

Debating the Name of Yaff and New Testament with James Faulkner

By Sha'ul bayn Yahukhenun ha Yahudah

Copyright 2012©



The Way of the Most High

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

Email – followyah@gmail.com
Website – www.thewayofthemosthigh.ca

2nd Moon Cycle, 8th Day (4/22/2010 Year of our Captivity)

Recently we Googled our website and came across a quotation of our previous blog regarding our rejection of Yeshua/Jesus and the New Testament. It was very interesting and sad. James R. Faulkner decided to write an article against people who actually love and use the Name of YaH Most High. His position is one which is New Testament-based. His reasoning is that people in Scripture often had their names changed, so why is it so wrong to change the Name of the Most High to "God." What Faulkner forgot to tell his readers is that "God" is not the Name of the Most High, but the name of a false mighty one which was adopted by Y'shr'Al (Israel) during Assyrian captivity. In Originally, "Gawd" was simply ancient Aibreeth (Hebrew) for a "troop" or a "tribe," as in numerical greatness or tribal fruitfulness. It is spelled gam (g), dalat (d). Gam simply makes the "ga" sound in this case. However, in the false worship of Ashur (Assyria), "Gawd" was clearly false worship and "Gawd" was worshiped for "fate" or "fortune." These people were also worshiping "M'ni" (Meni/Mani). But you don't hear people calling YaH as "M'ni" these days.

Faulkner continues his article with a simple aim. His aim is to convince the reader that if they accept the Name of YaH and start using it, then they will become mindful of the original text of Turah (Scripture) and Aibreeth (Hebrew script). They will question their Scriptures and start changing things, eventually ending up rejecting Yeshua/Jesus and the New Testament. And this is where the reference to our previous blog comes in. Faulkner uses us as an example of people who use the Name of the Most High, become Turah-based and reject Yeshua/Jesus. But his ultimate conclusion is that people like us will eventually reject the Turah (Scripture) as well... ending up without any beliefs like atheists. Nothing could be further from the truth, and this is simply a cop-out by Faulkner in order to scare people into continuing blind belief in Christianity and the New Testament. His attempt is to scare people away from Aibreeth (Hebrew script) and the originality of the Turah (Scripture) in comparison to the English "Bible" and New Testament.

Now certainly there are critics of the Turah (Scripture) even as there are critics of the New Testament. But as we have stated before, the problems with the New Testament are not the same problems as we have with the Turah (Scripture). The Turah (Scripture) is established historically through archaeology and history, and is prophetically accurate in the prophecies given to Abrahaym (Abraham) and M'shih (Moses) as a whole. It is self-evident of the Creator, in line with what is known as modern-day "creation science." It is self-evident of the existence of M'shih (Moses), the story of Sh'moot (Exodus), as verified by the archaeological find of Mount Seen'ee (Sinai), a.k.a. "Jabal Maqla" in Saudi Arabia. Anyone can Google that.

No, we will not reject the Turah (Scripture), as it is self-evident and true. But with regards to the New Testament we have no historical evidence that Yeshua/Jesus existed, apart from assumption-based writings made 50 to 400 years after his supposed life and death. We have no verification that Herod ordered the death of thousands of firstborn sons of Y'shr'Al (Israel)! We have no verification of the tomb or resurrection of any such Yeshua/Jesus (although fake claims have been made and exposed as fake). Most importantly, the New Testament has no accurate quotations from the Turah (Scripture) proving Yeshua/Jesus fulfills and applies the things which New Testament writers

attribute to said personage. We have given plenty of evidence and will provide more showing that the New Testament is falsehood in our *What's Wrong with the New Testament* section of our site.

Now that this is out of the way, we can address Faulkner's other points. Faulkner states under point number one that Matthew, the New Testament writer, "had no problem with interpreting or translating" the Name of the Most High. Yeah, well, like everything else in the New Testament, they felt they had the right to change the Turah (Scripture) and re-apply it any which way they liked... this renders Faulkner's point number one moot. Under point number one, he writes that the Almighty has more than one name. This is not true. He has lots of descriptive titles or appellations, but these are always used in reference to His singular Name, for example "יְהוָה (YaHUAH) רֹאֵה" (אָר - Ra'ee) or "YaHUAH the One who sees" (B'rasheet (Gen.) 16:13-14). But Faulkner doesn't seem to understand the difference between a name and a title or appellation.

False proof against using the Name number two is that Faulkner thinks there is nothing special about Aibreit (Hebrew script). Well, maybe he should throw out his Turah or "Old Testament" as he would call it. Oh yeah, he already did, by believing in the New Testament and attempting to scare people away from examining it with the Turah (Scripture).

False proof number three is Faulkner's idea that pronouncing the Name of the Most High doesn't make you better or "holy" as he writes. Well, that is false James Faulkner, and you know it. I guess he didn't read B'medbayr (Num.) 6:27; Sh'moot (Ex.) 20:24 or Wa'y'qora (Lev.) 22:32 and other texts we could cite. Hey Faulkner, perhaps you should crack open the Turah (Scripture) once in a while instead of reading the New Testament all the time... read before you speak... you are teaching falsehood. His fourth point is also New Testament based and basically states that people in the New Testament didn't use the Name of the Most High. That is debatable and we have proven in times past as Messianics that the Name was most certainly used in the New Testament, but since he doesn't address the Turah (Scripture), we'll simply say that this is more New Testament nonsense, so who cares?

Point number six which Faulkner makes is my previous blog of my rejection of Yeshua/Jesus and the New Testament. Again, Faulkner raises a point based on a false premise. The premise is that "he who rejects the New Testament rejects the Turah (Scripture) eventually also. I've already shown how wrong that idea is. Thankfully, Faulkner had the honesty to quote my blog in full. As a result, our website traffic has increased and Faulkner has unknowingly exposed people to the truth of our documents refuting the New Testament and bringing people to the Most High and His Turah (Scripture).

Thanks Mr. Faulkner. :)

YaH Khey (YaH lives),
Sha'ul and Alish'bai