because they have been conditioned by Paul to ignore the Towrah. They don't, therefore, know what they are missing, and they miss the fact that by demeaning it, Paul was contradicting the God he claimed to represent.

This presents a conundrum. If we encourage Christians to study the Towrah before rejecting Paul, they will not be open to it and thus will remain adverse to Yahowah and His plan of salvation. And yet, the most effective way to encourage Christian's to reject Paul is to compare this man's letters with God's teaching. Those who are rational will adjust their perspective, thinking, and attitude, recognizing that it is irrational to believe that God inspired a man to contradict Him.

After falsely testifying that the recipients of his preaching knew God and were also known by Him, the wannabe Apostle backtracked, suggesting that the Galatians were now orphaned. If that were true, then our salvation would be predicated upon our fidelity as opposed to God's provision, and our spiritual rebirth would be temporal, not eternal. If this were possible, heaven would have to be equipped with a revolving door. And for Paul's pleading to have any merit, so would hell.

But this egomaniac's errant theology pales in comparison to his abysmal attitude toward God. By asking the Galatians "how can you 'return'" to "the initial teachings (a.k.a., the Torah), Paul is implying that his preaching was vastly superior to Yahowah's teachings. And by calling God's plan a "worthless and incompetent initial step," he is suggesting that only a fool would choose to trust God's solution over his.

To which the man who played his audience as if they were fools, said that by choosing to observe the Torah, such individuals were choosing to be controlled as if they were slaves. That means that rather than freeing His children from bondage in Egypt, Paul would have you believe that Yahowah's domineering persona dragged His people away from the liberty they enjoyed in the Promised Land and then forced them to serve as slaves in Egypt.

But let's pretend for a moment that Sha'awl's view of Yahowah is correct, that God was a despicable deity, that He was completely incompetent, even counterproductive, and that His plan was incapable of freeing anyone, much less saving them. Who then was Sha'awl speaking on behalf of? Was Sha'awl going to save his believers based upon his authority and power, or were they going to have to rely on the same mean-spirited, counterproductive, and unreliable God Sha'awl repeatedly demeaned?

If you have not studied, and thus do not intimately understand, the spirit behind Yahowah's special day, the Sabbath (where we learn that we cannot work for our salvation and come to appreciate the nature of God's plan), the purpose of Yahowah's seven special monthly meeting times, or Invitations (wherein God delineates the path to salvation, adoption, and heaven), or Yahowah's Yowbel years (whereby we are asked to forgive all debts and free all people as a way of acknowledging that we appreciate what God is willing to do for us), then please invest the time to read the first two volumes of *Yada Yah* found at www.YadaYah.com.

Rather than facilitating our freedom from man's works-based religious schemes, rather than providing the means to our salvation, rather than enabling our adoption into our Heavenly Father's family by way of His Covenant, Sha'awl would have you believe that we become "controlled and enslaved by observing and attending certain days, months, seasons and years. And yet the most important elements in Yahowah's plan of adoption and of salvation are delineated thereby. The very days, months, seasons, and years Yahowah observed and attended have been recast as God's means to control and enslave His creation. When it comes to twisting, even inverting, Yahowah's Word, and revising, even contradicting, His plan, this is as bad as bad ever gets.

By connecting the message presented in verses nine and ten, as is required by reason and the evidence found in the oldest surviving manuscript of Galatians, it becomes impossible to overlook Paul's hatred of the Torah, and specifically his antagonism toward "observing and attending" Yahowah's set-apart times for us to meet each week and year. This passage cannot be seen as anything other than an assault on the Sabbath, Passover, Un-Yeasted Bread, First-Born Children, Seven Sabbaths, Trumpets, Reconciliations, Shelters, and the Yowbel years, whereby the self-proclaimed "Apostle" would have those who believe him reject the core

aspects of God's plan even though each element was described as an "eternal and everlasting prescription" in the Torah.

Therefore, for Paul to be right, the God whose plan he had rejected and demeaned would have had to have given Paul the authority to contradict Him. But that would make Paul the opposite of Yahowsha' and more competent than Yahowah. Moreover, since Paul claims to speak for Him, it should be noted that the endorsement of a god who needs correcting is as useless as is the advice of that god's apostle.

I've always wondered how Christians reconcile the fact that Yahowsha' meticulously observed the Sabbath, the seven Miqra'ey, and the Yowbel, and that He endured Passover and Unleavened Bread to save us. Yet in complete conflict with the Ma'aseyah's example, Christians justify Sunday worship, Lent, Easter, Halloween, and Christmas based upon Paul's promises. And that means that Paul, not "Jesus Christ," is responsible for the faith of Christianity and serves as its founder and guiding light.

While it is undeniably obvious that Paul was telling the Galatians not to observe any of the key elements of Yahowah's plan of salvation, and to ignore the relationship between these and Yahowsha's life, that is not to say that there weren't other "days, months, times, and years" worth denouncing. For example, the Galatians, as Celtic Gauls, would have been heavily influenced by the Druid religion as well as the Babylonian belief system by way of the Persian influence in the region. Even Greek mythology was spread throughout Galatia during the conquests of Alexander of Macedonia. But by this time, the Galatians were also Romans—and thus compelled to honor the Roman pantheon—which had come to include seeing certain men as gods. Octavian Augustus, for example, had rebuilt a temple in their midst to the Phrygian goddess, Cybele, calling it the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, or the Temple of Augustus and Rome in Ancyra, to venerate himself. It retains the extant text of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, "The Deeds of the Divine Augustus," on its interior walls.

According to Acts 14, Paul and Barnabas were called "Zeus and Hermes" during one of their visits after they had participated in the healing of a lame man. Pagan priests offered sacrifices to them. But when they refused, Paul alleges that Jews from Antioch persuaded the crowds to drag him out of town to stone him. And if true, which I doubt, it would make these people highly impressionable.

In the context of worshipping Zeus (king of the gods) and Hermes (messenger of the gods), it would have been appropriate for Paul to do what he did not do: denounce the assimilation of Roman, Greek, and Babylonian mythological holidays, and the celebration of them instead of observing God's instructions as Christians have done. For example, Dionysus, the god of grapes and wine, died

each winter and was said to be resurrected each spring. This “renewal” became an annual religious festival celebrating the promise of resurrection from the dead. Held over the course of five days each Spring, the Dionysia set the stage for the Christian replacement of Passover, Unleavened Bread, and FirstFruits, with Palm Sunday (“Passion Sunday”), Maundy Thursday (“institution of Communion”), Good Friday (“death and burial of Jesus Christ”), Holy Saturday (where “Jesus rested in the grave”), and Easter Sunday occurring during the last week of the Babylonian festival of Lent.

Similarly misguided practices are observed today in astrology, especially with the horoscope. As evidence of this, those who promote astrology say: “Days of the week are also associated with Sun signs and Planets and have their own Lucky Days,” to which some list each astrological sign along with its propitious time. And then they claim “numerology can help you predict your Lucky Days, and the destiny of your life based upon your birthday number, because it is your life number.” Recognizing that all of this was conceived in Babylon, and assimilated into Judaism during their captivity, it’s worth noting that had Paul not been so fixated on demeaning God’s Word, there were aspects of the Babylonian religion which were incorporated into rabbinical Judaism which were deserving of criticism.



Moving on to the next statement, Paul changes gears. We find him momentarily tabling his animosity for the Torah in favor of promoting himself. While these verses have no value spiritually, they are revealing, in that they paint a troubling picture of a tormented individual.

The Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear rendition of Galatians 4:11 reads: “**I fear you not perhaps without cause have labored in you.**” More comprehensively translated (and recognizing that Papyrus 46 corrects the perfect “*kopiao* – have labored” to the aorist “*ekopiasa* – had labored”), I think he was trying to say:

“I am afraid and fear (*poboumai* – I am alarmed, frightened, and concerned) for you (*umas*) that maybe (*me* – perhaps expecting a negative outcome) somehow (*pos* – in some way) without reason (*eike* – without purpose or result in vain and for nothing) I have grown tired struggling and laboring (*kopiao* – I have grown weary, emotionally fatigued, and discouraged showing effort) toward you (*eis umas*).” (Galatians 4:11)

As is the case with most annoying habits that simply won't go away, Sha'awl has misspoken once again. Those who faithfully present Yahowah's message never labor in vain. Even when God's Word is rejected, our witness serves a purpose—even if it just leaves people without excuse.

And there is nothing to fear. Souls who ignore or reject God's invitation to participate in His Covenant aren't punished as Christian mythology portends. So there is great joy when someone comes to know Yahowah, but we are not anguished even when a thousand choose otherwise.

Our job is to prepare ourselves by studying Yahowah's Word, so that when we go out, we accurately convey His message. How God's plan of salvation is received isn't our responsibility. Therefore, Sha'awl's lament is inappropriate and self-centered. He is once again wrong.

The KJV's take on this passage is peculiar: "I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." Albeit their misrepresentation should not be surprising since it's readily apparent that they translated the Latin Vulgate: "I am afraid of you, lest perhaps I have laboured in vain among you." While the NLT isn't accurate, it's less inaccurate: "I fear for you. Perhaps all my hard work with you was for nothing."

In the words which follow, Paul issues a command that would not even be appropriate if he was God. And since every statement he has made thus far has been inaccurate, ungodly, and injurious, since he may have been the most caustic man who ever lived, by ordering everyone who reads this letter to become like him, Paul has become delusional to the point of being psychotic, and his statements have become counterproductive to the point of being suicidal. And this is not the worst of it. He compounds this megalomania with a claim of perfection.

The Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 27th Edition with McReynolds English Interlinear presents the command and proclamation as follows: "Become as I that also as you brothers I beg you. Nothing me you did unright." But this rendition is both inadequate and incomplete, in that it fails to convey much of what was actually scribed by Sha'awl.

This command and this assessment are so outrageous, let's be especially deliberate in our analysis and consider and convey the implications of every tense, mood, voice, case, and particle. Therefore, completely and accurately recounted, Paul wrote:

“You all must become (*ginomai* (scribed *ginesthe*) – you are all presently commanded to come to be, continuing to exist (in the present tense the action must commence at once and continue into the future, in the middle passive, the reader is being acted upon and will be affected and influenced by their response,

in the imperative this is a command, and in the second person plural this is directed at everyone reading this letter)) **like** (*os* – the same as (conjunction (making a connection) adverbial (functioning like an adverb elaborating on the verb must become to reveal the purpose and the result) comparative)) **I** (*ego* – me (the nominative singular tells the reader that they are to become and be like the writer)).

Then I (*oti kago* – because also I namely by way of explanation (adverbial causal emphatic demonstrating the basis or grounds for an active and demonstrative prioritization and response to turn a direct assertion into an indirect claim)) **as a result like** (*os* – the same as (conjunction (making a connection) adverbial (functioning like an adverb elaborating on the verb must become to reveal the purpose and the result) comparative)) **you all become** (*umeis* – all of you becoming (nominative plural conveying you all to be) **called brothers in the faith** (*adelphoi* – fellow believers (in the vocative this indicates that they will be directly addressed as religious brothers)), **the means I want to compel, to bind, and to control** (*deomai* – the way I ask to possess, so I beg and plead to have supernatural power over and imprison, and I desire and want to throw into chains and restrict, wishing to forcibly obligate; from *deo* – to bind, tie, and fasten, to restrict, chain, and imprison, speaking of satanic demon possession through a controlling messenger, and to make ill and obligate to the authority of another (present (now and in the future) middle passive (the writer is being influenced by someone else and is being affected by his own desire to control) indicative (the mood of reality and assertion) first person singular)) **you all** (*umon* – all of you (in the genitive case the pronoun is being restricted to a specific characterization and marks a possessive relationship)).

In no way (*ouden* – in not even one thing at all (adjective accusative modifying a noun which is a direct object of a verb)) **were you wronged, harmed, or treated unjustly as a result of fraud** (*adikeo* – were you violated, mistreated, or injured, were you deceived in a wicked, destructive, or sinful manner; from *adikos* – to violate and treat unjustly through fraud and deceit (aorist active indicative – at a point in time in the past as a result of something done)) **by me** (*me* – with myself (in the accusative the writer is the direct object of the verb)).” (Galatians 4:12)

Bereft of the Greek terminology and full amplifications, Paul conveyed: **“You all must become and are commanded to exist like I. Then I as an emphatic priority as a result like you all become called brothers and fellow believers, the means I want to compel, to bind, and to control you all. In no way were you wronged, harmed, or treated unjustly as a result of fraud by me.”** (4:12)

According to the Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament, when *ginomai* “speaks of persons,” as it is doing here, they are being asked to “be born and appear” in a certain way – in this case, to appear like Paul and to be born of the same spirit that possessed Paul. Not only would that be destructive, deadly, and damning, the edict to make Paul, not Yahowsha’, the example to be followed and emulated was scribed in the imperative mood, making it a command. In the second person plural, it is for “you all” and thus for everyone reading this letter. The middle voice signifies that the subject, who in this case would be the reader, is being affected, influencing themselves, by their response. And the passive voice tells us that the reader is being acted upon as well. This voice is used by Paul as the “divine passive” to infer that he is an agent of god.

Very few people would be sufficiently impressed with themselves to suggest that others should imitate their behavior, as Paul is proposing here. In so doing, he has crossed the line from pretending to speak for Yahowsha’ to pretending to be the Ma’aseyah. Yahowsha’s life is the only one worth emulating. (Although, based upon many of the emails I have received, most of those who tell others to “behave more like Jesus” have no concept what He was like. After all, Christians would have to be Torah observant to follow Yahowsha’s example.)

Paul’s emphatic priority is to win back the souls who have rejected him. He wants them to become “brothers” in the sense of “fellow believers” because as the founder and sole advocate of the Faith, this gives Paul absolute control over them. By writing “*deomai umon* – the means I desire to compel, possess, and control you all,” Sha’uwl left no doubt as to his purpose in promoting his Faith. Based on “*deo* – to bind and tie (which is the basis of the Latin and English word “religion”), to fasten and restrict, to throw into chains and thereby to forcibly control and obligate,” *deomai* simply adds “desire” to this end. If all Paul wanted to convey was his will in this regard, he would have used *thelo*, because it does not carry any of the oppressive religious baggage.

Paul also claimed that he did nothing wrong, writing: “In no way whatsoever were you wronged or treated unjustly as a result of fraud by me.” But had he proclaimed: “I have said nothing right,” it would have been much closer to the truth – making his remarks delusional and disingenuous in the extreme. And yet setting his treachery aside, with these past two statements, the wannabe Apostle has begun to sound more like a wannabe god. And that perhaps is why he felt no compunction against telling us that his way was superior to God’s.

It should also be noted that in between these egotistical pontifications, Sha’uwl’s positioning was duplicitous. As a chameleon, he was always willing to change his colors based upon what he thought would win the favor of his audience. If these folks were Gentiles, as is suspected, then apart from his new

religion, he was lying with “then I like you become brothers,” but if they were Jews, who were Paul’s adversaries in this community?

The Catholic and Protestant religious renderings of this passage read: “Be ye as I, because I also am as you brethren, I beseech you. You have not injured me at all.” (LV) And: “Brethren, I beseech you, be as I am; for I am as ye are: ye have not injured me at all.” (KJV)

To help demonstrate the inaccuracy of the New Living Translation, here, once again, is the Nestle-Aland rendering of this repulsive proposition: “Become as I that also as you brothers I beg you. Nothing me you did unright.” Allegedly rendering their translation from the same base text, the New Living Translation published: “Dear brothers and sisters, I plead with you to live as I do in freedom from these things, for I have become like you Gentiles—free from those laws. You did not mistreat me when I first preached to you.” Once again, there is almost no correlation between Paul’s Greek and the words found in the NLT.

The more challenging Sha’uwl’s message is to decipher, the more comfortable I am with the idea of introducing you to his terminology by way of the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear. This isn’t because I think that their translation is particularly accurate, but instead, their grammatically literal, albeit simplistic, approach to the Greek text helps reinforce just how difficult the task of translating Galatians has become. Therefore, the NAMI reads: “You know but that through weakness of the flesh I told good message to you the former.”

The one advantage of this proclamation is that it affirms that Sha’uwl, himself, is to blame for the deficiencies in this letter that make it so difficult to translate.

“But (de) you realize (oida – you recognize and acknowledge) that (hoti) because of (dia – by way of and through) an incapacity, weakness, and limitation (astheneia – an illness and timidity, a lack of strength and frailty, an infirmity and ailment, a lack of insight and feeling of inadequacy) in the flesh (tes sarx – of the physical body or human nature), I announced the healing messenger and beneficial message (euangelizo) to you all (umin) this (to) previously (proteros – before, formerly, or earlier in the first place).” (Galatians 4:13)

Since Sha’uwl revealed precisely what was causing his “timidity, incapacity, and limitation in the flesh” in his letter to Corinth, it is again pertinent here.

“Because (gar) if (ean) I might want (thelo) to brag (dauchaomai), truthfully (aletheia), I would not be (ouk esomai) foolish or imprudent (aphron). For then (gar) I will say (ero) I am presently abstaining (pheidomai). But (de) someone (tis) not (un) approaching (eis) me (eme) might ponder

(logizomai) beyond (hyper) what (o) he sees (blepo) in me (me), or (e) something (ti) he hears (akouo) from (ek) me (emou), (12:6) and of the (kai te) extraordinary superiority of the exaggerated (hyperbole ton) revelations (apokalypsis). Therefore (dio), in order that (hina) I not become overly proud and be lifted up (me hyperairomai), there was given to me (didomi ego) a sharp goad and troubling thorn (skolops) in the body (te sarx), a spiritual messenger (aggelos) of Satan (Satan), in order to (hina) strike and restrain and incapacitate me (kolaphizo), so that as a result (hina) at the present time there is the possibility that I might not be conceited, currently exalting myself beyond what would be justified, so as not to be able to be insolent or audacious, lifting myself up (me hyperairomai).” (2 Corinthians 12:6-7)

Therefore, Paul’s statement is troubling, especially in this context.

If we can get beyond the issues associated with demon-possession, this letter continues to be more about Paul than about the nature of the message he should have been proclaiming and explaining. And such is the case with all of Paul’s epistles. They focus on Paul’s life not Yahowsha’s, and on Paul’s message not Yahowah’s. Thus far, Paul hasn’t accurately quoted a single line of Scripture, nor has he conveyed anything which would help anyone understand Yahowah’s nature, Yahowsha’s purpose, Yahowah’s Word or His plan of salvation. The relatively few partially accurate statements he has made haven’t contributed to anyone’s understanding because he hasn’t supported any of his positions with the proper citations. And the preponderance of what he has written has been inaccurate and/or incomprehensible.

No matter which standard you deploy, whether it is Yahowah’s Deuteronomy 13 or 18 tests or just the overall inconsistency with God’s Word, whether it is the writing quality, the plethora of internal contradictions, or the onslaught of logical fallacies, you’d have to be ignorant, irrational, or religious to consider the Galatians epistle “Scripture,” as in the sense of being “inspired by God.” But worse, even as one man’s opinion, Galatians isn’t even remotely helpful. In fact, this letter has been overwhelmingly counterproductive. Its only value has been to artificially evaluate Paul. And in that light, the verdict is dire.

The Christian renderings of this latest proclamation are as follows. The Catholic Latin Vulgate reads: “**And you know how, through infirmity of the flesh, I preached the *evangelizavi* to you heretofore: and your temptation in my flesh.**” The Authorized Protestant King James says: “**Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first.**” And the Evangelical New Living Translation published: “**Surely you remember that I was sick when I first brought you the Good News.**”

This next sentence is difficult to understand, not only because it is awkwardly written, but because we do not know what occurred during Sha'awl's last visit with these folks, nor do we know what has transpired since. So as hard as this letter is to translate, it is even harder to interpret. And along these lines, Papyrus 46 replaces the initial *umon* with *mou*, changing "you" to "me" in the initial clause. Further, it excludes *oude ekptuo*, "nor reject" in the middle of the sentence, leaving us with the NAMI unwilling to acknowledge the oldest manuscript, and preferring the majority rendering instead, publishing: "And the pressure of you in the flesh of me not you despised but not you spit out but as messenger of God you welcomed me as Christ Jesus."

Continuing to complain about the restraints imposed upon him by Satan, according to the oldest extant codex, Sha'awl scribed: "**And (kai) my temptation to prove my integrity** (*mou peirasmos* – my submission to another, my examination and test regarding consistency, fidelity, and virtue, my enticement which serves as the means to learn the true nature of my character of the reason for trying to prove myself; from *peirazo* – to try to see if something can be done, to attempt and endeavor to make a trial or test to reveal one's thinking regarding the other side) **in (en) my (mou) flesh** (*sarx* – physical body or human nature), **you did not ridicule, despise, or reject** (*ou exoutheneo* – you did not disdain, look down upon, make light of, treat with contempt, or disregard) [**nor (oude) reject** (*ekptuo* – scorn, spurn or loathe)].

To the contrary (*alla* – certainly and by contrast) **like** (*os* – because as in such a way or in the same way) **a spiritual messenger** (*aggelos* – a divine representative and heavenly envoy who was sent with a message) **of god** (ΘΥ), **you received and believed** (*dechomai* – you welcomed, entertained, and accepted) **me** (*me*) **as** (*os* – one who is like) **Christon 'Iesoun** (XN IN – divine placeholders for the Ma'aseyah (Implement Doing the Work of Yah) Yahowsha' (Yah Saves), but since this epistle has striven to disassociate Yahowsha' from Yahowah and the Ma'aseyah from the Towrah, it would be misleading to connect that which the author has severed)." (Galatians 4:14)

There are four problems with this statement, yet everything which was said contributes to our understanding of Sha'awl—a man named after the place he has led billions of souls. First, he continues to be fixated upon himself. It would be one thing for him to say that he was unqualified for this mission, as that would be honest, relevant, and useful. But there is nothing to be gained by wallowing in one's own temptations, especially when they reveal demon-possession, insanity, violent hostility, and sexual decadence. But I suppose that it is Paul's way of saying that his suffering was more important than Yahowsha's.

In this regard, *peirasmos* is yet another in a long list of terms indicting Sha'awl and his Christian audience. As is often the case with Satan's messengers,

they are so enamored with their perceived superiority and so dismissive of humanity's lack of mental acuity, they flaunt their ability to beguile the faithful. He, himself, is tempting readers because he knows that most will be unwilling to examine his lack of consistency and integrity so as to learn the truth about his character and his desire to present such a contrarian view.

Exoutheneo sets a very low bar. It is hard to imagine the founder of a religion, arguably the most infamous man who ever lived, telling the Galatians that they “did not ridicule or reject him, neither despising or disdain” him. Considering his propensity for *ad hominem* attacks on his opponents, that's almost funny.

Second, *aggelos* is a loaded word, especially in this context. It implies that Paul was “a heavenly messenger, a divine representative, and spiritual envoy sent by God,” all of which was blatantly untrue. *Aggelos* was used in Luke 1:26 to describe Gabriel / Gabry'el when the spiritual envoy visited with Mary / Miryam. It was used in Mark 1:2 to speak of the divine and prophetic witness of John / Yahowchanan the Baptist. And it was used in Mattanyah 25:41 in the context of the judgment awaiting those enduring the Tribulation, destining those estranged from God to spend their eternity separated from Him along with the other “spiritual messengers – *aggelos*” who were in league with Satan—better known as demons.

Third, as we have just reminded ourselves, in a direct reference to Satan's “*aggelos* – spiritual messengers and representatives, Sha'awl told the world in his second letter to the Corinthians that the trial he endured in the flesh was a sharp pointed stick (a goad used to control animals) which was wielded by one of Satan's “*aggelos* – demons.” And in actuality, the evidence Sha'awl personally provides in his letters confirms that he was Satan's implement, not Yahowah's. So, the Galatians should have been repulsed by this, and as a result, they should have rejected Sha'awl. Fortunately, most did.

And fourth, Sha'awl's use of *os*, translated “even as” before “Christon 'Iesoun,” is arrogant and inappropriate, because by using *os*, Paul is “comparing” himself to Yahowsha'. This notion is reinforced by the fact that the Greek word *os* (spelled omicron sigma) is based upon “*os*” (this time spelled omega sigma) which means “who.” Therefore, by using *os*, Paul has called himself: “a spiritual representative and heavenly messenger from God who is like (*os*) Christon Iesoun.” So even if Paul had not otherwise incriminated himself, the hubris associated with making such a statement is grotesque.

Jerome wrote the following for his pope, recognizing that the religious potentate viewed himself similarly to Paul: “[You despised not, nor rejected: but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.](#)” Serving an equally

deceived and egotistical political master, the KJV penned: “And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.”

While this isn't a translation of the Greek text, the NLT is rendered as Paul intended, which is one of many reasons we should be so critical of him. “But even though my condition tempted you to reject me, you did not despise me or turn me away. No, you took me in and cared for me as though I were an angel from God or even Christ Jesus himself.” And yet according to a manuscript written 1,900 years earlier than either the Nestle-Aland or the New Living Translation, it is obvious that Sha'awl said that the temptation was his trial, not a test for the Galatians.

The best face we can honestly put on this discussion is that it was misguided and it is irrelevant to our understanding of God or the path to Him. The message quality remains as deficient as the writing quality. But don't take my word for it, consider the NAMI's: “Where then the fortunateness of you I testify for to you that if power the eyes of you having dug out you gave to me.” If that is the inspired word of Sha'awl's god through his spiritual messenger, I opt for the God who created the universe, conceived DNA, and authored the Towrah. And it just gets worse the closer we look (at least while we can still look)...

“Where (*pou*), therefore (*oun* – accordingly and consequently then), the (*o*) declaration of blessedness (*makarismos* – the pronouncement of happiness and joy) of yours (*umon*)? I witness and testify (*martyreo* – I declare based upon first-hand knowledge and confirm through eyewitness experience) because (*gar*) of you (*umin*) that (*oti*) if (*ei*) possible (*dynatos* – able and competent), the eyes (*tous ophthalmos*) of you (*umon*) having dug out (*exorysso* – having torn, gouged, and plucked out) you gave (*didomi* – you produced and assigned) to me (*moi*).” (Galatians 4:15)

Since Paul has twice called the Galatians ignorant and irrational, how is it that he is expecting them to “proclaim how blessed” they feel. More curious still, how is it that Paul equates “joy” to “plucking out one's eyes?” Why would the living give their eyes to someone who can already see, unless it was to keep them unaware, and thus blind?

But all of the ugliness vanishes when seen through the rose-colored glasses worn by the NLT: “Where is that joyful and grateful spirit you felt then? I am sure you would have taken out your own eyes and given them to me if it had been possible.”

Their predecessors were more literal. LV: “Where is then your blessedness? For I bear you witness that, if it could be done, you would have plucked out your own eyes and would have given them to me.” KJV: “Where is then the

blessedness ye spake of? for I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me.”

Now that this has gone from demonic to sadistic, it is becoming ever more difficult to share Paul’s words without grimacing. But we are committed to seeing this through, right to the bitter end. With our goal in sight, the next plank in walking into the valley of death, the NAMI reads: “**So that hostile of you I have become telling truth to you.**” So from brothers to victims and now to foes, this is painful to read...

“So as a result (*hoste*), a hostile and despised adversary (*echthros* – hated enemy and odious foe) of yours (*umon*) I have become (*ginomai*) telling the truth (*aletheuo* – speaking no lies) to you (*umin*).” (Galatians 4:16)

Paul had become what the Galatians had implied, but not for the reason he suggested. Like the Adversary, Paul had lied to them.

With each new line, Galatians is becoming ever more like the Qur’an, both in tone and style. The Meccan surahs read like a never-ending argument between Muhammad and his neighbors, with the Allah’s Messenger constantly protesting that his signs and wonders were proof that he should be believed by a community that considered him demon-possessed and crazy as a loon. But in all fairness, the Qur’an’s rants are easier to read, because in Muhammad’s recital, the arguments on both sides are presented. With Paul, all we have is his response. But like the Qur’an, Paul’s letters are peppered with the names of Scriptural personages for credibility sake, even though the narrative is otherwise self-serving, self-aggrandizing, and argumentative.

The comparison of demonic doctrines noted, here are the translations for your consideration. LV: “**Am I then become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?**” KJV: “**Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?**” NLT: “**Have I now become your enemy because I am telling you the truth?**”

Since we only know one side of this argument, as we approach this next statement, we do not know who was stirring the people up, or even what they were promoting. Christian theologians will tell you that they were “Judaizers,” but Jews have seldom if ever proselytized anyone. In all likelihood, Paul’s opponents were Yahowah’s proponents—those who loved His name and His Word.

Since this was poorly written, even by Paul’s deplorable standards, let’s consider the Nestle-Aland McReynolds Interlinear: “**They are jealous you not well but to close out you they want that them you might be jealous.**” And so while it requires altering the order of the words, this appears to be what Sha’uwl was trying to convey...

“They are jealous (*zeloo* – they are deeply concerned and envious, coveting) **of you** (*umas*), **not** (*ou*) **rightly** (*kalos* – good, morally, attractively, healthily, or commendably), **but to the contrary** (*alla*), **they want** (*thelo* – they desire and propose) **to exclude and separate** (*ekkleio*) **you** (*umas*), **in order that** (*hina*) **you might be jealous** (*zeloo* – envious or deeply committed, coveting and desiring) **of them** (*autous*).” (Galatians 4:17)

This is the worst form of an *ad hominem* fallacy because the foe isn't even identified. Unaware of what has transpired, or who has done what to whom, it's impossible to objectively ascribe meaning to this criticism. Moreover, since Paul's opponents were promoting the Torah, they would have been trying to unify their audience with Yahowah, not separate them. So it was Paul's domineering nature which is being exposed here. He was afraid that he was losing his control over these people.

Beyond the idiocy of this insult, those who observe the Torah never share its wisdom in hopes that others will be jealous of them. We do it because we want people to be zealous for Yahowah and His Word.

In this case, Jerome's Latin Vulgate is as incomprehensible as Paul's Greek: “They are zealous in your regard not well: but they would exclude you, that you might be zealous for them.” KJV: “They zealously affect you, but not well; yea, they would exclude you, that ye might affect them.” This makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. Excluding someone doesn't make them zealous nor does it cause them to be “affected.”

Putting lipstick on this mythical, kosher pig, the NLT would have you believe Paul said: “Those false teachers are so eager to win your favor, but their intentions are not good. They are trying to shut you off from me so that you will pay attention only to them.” To their credit, I also see this as Paul's desperate attempt to retain his influence over the Galatians. It is one of the many symptoms of insecurity. And had this been what Paul was saying, then we could close the book on Galatians and return to the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms. Separation from Paul is irrelevant. Separation from Yahowah is life and death. If Paul was trying to garner a following, he shouldn't be followed.

After condemning jealousy, Paul is now advocating it. **“But** (*de* – now) **good and right** (*kalos* – moral, attractive, healthy, and commendable) **to be jealous** (*zeloo* – to be deeply concerned and envious, coveting) **in** (*en*) **good and right** (*kalos* – morality and attractiveness) **at all times** (*pantote* – always and forever). **And** (*kai*) **not** (*un*) **only** (*monon* – alone) **in** (*en*) **my** (*me*) **presence** (*to pareimi* – to be present) **with** (*pros* – toward, against, or among) **you** (*umas*).” (Galatians 4:18)

Therefore, according to Paul, what's bad for them is good for you. It is little wonder virtually everyone on the planet rejected him prior to his death.

This has become akin to a campaign speech in which the audience is asked to "believe" the candidate. And like them, Paul has consistently deployed the dreaded negative advertising strategy which plagues most elections. It is as if demeaning his opponents elevated his candidacy.

Directly from the Greek, the NAMI conveys: "Good but to be jealous in good always and not alone in the to be present me toward you." Jerome penned this in his LV: "But be zealous for that which is good in a good thing always: and not only when I am present with you." Parroting what the Catholic wrote, the KJV repeats: "But it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing, and not only when I am present with you." And in their own world, the NLT authored: "If someone is eager to do good things for you, that's all right; but let them do it all the time, not just when I'm with you."

If Paul's message had been about coming to know Yahowah, instead of following him, then his continued presence would have been unnecessary. It's the influence of Yahowah's Word which should have motivated the Galatians to be passionate, not the cult of personality. But Sha'awl was a self-promoter, so in his mind his presence was more important than anything.

This continues to be about Paul, not God. The Galatians were now "children of mine," not our Heavenly Father's sons and daughters. Even his mention of the Ma'aseyah in this context is misleading, because it circumvents the role of the Set-Apart Spirit.

"Children (teknon) of mine (mou) whom (hos) also (palin – furthermore and again) I have birth pangs (odino – I have engaged in the labor of childbirth) as far as (mechri – to the degree or until) that which (hos) might be formed (morphoo – may be fashioned) becoming Christos (XPΣ – divine placeholder for the Ma'aseyah (but without the definite article, the errant *Christos* used as a name is a better grammatical fit than the appropriate title "the Implement Doing the Work of Yah") in (en) you all (umin)." (Galatians 4:19)

This too is dead wrong. Men do not bear children, not even homosexuals like Paul. Those who have been adopted into our Heavenly Father's Covenant family have been born anew from above by way of our Spiritual Mother, the Set-Apart Spirit. They are adopted once they act upon the terms and conditions of the Covenant relationship. And they receive the Covenant's blessings through the annual Invitations to meet with God. There are few aspects of Yahowah's Towrah Teaching more important than this.

In Yahowah's family, there is no pain associated with childbirth. And yet the anguish and sorrow of being estranged from God will be all Paul's children, known as Christians, will ultimately experience.

So by claiming to have "suffered birth pangs" for "my children" Sha'uwl has once again portrayed himself as a twisted surrogate for God. He has established himself as the mother of his Faith.

It is deeply troubling that the Nestle-Aland, after claiming that their 27th edition manuscript was a near perfect representation of the original autographs, ignored the placeholders found in all of the originals and then perpetuated the myth that the Ma'aseyah was "Christ." NAMI: "Children of me whom again I have birth pains until that might be formed Christ in you."

But 1,700 years of religious tradition was too much to buck and still make a buck. After all, Catholicism's Latin Vulgate reads: "My little children, of whom I am in labour again, until Christ be formed in you." Of which the King James translated to produce their Authorized Version: "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you." These translations actually say that Paul served as a surrogate mother "until Christ" who was the "Son" (i.e., male) fulfilled that role. The wannabe Apostle was wrong on both accounts.

Since these mistakes are ridiculous, one must ask: why would Sha'uwl write something this divergent from God's symbolism and from human nature? Did he suffer from gender identity issues as the evidence suggests and Yahowah's testimony affirms? Was this why he was opposed to marriage, and does it explain why he was demeaning toward women? Is it why he expressed his love for Timothy—a man he personally circumcised even though he was belligerently opposed to circumcision? Even celibacy, which Paul promoted, is a perversion of Yahowah's marriage and parental symbolism.

Apart from his animosity toward God's symbols of the Covenant, which are marriage and family, and the specific roles God assigned to the Spirit and Son, Paul's sexual orientation is irrelevant, with a couple of caveats. According to Daniel's prophecy, Satan's Messenger will be a homosexual and Yahowah told us that Sha'uwl would be fascinated by male genitalia.

Swallowing Paul's repositioning, and regurgitating his delusion, the New Living Translation affirms that he was the "mother of the faithful," compounding the author's vanity, and affirming that this man gave birth to the religion of Christianity. "Oh, my dear children! I feel as if I'm going through labor pains for you again, and they will continue until Christ is fully developed in your lives." After removing Yahowah from their lives by renouncing the Torah, and after negating the purpose of the Ma'aseyah by separating Him from the Torah, it is

Sha'awl's intent to personally fill the void he has created. This is the essence of Pauline Doctrine.

A mother longs to be with her children, to comfort and nurture them, just as a father longs to support them, but these are our Spiritual Mother's and Heavenly Father's roles in our lives, not Paul's. And just a moment ago, Sha'awl was demeaning these same individuals. He said that he had wasted his time with them. But now feeling motherly...

“But (*de* – now) I would purpose (*thelo* – I would desire and want) to be present (*pareimi* – to arrive and to come) with (*pros* – to against, toward, or among) you (*umas*) now (*arti* – immediately) and (*kai*) to change (*allasso* – to cause a difference by altering the nature or character, exchanging or substituting, transforming) my (*mou*) voice (*ten phone* – the sound or tone of speech or the language) because (*hoti*) I am at a loss (*aporeo* – I am perplexed and puzzled, doubting and embarrassed, uncertain and don't know what to do, even disturbed) in (*en*) you (*umin*).” (Galatians 4:20)

Paul would indeed change his tone, and deploy a different tactic. His second and third letters, which were written to the Thessalonians, were sickeningly syrupy and sweet, except for his ongoing hatred of his own race.

And yet, had he been telling the truth, the tone of Sha'awl's voice, his style, would have been irrelevant. But deceivers deceive by pretending to be the opposite of what they really are. The Towrahless One, known as the “Antichrist,” isn't going to burst onto the scene by announcing that he is Satan's envoy, but instead will endear himself by pretending to be the world's savior. Even in the end, when the charade is no longer necessary, Satan's ambassador is going to present the fallen spirit who inspires him as “God,” rather than the “Adversary.” We are witnessing similar duplicity in Sha'awl's testimony.

And don't miss the fact that Paul doesn't know what to do, what to say, or how to react because he does not know Yahowah. When it comes to introducing souls to our Heavenly Father and then to nurturing His children on His Word, those who know Yahowah are never at a loss because He provided instructions regarding what we should say and guidance on what we should do.

But with Paul it is much worse that just being befuddled. He is distraught and embarrassed. He knows that he has ruined their lives, and worse, Yahowsha's Disciples exposed him for the fraud that he had become. It is why Paul would die alone, without a single supporter.

One of the many problems associated with “faith” is that it is enhanced and fades in relation to the source of the inspiration. The unthinking become particularly susceptible to cults of personality. Religious sects also succeed by

insulating the participants, surrounding them with other “believers,” and isolating them from skeptics. With this in mind, the Nestle-Aland’s McReynolds Interlinear translation attests that Paul’s faith was wavering as a result of his failures in Galatia: “I would want but to be present to you now and to change the sound of me because I doubt in you.”

Recognizing that such honesty would be bad for business, the Roman Catholic Jerome penned the following for his pope: “And I would willingly be present with you now and change my voice: because I am ashamed for you.” In support of their potentate, the KJV published: “I desire to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I stand in doubt of you.”

Always there for Paul, and thus willing to elevate him to the status of an eloquent and sympathetic spokesperson for God, if not a manifestation of God Himself, the NLT proposes that their Apostle actually said: “I wish I were with you right now so I could change my tone. But at this distance I don’t know how else to help you.” But alas, if Paul were speaking for God, and not for himself, he would have known what to write. So much for the claim that this was “inspired by God.”

Paul’s emotional interlude is now over. But during it he used “I” twelve times and “me” many more over the course of nine “verses” to say:

“I am afraid and fear for you that maybe somehow without reason and for nothing I have grown tired and discouraged, struggling to demonstrate effort toward you. (4:11) You all must become and are commanded to exist like I. Then I as an emphatic priority as a result like you all become called brothers and fellow believers, the means I want to compel, to bind, and to control you all. In no way were you wronged, harmed, or treated unjustly as a result of fraud by me. (4:12)

But you realize that because of an incapacity, timidity, weakness, and limitation in the flesh, I announced this healing messenger and beneficial message to you all previously. (4:13) And my temptation to prove my integrity and my submission to another, my fidelity and true nature of my character) in my flesh, you did not ridicule, despise, or reject. To the contrary like a spiritual messenger of god you received and believed me as Christon Iesoun. (4:14)

Where, therefore and consequently then, the declaration of blessedness and the pronouncement of happiness of yours? I witness and testify because of you that if possible and competent, your eyes having gouged and plucked out, you gave to me. (4:15) So as a result, a hostile and despised adversary of yours I have become telling the truth to you. (4:16)

They are jealous of you, not rightly, but to the contrary, they want to exclude and separate you, in order that you might be jealous of them. (4:17) But good and right to be jealous in good and right at all times. And not only alone in my presence with you. (4:18)

Children of mine whom also I have birth pangs, having engaged in the labor of childbirth as far as that which might be formed becoming Christos in you all. (4:19) But I would purpose to be present, to arrive and to come with you now and to change, altering the nature and character of my voice and language because I am at a loss, perplexed and puzzled, doubting and embarrassed, uncertain and I don't know what to do in you.” (4:20)

If you believe God inspired these words, your god is less capable than the average man.

LE: YY 09-01-2013