

Paul: Apostle of the Stumbling-Block

Examining Falsehood in Pauline Scripture

Copyright 2013[©]

by Sha'ul bayn Yahukhenun ha Yahudah



The Way of the Most High

“Exalting belief in our Father, the Most High **אֱלֹהֵינוּ** (YaHUAH), through His Turah, the 5 scrolls of M'shih (Moses).”

<http://www.thewayofthemosthigh.ca>

Email - followyah@gmail.com

The only abbreviation used in this will be *SC*, standing for *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*. This concordance is used in the free *E-Sword* program, which gives the Aibreet (Hebrew script) or Greek words behind the English text of Scriptures.

All Scriptural references will be our own translation of Scripture, based upon many resources, unless otherwise referenced.

Paul: Apostle of the Stumbling Block

This is a short study compared to the 3-500 page books on the issue of Paul's writings that abound. But we believe this article should be enough to understand and discuss the premise of Paul's writings and expose the reality of what he taught with regards to issues of the Turah (Law)... especially regarding worship and idolatry. This is one of those things that simply strengthens our section of our website entitled *What's Wrong with the New Testament*. Again, that is a statement and not a question. There is a lot wrong with the New Testament, and Paul's writings ought to be the first to be examined and scratched off the list of what is truthful according to the Turah (Scripture). New Testament believers owe it to themselves to examine this issue, as they claim that the New Testament is based on the Turah (Scripture) and was a natural outgrowth from it.

Paul is advertised as an Aibreem (Hebrew) P'rush (Pharisee) in his estimation in his own writings, and by those who follow his writings. His writings have been debated heavily. That is only natural, since 14 scrolls of the modern-day Christian "Bible" canon are composed of his writings. That is, if we assume that Aibreem (Hebrews) is written by him and included in that count (Romans to Hebrews). Undoubtedly, his writings form much of the basis of Christian beliefs about Yahushua/Jesus. Paul's writings give people the most exhaustive understanding of how "New Testament" believers should relate to the Turah (Scripture). Without the writings of "Sha'ul" or "Paul," there would be no "Pauline Christianity" as it exists today... and largely people would accept the validity of the Turah (Scripture) alone.

For some, the reading of works like this would be nonsense, as they have already made up their mind and concluded what they believe regarding Paul and his writings. Such information, claiming to examine falsehood in Paul's writings, must seem like heresy to a lot of people... an endeavour that leads one to forsake not only the "New Testament," but also the Turah (Law) and ultimately יהוה (YaHUAH) Most High. An endeavour which leads to atheism and damnation for some. Nonetheless, Alish'bai and I serve as a witness that this is not the case. We have come out of Pauline New Testament as a whole and maintained our belief in the Most High and His Turah (Law) alone. Those who have read through previous articles on our website, you KNOW and have already come out of a lot of deception. You have recognized that a lot of things asserted by mainstream "Christianity," the "New Testament," Orthodox Judaism, government, the health care system, newscasters and educators have been lies. What we will examine here is the very foundation of "Pauline Christianity."

Without a doubt, it would be hard for Christians to argue against cutting the foreskin, males covering their heads in prayer, feast days of Lev. 23 and other subjects of the Turah/Law, *had it not been for Paul's writings!*

Who was the Mighty One that Paul Worshipped?

Clearly, the Scriptures teach of an Almighty Creator, who created all things, and was the Mighty One of Awbrahaym (Abraham), Y'tsakheq (Isaac), and Y'shr'Al (Israel - Sh'moot (Ex.) 4:5). The Scriptures teach of the wonderful things that this Creator has done for His people throughout the ages, such as what He did to M'tsrayim (Egypt) in the Passover account in Sh'moot (Exodus). This Almighty Creator has revealed His Name, His Sovereignty, His deliverance, compassion, His laws, and how He is to be worshipped throughout the Turah (Scripture). But is this the Mighty One that Paul taught?

In Acts 17:22-23, Paul came to a place in Greece called the “Arios Pagos,” meaning the “rock of Ares,” a false mighty one which the Greeks worshipped (see Strong’s Greek #697). It is called “Mars hill” in most English texts. “Aries” or “Ares” is commonly worshipped falsely as a starry constellation today, in what is falsely called the “zodiac” or “Horus-scope” (horoscope). People often look at the stars to guide their lives, thinking that if they are born at the time when “Aries” is seen, then there are special “horoscope” implications for their lives. They even believe in different colours that go with each sign for their birth. Such things are not Scriptural. We do not believe in “Horus,” so we do not say “horoscope” or refer to the 12 constellations as “zodiac.” But there is truth to the fact that the stars show us Scriptural messages in the form of picture-constellations. Anyhow, the Greeks worshipped “Aries” or “Mars” for war.

So Paul comes to this “rock of Ares,” and he finds an altar built for the worship of a false mighty one which has no name. What most people assume is that this false mighty one was not really worshipped or known, because it was unnamed. However, it was “Agnostic” worship that was going on here. Check the Greek. It says “Agnostes Theos.” It is equivalent to what the false-worshipping Jews are teaching today through kabballah, in addressing the Most High as “Ein Sof” or the “Ineffable One” ... meaning you can’t pronounce His Name or truly know Him. They call Him “ha Shem” (simply “the Name”). But these cabbalists ARE worshipping someone. Their claim is that it is one and the same as **יהוה** (YaHUAH) whom we worship. We must emphasize that false worship was going on at this “rock of Ares.” Agnostics were conducting false worship and slaughtering at this altar of “Agnostes Theos,” this “rock of Ares.” False offerings were taking place there.

Paul then spoke to the people of Athaynos (Athens), saying “I understand that in all things you are very superstitious (or religious).²³ Because as I traveled and looked at your worship, I found an altar with this engraved on it, ‘To the unknown mighty one’ (Agnostes Theos), whom therefore you worship ignorantly. Him I declare to you.²⁴ The Mighty One that made the world and all that is in it...” (Acts 17:22-24). Think about this for a minute. People always try to rationalize it as “evangelism.” But we have to take it at face value and deal with it. We have to place ourselves in the shoes of the Agnostic Greeks hearing this message of Paul’s. If I was an Agnostic Greek, bringing slaughterings to this altar to the “Agnostes Theos,” and worshipping at this altar, how would I have interpreted Paul’s speech? Taking it as it reads, I would be led to believe that there is nothing wrong with the altar, or the mighty one that it represents, I simply didn’t know who it belonged to! Paul

has simply revealed that this unknown mighty one is the same mighty one that Paul serves and worships, and now declares to me. The only problem is... **this was not what YaH established in the Turah (Law) at Sh'kam (Shechem) or with the priesthood of Payn'khes (Phineas - see B'medbayr (Num.) 25:11-13).** This altar had nothing to do with the Almighty Creator of Scripture. And the people worshipping at this false altar were not worshipping the Mighty One of the Turah (Scripture).

Paul has come along and revealed to these Agnostics that this unknown mighty one is indeed the same one Paul worships, and now Paul is revealing this unknown mighty one more fully to them as the creator of all that is. They could therefore continue their worship at this altar, knowing more fully who it represents. But you might say, "No, that is not what Paul meant! Paul said that the Almighty does not dwell in idols, which is what Acts 17 continues to say after verses 22-24!" True, Paul did go on to say that the Almighty is not made by our hands in idols of gold, wood, or silver (17:29). This only goes to show how illogical Paul's preaching really is. **Out of one side of his mouth he preaches that they are worshipping the true Creator at this false altar on the "rock of Ares." But then he says that the Creator does not dwell in rocks or idols.**

There is no reason for Paul going around condoning false worship by giving their idols a different name or revealing their idols to them in a different way! And that is exactly what has been done in Acts 17:22-24. No, **we can't go around telling people that Buddha statues are being worshipped ignorantly, but that these same statues still point to יְהוָה (YaHUAH) as Creator of all that is.** We can't go around telling Catholics that their altars in their churches represent יְהוָה (YaHUAH). For one thing, the pagan altars are made from "cut stone," when the altar of YaH was not! He commanded His people not to make altars out of "cut stone" (Sh'moot (Ex.) 20:22 or vs. 25 in Bibles).

Contrary to the Turah (Law), Paul taught that a false altar represented the Most High יְהוָה (YaHUAH). And this is exactly what New Testament followers profess today. **A great multitude honestly believe that gentiles/pagans of different religions are truly worshipping the Creator whom Scriptural believers worship. This is a direct result of Pauline teaching... and it is false.** But the Turah (Law) revealed the Father to us. He never once said that people worshipping in Ash'rah groves (Sh'moot (Ex.) 34:13) or at Catholic (universally heathen) altars were worshipping Him! When examining Paul's writings, this is the reality that Scriptural believers must face.

What Stumbling-block?

Almost every time we come across the word "stumble" in Scripture, it is associated with "falling" and "death." One word for this in the Turah (Law) is "kashil," used in Wa'y'qora (Lev.) 26:37 for people falling over each other, even though no one is pursuing them with a sword. Another word is n'gap, which simply means to be stricken or plagued or killed (Sh'moot (Ex.) 8:2). When the "apostle of the stumbling-block" is revealed as such, then those who attest belief in "Scripture" will draw closer to the Most High and His Turah (Law)... without stumbling anymore.

The word for "stumbling-block" in Greek is "**skandalon**," from which we get our English word "**scandal**" from. A friend of ours who prefers to go by the name of

“ZekarIE” suggested we should focus on this word. And certainly we should, for there is one person who indeed laid a “scandalous trap.” A “scandal” is synonymous with the idea of an “evil plot” which is hidden and traps people. When we hear about scandals in the news, they are things that were kept secret which become revealed. “Scandals” are never a positive thing. They usually lead to shame and humiliation when exposed. In this case, the “scandal” or “stumbling-block” is the teaching of a false mighty one and the acceptance of food offered to idols. Once this step has been taken, people have accepted idolatry and can continue down a road of further lawlessness, which we now see in Christianity and modern-day reasoning. It is a total disregard to learning the original language of Aibreit (Hebrew) and reading the Turah (Law) for themselves. It is a disregard for the calendar of the Most High or anything else pertaining to the majority of laws and commands and instructions we read throughout the Turah (Law).

For thousands of years, Scripture had revealed to the people of the Most High that it was rebellion and transgression to eat food offered to false mighty ones or idols. But today, people are eating “halal” meat offered to “Allah,” and eating Indian foods which are “karpas” and dedicated to “Krishna.” They eat “kosher” foods dedicated to “haShem” under false rabbinical traditions... foods which they approve of, even if they are not organic or natural. But we are called to an exemplary dietary lifestyle to separate the clean from the unclean in Wa'y'qora (Lev.) 11, and not to add or take away from the Turah (Law) of YaH (D'bayrim (Deut.) 4:2).

Only in the Turah (Scripture) do we find the full story of Bayl'aym (Balaam) and Bal'aq which speaks of how these two rebels caused Y'shr'Al (Israel) to transgress by eating food offered to idols. For proof that Bayl'aym (Balaam) placed a stumbling-block before Y'shr'Al (Israel), teaching them to eat food offered to idols, read B'medbayr (Num.) 31:8-16 and D'bayrim (Deut.) 23:4-6. And yet when Paul teaches that it is okay to eat food offered to idols in 1 Corinthians 8, most people will never recognize this stumbling-block for what it is. Paul makes it sound so logical, rational and acceptable to the New Testament believer. People are afraid of shaking the foundations of their belief system. But ignore it as they may, there it stands... in the writings of their own “Bible” as they call it... in the writings of Paul.

The Stumbling-Block is Placed

By far **the most noticeable instance of anti-Scriptural teaching in Paul’s writing is found in 1 Corinthians 8.** Largely glossed over by preachers and laity alike, this text has been used to reason away “gentile” dietary lifestyle for roughly two millennia now. **Paul proclaimed a NEW and un-Scriptural “LIBERTY” with regards to diet.** He takes great length to explain that it is ok to eat food offered to idols in 1 Corinthians chapter 8. “Certainly, **concerning the eating of that which is offered to idols, we know that an idol is nothing** in the world, and that there is no other mighty one but One. ... To us there is but one Mighty One, the Father, from whom are all things ... ⁷But there is not in everyone THIS KNOWLEDGE. For some who are conscious of the idol in this hour, do eat it as a thing offered to an idol, and their conscience being weak is defiled. ⁸But food does not recommend us to the Mighty One. For we are not better if we eat, nor worse if we do not eat” (1 Cor. 8:4,6-8).

Wow! How much more do you need to hear? Case closed! But in case you did

not catch what is said - since Paul is very confusing to most people - let us go over it again. **Firstly, verse 7 admits that they were eating food offered to idols. Paul's opinion is that some people were weak, and they felt guilty when they ate such food.** After these verses, in the same chapter, Paul goes on to say that this is a true "liberty" (8:9) which the followers of Yeshua/Jesus are granted... liberty to eat food offered to idols. This is due to the fact that they know that an idol means nothing and so their conscience doesn't bother them. But he then has to do some back-peddling because he thinks that some may interpret the eating of food offered to idols as an occasion for others to do so without guilt. But can you think of a greater oxy-moron? **In one sense, he is saying that it is wrong to eat food offered to idols because people will think it is okay to do it and that idolatry is fine. BUT first he said that if you know that an idol is nothing, then you can do it! Not only does he contradict himself, but he most importantly contradicts Scriptural dietary laws** and examples. Let us examine again what he has said above, in point form below.

1. You can eat food offered to idols because idols are not real (8:4). Only the Almighty is living and real (8:6).
2. Not everyone knows that idols aren't real (8:7), but those who understand Paul's writing know that idols aren't real (8:4), so they can eat food offered to idols (8:4).
3. But be careful not to eat food offered to idols in front of others, because you'll give them the impression that idolatry is okay... so they will continue to offer food to idols... and feel right for doing so (8:7).
4. It doesn't matter what you eat, because following dietary laws does not recommend you to the Almighty. It doesn't get you "brownie points." It doesn't improve your standing before Him if you eat, or do not eat food offered to idols (8:8).

On that fourth point above, readers should ask a question. Does it really matter what you eat or do not eat? Christians and Messianics would do well to look up every reference to "clean" and "unclean" in the Torah (Law) and they would know that it is important. **Paul's teachings on eating food offered to idols has resulted in one of the greatest apostasies and departures from Scriptural truth and obedience.** It is Pauline Christianity's method of "evangelism" that causes Christians to think it is fine to eat what they want, watch what they want, listen to what they want, and partake of all the unclean modern-day Gentile lifestyle habits... but they call it all "clean."

A Strange Conversion

In Acts 1, we pick up the story where the self-styled "gospels" supposedly left off. After Yahushua/Jesus is claimed to have "ascended," his representatives or "apostles" returned to Y'rush'lam (Jerusalem) as instructed. But one of the twelve representatives was missing because he betrayed Yeshua/Jesus and killed himself. **Note**

that there are two completely contradictory accounts of this supposed “suicide” when you compare Matt. 27:5 with Acts 1:16-20. Another problem with this text is that Acts 1:16-20 quotes from Psalm 69:25. *Acts applies this to “Judas Iscariot,” whereas originally it did not apply to him.* Psalm 69 speaks of a person who is in great agony, and finds himself without comforters. In Psalm 69:22 onward, the writer prays against his adversaries and wishes **THEM** bad things. In verse 26 (vs. 25 in Bibles), he prays that “**their** habitation would be desolate, and let none dwell in **their** tents.” The word for “their tents” is definitely plural, as “ahaylayhaym.” The singular is “ahayl.” Plural for tents is “ahaylay.” The hay and mem or “haym” ending is “their.” **This text, quoted by the writer of Acts 1:16-20, applies to a plurality of wicked people... not to a single betrayer!** Oops. Once again, we are not supporting the Psalms or writings outside of the Torah (Law) but we are showing that in terms of reading comprehension, Acts didn't have it. Anyhow, Peter suggested that since Judas died as a betrayer, he must be replaced with another representative/apostle. So they prayed and asked to be shown who should be chosen, and then they cast lots. The lot revealed that a fellow named Mattathias was chosen. With this selection there were once again 12 representatives forming a foundational group in Acts 1, which to the “New Testament” writers was a big deal. Their idea was to replace the 12 tribes of Y'shr'Al (Israel) with their measly new followers of Yeshua/Jesus. Then enters Sha'ul/Paul. In the writing of Acts, we find that not once, not twice, but three times, the conversion story of Sha'ul/Paul is told. Really? Do people really need three records of Paul's conversion in one book? All three accounts are basically the same, but there are some pretty significant differences. Quite odd that they can't even get the story straight in one book.

Conversion Stories in Acts – 9:1-31; 22:4-21; 26:11-20:

- Paul gets letters from the high priest so that he can arrest Nazarenes or “followers of the way” and bring them to be tortured, questioned, imprisoned, and/or killed. He is off on his merry way to Dameshiq (Damascus) (9:1-2; 22:4-5; 26:10-12). Same in all accounts.
- On his way to Dameshiq (Damascus), a light shines all around him, he falls to the ground and hears a voice from above. He is blinded by the light (9:3,8; 22:6,9,11; 26:13). Same in all accounts.
- He is told to go into the city and he would be told further instructions then (9:6).
- **The males who are with him remained standing the whole time, and heard the voice, but saw no one (9:7). The people who are with Paul saw the light, but did not hear the voice (22:9). The people who are with Paul are also fallen to the ground (26:14).** Very conflicting accounts here.
- Paul is brought to Dameshiq (Damascus) and is there for three days, blinded, without food or water (9:8-9).
- Ananias was at Dameshiq (Damascus) and Yahushua/Jesus appeared to him and told him what to do for Paul. Same in all three accounts.
- Ananias is afraid of Paul and protests, but Yahushua/Jesus tells him that Paul is to be a witness to the gentiles and suffer a lot of things for his name (9:13-16).
- Ananias goes and heals Paul's sight, and Paul is immersed (baptized) (9:19).
- Paul spends some days with followers of Yahushua/Jesus in Dameshiq (Damascus)

(9:20).

- Paul preaches in the synagogues and news of his conversion and witness spreads (9:20-22).
- 9:23 indicates that a great length of days had passed and there was a plot to kill Paul.
- Paul is let out of Dameshiq (Damascus) by other followers who helped him over the city wall (9:25).
- Paul goes to Y'rush'lam (Jerusalem) to join the followers there (9:26; 22:17; 26:20).
- Followers of Yahushua/Jesus in Y'rush'lam (Jerusalem) are afraid of Paul and do not believe he converted (9:26). Same in all accounts.
- Barnabas brings Paul to apostles to vouch for him, since people are scared about Paul, and he reports about the great things Paul had done in the name of Yahushua/Jesus (9:27; 26:20). Same in all accounts.
- Paul goes in and out of Y'rush'lam (Jerusalem) teaching and debating with Greeks (9:28), then to Caesarea, Tarsos, Galil (Galilee), and Sh'meroon (Samaria) (9:29-30).

As it was said earlier, the differences between the stories of Paul's conversion in Acts chapters 9, 22 and 26 seem to be minimal to most people. But one major difference between the accounts of Acts 9, 22, and 26, is that in chapter 26 Paul is said to receive instructions from Yahushua/Jesus at his conversion on the road to Dameshiq (Damascus). In Acts 9 and 22, Paul was supposedly told to go to Y'rush'lam (Jerusalem) and **THEN** he would receive instructions. That might seem like a minor difference to people, but it completely changes the scope of Paul's story in these three accounts of his conversion. How could he be told to go to Y'rush'lam (Jerusalem) to get his instructions in the earliest accounts, and then in later accounts he claims he got the instructions right at his conversion? These minimal differences might not be a strong reason to reject his writings, and there are certainly much stronger reasons that we are examining, but they are quite significant.

Most people believe that Acts was written by Luke. Let's run with that for now. And let us also take it for granted that Luke has accurately related the details of Paul's conversion story three times, with some minor differences and a few major differences. But **take a look at the account which Paul himself gives in Galatians! The differences between his account in Galatians, and Luke's three accounts in Acts**, are noted once again in highlight.

Conversion Story in Galatians 1:13-2:9:

- Paul persecuted "followers of the way," same as in his conversion accounts in Acts (Gal. 1:13).
- Paul leaves out details of being blinded by light, his conversation with "Yahushua/JESUS," and interaction with Ananias, but simply says that the "Son" was revealed to him (vs. 14-15).
- **Paul did not speak with others at the point of conversion. Rather, he**

- “conferred not with flesh and blood,” vs. 16. Instead, he “immediately” (vs. 16 again) went to Arabia, and then returned to Dameshiq (Damascus) (vs. 17). Note that Paul makes a huge point in saying that he did NOT go to Y'rush'lam (Jerusalem) at the time of his conversion (vs. 17). This contradicts Acts 9:26; 22:17; 26:20! “AFTER THREE YEARS,” then Paul went to Y'rush'lam (Jerusalem) to see Peter, and stayed with him for 15 days (vs. 18). See previous point for contradiction references.
- **HE DID NOT SEE ANY OF the other apostles, except James** (vs. 19). This contradicts Acts 9:27; 26:20. **This even contradicts his admission that John was there when they gave Barnabas to him and sent them away to the gentiles in Gal. 2:9!**
 - **Paul then pauses to assure those that he is writing to that he isn't lying** (vs. 20). Now I don't know about you, but any time that we have encountered liars, we have noticed that they are usually the first to say that they aren't lying. If Paul WASN'T lying, why would he have to assure them that he wasn't?
 - **THEN Paul went to Syria and Cilicia, and he STILL WAS NOT KNOWN to the congregations in Judea.** They had only heard that he converted (vs. 22). This contradicts Acts 9:28-30.

What can we conclude regarding Paul's conversion stories in Acts chapters 9, 22, and 26, when compared with Galatians 1-2? Well, Paul was either having a case of senile dementia, since he is said to have written Galatians in his old age, or he was deliberately placing congregations that rejected him out of his conversion story.

For now, we should realize one simple thing... Paul couldn't get his own story straight... never mind teaching the Turah (Law) to people. I don't know about you, but every time I tell how I became a believer in the Most High and His Turah (Scripture), the story is still the same. Paul is one person who fails to get his own conversion story correctly detailed, although it is told numerous times.

Well, I guess Paul might have pleaded insanity if he were alive today. Listen to how eloquently Ferrar Fenton translated 2 Cor. 11:16-17: “I say again, let no one consider me to be a fool; but if I am, and YOU SHOULD REGARD ME AS A FOOL, then I myself will boast a little. ¹⁷What I say I DO NOT SPEAK FROM THE Sovereign (KJV – Lord); but as though in delirium from this madness of boasting.” Can you see that Paul makes absolutely no sense? Isn't this double-talk? First he says that no one should consider him a fool, but then he says that they should regard him as a fool. Was he drunk when he wrote these things? What did he mean by “delirium” or “insane” as other translations read? **Would you count the writings of an “insane” or “delirious” person as truthful?**

“You Can Trust Me, I'm Not Lying”

One very interesting nugget about Paul is that he has to convince his audience that he is not a liar. Paul had to tell people on several occasions that he was not lying. After he relates his conversion story in his letter to the Galatians, completely different from the stories of his conversion throughout Acts, he says “the things which I write to you, see, before the Mighty One, I do not lie” (Gal. 1:20). And again in 2 Cor. 11:5,

and verse 31. And again in 1 Tim. 2:7. But interestingly enough, Paul expects people not to believe that he is lying in all of these passages, even though he stated in **Romans 3:7 that he does lie sometimes to exalt the truth of the Almighty.**

When Paul was on trial in Acts 21:28, he tried to defend himself by saying “I have lived with a clean conscience before the Mighty One until this day” (Acts 23:1). And when he stated this, “the high priest KhenunYaH (Hananiah) commanded those that stood by him (Paul) to strike him in the mouth” (Acts 23:2). The high priest must have thought he was lying about that, or Paul wouldn’t have been on trial. In our view of things, teaching the “New Testament” is to teach against the Turah (Law) as a whole, and so the accusation against Paul is true, and the high priest was right to physically cause Paul to be hit and quieted. If such events were actually historical, which we do not believe to be the case. But as evidenced earlier, Paul taught that it was okay to eat food offered to idols. He taught that a false altar of worship was representing the Almighty as “Agnostes Theos” or the “unknown mighty one,” its only that the people worshipping there didn’t know the Name of the Almighty. And we could go on through his writings in Romans, Galatians and other places where Paul teaches against the Turah (Law), and the priesthood of L’wi (Levi) which is forever (Sh’moot (Ex.) 40:15). Truly, there was some validity for Paul being hit in the mouth when he claimed that he had lived with a clean conscience. Apparently, there were others who thought Paul was a liar.

Paul Lied to Teach “the Truth”

“For if **the truth of the Mighty One increases through my lie** resulting in His exaltation, why then should I be judged as a transgressor” (Romans 3:7)? Clearly, some people thought that Paul was a rebellious transgressor who taught against the Turah (Law) or he wouldn’t have to make such a statement. Paul’s defense was that the truth is exalted through his lie. Do you want to believe in the writings of a self-admitted liar, who explains away his lies by saying that they actually increase the truth and exalt the Almighty? Can we possibly think that the Almighty wants the Scriptures and laws regarding the prohibition of eating food offered to idols to be lied about? **Does the Almighty allow us to eat food offered to idols in order to witness to idolaters, like Paul taught people to do in 1 Cor. 8? Does the Almighty allow us to lie about false altars of worship in order to bring people to the Almighty like Paul taught people to do in Acts 17:23?** Well, apparently a lot of people think that way, because Christendom mostly uses any means necessary to get the converts to come. They will become like any other culture or people, learn the language, dress the same, eat unclean foods and anything else they must do in order to “evangelize” in their “missionary” attempts to “save others in the name of Yeshua/Jesus” and “take the message of salvation to the world.” In reality, we can see that Christianity is mostly a Pauline religion based on an anti-law attitude that separates itself from the Turah (Law).

Lie Number One – Only Kh’wah (Eve) was Deceived

One of the most obvious lies is found in 1 Timothy (Tim.) 2:14. “And Adam was not deceived, but the female (Kh’wah (Eve), having been deceived, fell into

transgression.” In B'rasheet (Gen.) 3, dealing with the deception of Adam AND Kh'wah (“Eve”), we read that Kh'wah (Eve) “saw that the tree was wonderful for food, that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree desirable to make one wise, and she took of its fruit and ate. And she also gave to her husband WITH her, and he ate” (vs. 6). Then we read in vs. 17 “Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree”... and we know the rest. The bottom line is that Adawm WAS deceived, as was his wife. Adawm was there WITH her when she took the fruit and gave it to him. He heard the lies, and he bit into the falsehood also. He listened to the voice of his wife.

Lie Number Two – No One is Righteous

In Romans 3:9-18, Paul quotes Psalm 14:3. Again, such texts from the Psalms are only a divergence from returning to the Turah (Law), but in looking at this text we find that Paul doesn't have any reading comprehension in his reference. **Psalm 14:1-4 is talking about corrupt males, who do wickedly, who are filthy, and who destroy YaH's people like eating bread. Of course there is none righteous among the wicked people** who eat YaH's people like bread! But Paul uses this quote to say that there absolutely isn't a single righteous person alive! His idea is that we are all filthy and under “sin” (KJV – Rom. 3:9). Now it is certainly true that all people have fallen short of obedience to the Turah (Law) of the Most High. It is also true that we became transgressors through the seed of Adawm, because of his original transgression which caused our fallen state of being... hence the fact that we die and return to the dust, as the original Adawm. But the worst thing about Paul's argument in Romans 3 is that he is trying to compare those who observe Turah (Law) with those who do not. He contradicts himself in that comparison, because he uses Psalm 14:1-4 in his speech, but uses it in reference to Turah-observant believers. He tries to show that those who observe the Turah (Law) are not righteous, because his view is that all people are filthy and condemned under “sin” (Rom. 3:9). But Paul is wrong when he states that Turah-observant believers are “without the fear of the Mighty One” (Rom. 3:18). He is wrong when he states that Turah-observant believers are “swift to shed blood” or “filled with cursing and bitterness” (Rom. 3:14-15). How do we know this? Psalm 14 states that it is the “fool” or the “wicked” that have these qualities. Cursing, bitterness, lying, murder and so forth is condemned by the Turah (Law)! **Those who observe Turah would love the Almighty with all their heart and mind and strength, and they would not murder, curse, or be filled with bitterness.**

Paul's writings make it seem like no one can be righteous and that the observance of Turah (Law) will lead to cursing, bitterness and every transgression imaginable. Rather than commandments causing people to live righteously in observance of such commands, **Paul's idea is that the commandments TEMPT us to do wrong** (which we will discuss shortly)! And it is quite evident that Christians are following Paul's attitude, because they often see themselves as being imperfect, messy, no different from anyone else except for their profession of belief in “Jesus.” But when the Almighty decided to choose a people and place them apart from all the nations, unlike Christianity, Y'shr'Al (Israel) was to be a royal priesthood and nation. They were not to be like everyone else. They were to be peculiar and strange to the other nations. And indeed, all who follow the Most High are to be set apart from others. We are to be different. If we follow the laws and commands of the Almighty in His Turah (Law), we

will be different. His laws and government are completely different than gentile nations' laws and government. But it is no wonder that Paul thought there is no one righteous, because he did not know what true righteousness is. This brings us to lie number three, Paul's understanding of HOW we are "righteous."

Lie Number Three – Paul's Idea of HOW We are Righteous

Paul declared a "righteousness that is separate from the Turah" (Romans 3:21-22). But the Turah (Law) teaches that **there is no righteousness apart from the Turah (D'bayrim (Deut.) 30:14-20; 32:45-47)**. Paul declared a righteousness that is "by belief (faith) alone" (Romans 3:28). If Paul tells us that we will be declared righteous by our belief, but the Turah (Law) teaches that we pray and believe and repent and act in accordance with the Turah (Law), then who are you going to believe... the Turah (Law) or Paul? If Paul says people are righteous apart from the Turah (Law) or works, but the Turah (Scripture) defines righteousness as following the Most High alone with all your strength, mind, and being through observance of the Turah (Law), who are you going to believe... the Turah (Law) or Paul?

Paul constantly separates those who obey the Turah (Law) from those who simply believe. He does this in phrases like "of the Turah" or "of belief." In one major statement, he states that those who are "of the Turah" will not be inheritors of everlasting life (Romans 4:14). Paul believes that the "Turah works out wrath" (Romans 4:15). Instead of causing people to love the Turah (Law) and uphold it as YaH commanded, Paul causes people to fear the Turah (Law) as "working out wrath," and teaching that the Turah (Law) enslaves people under a cruel "bondage." He teaches that it is a "ministry of death" (2 Corinthians 3:7). He also called it a "ministry of condemnation" (2 Cor. 3:9). And the reason is **because when you break a commandment, the commandment stands as a witness that you have broken it, and you are condemned.** Paul uses the word "bondage" a total of 12 times in Romans, Galatians, and Aibreem (Hebrews), in reference to the Turah (Law).

PAUL BLAMES TRANSGRESSIONS ON THE TURAH. His idea is that if we didn't have the Turah (Law), then we wouldn't have transgressed. Romans chapter seven is one of the most confusing arguments in Paul's writings, but if you sift through all the double-talk you can see the point he is making. **"I would not have known transgression, except by the law. And I would not have known lust (desire to have or covet), but the law had said 'You will not lust' (10th commandment, not to covet). But transgression, taking an opportunity through the commandment, worked in me every kind of lust. And without the law, transgression is dead"** (Romans 7:7-8). This is absolute falsehood and nothing could be further from the truth. Essentially, **Paul is saying he never would have had any kind of lust or desire to covet if it wasn't for the 10th commandment! Without the laws of the Turah (Law), there would be no transgressions he says!** But let me illustrate how Paul is wrong. Most people don't know that the Turah (Law) commands us to wear beards, that we should wear clothing that is not mixed with different fibres, that we should not have sex during the 7 days of a lady's menstrual cycle even if that cycle seemed to have ended on the 5th or 6th day, that they should pay their employees at the end of the day, or much of anything else that the Turah (Law) speaks about. **But people break all of these commands without**

knowing them. Therefore, people transgress the Turah (Law) without knowing it, because they do not love the commands of YaH or seek to obey them and know them. By and large, most people don't know what Scripture commands us to do. They don't transgress because they know what Scripture says and deliberately rebel against it. Most people transgress because they do not love YaH and His commands and instructions and seek to live by them... not because YaH gave us those commands. ***Most importantly, if we blame our transgressions on YaH giving us the Turah, then we are blaming YaH for our transgressions!*** That is not right! When Adawm ate of the tree which YaH commanded him not to eat of, Adawm did not say "Almighty Father, You commanded me not to eat from that tree. If You did not make such a commandment, then I would not have been tempted to eat from that tree. There would have been no commandment to tempt me to break it. It is Your fault that I ate from it, because You commanded me not to eat from it, which made me tempted to eat of it!" That is Paul's logic.

It is no wonder Paul thought that M'shih (Moses) had a ministry of death and condemnation (2 Cor. 3:7-9)! He thought that we transgress because we are tempted, and we wouldn't be tempted if the Almighty didn't give us those commandments of death and condemnation in the first place. But can we honestly believe that the Almighty delivered His people out of bondage to M'tsrayim (Egypt) only to give them a "ministry of death" or a "ministry of condemnation" as Paul called it? ***Did the Almighty spend 40 days and nights with M'shih (Moses) in the mountain, teaching M'shih (Moses) how to administer death and condemnation upon Y'shr'Al (Israel) through engraved commandments?*** Alish'bai and I cannot believe that. Rather, the Almighty said that He gave them His commandments to set them apart from other peoples and nations, to make them a royal priesthood, and to give them a prosperous life. In fact, He stated that if they obey His commands, then they will live long and prosper (D'bayrim (Deut.) 6:1-3; 11:27)!

Paul goes as far as to say that our evil "passions" are a result of the Turah (Romans 7:5)! And immediately after he writes that, he states that we are now "released from the Turah" (Romans 7:6). Again we have the idea that the Turah (Law) is an enslaving tool, but those like Paul are free from all law/Turah. They are Turah-less or lawless according to Paul's teachings. But none of this is what the Most High established with His oath-relationship people Y'shr'Al (Israel). ***The Almighty Judge will judge us according to His laws, even as judges in our nations today rest their judgment according to their law books and constitution.***

Lie Number Four – You are Loved or Hated Before You are Born

One of the worst parts of Paul's teachings is that people are either loved or hated by the Most High before birth. This is found in Romans 9. He states that it doesn't matter if you run after YaH, or wish to know YaH and love YaH. You must be "called" or "chosen." You are either loved or hated by **אֱלֹהֵינוּ** (YaHUAH) before you are even born. See particularly verses 11 to 16. Paul misquotes two passages in Romans 9:12-13. In verse 12, he quotes B'rasheet (Gen.) 25:23. At that time, Rab'qoh (Rebecca) was pregnant with two boys in her womb. YaH spoke to Rab'qoh (Rebecca) of the truth that Yaiqob (Jacob) and Aishu (Esau) would become two nations, and that

Aishu (Esau) would serve Yaiqob. ***But nowhere did the Almighty say to Rab'qoh that he hates Aishu (Esau) in this passage, prior to the birth of Aishu (Esau)!*** And that is the foundation of Paul's teaching on this subject. Yet Paul makes it seem like before these boys were born, the Almighty loved Yaiqob (Jacob), but hated Aishu (Esau).

Paul says that it doesn't matter how hard you run or seek after the Creator, if you are a vessel determined beforehand for unrighteousness, then that is what you will be (Rom. 9:16). Does that at all sound like a righteous Creator who gave free will and who says that He will love those who love Him and obey His commands, the same Creator who said He places before us life and death, but to choose life (D'bayrim (Deut.) 30:15-16)?

People have been deceived by Paul's writings on this subject. I have heard on a number of occasions people tell me they choose to live unrighteous or deliberately transgress the commandments because the Almighty made them that way. **"Oh, then why did God make me this way? He knew I was gonna be a homosexual, so He can't possibly condemn me for making me this way."** Another fellow actually quoted me Romans 9 on this subject, saying that he must have been hated by YaH before he was born, and that is the reason why he does not follow Scripture. If you are a Christian or Messianic who believes Paul's writings are Scripturally true, then what are you going to say to that? You shouldn't have anything to say, because if YaH made them a vessel of dishonour and hated them before they are born, how are you going to "save them" as you think you are "evangelizing?" The point is... Paul lied. Contrary to the numerous times that Paul said he wasn't a liar, his teaching in this regard isn't true. The Almighty can make a righteous vessel out of us if we will allow Him to work on us with His hands. That can only happen when we allow Him to give us a love for His Scriptures, His laws and commands, and to enable us to obey His laws and commands in righteousness. If we turn to Him and love Him, He will turn to us. If we seek Him, we will find Him. Even when we have done great evil, He only asks that we turn from it and serve Him instead of false mighty ones and worthless matters (D'bayrim (Deut.) 30:1-4).

Lie Number Five – Paul's Teaching on Cutting the Foreskin

(Taken in part from our article on *Cutting the Foreskin: Mark of our Bodily Tent in Oath with YaH*, with added thoughts from Paul's writings)

Are Paul's ways the same as the Way of the Most High? Are Paul's thoughts the same as the thoughts of the Sovereign of Y'shr'Al (Israel)? What do the Scriptures have to say on this issue? These are the real questions we must ask regarding this subject. Sadly, as we proceed into the depths of the promises of YaH and His command concerning cutting of the foreskin, we will see that Christianity has not had a clue on this subject.

Abrahaym was asked to bring his own son Y'tsakheq (Isaac) as an offering to YaH. This story is known as "The Binding" in B'rasheet (Gen.) 22:9, where the words found in the original are "wa'y'aiqode," translated "and he bound" Y'tsakheq (Isaac). As Abrawm had bound Y'tsakheq (Isaac), and was about to slay his son on the altar of burnt offering, a ram (male lamb) was provided by YaH, showing that it was not necessary for Abram to slaughter his son, and that this was a trial of Abrawm's willingness to

“lay it all on the altar” so to speak. B'rasheet (Gen.) 22:1 shows this, stating that “Alahym (the Mighty One) tried Arawm.” Even before Arawm went to offer his son, the name of this land was called “Mer'Yah” even before this offering took place. “Mer'Yah” means “my provision” (m'ri) is of “YaH.” Proof of this is in verse two, as the Most High asks Arawm to take his son to the land of “Mer'Yah.”

YaH made an oath to Arawm that He would make Arawm's descendents multiply “exceedingly” (B'rasheet (Gen.) 17:2). Then the Almighty gave Arawm the name of “Abrahaym,” changing his name from “high father” (Arawm) to “high father of many nations” (Abrahaym). This was a promise and an oath between the Almighty and Abrahaym. And because of Arawm's belief in this promise, “it was accounted to him as righteousness” (15:6). Arawm's servitude was tried in the story of when he “ayqod” (bound) his son. Abrahaym was then asked to cut the foreskin of his flesh as an outward sign of this righteousness, and of his oath-relationship with the Almighty. “This is My oath which you will keep between Me and you, and your seed (descendents) after you: Every son among you will be cut. ¹¹And you will cut off the foreskin of his flesh. And it will come to be a mark of the oath between Me and you” (17:10-11). The Almighty continued by saying that this was something to be done to Abrahaym's natural descendents, as well as those who are purchased with silver (slaves/servants/co-habitants) (vs. 13).

Shockingly enough for Christians, the Almighty said that this was to be an “everlasting oath” (vs. 13)! Our question to “New Testament” believers must be: How long is “everlasting?” We believe that YaH meant it when He said it will be “everlasting.” Moreover, אֱלֹהֵי יְהוּאָה (YaHUAH) said that anyone who doesn't follow this physical sign of this oath will be “cut off” (in other words “destroyed”) from His people.

So what is the sum of this short analysis of Abrahaym in B'rasheet (Gen.) 15-17?

1. Awbrahaym was declared righteous because he believed that the Most High would give him a son. He showed that he was righteous through obedience when tried in the story of the “Binding” in chapter 22 which took place AFTER cutting the foreskin in chapter 17. Therefore it doesn't make sense that all YaH cares about is the righteousness of one's heart. **Awbrahaym was declared righteous before he was asked to do an outward physical cutting of the flesh**, and before he was asked to offer his son. This cutting of the flesh was **as a sign** between the Most High and Awbrahaym.
2. It is an “everlasting” sign.
3. It is a sign for both the descendents of Awbrahaym, and those who become a part of YaH's people by being purchased with silver.

Now if “New Testament” believers truly believe that cutting the foreskin is a type of enslavement and something horrible, then why did the Almighty command Awbrahaym to do it in the first place? **Why would the Almighty declare Awbrahaym righteous, only to punish him with the duty of having to cut his foreskin?** We believe what Scripture said... that it was an outward sign of an oath-relationship with the Almighty.

It should be pointed out that there is a correlation between the word “oath” (“covenant” in KJV) and the word for “circumcise” in the common English translations. We do not use the word “covenant” because of its relationship to witchcraft “covens” and their blood “covenant” rituals. The word for “oath” is “b’reet,” which means to “cut an agreement,” and was shown through a sign like a rainbow or other physical way of showing trustworthiness, and by swearing an oath between one another. In the case of Nuakh (Noah), an oath was made, which was simply a promise of the Most High, no animal offerings involved, and the sign of the rainbow was to follow (see B’rasheet (Gen.) 6:18-19; 9:9-17). **The greatness of the oath of cutting the foreskin is comparable to the animal offerings. Rather than cutting an animal offering and making an oath with Abrahaym, he and his descendents (and those purchased with silver) would be cut in their flesh!**

Please understand that the ancient people of Scripture thought of themselves like trees. The tree produces seeds and from those seeds we get fruit. The fruit then bears more trees and more fruit through its seeds. Likewise, sperm was considered to be seed, planted in the fertile soil of the womb, resulting in a fruitful tree. Thus, the Almighty directly made a “cutting” and an oath with Abrahaym that was to last forever, and an oath to his seed/descendants. There WAS NO ANIMAL OFFERING, instead, there was a cutting of the foreskin. Cutting upon Awbrahaym’s foreskin was the very place where his seed (sperm) proceeds from. It is a physical sign that shows who the people of Abrahaym’s oath belong to. **It is a physical sign of a heart acceptance of the Almighty.** It is deemed as a righteous action, and shows that we honour YaH’s oaths and commands. It shows we belong to the oath and promise of Abrahaym, and are his seed.

What most people don’t know is that there is no such thing as “circumcision” according to Scripture. The word “circumcision” in English means to “cut around” the head of the penis. This is the common interpretation of Scripture. It is the common practice of hospitals. However, if you go to different places around the world, you will see that this is not the only way to cut the foreskin of one’s flesh. The word in Scripture for “circumcision” is “mool” which means to “cut back” the foreskin of the flesh. It doesn’t mean to “cut around” the head of the penis. Modern-day cutting around the head of the penis is a process which is complicated and often ends in drastic results. Because of the 20-40 minute process, there is an extreme amount of pain which one would need to be “put under” drugs for. We will not go into the details for modern-day cutting around the head of the penis, but it should be noted that oftentimes the skin is cut well below the head of the penis and results in a lot of discomfort and pain to the male long after the operation. Penises have been deformed, bent, or lots of other tragedies as a result of the common modern-day cutting around the head of the penis for both children and adults. ***Scripturally speaking, “circumcision” or “mool” should have been translated simply as “to cut back” the foreskin of the penis.***

Scriptural cutting of the foreskin is a short, quick, single cutting of the foreskin that hangs over the head of the penis. That is why it is called “foreskin,” not the entire skin that covers the head of the penis! One may do a search on Google for Troy Miller’s circumcision websites dealing with “milah” vs. “periah.” One warning, Troy’s websites on this subject show you how to perform a “mool” (simply cutting the

foreskin and not around the head of the penis), but we do not advise that you do this yourself. It must be given a lot of thought, a seriously sharp knife (such as a barber's straight-razor or professional grade scalpal), and it must be done in one stroke that is precise, hard and fast, and should never be done alone. Your instrument should be able to cut through cow hide or thick chicken skin with ease. A proper clamp such as the "mogen clamp" allows for an accurate cut and blocking of blood loss. If you would like to talk to us about this process and experience, please contact us. But let us get back to the promise to Abraham and the Scriptural sign of that oath through cutting the foreskin.

Century upon century since Paul's writings were written, Catholics, Christians, and the recent movement of "Messianic Jews" have forsaken the physical act of cutting one's foreskin... due to Paul's preaching. Paul is the only one who speaks negatively against the cutting of the foreskin. Paul teaches that if a person is practicing the Torah (Law), then cutting the foreskin profits them. But if a gentile practices Torah (Law), it is regarded to him as cutting the foreskin. In other words, we have a double standard under Paul's teachings (Rom. 2:25-26). Those who obey the Torah (Law) and cut the foreskin have a profit. But gentiles don't have to, because when they obey the Torah (Law), it is as if they cut their foreskins already. Oh, but Paul is so confusing, because he teaches that the Torah (Law) is a ministry of death and condemnation... so why would a gentile be observing the Torah (Law) anyhow? Paul does away with the fact that a person literally has to cut their foreskin to observe Passover, as commanded in Sh'moot (Ex.) 12:48. And most people don't observe Passover as part of their belief in Yahushua/Jesus since he is supposedly their "Passover Lamb" and/or they observe "the Lord's supper" instead. The bottom line is that most people who have read and believed Paul's teachings would understand that according to Paul, if you have accepted Yahushua/Jesus, then the foreskin of your heart has been removed and you don't have to cut your physical foreskin.

In Paul's mind, if you obey the Torah/Law of Yah, then you are cursed (Gal. 3:10). His opinion is that no one can keep all the commands and laws perfectly, so they will naturally fall short. He argues this way in Gal. 3:11-12, when he states that we are "justified by faith." BUT to Paul, "the Torah is not of faith." Paul's contention is that if you obey the Torah, then you are under a curse, and you are not believing or "of faith," because the Torah is not of "faith." He proceeds to say that if you observe the Torah, you will live in it/by it. This is true according to Wa'y'qora (Lev.) 18:5 and D'bayrim (Deut.) 8:1 and 30:16. But Paul says the opposite! We live by "faith" now, and not by the "Torah." He also contends that the Spirit is not received by works of the Torah (Gal. 3:2). Perhaps this is one reason why Christians often believe the Spirit of the Most High was not given to the people of Yah in the period of the Torah (Law). No, to them, the Spirit of **אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** (YaHUAH) was given after Yahushua/Jesus. This is of course to ignore examples like B'rasheet (Gen.) 41:38, where P'rai'h (Pharaoh) asks if there is any like Yusap (Joseph), in whom is the Spirit of Alahym (the Mighty One).

The fact is, Paul did not preach to people that they should cut their foreskin according to the Torah in any of his writings. Not once does he mention the fact that physical cutting of the foreskin is a sign between Yah and His people forever. Not once does he mention that the physical cutting of the flesh is a requirement to observe Passover. In fact, nothing could be more anti-circumcision than Paul's statement in 1

Cor. 7:18, which states that if you weren't cut in your foreskin when you got "called" to believe in Yahushua/Jesus, then it doesn't matter if you get your foreskin cut. We would say it is the opposite way around. Belief in Yeshua/Jesus voids any observance of the Turah (Law) due to blasphemy. In Sh'moot (Ex.) 12:41-49, it is stated that no one who has foreskin can partake of Passover, the very meal which Yahushua/Jesus supposedly used as a remembrance of him (Lukas 22:13,19). As we have seen so far, cutting the foreskin is an outward physical sign of a spiritual heart acceptance and oath with YaH.

Paul COULD HAVE BEEN RIGHT if it could be proven that "circumcision of the heart" was a new teaching of the "New Testament" which came into effect only after the period of the Turah (Law). But the fact of the matter is... **CUTTING THE FORESKIN OF THE HEART IS NOT A "NEW TESTAMENT" TEACHING!** The Almighty commanded cutting the foreskin of the "heart" in D'bayrim (Deut.) 10:12-17 and 30:6. M'shih (Moses) shows that it was understood that cutting of the foreskin of the lips was necessary when he says that he is a person of "fore skinned lips" (Ex. 6:30). So who is greater? Who is right? Was it YaH who commanded cutting the foreskin of our flesh, plus cutting the foreskin of the lips and heart? Or was it Paul who taught that all we have to do is accept Yahushua/Jesus and have our heart circumcised? **By the way, if it was acceptance of Yahushua/Jesus that brings cutting of the foreskin of the heart... HOW THEN WERE THE PEOPLE OF THE TURAH (Law) CUT IN THEIR HEARTS?** This is the crux of the matter. As for us, we believe what the Most High said, not "New Testament" teachings which change His commands and words. Here are a few texts from the Turah (Law) representing what the Almighty thinks of people who have not cut the foreskin from their flesh, lips and heart:

- Anyone fore skinned is "cut off" from YaH's people - B'rasheet (Gen.) 17:14.
- Don't marry to fore skinned people – B'rasheet (Gen.) 34:14.
- No Passover for the fore skinned - Sh'moot (Ex.) 12:48.
- If heart is fore skinned, YaH is against you – Wa'y'qora (Lev.) 26:41.

Having one's foreskin cut, in and of itself, does not earn anyone everlasting life. But one should first be cut in the foreskin of their heart and lips, and then be cut in the flesh as a physical sign of their oath with the Most High.

Lie Number Six – Males Shouldn't Wear Head-Coverings or Have Long Hair

(Partly taken from our website article on *Hair and Head-Coverings*)

Read 1 Cor. 11 and you will note quite plainly that Paul is comparing gents and ladies. The **ladies are to cover their heads in prayer, whereas the males are not to do so.** If the ladies cover their heads in prayer, they bring honour to Yahushua/Jesus. If males cover their heads in prayer, they bring dishonour to Yahushua/Jesus. He also taught that males should not have long hair. Both of these concepts speak against precedents laid out in the lives of righteous males in the Turah (Law). Throughout the writings of Scripture we find that the Aibreem (Hebrews) covered their heads in prayer and worship.

Without fail, male Yahudim (worshippers of YaH who follow the Turah (Law)) have always covered their heads in prayer and worship, as well as ladies. Originally for

the priesthood yes, and Y'shr'Al (Israel) as a whole was a priesthood (Sh'moot (Ex.) 19:6). Not only in prayer and worship, but the majority of the time. Islamic people do the same. North American Christian ladies used to cover their heads at all times also, using bonnets. People in Turkey and other European countries have also covered their heads from time to time, both sexes. People in Afghanistan cover their heads. In fact, if you were to Google “the evolution of hats,” you would find many documentaries on the use of head-coverings throughout time, in different cultures around the world. Truth be known, it is only in recent fashion that people have discarded their head-coverings, and that males in particular have been clean shaven and very short-haired.

Paul’s teaching on head-coverings is based on the teaching of “headship,” meaning a “hierarchy of authority.” He explains that the Head who is above Yahushua/JESUS is the Most High Father (vs. 3). Paul progresses by saying that the “Head of Adawm (Man)” is “Yahushua/Jesus” And even as Ahayran (Aaron) was the high priest, and the other priests came under his headship, so also the “New Testament” nullified this concept, claiming that there was a new priesthood through their “High Priest” “Yahushua/Jesus” and all his little priestling-followers (see Rev. 1:5-6). This is another problem with the “New Testament.” **The Most High made a promise to the tribe of L'wi (Levi) that their priesthood would endure forever (Wa'y'qora (Lev.) 6:18-22; 7:34).** Anyway, Paul completes the hierarchy of headship by stating that the head/authority above the female is Adawm (the male). This is about the only thing that Paul got right in this speech regarding headship.

What Paul says next in 1 Cor. 11 about head-coverings in relation to Scriptural headship is appallingly not in line with the rest of Scripture. It is not only “appalling,” but “a-Pauline-Christianity” teaching which contradicts the rest of Scripture. Please don’t misunderstand. For several years, when we still believed in the “New Testament,” we tried to reconcile Paul’s teachings with the rest of Scripture. **There are those who would defend Paul to the bitter end, trying to define Greek words used in 1 Cor. 11, and change the context of what he says.** But in the end, the context speaks for itself, and we must deal with it. He ties the issue of head-coverings to the teaching on Scriptural headship. In the same breath that he speaks on headship, he states that a male dishonours Yahushua/Jesus who is his leader, if he covers his head when praying or prophesying (vs. 4). And if a lady does not cover her head when praying or prophesying, then she dishonours her husband (vs. 5). **The context allows no other conclusion. The context is Scriptural headship, and how head-coverings honour or dishonour that hierarchy of headship.**

“Messianic Jews” try to argue that 1 Cor. 11:7 speaks against males “veiling” their faces (G#2619 – katakalupto), and not against head-coverings. But vs. 7 speaks plainly in line with vs. 5 and the context of honouring or dishonouring the Scriptural hierarchy of headship. Paul states that because Adawm (Man) is created in the image of Alahym (the Father and the messengers (angels)), he should not cover his head. So what is the big deal? Well, the problem is that while Paul says it brings dishonour, the Turah (Law) gives us a different picture. If we take a second to think about the Tent of YaH and its services and priesthood, described in Sh'moot (Ex.), we can learn a lot. There was a covering of hair and a covering of skin which covered the Tent of the Most High. The Scriptural priests had to have their heads covered, as can be seen in Sh'moot (Ex.) 28:40. A special head-covering was to be worn by the high priest, noted in Sh'moot (Ex.) 28:36-38. Even in times of mourning, the high priest was never allowed to take off his head-covering (Wa'y'qora (Lev.) 21: 10-11). But I suppose Paul wasn’t talking about the priests and high priest in 1 Cor. 11, right? To us, it doesn’t matter. But to “New Testament”

believers, it is a serious matter to consider.

The Tent of the Most High which was with His people Y'shr'Al (Israel) in the wilderness. Think about the ark of **אֲרוֹן הַבְּרִית** (YaHUAH) which was in the most set-apart place, with the karabim (cherubs) facing one another on top of the ark (Sh'moot (Ex.) 25:18). Now surely is quite absurd to think that messengers (angels), in their exalted and pure state, have to cover their faces before the Most High, and yet Christian preachers say or teach that it is Scriptural to remove a head-covering when praying or prophesying! Are we better than the messengers (angels), that we need not cover ourselves in the presence of the Most High in prayer? Even if Paul's writings in 1 Cor. 11:7 meant not to "veil" one's face with a head-covering, such a thing would be against Scriptural thought when we think of this example.

Paul is the lone ranger whose writings are used against the Turah (Law) in general, although certainly there are problems with the rest of the "New Testament" as well. But in this case, it is Paul who speaks against head-coverings. Scripture states that we should confirm things with at least two or three witnesses (D'bayrim (Deut.) 17:6). This exposure of Paul's anti-Turah teaching on head-coverings should be enough to at least open your mind to the truth that we should disregard the "New Testament."

Now we need to look at the issue of Adawm (men) having long hair. People have taken Paul at his word, believing that long hair on a male is unscriptural. On the subject of males with long hair, we will see momentarily that Paul is wrong. **The command not to shave the head or cut off the sides of the beard** is given in the midst of a chapter warning Y'shr'Al (Israel) not to profane or defile themselves (see Wa'y'qora (Lev.) 21, particularly verse 5). Thus, **it is defiling in the sight of the Almighty to shave one's head or beard.** Most males did not have long hair, but exactly how long is debatable. There are several Scriptural examples. There are those who take a vow of "n'zeer" (separation) who were commanded to grow their hair until the end of their vow (B'medbayr (Num.) 6:2-5). Most importantly, understand that we are not to round the corners of the head, meaning a shortly shaved or cropped hairstyle like the heathen (gentiles) (Wa'y'qora (Lev.) 19:27). Scriptural males are to wear a longer style of hair, and these are generally the types of hairstyles which the males of Scripture had. Nor were they to destroy the borders of their beards (jaw-line) by shaving (*ibid*). The Scriptural command of Wa'y'qora (Lev.) 19:27 is not to "destroy (ta'sh'khait) the borders (at pay'at) of your beard." Plainly, this commandment is **not to shave off our beard**. Let us get real honest. The only reason modern males are clean shaven and have close-cropped hairstyles is because of modern-day gentile fashion trends . . . and it is only since the later half of the 19th century . . . less than 100 years. Of course, there are exceptions to the rules about not shaving the hair or beard provided for in the Turah (Law), but the commandment still stands as a whole. **Most Christians would no longer see this command as a valid spiritual AND literal command.** In fact, they probably wouldn't see it as either spiritual OR literal.

In ancient times, beards were a sign of maturity, the pride of Adawm (Man), and nobility. Pulling out someone's beard or destroying it by shaving was a great shame. ***The command to keep our beards grown out is one that is both spiritual and literal,*** although Christianity would have a hard time seeing this. We are allowed to trim the beard, but not to destroy it by removing it. The beard shows our maturity, like a grown lion. **To shave the lion's mane is to de-masculinize the male lion; just as shaving our beards would be to make us like ladies.** Like cross-dressing, the destruction of the beard is a fashion trend that has buried the line of demarcation between male and female. One of our favourite quotes is a Greek saying which states that "There are two kinds of people in

this world that go around beardless – boys and women – and I am neither one”
(<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/beard>).

Conclusion: Whose Message was It?

Will you choose the Aibrete (Hebrew) Way of the Most High? Or will you choose the Greco-Roman lawlessness of Pauline Christianity and “New Testament” belief? What is the final word on this subject? Paul taught his listeners to eat food offered to idols in 1 Cor. 8, verses 4 and 10 and chapter 10, verses 25 to 27. If you make the right choice to reject the “apostle of the stumbling-block” known as Paul, it will take some time to heal. You will need to re-evaluate things and ask yourself “Did I get this from Paul’s mouth or another ‘New Testament’ idea, or is what I believe according to Turah (Law)?” It will take time, but you will need to re-read the “New Testament” by searching the Turah (Law). Every time you find “it is written” in the “New Testament,” you KNOW that the “New Testament” is quoting from somewhere. So search for such texts and prove to see if the “New Testament” has kept the quote in its original context and application. We guarantee you it does not, and we have shown enough regarding these matters through our website sections that deal with the New Testament. You will need to get a “Hebrew to English” Turah (Law), and look at the original text yourself, by learning Aibrete (Hebrew script). If you find this hard to do, we pray that our website information will help you to understand these texts better. Such measures will give you a proper view of Scripture and how you should now live in accordance with the Turah (Law). May יהוה (YaHUAH) favour you and keep you, grant you wisdom and understanding. May He give you strength to walk as the “followers of the Way of the Most High” once walked. The “New Testament” took this concept of “followers of the Way” and changed it to apply to believers in Yeshua/Jesus, rather than those who followed “ha Darak” (the Way) of the Turah (Law), the Way of the Most High.

Sources

The Companion Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1922.

Fenton, Ferrar. The Holy Bible in Modern English. Merrimac, Massachusetts: Destiny Publishers, 1966.

Strong, James. Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible; Hendrickson Publishers, ISBN 0-917006-01-1.