

New Testament Pastor Bumbles Debate on Turah (Scripture)

DEBATING “THE WAY OF THE MOST HIGH,” THE WRITINGS OF PAUL AND
FOOD OFFERED TO IDOLS

Martin Hanna



vs.

Sha’ul bayn Yahukhenun



By Sha’ul bayn Yahukhenun

Copyright 2013 © Roman year



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

Email – followyah@gmail.com

Website – www.thewayofthemosthigh.ca

We have debated numerous pastors, rabbis and imams throughout our walk and teaching of *The Way of the Most High*. We find these religious teachers are all the same, bought and paid for on the backs of their laity, saying anything to avoid Scriptural problems and calm the sheep that they deceitfully lead. New Testament believers owe it to themselves to draw near to the Most High and His Turah (Scripture). Such debates as these are examples that we ought to trust the Most High and His Turah (Scripture) alone.

This debate is between Dr. Martin Hanna and I, Sha'ul bayn Yahukhenun. Martin is an associate professor in "historical theology." He is also looked upon as a pastor. He has written a book which we consider to be blasphemous, entitled *The Cosmic Christ*. He works for Andrews University in the United States under the hospices of the Seventh-day Adventist church. He is one of few pastors or teachers who have been willing enough to debate the Turah (Scripture) in public... to the detriment of their New Testament belief.

In our day and age, many people place their trust in religious leaders like Martin Hanna. They always smile, patiently listen and go around preaching peace and love. But underneath the religious façade of these paid pastors/teachers/rabbis/imams is a nasty underside of deliberate deception and avoidance. THEY KNOW that what they are teaching and doing does not stand up to the Turah (Scripture), but they press on anyhow.

This debate took place on Facebook for a period of over a month. For the record, Martin Hanna still to this day has not read and debated any of our articles point by point. Clearly he avoids these issues and/or has no answer to our presentations.

This debate stands as a memorial of how New Testament pastors reason away their transgressions of the Turah (Scripture) like eating food offered to idols. They render it "spiritual" and interpret it and blaspheme it any which way they will. In this debate, there are a number of things that are made clear and will be re-iterated at the end of this Part 1:

1. Martin conceded that the Turah (Scripture) is superior to the New Testament in taking cutting of the foreskin further than simple cutting of the flesh. Cutting the foreskin is not a "new" and original concept of the New Testament, and in fact the Turah (Scripture) went further than the New Testament, to the cutting of the foreskin of the lips.
2. Martin has revealed that he liked my website, and he quoted from Y'ramYahu (Jer.) 6:16. Ironically, that text spoke regarding a rebellious people who would not walk the Way of the Most High. Martin is like that rebellious people.
3. Martin conceded that eating food offered to idols is a great transgression according to the Turah (Scripture). Martin admitted he is blindly following the teachings of Paul, whom he believes was following Yeshua/Jesus.
4. Martin exposed himself as one who thinks that if they transgress ignorantly, then they are not guilty. He gave the example that if he speeds with a police escort, then it is okay. In other words, you can ignorantly transgress the commands of YaH, and you won't be held accountable or guilty.

It is our prayer that this debate will serve as an example to many New Testament believers who are questioning the New Testament. It shows first and foremost that pastors/New Testament preachers have no logical, contextual and linguistic Scriptural means of dealing with the problems that the Turah (Scripture) poses against the New Testament. This debate is an exhibit which exposes the avoidance and often flippant

attitude with which New Testament pastors treat the Turah (Scripture). Enjoy the discussion.

Sh'loom,
Sha'ul bayn Yahukhenun

Disclaimer: I reserve the right to edit this article at any point to reflect future discussion/debate with Martin Hanna. This debate will be taken off our website and stricken from internet record if by some mighty wonder that Martin repents, serves YaH alone, and teaches the Turah (Scripture) alone. This article is in no way a defamation of the character and person of Martin Hanna. I have personally gone to university under his leadership at one point, and have enjoyed many conversations including this debate with him. The pictures used in this article are available to the public at large on Facebook as of today's date, the 1st Moon Cycle, 30th Night (5/3/2011 Roman date).

PART 1: DEBATING “THE WAY OF THE MOST HIGH,” THE WRITINGS OF PAUL AND FOOD OFFERED TO IDOLS

First Half of Part 1 Debate: The Way of the Most High

Martin Hanna posted (3/18/2011):



From shadow to substance.

Sha’ul notes: The subtitle under the above picture was written by Martin Hanna as descriptive of the picture, implying that the high priest of Wa'y'qora (Lev.) was a shadow of the high priest Yeshua/Jesus who is the substance. Common New Testament belief is that there is no substance to the Turah (Scripture), it is only a shadow of supposedly better things in the New Testament/Yeshua/Jesus. This picture was taken from J Son O Rourke, a false preacher who donned a robe for a day, pretending to have a clue about what the Turah (Scripture) exemplified in the services of the House of the Most High YaH.

Sha’ul posted in response (same date):

Wearing a robe is one thing... living the Turah (Scripture) is another. Living the Turah (Scripture) would be substance. Wearing a symbolic robe is a shadow. Question is, does J Son have the guts to walk the Way of the Most High? Does he only put on a robe for show or would he wear Scriptural clothing regularly? What about you Martin? Have you considered our website yet and been honest with our section on What's Wrong with the New Testament?

Martin responded (ibid):

Happy Sabbath Sha'ul! I did visit your website; but it will take me some time to fully digest all that you have shared there. Surely the question comes to all of us (J Son, Martin, and Sha'ul): Do we have the guts to walk in the way of the Most High? It good to be in touch with you!!

Sha'ul (ibid):

Thank you for your kind and honest answer Martin. I truly wish you peace. My wife and I have honestly had the guts to walk the Way of the Most High as best we can. The more we read the Turah (Scripture), the more we see how we ought to live the ancient paths.

Martin (ibid):

As I read your website and your comments, I am reminded of the words of TaNaKh: Thus says the Lord: "Stand in the ways and see, And ask for the old paths, where the good way is, And walk in it; Then you will find rest for your souls. **But they said, 'We will not walk in it.'** (Jer 6:16).

Sha'ul notes: Looking back at this post of Martin, a number of things are evident about what Martin thinks of the Way of the Most High, the ancient paths. Martin admits he has viewed our website, and stated that it will take him some time to digest. Well, it must not be sitting very well in Martin's stomach, because it has been over a month now (5/3/2011 Roman date) that he has avoided reading and responding to our website. His attitude seems to be that of the Scriptural text he quoted, "We will not walk in it."

Sha'ul (3/27/2011):

Almost 10 days now since you last looked at my website and stated that you would examine the evidence regarding the so-called "New Testament" which I have over 100 pages on. What have you done with this time Martin? How important is this great issue of blasphemy to consider to you? Thus far you have offered no public rebuke of my articles such as my article on the writings of Paul for example, showing how Paul encouraged the eating of meats offered to idols strictly forbidden in the Turah (Scripture). Remember Martin, that even though you may place my website and such study of the Turah (Scripture) in your mind as perhaps the last priority on your list, that it ought to be first priority as a follower of the Most High. For He alone is our Rock (D'bayrim (Deut.) 32:4). You have one of the greatest responsibilities to bear in judgment, for you are leading an entire campus of people with a doctrine opposite to this, teaching that there is another Rock and Redeemer (Yeshua/Jesus). Remember that YaH of HOSTS is watching. These are His courts. I offer you the opportunity now to respond in whichever way you see fit, be it to public debate, rebuke, or consent that the things I have stated are correct, to the exaltation of the Name of YaH.

Martin (ibid):

Sha'ul, I expect to be slow to rebuke you or debate with you. But that's not the reason that I have not contacted you before now. I am preparing for an important ministry responsibility and have not been able to carefully study your website. When my present mission is done, I look forward to friendly dialog with you. In the meantime, I rejoice with you that YaH is sovereign!

Sha'ul notes: Interesting, Martin was afraid (slow) to rebuke me or debate me. Why? Is it because he knew that he doesn't have a leg to stand on? Is it because he has a PhD but doesn't really know Scripture or Aibreit (Hebrew) or the Turah (Scripture)? Well,

as people will see in the upcoming aspects of this debate, it is no wonder he was afraid to get into the thicket of things.

Second Half of Part 1 Debate: Paul Taught Food Offered to Idols

Martin (3/27/2011):

With regard to your comments on Paul, I agree with you and Paul that we should "flee idolatry" (1 Corinthians 10:14).

The idol and the meat is nothing in itself (1 Cor. 10:19) but they represent devils (10:20).

Therefore, Paul condemned partaking of the Lord's table and the table of devils (10:21).

At the same time, you are correct when you imply that Paul was not overly careful about the matter. He did not recommend careful investigation of whether some meat had been offered to idols or not (10:27). However, if it was clear that this was the case, one should not eat (10:28).

Sha'ul (ibid):

I have addressed these texts in my article on *Paul: Apostle of the Stumbling-block*. For one thing though, I am surprised that you have not seen the false reasoning Paul uses in eating food offered to idols. Clearly, as you have referenced in 1 Cor. 10:19, since an idol is nothing, you can eat food offered to idols according to Paul. But the Most High says under no circumstances are we to eat food offered to idols (D'bayrim (Deut.) 32:37-38). I have referenced much more evidence in my article in this regard.

Martin (ibid):

When I have read your article I will be better informed of your point. But until then, it seems that Paul's point, as I have outlined it here, is quite in harmony with the spirit of the law. An idol is indeed nothing in itself though it represents the devils worshiped by the nations. Therefore, one should avoid eating meat offered to idols. At the same time, if one in ignorance eats such meat, one is innocent of either the worship of idols or of causing someone to stumble.

Sha'ul notes: Notice that Martin said WHEN he reads this article. To date, Martin Hanna has not upheld his word. Perhaps he is scared to read our article on Paul. Certainly he has an inability to respond to it. Martin also often uses words like "seems" when referencing what he thinks about Scripture. No Martin, it doesn't "seem" to be Paul's point at all. The issue is WHAT he actually said and wrote. In any case, Martin, even though he did not read the article, decided he was still going to debate the issue and promote his New Testament propaganda. And I responded in turn.

Sha'ul (ibid):

Martin. I was specifically referring to 1 Cor. 8, which is much more explicit than chapter 10. And you said that it is about "eating meat offered to idols" "in ignorance." But that is not at all what Paul taught. In 1 Cor. 8:7 it is clear that he is addressing those who

KNOW the food is offered to idols, and their conscience tells them it is wrong. Paul says no it isn't wrong, for an idol is nothing. YaH says it IS wrong.

Martin (ibid):

I would respectfully disagree Sha'ul. Paul does refer to ignorance in chapter 10. I regard this as an explanation of the less developed teaching in chapter 8. Christians at Corinth **may** have been worried about buying food from unbelievers who may have offered those foods to idols. Paul may be teaching that the idol cannot actually contaminate the food. However, he makes it clear that we should not sit in the devils temple and eat meat offered to idols (8:10).

I agree with you that YaH says that it is wrong to eat meat offered to idols.

However, like Paul, I interpret that command differently than you do.

We should make a clear distinction between true and false religion. But that distinction is not in the letter of the law, as if the idol in itself could contaminate the food.

Even the TaNaKH teaches that idols are nothing in themselves: having no breath (Jer 10; 51:17; Dan. 5:23; Hab 2:18).

Sha'ul notes: Notice that Martin agreed with me that it is wrong to eat food offered to idols according to the Turah (Scripture). His contention is that we "interpret" differently. No Martin, again, this is not about "interpretation," it is about WHAT SCRIPTURE SAYS. And nowhere in the Turah (Scripture) do we find that YaH condoned eating food offered to idols. And if YaH says that idols are lifeless in the texts which Martin quoted in the post above, then why did YaH say we can't eat food offered to idols in the first place? Clearly, according to Martin's reasoning, YaH should never have commanded us to not eat food offered to idols. If idols are lifeless and dumb, then why would it be offensive to YaH at all if we eat food offered to idols? Martin is out of line and has conceded that it is wrong to eat food offered to idols according to the Turah (Scripture). He has revealed himself as a false preacher in the steps of Pauline Christianity.

Sha'ul (ibid):

Interesting, **you could not deal with the statement made in 1 Cor. 8:7, so you produced the idea that this is a problem of interpretation and went back to the idea of "ignorance" in chapter 10.** Interestingly enough, the word "ignorance" regarding the eating of meat offered to idols is not used in chapter 10 either. **In fact, in 10:29 Paul states that his conscience and those who think like him, is not bothered at all by meat offered to idols.**

And what would a follower of the Most High be doing in a house of demons (or devil temple as you call it) in the first place? lol. This shows that the people Paul was hanging around didn't exactly know YaH and how to obey the government (Turah) of YaH in the first place.

Martin (ibid):

Aside from the debate over what Paul meant, I think you and I may actually actually agree in spirit Sha'ul, if not in letter. Do you not refer on your website to following the TaNaKH as far as is possible? Is this not accepted by God even where the letter of the law has been infringed due to ignorance or necessity?

Point taken, Sha'ul. If they were mature worshipers of YaH, Paul would not have needed to instruct them as he did.

I am not arguing that the word ignorance is used by Paul. I am suggesting that it is implied when he says that there is no need to ask whether what you have been served has been offered to idols or not.

Neither am I suggesting that my interpretation is right and your's is wrong. We simply happen to disagree at this point in our discussion. The real issue may be a difference of opinion about how to keep the TaNaKH. I agree with Paul that it is possible to be circumcised according to the letter of the law and yet not really keep the spirit of the law (Romans 2:25-26).

Sha'ul notes: Look at the kind of deceptive language Martin uses. "I am not arguing that the word ignorance IS used by Paul. I am SUGGESTING that it is IMPLIED." Well Martin, that doesn't cut it in the real world of those who want to truly read and apply Scripture to their lives and understanding. We can't trust in "implications" and "suggestions" or "interpretations." We can only go by what SCRIPTURE SAYS. Clearly, New Testament pastors like Martin don't know what it means to truly read Scripture in its original context, according to its literal words and application.

Sha'ul (3/28/2011):

Thank you for your direct questions. I do believe in following the Torah (Scripture) as far as is possible. I don't see what that has to do with this discussion though. Perhaps you mean that if the only meat around is meat offered to idols, then we can reason that we can break the commandment? I would say no. As for Paul "implying" ignorance as you stated, the answer is no. First Corinthians 8 is pretty specific that these were people who knew that the food/meat was offered to idols. Paul's reasoning is that idols are nothing though, so it is okay. Anyone who can read the English text and reads these comments on your profile will probably see that and agree. That is, unless they have a problem with English. But it is certainly not a matter of interpretation. You can't change the text and try to make Paul look righteous. As for cutting the foreskin, you have obviously made up your mind as to your thoughts on the issue. But you may want to consider my article on cutting the foreskin. For YaH took cutting the foreskin further than Paul ever did. YaH stated cutting the foreskin of the heart, lips, and ears, long before there ever was a "New Testament" or Christianity.

Martin Disputes the Issue of Cutting Foreskin as Well

Martin (ibid):

What I am saying is that if one does not know whether meat has been offered to idols then there is no sin in eating it because the idol in itself does not contaminate the meat.

Also, if one does know that the meat was offered to idols, the meat in itself would still not be defiled, but one should then avoid eating such meat when the reasons mentioned by Paul are relevant.

On the question of circumcision, I think the point you made is the point Paul is making. True circumcision goes beyond circumcision in the flesh.

On the matter of keeping the TaNaKH, what do you mean when you refer to keeping it as far as is possible? Does this mean that one must use spiritual discernment when applying the letter of the law?

Sha'ul (ibid):

The problem Martin is that the Most High did not say that if your meat was offered to an idol, that you could eat it in ignorance. So you are following a commandment/teaching of flesh... Paul to be exact. Moreover, you stated that even if the meat was offered to idols, the meat would still not be defiled. And of course you offered no proof for your claim in this regard from Scripture. That is shaky ground and would not hold up in court. Remember, you stand before the courts of the Most High. You ought to have some proof for your claims. You won't be able to say that you were going by opinion or interpretation or some "spirit of the law" when you stand before YaH. I appreciate your honesty and politeness. However, one of us IS wrong. As to the matter of keeping the Turah (Scripture) as far as possible, I speak no mysteries or "spirit of the law." The Turah is government and law of YaH. I stated earlier that YaH originally had a greater purpose to cutting the foreskin for example, which the New Testament completely missed. That being the cutting of the foreskin of the lips, heart, and ears. In totality, there are many things we are PHYSICALLY limited and incapable of obeying in the Turah (Scripture). For example, going to Gar'zim (Gerezim) 3 times a year (D'bayrim (Deut.) 12:5-7;16:16).

Martin (ibid):

Neither did the Most High say that you could not eat in ignorance.

Yes, I am following Paul, as he followed Christ, who claimed to fulfill the law. Of course, the discussion we are having boils down to whether or not Christ really did fulfill the law. I am sure we will discuss that further.

The issue of the defilement of meat offered to idols has to do with how we define the word "defilement." This could be physical or spiritual, literal or symbolic.

Sha'ul notes: Once again, notice the language that New Testament pastors use when they can't directly deal with the literal, physical sense of Scripture. They say that it "could" be spiritual or symbolic. It is all based on mystery, secret, interpretation, and symbol for these false New Testament teachers.

Sha'ul (ibid):

By your reasoning Martin, I suppose that we could ignorantly use pagan names like "God" to refer to the Most High. "God" comes from Ashur/Assyria. And by your reasoning, I suppose we can be ignorant of whether the music we listen to was stolen from someone who worked hard for it. In other words, we can transgress any law as long as we are ignorant by your reasoning. Well in today's world, you can be ignorant of the speed limit, but a cop will still pull you over for speeding. What will you say to the officer? lol.

Martin (ibid):

I think it is more difficult to keep the spirit of the law than the letter. So we must depend on YaH to write his law in my heart.

I don't see what the meaning of circumcision is that has been missed in the NT. All you have said about circumcision seems to me to be taught in the NT.

I agree with you that we ought to obey the Torah. Our discussion is about how we interpret it and interpret how it is to be obeyed.

Sha'ul notes: More difficult to keep the spirit of the law than the letter? Lol. How do you spiritually give the tithes that the Torah (Scripture) talked about? Oh right, pastors would never read Torah (Scripture) from a "spirit of the law" perspective, because then no money would be coming in.

Sha'ul (ibid):

How can you have the spirit of something you do not follow literally? That is very contradictory. I have a body/literal. I have breath/spiritual. Spirit is connected with flesh. You can't say something is spiritual and not literal. As for cutting the foreskin, Paul said nothing of cutting the foreskin of the ears or lips. Only cutting the foreskin of the heart was stated in the New Testament. Which is not "new" at all, but stolen from the Torah (Scripture). And they do away with cutting the literal foreskin, an everlasting oath (b'rit ayulam) with the Most High. Shaky ground friend. It won't hold up in court. And they forgot cutting the foreskin of the lips and ears in the New Testament.

Martin (ibid):

You make too many assumptions about what I would say. I think we should buy music that someone produces for sale. But I also listen to the same music on the radio if I cannot afford to buy it.

Sha'ul (ibid):

I did not say you would steal people's music. I'm saying by your reasoning of ignorance you could break any law and not be held accountable, due to your ignorance.

Sha'ul notes further: Thus, if you got some music from someone and found it was stolen, YOU ARE STILL GUILTY OF THEFT!

Martin (ibid):

I also keep the speed limit under ordinary circumstances. However, if there is an emergency, the cops help me with an escort to get to the hospital quickly.

As far as the word "god" I understand it our current usage to refer to false gods as well. Therefore, we must specify which god we worship. Like you, I worship YaH. your accusation with regard to "any law" is even more of an assumption than what you said about music.

I am not suggesting that we should not keep the law literally. But even the "literal" application of the law is subject to interpretation.

A law that requires a certain speed in a certain place does not contradict a law that allows a different speed in a different place. By studying both literal laws we can discern

the spirit or goal of those laws. Then we can apply them to places where no speed limits are posted. without the literal we could not discern the spiritual.

Sha'ul notes: This is where our debate ended. It ought to be enough on this subject to show how off base with the Turah (Scripture) Martin is. Notice that Martin never addressed my reference to "God" as a false mighty one, a proper name in fact, not to be used by us in reference to the Most High. He clearly shows that he does not understand the "literal" application of the Turah.

Shalom to all,
Sha'ul bayn Yahukhenun