

## Evidences for Corruption of Scripture

### Evidence of Suppression

Remember Orwell's 1984? Words were fabricated and eliminated to communicate specific ideas for control purposes. Let's see if this method has been utilized within Christianity. 'Lord', 'Jesus', 'Christ', 'cross', 'church', 'holy', 'obey', 'keep', and 'law' among others are all deliberate substitutions for specific and significant terms that are now suppressed. Denying this is intellectually dishonest, but let's examine some evidence.

First and foremost, God has repeatedly expressed his desire to be called upon by his name, Yahowah (YHWH). Christians don't bother to acknowledge that God even has a name and assert that he actually has many names. Credit for this goes to the Jews though (Jer 23). "The Lord" is literally the definition of haBa'al. Yahowah will not leave unpunished anyone who participates in diminishing the recognition of his name so as to remove "Yahowah" from our vocabulary. (Ex 20:7) The Hebrew conveys "carrying away (removing) and replacing with emptiness" as opposed to the commonly translated "misuse". Efforts to accomplish this are perfectly stated by Jeremiah (23:26) and reiterated dozens of times elsewhere. Under our very noses, "Yah", the acceptable short form of Yahowah, is obscured as "-iah" as expressed in the names of many prophets that communicate powerful messages pertaining to God, i.e. Yirmayahuw = Yahowah Uplifts.

And what of the Son? 'Jesus' was unheard of until being fabricated in the 17th century. 'Iesous' is also a substitute for the placeholder written in Greek because names are never translated but rather transliterated to a phonetic equivalent which the Greek alphabet did not permit. Yahowsha' could not be correctly articulated via the Greek alphabet but could be referenced with a LXX and Torah comparison to discover the actual Hebrew name. Yahowsha' incorporates Yahowah and Salvation. Why would anyone want to suppress that?

Ma'asaYah equates to "Yahowah's Work" but has practically been resigned to obscurity and replaced by messiah which is an adjective meaning anointed. Many kings and prophets were anointed. The prophet whom Yah promised Moshe would convey his instructions since the audience present at the time was too terrified to listen (Dt 18) was surely anointed. For some reason though, Christians chose to transliterate christos instead of translating to anointed. The devious reasons for this require more intensive explanation than I can post here. The anointed prophet certainly proclaimed the same message as Yahowah. Even today, nobody is listening. Why suppress his teaching?

The imagery of a cross is nothing new. In fact, the cross is old as Babylon and Egypt where it was displayed as an ankh or worn on a necklace or in a pattern of a headdress ... like the one Tammuz, aka Bacchus wore and is also associated with Dionysus and Osiris. A 'stauros' is an upright stake upon which men were impaled by several methods. 'CruX' is not to be found in the Greek texts. The significance of "upright" has been suppressed for so long that there is no point addressing it further here.

Ecclesia was a perfectly suitable translation for the mow'ed mikra'ey (called-out assembly) described by Yahowah in his instructions regarding appointed meeting times. The idea of setting apart time to meet with God as his set-apart people on the occasions he set apart for that specific and prophetic purpose is

suppressed by 'church'. There is no avoiding Circe in determining the derivation of church. Circe is the daughter of sungod, Helios. That, of course is suppressed as well.

Setting something apart from other things identifies a special purpose without necessitating a religious context. But religion requires more than being uncommon. 'Holy' more adequately communicates a sanctimonious concept. The idea of being separated, distinguished from the ordinary, set apart for a greater purpose may not be suppressed entirely but is removed from the appropriate context.

Strange as it may seem, Yah does not command obedience but rather attention. The Hebrew term often translated 'obey', shama, means 'listen'. Simple enough, unless religious people prefer some more authoritative role that they can then assume for themselves. Obedience then becomes a more suitable concept to that end. Listening to instructions engenders knowledge and understanding that in turn fosters wise decisions. Obedience requires nothing more than faith. Suppressing this concept has created masses of "believers" who are clueless devotes.

Yah's instructions could still be corrupted even if people know to listen attentively to them. We are further instructed to 'guard' or 'protect' the instructions for posterity. The Hebrew shamar conveys this. That has been suppressed however because the instructions have been contorted into an impossibly arduous "law" that must be "kept" rather than guarded. And since it is such a terrible law, maybe abandoning it altogether is best. We'll just keep the ones we like and make up some others that will keep the flock in line ... and giving.

Yes, the teaching, requirements, rules and commands that bring blessing and govern our behavior as a people set apart from this ever declining world are collectively referred to as the "law of Moses". The 119th psalm is an ode to each of these. The 19th psalm refers to Yah's torah as perfect and restoring the soul. Religious people have hated Yah's instructions from the time they were delivered until now. Suppressing 'teaching' and proclaiming 'law' as a taskmaster paints a distorted but effective message. Did God redeem his people from slavery only to perpetually subject them to an oppressive law?

---

### Evidence of Mistranslation

Relative to my main premise, here is a detail of Jeremiah 31:31 that I shamelessly swiped from a forum:

**"Behold** (hineh – look, listen, and pay close attention to what follows), **days** (yowmym – times) **are coming** (bow' – will arrive and will return), **prophetically declares** (na'um – foretells, predicts, and reveals) **Yahowah** (YaHoWaH), **when** (wa) **I will cut** (karat – I will create, completely establishing and totally stipulating, I will actually make by way of separation (qal stem affirms reality and perfect conjugation speaks of an act which is total, complete, and indivisible)) **relationally with** ('eth – as an eternal symbol on behalf of) **the household and family** (bayth – the home) **of Yisra'el** (yisra'el – those who strive and contend with, engage, persist, and endure with, are set free and are empowered by God) **and relationally with** (wa 'eth – as an eternal symbol on behalf of) **the household and family** (bayth – the home) **of Yahuwdah** (Yahuwdah – those who are related to and engage with Yah) **a renewed and restored** (chadash – a renewing, restoring, repairing, and reaffirming) **Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship**

(beryth – nurturing and engaged relational agreement established on the foundation of beyth – family and home, a mutually binding partnership promise, solemn oath, and active alliance, and a participatory pledge based upon a marriage vow which fosters and encourages).” (Yirmayahuw / Yahowah Uplifts / Jeremiah 31:31)

The part of this verse which Christians, desperate to justify their “New Testament,” miss, is that the renewal and restoration of the “beryth – Covenant” isn’t with Gentiles or their church, but instead, with Yahuwdah and Yisra’el. This promise, therefore, cannot apply to Christians or Christianity. It’s game over.

As a result, the only question worth debating in this passage is whether chadash should be translated “new” or “renewed,” as both are etymologically acceptable. Is God going to renew and restore, reaffirm and repair the Covenant presented in the Towrah with Yisra’el and Yahuwdah, or is He going to scrap the Towrah’s definition of this relationship and create an entirely new agreement?

To put this question to rest, you should know that the primary meaning of chadash, sometimes transliterated, hadas, is “to renew, to restore, to repair, and to reaffirm.” Of the ten times this verb is scribed in the Towrah, Prophets, and Psalms, it is translated: “restore and reaffirm” in 1 Samuel 11:14, “renewed and repaired” in 2 Chronicles 15:8, “to repair” in 2 Chronicles 24:4, “to repair and mend” in 2 Chronicles 24:12, “renewed” in Job 10:7, “renew” in Psalms 51:12, “renewed” in Psalms 103:5, again as “renewed” in Psalms 104:30, “repair” in Isaiah 61:4, and “renew and restore” in Lamentations 5:21.

As such, this passage actually reads: “Behold (hineh), days (yowmym) are coming (bow’), prophetically declares (na’um) Yahowah (YaHoWaH), when (wa) I will actually cut (karat) relationally with (‘eth) the household and family (bayth) of Yisra’el (yisra’el) and on behalf of (wa ‘eth) the household and family (bayth) of Yahuwdah (Yahuwdah) a renewing, restoring, and repairing (chadash – with the secondary meaning being: a renewed, repaired, and restored) Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship (beryth).” (Yirmayahuw 31:31) And in this way, Yahowah is saying that His Covenant “is renewing,” that it “is restoring,” and that it “will be affirmed,” as it “will repair” the relationship He has had with Yahuwdah and Yisra’el.

While this rendering of the 31st verse of Yirmayahuw is completely valid, it isn’t necessarily the conclusion you would come to if you casually looked up chadash in your favorite lexicon. Strong’s, for example, presents S2319 chadash (חֲדָשׁ) as “new,” and then they claim that it was translated “new” 48 times [in the King James Version for which their concordance was created]. But look closely. The initial Strong’s entry regarding this word reveals that it is “From S2318 chadash (חֲדָשׁ),” which they define as “to renew, to make anew, and to repair.” But that is misleading. It is actually the same word. As is chodesh (חֹדֶשׁ), which is translated “month” 254 times according to Strong’s. Therefore, the same three letters can be used to convey a verb, an adjective, and a noun—something which is quite common in Hebrew, as well as most ancient languages.

So while there is absolutely no textual distinction between these three forms of chadash in the Divine Writ, the Masoretes created one—and it is that variation which has caused modern lexicons to make three words out of one. This known, there was an additional slight of scholastic hand in operation here. In Hebrew, like most all languages, verbs rule. Because they are active, they shape the meaning of the nouns, adjectives, and adverbs which are based upon them. For example, if you are diligent in your Scriptural study, you will discover that the root of most nouns, adjectives, and adverbs are verbs. But in this particular case, we find a very telling contrived exception to the rule.

I share this with you because the verbal definition, which in the case of chadash/hadas is “to renew, to repair, to

restore, and to reaffirm,” should have prevailed. In fact, it is from the root meaning of “chadash – renewal and restoration” that chodesh/hodes became “month,” as the light reflected from the moon’s surface was “renewed and restored.”

That is not to say, however, that the adjective chadash/hadas cannot be translated “new.” It can be when the context dictates. It only means that if there are two equally viable options, as there are in Yirmayahuw / Jeremiah 31:31, we should choose the form which is consistent with the verbal root. And that becomes especially important if the other option would have God contradicting Himself.

As further affirmation of “renewed and restored” being an appropriate translation of chadash/hadas in this context, we find that within the prophetic writings of Yirmayahuw and Yasha’yahuw, each time Yahowah inspired either man to scribe chadash/hadas, by rendering it “renewed,” or especially “restored,” we achieve a substantially more enlightening result than translating this word “new.”

These things known, the next line seems to suggest that there will be a new covenant, one different than the one whose terms and conditions were delineated in the Towrah. But is this even possible? Could God do such a thing without seriously contradicting other statements He has made, and in so doing, rendering Himself capricious, and His Word unreliable?

**“It will not be exactly the same as (lo’ ka – it will not be identical to) the (ha) Covenant (beriyth – familial relationship, marriage vow, binding agreement, and pledge) which relationally (‘asher) I cut (karat – created through separation) with (‘et) their fathers (‘abowtam) in the day when (ba yowm) firmly grasping Me (hazaq – I repaired, renewed, and restored them, I established, sustained and supported them, I caused them to prevail and grow, as they were strengthened and encouraged by My power and authority) in their hand (ba yad – by them taking initiative, engaging, and reaching out) I led them out (yasa’ – I descended, extended Myself, and I served them by guiding them away) from (min) the realm (‘erets) of the crucible of Egypt (mitsraym – a metaphor for human religious, political, economic, and military oppression and divine judgment), which relationally (‘asher) they broke, disassociating themselves (parar – they violated and nullified, they frustrated, tore apart, and shattered, and they split away) from (‘eth) My Family-Oriented Covenant Relationship (beryth – My nurturing and engaged relational agreement established on the foundation of beyth – family and home, My mutually binding partnership promise, My solemn oath and active alliance, and My participatory pledge based upon a marriage vow which fosters and encourages), though (wa) I (‘anky) was married to them (ba ba’al hem – I was their husband), prophetically declares (na’um) Yahowah (YaHoWaH).” (Yirmayahuw / Jeremiah 31:32)**

This affirms that the original Covenant was honored by God when He “hazaq – reached out to His people, and grasped hold of them, to renew and restore them,” “yasa’ min – leading them away from” “mitsraym – the crucible of religious and political oppression and divine judgment.” But, now, since Yisra’el and Yahuwdah subsequently “parar ‘eth beryth – broke their end of the agreement, and disassociated themselves from the relationship, the “beryth – Covenant Agreement” must be “chadash – reaffirmed, repaired, renewed and restored.”

The question now becomes: how is God going to do this without contradicting Himself? And what we find is a solution which is not only marvelous in its implications, but also one which completely destroys the Christian religion. Yahowah said:

“Indeed (ky – surely and truly) with this (ha zo’th – in conjunction with these conditions and provisions the) Familial Covenant Relationship (beryth – reciprocal partnership, active alliance, and engaged agreement, mutually

binding and nurturing promise, solemn oath and participatory pledge, based upon a marriage vow) which relationally ('asher) I will cut (karat – I will create and establish through separation) with ('eth – and alongside) the House (bayth – household and family) of Yisra'el (yisra'el – those who strive and contend with, who engage, persist, and endure with, who are set free and are empowered by God) after ('ahar – following) those days (ha yowm hem – that time), prophetically declares (na'um – predicts and promises) Yahowah (YaHoWaH), I will actually give My Towrah, completely providing and producing My Teaching and Instruction (natan 'eth Towrah – I will reliably bestow and totally devote My Direction and My Guidance as a gift, putting it (here the qal stem affirms that this will actually occur and the perfect conjugation tells us that the gift of the Towrah will be whole and complete, indivisible and uninterrupted throughout time)) within their inner nature (ba qereb – internally, inside their person, within their core and midst, becoming part of their psychological makeup, thoughts, and emotions). And (wa) upon ('al – as the Almighty concerning) their heart (leb – speaking of their source of life, and the seat of love, volition, feelings, attitude, and character) I will actually write it (katab – I will genuinely engrave and inscribe it (written in the qal relational stem, telling us that we can rely upon this occurring, and in the imperfect conjugation, affirming that it will produce ongoing results throughout time, with the first person singular prefix, saying that God, Himself will be doing the writing, and with the third person feminine singular suffix, telling us that it is the Towrah, which is a feminine noun, which will be inscribed)). And (wa) I shall be (hayah – I will always, reliably, and without interruption or exception be (qal stem perfect conjugation)) God ('elohym) to and for them (la la), and (wa) they (hem), themselves shall be (hayah – they will always and reliably exist, eternally receiving the complete benefits of (qal relational stem affirming the genuineness of this promise, and imperfect conjugation which tells us that there will be ongoing and unfolding assistance and advantages associated with being considered)) to and for Me as (la la) family ('am)." (Yirmayahuw / Jeremiah 31:33)

The insights provided by the unique relational aspects of Hebrew tenses require greater diligence on our behalf, but they are worth the investment of our time, especially in passages like this one. It wouldn't be a stretch to suggest that the affirmations they provide regarding the unfolding and continuous results we can expect from God giving His Torah to us, placing His Instructions and Teaching inside of us, and writing His Guidance and Direction on our hearts, are as essential to our inclusion in God's Covenant Family as anything ever written.

---

### Evidence of Corruption

Here is one from John that I also stole. The very notion that God hands over to men His unique discernment to forgive or condemn violations of His own terms should by itself shout, "What's wrong here?" But of course nobody is listening. Consider what the Greek text of John 20:22-23 communicates in context: (Resembling 'draw near to Me, and I will draw near to you'.)

**"And when He had said this, He breathed on them and said: 'Accept, associate with, and use (lambano – take upon yourself in order to be carried away, take hold of and use productively, choose to form a relationship with, accept, receive, experience, and exploit courageously) the revered, cleansing, and set-apart Spirit.**

**If (an) someone (tis – a certain individual) is dismissed and sent away (aphiemi – divorced, forsaken, or disregard; neglected or omitted) [by the Spirit], missing the way and erring (hamartia – being without a share because they wandered off on the wrong path and were not made upright), he or she (autos) will be dismissed and sent away (aphiemi – divorced, forsaken, and disregard; neglected and omitted).**

**If (an) someone** (tis – a certain individual) **is empowered to gain possession** (krateo – if they hold on to and retain) [the hagios Spirit] **they will be empowered to gain possession and they will be held on to and be retained** (krateo) [by the Spirit].” (Yahowchanan / John 20:22-23)

An interlinear alone may not reveal this, but an honest and critical evaluation of the existing words in context with an exegetical guide and associated dictionaries will. Further explanation of this reciprocal relationship continues:

“What Yahowsha’ is translated saying is that those who err and miss the way in this life, and those who are as a result dismissed by the Spirit, will be forsaken in heaven. And those who are reborn into Yahowah’s family by way of the Spirit shall always be empowered and shall always be retained. Adoption is forever, but to be adopted, we must accept the terms and conditions of the Covenant and walk to Yahowah along the path He provided through His Invitations to be Called Out and Meet with God.”

---

### Evidence of Deception

Anyone who invests the time to examine Paul’s quotes from scripture will discover that he consistently removes context or otherwise twists the passages into a vastly different message. Here is just one example ... again ripped-off from someone who articulates the matter far better than I could, this time from his Questioning Paul:

... let’s compare what Yahowah inspired Moseh to affirm regarding His Towah with Sha’uwl’s misquotation of the same statement. The Towrah reads:

“Invoking harm upon oneself is whoever relationally and beneficially is not established, restored, and supported by the words of this Towrah, approaching by engaging through them. And then the entire family responded, ‘This is true, acceptable, and reliable.’” (*Dabarym 27:26*)

So why does Galatians say:

“Because to the degree that out of tasks and activities of the Torah, they exist under a curse which a supernatural power deploys when he wishes to invoke harm by promoting evil, doing what is accursed, denounced and detested, for it has been written that: ‘To become accursed, to become abhorrent, and repugnant, everyone who does not remain in everything that having been written in the scroll of the Torah, to do them.’” (*Galatians 3:10*)

These statements aren’t remotely similar, and in fact they are diametrically opposed to one another. The Towrah says: “a person evokes harm upon themselves, they are not restored or established, when they ignore the Towrah and when they fail to act upon it.” Galatians says: “to become accursed, a person should remain associated with Towrah, doing everything its God asks.” This “citation” is so blatantly fraudulent, so obviously disingenuous, why have so many people been fooled by Paul’s errant quotations and subsequent assertions? This isn’t the first time Sha’uwl has misquoted God, nor will it be his last. It is just the worst.

I have yet to see one of Paul’s quotes from scripture that does not twist its meaning.