

*ONE BIBLE,
TWO GOSPELS?*

*Which Gospel Message
Are You Trusting?*

Questions and Answers from the Bible

by Bill and Karen Bishop

ONE BIBLE, TWO BELIEFS

INDEX	p. 1
PERSPECTIVES	p. 3
LEGEND	P. 4
1 – TRUTH.	p. 5
2 – SPIRIT OF TRUTH & SPIRIT OF ERROR	p. 7
3 – ANOTHER GOSPEL	p. 8
4 – IMAGE OF GOD	p. 9
5 – WHAT REALLY IS THE GOSPEL MESSAGE?	p. 10
6 – WHY Y'SHUA CAME	p. 12
7 – CHOICE OF GATES	p. 14
8 – OBEDIENCE	p. 16
9 – GOD'S TEST	p. 18
10 – WHAT IS RIGHTEOUSNESS.	p. 19
11 – DEPART FROM ME	p. 21
12 – WHAT IS LOVE?	p. 22
13 – WHAT IS WORTHY OF DOCTRINAL FORMATION?.	p. 25
14 – HOW DID PAUL TREAT THE LAW?	p. 28
15 – HOW ARE WE TO WORK WITH PAUL'S WORDS?	p. 29
16 – HOW DOES PAUL RELATE TO THE LAW IN HIS WRITINGS?	p. 31
17 – WHAT IS GOD'S VIEW OF LAW KEEPING?	p. 33
18 – IMPORTANCE OF FOUNDATION	p. 34
19 – HOLY AND UNHOLY, CLEAN AND UNCLEAN	p. 36
20 – WHAT IS NEW?	p. 38
21 – HOW DO BELIEVERS FIT IN?	p. 43
22 – UNITY	p. 51
23 – SALVATION	p. 53
24 – NEW CREATURE	p. 54
25 – OPERATION OF THE SPIRIT	p. 57
26 – FROM NEW TO OLD?	p. 60
27 – COVERED IN THE BLOOD	p. 62
28 – Y'SHUA'S VIEW OF THE LAW	p. 63
29 – DINING OPTIONS	p. 64
30 – SABBATH	p. 66
31 – FALLING AWAY	p. 68
32 – FEASTS	p. 69
33 – THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE	p. 71
34 – HE IN ME	p. 72
35 – Y'SHUA'S OBJECTIVE OF TRUTH	p. 74
36 – NEED FOR COMMITMENT	p. 75
37 – SAVED AND JUSTIFIED; SAME OR NOT?	p. 77

38 – PAST AND FUTURE SINS	p. 78
39 – BY GRACE, THROUGH FAITH	p. 79
40 – SANCTIFICATION	p. 80
41 – NOTHING NEW	p. 82
42 – FALSE PROPHETS	p. 83
43 – RECONCILIATION	p. 86
44 – CLOSING THOUGHTS	p. 90

PERSPECTIVES: If We Conclude ... , Then How Do We Explain ... ?

Often times, our belief systems are formed and reformed around various ideologies that present themselves to us. But what if those formations contain error that can be destructive to our relationship with the Creator? What if we have fallen into deception? If so, how do we detect it and get on right footing? It is commonly understood that the one who is deceived is the last one to know it. That is the reality of deception. Our creator seemed to understand this, so He gave us a manual that defines His Truth in its entirety. By referring to this manual, we can come to identify deception!

When a family member is in imminent danger, there is typically a bit of alarm in the voice that reaches out to warn and (if possible) rescue him. All Believers are one in the family of God, and we fear that many in this family are in dire danger today. If the words that follow seem harsh, please realize that it is merely the nature of the voice of alarm. The largest portion of what may seem to be harsh rhetoric, however, comes from quotations of the actual Biblical text itself. It is because of these passages that we are so alarmed for our precious brethren. It quickly becomes obvious that the harshness expressed in the Biblical text itself is intended to be a wake-up call, so we will not simply ignore it. Neither do we attempt to diminish this effect. However, we certainly do not desire to browbeat our fellow brethren. If it appears that we are, we apologize in advance. We simply want to "reason together" from the Word itself. If what we come to believe is Biblically sound doctrine, shouldn't it be able to survive some challenges by contrasting various portions of the Biblical text? We have seen numerous chasms between what is commonly taught today and what we see in the full counsel of Scripture. If our belief system has a direct bearing on our relationship with the Creator, then is it not of vital importance to allow the full counsel of Scripture to speak to our hearts? Should we not challenge ourselves about how our belief systems align to God's full Truth?

Since what is perceived to be Truth is front and center of our belief systems, addressing Truth seems to us to be a good place to start. We have developed a series of questions with appropriate Biblical references to springboard this "reasoning together" dialogue. Please know that your questions, concerns, or comments are welcome as long as they are considerately stated. We desire further dialogue! So – here goes ...

Legend:

Bible verses are in italics. They are all KJV, and any noted emphasis is ours.

Statements of fact are in blue font.

Premises are in green font.

Information drawn from other sources is in purple font.

Questions are in red font.

~~~~~

## 1 - TRUTH

What is Truth? How do we identify it?

*John 17:17*

(17) Sanctify them through thy truth: **thy word is truth.**

Since Torah was the source of Father's Word when Y'shua walked the earth, Y'shua Himself is saying that Torah is "Truth", and He links this Torah Truth to our sanctification. Then Ephesians concurs:

*Ephesians 5:25-27*

(25) ... even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;

(26) That he might **sanctify** and cleanse it with the washing of water by the **word,**

(27) That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.

This then would indicate that our sanctification is dependent on our proper understanding of Father's Truth as it is revealed in His Word.

If we then conclude that Torah (the foundation of Father's Word) has been abolished, how are we to be sanctified?

Y'shua claimed to be The Truth:

*John 14:6*

(6) **Jesus saith** unto him, **I am** the way, **the truth**, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.

Is the Truth of Father's Word different than the Truth that Y'shua claims to be? Does John speak to this?

*John 1:14*

(14) And **the Word was made flesh**, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten **of the Father,**) **full of grace and truth.**

Whose Truth engulfed Y'shua when He was made flesh by the Father?

Why is Father's Spirit called the Spirit of Truth, and whose Truth would His Spirit present to us?

John 15:26

(26) *But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the **Spirit of truth**, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me:*

Since this Spirit **proceeds from the Father**, it is HIS Holy Spirit.

Will the Father's Spirit then uphold the Truth He stated in His Word, or direct us in opposition to it?

John 16:13

(13) *Howbeit when he, **the Spirit of truth**, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.*

Who then will this Spirit be hearing from as it guides us "into all truth"?

Are there three different truths (the Truth of Father's Word in Torah - the Truth brought by the Son - the Truth of Father's Spirit), or are they one unified truth? How many truths did Y'shua indicate when He professed to be THE Truth?

John 14:6

(6) *Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, **the** truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.*

How do we know what is NOT Truth?

1 John 2:4

(4) *He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.*

2 Timothy 3:7

(7) *Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.*

## 2 – SPIRIT OF TRUTH & SPIRIT OF ERROR

John emphasizes that there is a Spirit of Truth AND a Spirit of Error.

1 John 4:5-6

(5) *They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them.*

(6) *We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the **spirit of truth**, and the **spirit of error**.*

Which spirit are we following when we oppose Father's foundational instructions?

John 10:1-5

(1) *Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.*

(2) *But he that entereth in **by the door** is the shepherd of the sheep.*

(3) *To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear **his voice**: and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out.*

(4) *And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for **they know his voice**.*

(5) *And **a stranger** will they not follow, but will **flee from him**: for they **know not the voice of strangers**.*

Might entering in by the "door" of John 10:2 be through obedience to the precepts of the Father, aligning to His will and ways? What directs Y'shua's voice (the voice of the Shepard that we are to hear)?

John 12:49-50

(49) *For I have not spoken of myself; but **the Father** which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.*

(50) *And I know that **his commandment** is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, **even as the Father said unto me, so I speak**.*

Who is the stranger mentioned in John 10:5 above? Is it not the voice of one who speaks CONTRARY to what Father speaks?



### 3 – ANOTHER GOSPEL

Galatians 1:6-7

(6) *I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto **another gospel**:*

(7) *Which is **not another**; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.*

Since it is Father's voice that speaks to us through **His** Holy Spirit, and He would not contradict Himself, it must be the spirit of the stranger or the spirit of error that teaches us "another gospel" as found in 2 Corinthians:

2 Corinthians 4:4

(4) *In whom the **god of this world** hath **BLINDED THE MINDS** of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of **Christ, who is the image of God**, should shine unto them.*

Why is Y'shua said to be the IMAGE OF GOD (the Father) in this verse? In like manner, whose image will we actually be in if we conform to the image of the Son?

In 2 Corinthians 11:3-4, we find this other gospel being tied to another spirit (the spirit of error) AND to another Jesus.

2 Corinthians 11:3-4

(3) *But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.*

(4) *For if he that cometh preacheth **another Jesus**, whom we have not preached, or **if ye receive another spirit**, which ye have not received, or **another gospel**, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him.*

If Y'shua is in Father's image, then whose image will the counterfeit Jesus assume? Likewise, if we follow the wrong "Jesus", whose image will we assume?

When we tie the passages in this section together, we see that listening to the words that come from "the god of this world" (or the spirit of error) can **blind our minds** to the TRUE gospel message, even as the serpent convinced Eve that God didn't really mean what He said.

## 4 – IMAGE OF GOD

Romans 8:29

(29) For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be **conformed to the image of his Son**, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.

The firstborn among many brethren implies that we (being the brethren) should also bear the image of the Father that Y'shua bore.

While Galatians 1:6 says that the perverted gospel removes us "from Him that called" us unto Y'shua, John 6:44 tells us Who it is that actually calls us to Y'shua.

Galatians 1:6-7

(6) I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto **another gospel**:

(7) Which is **not another**; but there be some that trouble you, and would **pervert** the gospel of Christ.

John 6:44

(44) No man can come to me, **except the Father** which hath sent me **draw him**; and I will raise him up at the last day.

Paul clarifies in Galatians that what he terms "another gospel" is actually just a perversion of the true gospel message.

That indicates that it might be similar, but with a twist – such as being an incomplete picture of the true – causing many to fall short of fulfilling their intended sanctification process.

Could the key to understanding this perversion be relative to its ability to draw us away from the Father (Galatians 1:6 above)? If so, just what would the nature of this perversion of the gospel message be?

## 5 – WHAT REALLY IS THE GOSPEL MESSAGE?

What is the true gospel message that Y'shua (the voice of the true shepherd) said He came to teach, and how does it differ from the perverted version?

*Luke 4:43*

*(43) And he said unto them, I must preach **the kingdom of God** to other cities also: for therefore am I sent.*

*Mark 1:14*

*(14) Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching **the gospel of the kingdom of God**,*

There are 104 references to the "gospel" in the New Testament: In total, there are 5 references to the gospel of the Kingdom. There are 4 references to another gospel, 3 to the gospel of truth/salvation. There is 1 mention of the gospel of mystery, 2 to the gospel of promise or hope, 2 to the gospel of circumcision or uncircumcision, 1 of the gospel to Abraham, 7 of the gospel spoken by Paul or associates, 2 of the gospel of peace, 1 of the gospel pertaining to grace, and 1 to the everlasting gospel. There are 16 mentions of the gospel of the Son, Jesus, or Christ, and 7 mentions of the gospel of God. Lastly, there are 52 references to the gospel with no specific or implied specification.

If we conclude that the gospel (good news) message is simply the forgiveness of sins, how do we reconcile that with the actual wording of these 104 references to the "gospel" in the New Testament? Why is there is no mention of the "gospel of the blood", the "gospel of the forgiveness of sins", the "gospel of absolution", etc., while that which Y'shua actually taught was specified as "the gospel of the Kingdom of God"?

If the remission of sin is merely the first step in the ultimate reconciliation process that Y'shua's gospel of the Kingdom message was all about, then to say that the gospel of atonement was the entire gospel message would fall short of the entire picture. If the reconciliation Y'shua accomplished was actually to pave the way for the broader purpose of restoration to Father and His Kingdom, then to end the gospel message after only the first step of the process would cause many to fall short in the intended walk of sanctification.

*Hebrews 2:17*

*(17) Wherefore in all things **it behoved him (Y'shua)** to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things*

*pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.*

Reconciliation to Who for what purpose? Does not even Paul indicate that attaining access to the Father is the purpose of the Son and the Spirit?

*Ephesians 2:18*

*(18) For **through him (the Son) we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.***

## 6 – WHY Y'SHUA CAME

What if that broader spectrum was the very purpose for Y'shua's coming? Might not the message of Kingdom restoration be the thrust of Y'shua's ministry – about how we can be restored to Father as we embrace the power and loving guidance of the Father's Spirit of Truth?

*John 18:37*

*(37) Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. **TO THIS END WAS I BORN, and FOR THIS CAUSE I CAME INTO THE WORLD, that I should bear witness unto the TRUTH.** Every one that is **of the TRUTH** heareth my voice.*

Y'shua reveals here the ultimate reason He came. It was to BEAR WITNESS UNTO THE TRUTH. He then says that everyone who is OF THE TRUTH will hear His voice. (Everyone will understand how this TRUTH is integral to providing the full measure of atonement that He would secure for us.)

According to this verse, if we are not "of the Truth", are we really hearing His (Y'shua's – the true Shepard's) voice? Again, what does "of the Truth" mean?

What was the Truth He taught, and how does it relate to the "way" of God in Matthew 22?

*Matthew 22:16*

*(16) ... Master, we know that thou art true, and **teachest the way of God in truth,** ... .*

Would this "WAY OF GOD" not be the same truth that Father's Spirit of Truth wants to guide us to?

*John 16:13*

*(13) Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.*

What is this singular, unified Truth that was embraced and taught by the Father, the Son, and the Spirit?

How can all of these verses be compiled short of understanding that God's Truth is a continuous Truth that extends from the Old Testament into the New?

Accordingly, might the gospel message that disconnects the Old from the New and distorts the divine nature of that singular unified Truth be “another gospel” referenced by Paul (that is actually a perversion of the real gospel message)?

*Galatians 1:6-7*

*(6) I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto **another gospel**:*

*(7) Which is **not another**; but there be some that trouble you, and would **pervert** the gospel of Christ.*

Might it be the incomplete gospel message that causes many to fall short of restoration to the kingdom by subverting the intended sanctification process?

## 7 – CHOICE OF GATES

*Matthew 7:13-14*

*(13) Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat:*

*(14) Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.*

The wide gate leads to the broad way; the strait gate leads to the narrow way.

How does wide relate to broad, and strait relate to narrow?

Many today teach that the strait gate is for Believers and the wide gate is for non-Believers. However, there may be room for doubt about that scenario. The “gates” may relate to belief systems formed by our instruction from pastors and teachers. The “ways” may relate to the lifestyle that results from those beliefs. Actually, the verses that follow may lend credence to that concept, and bring strong implication that these warnings are for those who would consider themselves followers or Believers:

*Matthew 7:15*

*(15) Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.*

While “prophets” in this verse generally applies to those who prophecy, it is not always limited to the foretelling of future things, but can potentially apply to those who simply present a “divine WORD” that may be from the “god” of this World rather than from the TRUE GOD - possibly a measure of instruction that is not built on the unity of divine Truth.

This warning of false prophets may then be a continuation of the warning of the two types of gates. The straight gate may be where the straightforward unified divine Truth is taught, and the WIDE gate might be where the wider perspective of the world’s version of truth is taught. The broad way would be to follow the world’s view of morality, and the narrow way would be to align to the Truth of God’s designed path. In fact, the next few verses indicate that falling prey to the distorted version may prevent some from entering the Kingdom:

*Matthew 7:21-23*

*(21) Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.*

*(22) Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?*

*(23) And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.*

So, what type of misconception would carry such dire consequences?



## 8 - OBEDIENCE

How did Father view Saul's version of obedience?

1 Samuel 15:19-23

(19) Wherefore then didst thou not obey the voice of the LORD, but didst fly upon the spoil, and didst evil in the sight of the LORD?

(20) And Saul said unto Samuel, Yea, **I have obeyed the voice of the LORD**, and have gone the way which the LORD sent me, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and have utterly destroyed the Amalekites.

(21) But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto the LORD thy God in Gilgal.

(22) And Samuel said, Hath the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.

(23) For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as **iniquity** and idolatry. **BECAUSE THOU HAST REJECTED THE WORD OF THE LORD**, he hath also rejected thee from being king.

Is it not obvious that Saul was proud of his accomplishment, thinking he had operated in obedience? What was the outcome?

Does our understanding of iniquity match Father's? Is it possible to think we are being obedient to Father's ways, while our actions actually fall under the category of being "in iniquity"?

Y'shua professes total alignment with Father.

John 10:30

(30) *I and my Father are one.*

So - What is Y'shua's view of iniquity? Could even unintentional departure from Father's ways by those working on His behalf be viewed as being "in iniquity"?

Matthew 7:21-23

(21) Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth **the will of my Father** which is in heaven.

(22) *Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?*

(23) *And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me,*

***ye that work iniquity.***

The word "iniquity" in verse 23 is Strong's G458 (anomia) – *the condition of without law, because ignorant of it, because violating it.* Equating God's divine law to the roots found in Torah, this would equate to lawlessness (Torahlessness) due to ignorance of it or violation of its precepts.

Does not verse 21 confirm that it is the will of the Father (as expressed in the precepts of His Word) that defines iniquity in verse 23? Is it not a huge consequence to be turned away from heaven BY Y'SHUA because of this iniquity?

## 9 – GOD’S TEST

Is there something to consider from the Old Testament about this passage?

*Deuteronomy 13:1-4*

(1) *If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder,*

(2) *And the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them;*

(3) *Thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: **for the LORD your GOD PROVETH YOU, to know whether***

***ye love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul.***

(4) ***Ye shall walk after the LORD your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him.***

Do we not see that we must reject even those who do signs and wonders if they draw us away from Father’s precepts? This says God proves (tests) us! Might Father actually allow these signs and wonders to see who will be faithful to cleave to Him and His ways in spite of such signs? Might this not relate to those who are working miracles in Matthew 7:21-23 who are found to be in iniquity (lawlessness or Torahlessness) - those whom Y’shua Himself declares that He will not receive into the Kingdom of Heaven?

*2 Thessalonians 2:10-12*

(10) *And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the **LOVE of the truth**, that they might be saved.*

(11) *And for this cause God shall send them **strong delusion, that they should believe a lie:***

(12) *That they all might be damned who **believed not the truth**, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.*

Would not the “love of the truth” in verse 10 relate to the divine unified Truth of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit – the Truth which has its roots in Torah? If we do not **LOVE this divine Truth** as expressed throughout the Bible, might we fall into this trap? Might the delusion Father allows then cause us to believe a lie (a distorted version of the gospel message which excuses - or even denies the potential of - iniquity)?

## 10 – WHAT IS RIGHTEOUSNESS

**Never mind how we see it** – how does Father view unrighteousness (verse 12)? Is this why so many enter the wide gate, and so few move toward the strait one?

*Deuteronomy 6:25*

*(25) And it shall be our righteousness, **IF** we observe to do all these commandments before the LORD our God, as he hath commanded us.*

Is this legalism?

Heaven forbid that Father would teach legalism! Father calls it “our righteousness” and Paul says that as Believers, we were created for and ordained to walk in good works as Y’shua did!

*Ephesians 2:10*

*(10) For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.*

So, what is legalism?

John 10:1 indicates that some might try to get to heaven some other way than through Y’shua.

*John 10:1*

*(1) Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.*

It seems that some folks think they can be good enough in their own self-sufficiency that they don’t need to look to Y’shua for their atonement. If they can follow the moral standards they believe to be right, they think they will be allowed entrance to heaven. There is a difference between “works through Y’shua” (righteousness) and “works in place of Y’shua” (legalism). It may well be the difference between entrance, or no entrance.

Likewise, a mere profession of faith without works to follow may be hollow in God’s eyes:

*James 2:20, 22, 24, & 26*

*(20) But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?*

*(22) Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith*

made perfect?

(24) Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.

(26) For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.

Is not the alignment to Torah instruction repeatedly shown as a part of the equation?

While obedience to the Law and good works alone can never bring us restoration, does this mean we should no longer keep divine Law?

Why does Deuteronomy 6:25 say that observing Father's commandments will be "our righteousness"?

Conversely, wouldn't "unrighteousness" then be the failure to "observe to do" Father's commandments "as He hath commanded us"?

If we do NOT LOVE the divine unified Truth of the Father, the Son and the Spirit that we were meant to observe, and we (as a result) fail to revere His commandments, what then does verse 12 of 2 Thessalonians 2 say might happen?

*2 Thessalonians 2:12*

*(12) That they all might be damned who **believed not the truth**, but had pleasure in **unrighteousness**.*

## 11 – DEPART FROM ME

Does the judgment in 2 Thessalonians 2:12 seem to correlate with Matthew 7:23?

*Matthew 7:23*

*(23) And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.*

Paul show us the relationship between iniquity and truth in his discussion of what charity (love) is.

*1 Corinthians 13:4-6*

*(4) Charity suffereth long, and is kind; ...*

*(6) Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth;*

Is not lawlessness (Torahlessness – failure to follow God’s divine Law) the definition for iniquity?

If we turn our back on the precepts of Father’s Truth, what does this indicate about our ability to show Father the love He deserves from us?

Is obedience to Father’s commandments to be viewed as a means to earn points with Father, OR is it the way we are taught to love Him? If it brings us closer to Him, would it not enrich our relationship with Him, and Him with us?

## 12 – WHAT IS LOVE?

Eight times in the Old Testament love is linked with keeping Father's commandments. It is brought through in the New Testament as well.

*John 14:15*

*(15) If ye love me, keep my commandments.*

If keeping the commandments is the way we are to show our love for Father, what is "not keeping them" to be seen as?

What did Y'shua confirm as a prerequisite to entering Heaven in Matthew 19:17?

*Matthew 19:17*

*(17) And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: **but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.***

If keeping the commandments is needful to enter into life, what would the converse of not keeping them be?

Deuteronomy 13:1-4 indicates that Father will try us to see who really loves Him.

*Deuteronomy 13:3-4*

*(3) ... **for the LORD your GOD PROVETH YOU, to know whether ye love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul.***

*(4) **Ye shall walk after the LORD your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him.***

Is our relationship of love with Him to be based upon our righteousness as we perceive it, or is it to be centered on obedience to what He has commanded us?

Is our relationship with Him to be confirmed by how we "feel" at any given time (an extremely deceptive gauge), or by what we actually do?

*Jeremiah 17:9-10*

*(9) The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?*

*(10) I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.*

Because some people might keep the commandments for the wrong reason (i.e. trying to earn their way to heaven), is their apparent hypocrisy a reason for us to scoff at keeping them?

Is it any reason to disdain the words that are so clearly expressed by Father and confirmed by the Son?

Isn't that rationale somewhat like saying: "There are hypocrites in the church, so I won't go to church."?

What is evidence of our true love for Him – our relationship with Him according to Deuteronomy 13:1-4, and again in 1 John?

*1 John 5:3*

*(3) For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous.*

Isn't this what Y'shua referenced as well when he asked us to put on His yoke? Would that not be the same commandments He observed as He aligned with Father?

*Matthew 11:28-30*

*(28) Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.*

*(29) Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls.*

*(30) For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.*

What is the reward that lies ahead if we do so?

*Revelation 22:12-15*

*(12) And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.*

*(13) I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.*

*(14) Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.*

*(15) For **without** are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.*

Might the "narrow" way and the "strait" gate align to the gates of the heavenly city where those who have kept the commandments may enter?



What of the wide gate where many in this life will enter? Does it result in being left "without" the heavenly gates?

Could those who love a lie (verse 15) relate to those who have loved the lie of the distorted gospel message (2 Thessalonians 2:11) instead of loving Father's Truth enough to adhere to it?

If Paul's belief system does not embrace a unified Truth of Father, Son, and Spirit, and adherence to God's law, then how are we to perceive HIS relationship to God? Even if Paul did miracles, but draws us away from Father's precepts, does not Deuteronomy 13:1-4 stress that we should reject his teachings? If Paul was teaching that Torah is no longer valid, would this not be rejecting Father's precepts? Would not such words from his mouth be heresy in view of all that has been taught by Torah AND by Y'shua himself? So - is he heretical (and must be rejected) or simply misunderstood?

Maybe Paul is simply misunderstood, primarily due to our Anglicized perspective. It is likely that that very same Anglicized perspective of Paul's words could actually be the strong delusion God allows to test His own - to see who really DOES LOVE His Truth!

### 13 – WHAT IS WORTHY OF DOCTRINAL FORMATION?

If we are to understand Paul properly, should we not get to the core of the matter? What do Paul's words in 2 Timothy indicate?

2 Timothy 3:15-16

(15) And that **from a child** thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to **make thee wise unto salvation** through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

(16) **ALL scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for DOCTRINE, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:**

What Holy Scriptures did his listeners know from childhood?

Did He not ascribe divine inspiration of God to these same Scriptures, and say they would make man "wise unto salvation" through Christ?

Since the New Testament was not in existence when Paul wrote this, what did he consider as "all Scripture"?

What part of "ALL" can be taken to mean that Paul thought some portions of these childhood Scripture had become obsolete?

If we are to take Paul's words here seriously, he is laying the groundwork for the manner in which we must base all understanding for his teachings. With these very words, Paul is validating the entirety of Torah teaching, and emphasizing that it is all worthy not only for correction, but for doctrine. He doesn't speak with forked tongue, so this view of Torah will be foundational to all of his teachings. He warned us not to be deceived in respect to proper instruction, but to continue in that which had been learned from childhood.

2 Timothy 3:13-14

(13) But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, **deceiving, and being deceived.**

(14) But **continue** thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them;

The Bereans of Acts 17:11 Paul commended those of Berea because they searched these same Scriptures to test Paul's teachings, while those of Thessalonica were criticized because they failed to do so.

Acts 17:11

(11) *These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the **scriptures** daily, whether those things were so.*

What might that say to us today? How are we to know whether to receive or reject Paul's words without referring back to Torah as the Bereans did?

If Paul understood that his words would be compared with Torah instruction, why would he actually teach things which he knew would be refuted by Torah and rejected because they did not align with it?

If we fail to put Paul's words into their proper context of Torah, might they not be easily misunderstood?

If we conclude that the Father's precepts of the Old Testament are no longer necessary, then how are we to properly divide the "Word" of Truth referenced by Paul?

2 Timothy 2:15

(15) *Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, **rightly dividing the word of truth.***

The word "dividing" in this verse is Strong's #G3718 (orthotomeō). Though it can mean: *to divide*, it is not division in the sense of cutting apart the text into opposing segments. It actually means: *to discern properly; equivalent to doing right; without perversion; to proceed on straight paths; hold a straight course; to teach the truth directly and correctly.*

Peter acknowledges that Paul's words can be hard to understand, but that wrestling with them can lead to destruction.

2 Peter 3:16

(16) *As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are **some things hard to be understood**, which they that are **unlearned and unstable wrest**, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.*

This wrestling is by those who are unlearned in Torah and are thus unstable. They will wrestle with Paul's words, trying to make them say something they were not intended to say.

What did Paul mean when he admonished us to STUDY to show ourselves approved and rightly divide the Word?

Would not studying and understanding Torah enable us to determine proper intention as we ingest Paul's writings, even as the Bereans did?

Since Paul indicates that Torah is the foundation for doctrine, shouldn't we determine to study Torah in order to validate the proper interpretation of Paul's words?

## 14 – HOW DID PAUL TREAT THE LAW?

Can we not realize that Paul actually revered the Words of Torah?

Paul professed that the manner of the law of the fathers was “perfect”, and that he was taught according to this “perfect manner”:

*Acts 22:3*

*(3) I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the **PERFECT manner of the LAW of the fathers**, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day.*

Would he then (being “zealous” toward the God who had ascribed this “perfect manner”) turn his back on it?

Paul also professed that he had done nothing against the customs of the fathers:

*Acts 28:17*

*(17) And it came to pass, that after three days Paul called the chief of the Jews together: and when they were come together, he said unto them, Men and brethren, though I have committed nothing against the people, or customs of our fathers, yet was I delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans.*

Would this not mean that he had kept and was continuing to keep the same law that the Jews held dear?

Were some passages of Paul’s epistles hypocritical (speaking against the very Scriptures that he himself had validated and denigrating the very laws that he himself kept), OR is he just misunderstood today?

Since Paul said all Scripture (primarily Torah) is inspired by God and profitable for doctrine, should we not evaluate Paul’s words in their full context which upholds these Scriptures (Torah) before forming a doctrine around them?

## 15 – HOW ARE WE TO WORK WITH PAUL’S WORDS?

But how are we to deal with some passages of Paul’s epistles that seem to contradict other of his words?

Paul does not contradict himself. Some of his words have become misunderstood due to failure to properly consider three significant things: Paul’s 1) his cultural manner of circular reasoning, 2) the fuller context of his writings, and 3) the Torah foundation stone they are built upon.

Because we see things only from our Western Anglican worldview, our American translations and teachers often misconstrue Paul’s words and derived deceptive teachings from them.

For instance: Does Paul’s Galatians 5:18 seemingly negative reference to being “under the law” actually conflict with Romans 3:31, or does proper understanding align the two references?

*Galatians 5:18*

(18) But **IF** ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.

*Romans 3:31*

(31) Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, **we establish the law**.

Maybe Paul meant something along these lines: ~~~ that the Spirit will not lead one to break the Law that Father established – so those who are led by the Spirit WILL no longer fall under (or have to face the penalty of) the Law, because they are being led to obey it by the Spirit of God Himself; that by being led to obey Father’s Law by Father’s Spirit, we establish the validity of the all-encompassing Law Father put into place; that **IF** we are walking in the counsel of Father’s Spirit, and yielding to Father’s Spirit, we will not be UNDER the Law’s condemnation; rather we will LIVE it fully from one moment to the next, and as it lives on in us, it is exhibited to others through our witness. ~~~

Might our Anglicized perspective of Galatians 5:18 tend to make something out of Paul’s words which he did not mean because we did not bring his teaching full circle to include Romans 3:31?

Should we not be faithful to put ALL of Paul's words in context with ALL the rest of his words, and lay them always upon the foundation stone he established in his epistles to Timothy, and THEN (and only then) build doctrine around them?

## 16 – HOW DOES PAUL RELATE TO THE LAW IN HIS WRITINGS?

In the "church's view of doctrine, is there not a lack of emphasis on Father and HIS ways, as though the commandments were somehow unfitting after Y'shua? Does Paul reflect this view, or oppose it?

Romans 7:12

(12) Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

What did Paul mean in Romans 8:2?

Paul confirms here that it is the "law of sin and death" that we are freed from when we enter into the Y'shua. Freedom from that "sin and death" bondage" puts us under the "law of the Spirit of life".

Romans 8:2

(2) For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the **law of sin and death.**

Paul clearly shows us here that it is the law of sin and death that is the bondage from which we are to be freed through Y'shua.

Why do common doctrinal teachings of today's church then relate the divine Law of the Father (the law of the Spirit of life" in this verse) into a bondage from which we must be freed?

Does it not become quickly obvious that ignoring Paul's far-reaching tenets as revealed in the full context of his circular reasoning makes cherry picking verses like Galatians 5:18 extremely dangerous? Does it not become frighteningly apparent that this can result in the introduction of invalid and destructive doctrinal formation?

If Paul spoke with forked tongue or attempted to invalidate Father's precepts for the walk of the Believers of his day or ours, would his writings have a place at all in our book of Scripture today, and what would that say about the supposed divine inspiration of his writings?

Might isolating the words of Paul from their cultural and lawful context lead us astray?



Might such cherry-picking subject us to the doctrines often presented in the “church” today which tickle itching ears by slashing and otherwise altering some of Father’s precepts?

Will it cause iniquity from Father’s perspective to enter into the heart and life of today’s Believers (through violation of His instruction)? Even when there is no wicked intent on our part, might we fall prey to such iniquity in Father’s eyes as a natural consequence of failing to LOVE His Truth (as it was first presented in Torah) properly?

## 17 – WHAT IS GOD’S VIEW OF LAW KEEPING?

When the perspective of Father’s precepts is altered by such doctrinal deviation, does it become possible for Believers to be viewed by Father as profaning Him while they are thinking all is OK?

*Ezekiel 22:8*

(8) *Thou hast despised mine holy things, and hast **profaned** my sabbaths.*

Might Father view disregard for His Law as sacrilege? How does he feel when we don’t honor His precepts? Can we really say we “love” Him, or that we are “worshiping” Him, when we fail to properly honor Him?

*Ezekiel 22:14*

(14) Can thine heart endure, or can thine hands be strong, in the days that I shall deal with thee? I the LORD have spoken it, and will do it.

## 18 – IMPORTANCE OF FOUNDATION

When we fail to provide the 2 Timothy 3:15-16 foundation stone, is not the “wisdom unto salvation” lost, and replaced by distortion that will compromise our salvation process?

2 Timothy 3:15-16

(15) *And that from a child thou hast known **the holy scriptures**, which are able to **make thee wise unto salvation** through faith which is in Christ Jesus.*

(16) **ALL scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for DOCTRINE, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:**

How are our pastors to form proper instructions for righteousness when they bypass or chip away at the very foundation stone their doctrines are to be built upon?

2 Timothy 4:1-5

(1) *I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom;*

(2) **Preach the WORD; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.**

(3) For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, **having itching ears;**

(4) And they shall turn away their ears from the **truth**, and shall be turned unto fables.

(5) *But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, **make FULL PROOF of thy ministry.***

Is not this “Word” (verse 2) that is to be used for reproofing and rebuking the same as the Holy Scriptures known from childhood (Torah) referenced in 2 Timothy 3:15?

Must not Paul’s instruction to “make FULL PROOF of thy ministry” then be to ALWAYS base our teachings on Torah?

Why then would Paul do otherwise? Are we still unable to see the pitfalls that can result when we disregard the very foundation that Paul himself established?

Yet, that can be the end result when we isolate select verses and string them together to form a doctrine that is not congruent with Torah. It serves

to subvert Paul's true intent and circumvent the foundational basis of his instruction.

Did not Paul's words specify that we must make FULL PROOF of our ministry - the tenets of our belief systems that we will pass on to others?

Will we not be held accountable for what we teach others?

Did not Y'shua have something to say about what we teach others?

*Matthew 5:19*

*(19) **Whoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.***

Do we take Paul seriously when he warns in 2 Timothy 3:13-16 of "deceiving and being deceived" (verse 13) if we don't properly consider Torah, AND that it could affect our salvation (verse 15)? By extension, could it not then affect the salvation of those whom we teach?

## 19 – HOLY AND UNHOLY, CLEAN AND UNCLEAR

If we ignore the parts of Torah instruction that we don't like, how does that make us appear before our Father above?

How do we explain the emphasis expressed by our Father in Ezekiel 22:26?

*Ezekiel 22:26*

*(26) Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they shewed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them.*

It seems profoundly evident that all of God's commandments are built upon the concept of the separation of the clean from the unclean and the holy from the profane, as well as honoring that which is important to Him.

If that the clean versus the unclean and the holy versus the unholy, as well as the honoring of His Sabbaths are all major aspects of Father's precepts, then what is the result if we fail to apply those precepts in our own lives?

If we think that was then and this is now - that it is no longer a consideration, how do we explain that Isaiah says Sabbaths would still be observed and Ezekiel said clean and unclean standards would still apply during the Millennial reign?

*Isaiah 66:23*

*(23) And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the LORD.*

*Ezekiel 44:23*

*(23) And they shall teach my people the difference between the holy and profane, and cause them to discern between the unclean and the clean.*

Are we seeing today an entire doctrine that condones departure from Father's precepts?

Could pastors be teaching to our itching ears that want to be able to consume what Father says is unclean, interact with what He sees as profane, and indulge our own desires on His hallowed Sabbath days?

*Exodus 20:11*

(11) *For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and **hallowed** it.*

## 20 – WHAT IS NEW?

Does the concept of being “new” change God’s intent? If we conclude that John 13:34 is a brand spankin’ “new” commandment that replaces all of the “commandments” given to us by Father in Torah, does this then raise inconsistencies with other Scriptural passages?

*John 13:34*

*(34) A **new** commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another.*

Was not this the same intent Father put forth in His Torah passage of Leviticus, meaning that it may not be so new after all?

*Leviticus 19:18*

*(18) Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the LORD.*

How do John’s own words of clarification in his first epistle shed light on the word “new” used in his gospel passage?

*1 John 2:7*

*(7) Brethren, I write no **new** commandment unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the **word** which ye have heard from the beginning.*

Do John’s words here not seem to confirm that John’s use of a “new” commandment in his gospel reference was NOT in the sense of replacing the “old”, but rather merely a fresh rendering of that which preceded it in the Leviticus passage of Torah? Does not that which comes later just amplify that which came before?

John used the same Greek word for “new” in both of his references (John 13:34 and 1 John 2:7). It is Strong’s G2537 (kainos). Lexicon references reveal that this term shows: *new in freshness rather than age, renewed.*

Would that not explain that his word “new” in the phrase “new commandment” of 1 John 2:7 was actually an extension of the commandments of Torah (possibly with a slightly more spiritual application), but never intended to replace its Torah counterpart?

If we conclude that the new covenant replaces the old, how do we explain the wording in Hebrews 8:8?

Hebrews 8:8

(8) For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a **new** covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah:

The Greek word for "new" here is also "kainos" (as used in both of John's references above) - *RENEWED*.

Is it referenced again?

Hebrews 8:13

(13) In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is **ready to** vanish away.

But how does this "new" covenant relate to the "old" in this verse?

The word "old" in Hebrews 8:13 is Strong's G3822 (palaioo) which means: *ancient – rendered obsolete*.

Does that mean the obsolete is to be destroyed? Is there more to be understood from studying "palaioo"?

The opposing counterpart to "palaioo" is Strong's G365 (ananeo) – *to renovate, renew*; and Strong's G341 (anakainoo) – *to restore, make new*.

This then heavily puts "palaioo" in the light of being unrenovated, and its opposing counterpart "ananeo" as being renovated. It should be obvious that something which has been "destroyed" (as we understand the word today) could never be made new – that the "old" must remain in-tact in order to be renovated to the "new". So – we can see how this fits with the definition of "kainos" (the term for "new" in this verse).

Are we not being shown then that the "new" is a renovation of, a renewal of, a restoration of the "old"?

Zodhiates states that the English reference of "vanish away" in Hebrews 8:13 is Strong's G854 (aphanismos), *loosened, regenerated, to disappear as in being absorbed by or incorporated into*. It is derived from Strong's G853 (aphanizo). Zodhiates says of "aphanizo" that this word AS WELL AS ITS SYNONYMS should **NEVER be taken to mean annihilation**. Nothing is annihilated, but simply changes from one state to another. The same Greek word "kainos" is translated "new" in Hebrews 9:15 as well.

Hebrews 9:15



(15) *And for this cause he is the mediator of the **new** testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.*

A very loose analogy to the process of transitioning from the old covenant to the new might be akin to uploading a fix to a computer program that had need of an upgrade to obtain maximum effectiveness. In this sense, this verse might then imply that the new testament does not destroy the old, but that it expands the effectiveness of the first to include the redemption from the penalty of transgression so that one might receive eternal life.

If we conclude that the Father's first covenant was to be thrown away later, how do we explain 1 Chronicles and Psalm 105?

*1 Chronicles 16:16-17*

(16) *Even of the covenant which he made with Abraham, and of his oath unto Isaac;*

(17) *And hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an **everlasting** covenant,*

*Psalms 105:9-10*

(9) *Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac;*

(10) *And confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an **everlasting** covenant:*

Actually, is there ever any indication that ANY covenant Father made with His people was temporary when He made it – did He ever say UNTIL or any such thing when forging a covenant?

If Father could or would break something which he established in this manner, what would that say about the nature of the God we serve? What else has He promised that He might abolish?

However, if he improves upon it through extra provision without destroying the initial groundwork, would it not encourage us by showing that He will work with what he has already made to make it even better – just as the potter does not throw the clay away?

When does this "new" covenant take effect? If we conclude that this "new" covenant is already operative in its fullness, how do we explain the wording "is ready to" in this Hebrews 8:13 text, which indicates that it has not yet happened?

"Ready to" is Strong's G1451 (eggys) – near, imminent, soon to come to pass.

So - the Book of Hebrews was written after the resurrection of Y'shua, and this verse informs us that the "new covenant" is still to come to pass.

How does this correlate with the timing for this "new covenant" revealed in Jeremiah and Ezekiel when Israel and Judah have finally been brought together? Has that happened yet?

*Jeremiah 31:31-34*

(31) *Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a **new covenant** with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah:*

(32) *Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD:*

(33) *But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.*

(34) *And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.*

Has **everyone** (from the least to the greatest) yet known the Yahweh?

*Ezekiel 37:16, 19, 21, 22 & 26*

(16) *Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For **Judah**, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of **Israel** his companions:*

(19) *Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand.*

(21) *And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will take the **children of Israel** from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land:*

(22) *And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all:*

(26) *Moreover **I will make a covenant of peace with them**; it shall be an **everlasting covenant** with them: and I will place them, and multiply*

*them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore.*

If this has come to pass already, when did he restore the bond of Israel and Judah, and where is His sanctuary in the midst of them?

While those who come to Belief in Y'shua now have the Torah written on their hearts by the Holy Spirit within them, this is the beginning of the transition to the new covenant that will be concluded in the time-frame of Ezekiel 37:26.

## 21 – HOW DO BELIEVERS FIT IN?

If we assume that we are not a part of either of these two peoples (Judah or Israel in Jeremiah 31:31 and Ezekiel 37:16), then how do we have a place in this new covenant at all?

If we are a part of these two peoples, which group are we accounted with?

What is meant by Galatians 3:29?

*Galatians 3:29*

*(29) And **if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed**, and heirs according to the promise.*

Being "Christ's" is a spiritual component that is merely counted as a physical manifestation. We are seen by Father as being of Abraham's seed though we may or may not have any direct blood lineage that links to him. Jacob was a descendant of Abraham, and he was given the name Israel in Genesis 32:28. All twelve tribes descended from Jacob (Israel). While Judah remained in the land, the northern tribes assimilated with other nations, and became known as Israel. They must be reunited for this prophecy to be fulfilled. The entire house of Jacob will one day be reunited, and referred to as Israel, so we can identify as Israel through our spiritual association with Y'shua.

Going back to Galatians 3:29, if we believe that we are to be separate from and not in any way associated with Judah or Israel, then what does that mean relative to being Christ's?

Would not the converse be that if we reject being Abraham's seed then we cannot be counted as being "of Christ"? If the two go hand in hand then how does such a profession fit with who we are in Y'shua?

If we conclude that we are a stand-alone entity that is not related to the Hebrew people or their faith in any way, then how do we explain Romans 11?

*Romans 11:13-26*

*(13) For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office:*

*(14) If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them.*

*(15) For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?*

(16) *For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches.*

(17) *And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree;*

(18) *Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.*

(19) *Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in.*

(20) *Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear:*

(21) *For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee.*

(22) *Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, **if thou continue in his goodness:** otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.*

(23) *And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graff them in again.*

(24) *For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?*

(25) *For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.*

(26) *And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:*

If we don't believe this passage relates to us, then who are the Gentiles of verse 13?

If we don't see any relativity to Israel then who (in verse 15) were those who were cast off, and why? What in this same verse is this transition from death to life and the reconciliation of the world?

If we are divorced from our Hebraic roots, what are we to see as the natural "good" (per verse 24) olive tree and what is the "wild" olive tree as specified in verse 17?

If we exclude the Jewish people, the Father, and Torah from the mix, then who are the what is the root and fatness of the natural tree of verse 17?

What does the supporting in verse 18?

This passage makes almost no sense unless we understand that as Gentile

Believers, we are of the "wild" (spiritual) olive tree, and have been grafted into the natural (bloodline) olive tree of Israel. The natural branches (many who were of the Jewish faith) were cut off due to failure to recognize Y'shua. Conversely, the spiritual seed through Abraham was grafted in upon belief of Y'shua. The grafting in of the Gentile Believers WAS the reconciliation of the world and the means of going from death to life for them. We must understand that the root of the natural olive tree is Torah, and the fatness that is associated with it is the pure spiritual nourishment that it provides. When we are grafted into this tree, this verse tells us that we too are supposed to partake of Torah as OUR source of nourishment as well. Then verse 18 indicates that as Gentile grafted branches, the Torah (root of the tree) is to be what supports us.

Before leaving chapter 11, who are those who are not to be highminded, but to FEAR in 1 Corinthians 11:20?

It is the (Gentile Believers) who are grafted into the natural tree who are cautioned not to be highminded. They are told in the next three verses that if they do not continue in God's goodness that they too can be cut off; and that the natural branches can be grafted back in again if they come to belief.

Could this "fear" and the need to continue in God's goodness or face His severity in verses 20-22 have something to do with Hebrews 10:26-31?

Hebrews 10:26-31

(26) For if we sin wilfully **after that we have received the knowledge of the TRUTH**, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins,

(27) But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.

(28) He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses:

(29) Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath **counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?**

(30) For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, **The Lord shall judge his people.**

(31) It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

If our willful sin (verse 26) is the means by which we count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing (verse 29), might that not be because we have failed to adhere to the fullness of the Truth about God's view of iniquity?

Returning to Romans again, it might be rather important to understand that the word IF in verse 22 makes the promise of His goodness to us highly conditional.

*Romans 11:21-22*

(21) *For if God spared not the natural branches, **take heed lest he also spare not thee.***

(22) *Behold therefore the goodness **and severity** of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, **IF thou continue in HIS goodness: otherwise **thou also shalt be cut off.*****

What are the terms of this conditionality, and who's goodness is HIS goodness?

Our standards in reference to "goodness" might not quite match those of our Father above.

So – whose standards do we need to consider – ours or His? Whose set of standards does HE consider when He observes our walk?

Is Peter trying to tell us that we should aspire to the Father's standards of holiness when he referenced Father's instructions to be "holy" for HE is "holy"?

*1 Peter 1:16*

(16) *Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy.*

There is a standard doctrinal stance that is built almost exclusively around the love of God. It disavows any negative consequences in the post-Y'shua age, simply due to belief on Y'shua.

How do we reconcile this type of stance with Romans 11:22 which relates the consequences for failing to continue in HIS goodness? How do we explain that verse 22 stresses not ONLY the GOODNESS of God, but **His SEVERITY as well**, and warns us to take heed to it?

Along those same lines, how do we explain that Hebrews 10:25-31 is announcing judgment on some Believers – people who have received the knowledge of divine Truth and counted himself to be under the blood of God's covenant? How do we explain the fiery indignation and the vengeance of God that he will face due to his walking in willful sin after his belief in Y'shua?

*Hebrews 10:26-31*

*... if we sin wilfully **after that we have received the knowledge of the truth**, ... certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries ... sorer punishment ... shall he be thought worthy ... Vengeance belongeth unto me, **I will recompense**, saith the Lord ... **The Lord shall judge his people**. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.*

What choice can we make to avoid this condemnation?

1 Peter 1:14-17

(14) *As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance:*

(15) **But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy** in all manner of conversation;

(16) *Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy.*

(17) *And if ye call on the **Father**, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, **pass the time of your sojourning here in fear:***

Returning to Romans 11:20, highmindedness is not only linked to fear, but to our attitude toward the branches which had been cut off. Replacement Theology is the thought that God actually REPLACED the Jewish people with Gentile Believers in His plan for mankind.

If this was actually the case, then how do we explain the words of Romans 11:23-24 which say the branches of the natural tree which were cut off can be grafted back into the natural tree again (Romans 11:23-24)?

What is being ignorant in our own conceits in verse 25? Is this highmindedness a false confidence in our position as Believers which blinds us to the reality that we can be cut back out of the tree we were grafted into?

Romans 11:8 says that GOD Himself gave those of the natural tree a spirit of slumber for a time:

Romans 11:8

(8) *(According as it is written, **God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;**) unto this day.*

Verse 25 specifies the period of time for this slumber as being UNTIL the fullness of the Gentiles be come in:



Romans 11:25

(25) *For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, **until** the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.*

If we conclude that the Hebrew people have no place in God's plan now, but it was God Himself that imposed their slumber for a time, then what does that say of God's character?

Will He hold them accountable for what He Himself did to them to bring about His broader purpose, or will He work with them again in order to bring the grafted and the natural branches together again in His natural tree?

Along these lines, how do we explain that verse 26 states that "all Israel" will be saved?

Romans 11:26

(26) *And so **all Israel shall be saved**: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:*

As Believers, we are supposed to make the Jewish people jealous:

Romans 11:11

(11) *I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy.*

If it is the Jewish people who are the ones to be made jealous, per verse 11, how is that ever supposed to happen when they cannot identify with the church's view of the Messiah and the Law whatsoever?

Such jealousy can only happen when we begin to align to the same standards of Father that they observe. Then they would begin to watch to see what we're about, and might actually come to know Y'shua.

How does this whole Romans 11 passage coordinate with Ezekiel 37 that prophesies the completion of what Paul describes in Romans 11 – two sticks (branches) being formed into a single tree?

Ezekiel 37:19

(19) *Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand.*

How does this futuristic scene unfold? Who does Ephraim represent in this verse, and who is Judah? How are they to be formed into "one stick"?

The majority of the northern 10 tribes did not return to their homeland after their captivity, but dispersed into other regions and assimilated with other cultures, soon losing their identity as "Israel". Many of these people groups, particularly from the tribe of Ephraim are thought to have ended up in the United States, so there is a strong potential that many who are coming to Y'shua may be loosely viewed as being Ephraim – or in the broader sense – Israel. If these mostly Gentile Believers are both "Israel" and those of the wild olive tree, then they could be the ones to rejoin with Judah or the natural olive tree when it is time for the "new" covenant to be fully realized.

Why does Ezekiel 37:19 say that Israel will be taken to Judah, rather than Judah being brought to Ephraim?

This seems to suggest that Ephraim (Gentile Believers) must find the root of Torah before Judah (the Jewish people) will find their Messiah.

If we think that those of the Jewish faith and Christians were always destined to be separate, then how do we explain Paul's words in Galatians:

Galatians 3:27-28

(27) For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

(28) **There is neither Jew nor Greek**, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for **ye are all one in Christ Jesus**.

Once belief in Y'shua enters the picture, we are all simply one in HIM.

If we don't see the unity of the Jewish believers and Gentile believers from this passage in Galatians, then how are we to understand the unity of the Spirit in Ephesians, as it is associated with "one Spirit, One Lord, one faith, and one baptism"?

*Ephesians 4:1-6*

*(1) I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called,*

*(2) With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love;*

*(3) Endeavouring to **keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace**.*

*(4) There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling;*

(5) *One Lord, one faith, one baptism,*

(6) **One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.**

How are we to explain the emphasis of Father in Ephesians 4:6 and its association to the “unity” of the Spirit in verse 3 of this passage?

Since the Spirit proceeded FROM the Father, the essence of the two will be identical!

## 22 - UNITY

Many pastors today emphasize Jesus (Y'shua), rarely ever mentioning the Father. This has become pretty standard fare in Christendom today.

Is this emphasis on Jesus appropriate though? If the emphasis is always on Jesus and what He did, how do we explain that Paul puts the emphasis on Father, and shows that Y'shua came to reconcile us to Father?

*Ephesians 2:18*

(18) For **through him (the Son) we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.**

If we are to view Christians as separate from the Jews who came to believe on Y'shua, how do we explain that historically, both the Jews and the Gentiles who came to believe on Y'shua were united as one body in Christ AND in Torah – meeting together in the synagogues of Paul's day?

They were a people united in faith that was abiding in the ways and understanding of the Father - through His Son - as administered by His Spirit.

*Ephesians 2:11-14*

(11) Wherefore remember, that ye being **in time past** Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands;

(12) That at that time **ye were** without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world:

(13) But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of **Christ.**

(14) For he is our peace, who **hath made both one**, (i.e. - one with the "Circumcision" or Jew of verse 11) and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;

*Galatians 3:28*

(28) There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

*Ephesians 4:3-5*

(3) Endeavouring to keep the **unity of the Spirit** in the bond of peace.

(4) There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling;

(5) One Lord, **one faith**, one baptism,

What is the “one hope of your calling” Paul was referencing here? Could it relate to the ministry we are called to accomplish in 2 Corinthians?

*2 Corinthians 5:18-19*

*(18) And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath **given to us the ministry of reconciliation**;*

*(19) To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath **committed unto us the word of reconciliation**.*

## 23 – SALVATION

If we conclude that salvation is separate from the Law observed by the Jewish people, then how do we explain John's words:

*John 4:22-24*

(22) *Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for **salvation is of the Jews.***

(23) *But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him.*

(24) *God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.*

What is "spirit" here, and what is "truth"? Can we believe Y'shua when He says Truth is the Word of the Father, and links it to the sanctification process of salvation?

*John 17:17-19*

(17) *Sanctify them through thy truth: **thy word is truth.***

(18) *As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.*

(19) *And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified **through** the truth.*

If we conclude that sanctification is automatic without any further ado when we come to belief in Y'shua, then why did Y'shua ask Father here to sanctify us through HIS TRUTH? Likewise, why did Paul have to pray for us to be wholly sanctified, that our spirits, our souls, and our bodies might be "preserved blameless" unto the coming of Y'shua?

*1 Thessalonians 5:23*

(23) *And the very God of peace **sanctify you wholly**; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

## 24 – NEW CREATURE

2 Corinthians 5:17

(17) *Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.*

Does Paul's pronouncement of our being a new creature mean our responsibility has ended, that all has been done for us and there is no more for us to do? If so, why did Paul then instruct us about what we DID need to do?

Ephesians 4:20-24

(20) *But ye have not so learned Christ;*

(21) *If so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as **the truth is in Jesus:***

(22) *That ye **put off** concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;*

(23) *And be renewed in the spirit of your mind;*

(24) *And that ye **put on** the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.*

To "put off" or "put on" something, we must choose to do so and follow through with action that accomplishes it. It seems that this principle is pointing to accepting the Truth that is in Y'shua and committing to the renewal of the spirit of our mind through Him. We are to "put off" our unrepentant nature, and "put on" the heart of consecration that aligns us to our Father's will.

How then can Paul ever mean that this becoming a "new creature" is an instant transformation, and God has it all under control henceforth - that we are just able to glide through life however we please?

Whereas loving others seems to be a high priority, and is highly esteemed, shouldn't its achievement still be guided by the Spirit in God's ways, rather than by our own means and standards? Are not God's ways front and center to the "**truth that is in Y'shua**" in this passage?

Did not Paul understand that as long as we are yet in these flesh and blood bodies, we will continue to wrestle with the sin nature? Is that not the entire crux of his message in Romans 7?

Romans 7:14-21

(14) *For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.*

(15) *For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.*

(16) *If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good.*

(17) *Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.*

(18) *For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.*

(19) *For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.*

(20) *Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.*

(21) *I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.*

Does not being new creatures in God correlate to being "sons of God"? If we believe that our status of adopted sons is completed (fully implemented) when we believe on Y'shua, then how do we explain that it is repeatedly shown as being a progressive process? Does Father's Spirit within us just destroy any temptation of sin within the "new creature", OR does it simply provide us with the POWER to ENABLE US to overcome and break the cycle and power of the sin nature so we do not have to continue to be imprisoned by it?

*John 1:12*

(12) *But as many as received him, to them **GAVE HE POWER to become the sons of God**, even to them that believe on his name:*

*1 John 3:1-2*

(1) *Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we **should be called the sons of God**: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.*

(2) *Beloved, now **are\*** we the sons of God, and **it doth not yet appear what we shall be**: but we know that, **when he shall appear, we shall be like him**; for we shall see him as he is.*

\*Note that the word "are" in verse 2 is in the present indicative active mode, indicating contemporaneous action as opposed to the past or the future – as in "BEING" accomplished.

Note that verse 2 tell us when this process is finally accomplished - when the manifestation of being Sons occurs – when we will be sons even as Y'shua is the Son. It will be yet future - when Y'shua shall appear!



To whom does the adoption pertain?

Romans 9:4

(4) Who are **Israelites**; **to whom pertaineth the adoption**, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises;

How are we to attain to the adoption if we do not count ourselves as being "Israelites"?

Galatians 4:5

(5) To redeem them that were **under the law**, that we might receive the **adoption of sons**.

While we often perceive that there is somehow more leniency toward disobedience today, is it not clear in Torah that Father has intense disapproval toward disobedient "sons"?

Deuteronomy 21:18-21

(18) If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, **which will not obey the voice of his father**, or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them:

(19) Then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place;

(20) And they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and a drunkard.

(21) And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones, that he die: so shalt thou put evil away from among you; and all Israel shall hear, and fear.

Might not this have been intended to foreshadow what our Father's feeling would be to those who are to be His adopted "sons" as well? How might we be viewed as Father's adopted sons if we disregard His precepts?

1 John 5:3

(3) For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous.

Would these not be the rules of our Father's house – the household we are adopted into? Would it not then be the power of the Spirit of adoption (Father's Holy Spirit) which enables us to obey them?

Romans 8:15

(15) For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the **Spirit** of adoption, whereby we cry, **Abba, Father**.

## 25 – OPERATION OF THE SPIRIT

Do we receive the Holy Spirit in complete measure when we first believe, or will the power of the Spirit within us be increased as we choose to walk in obedience, and be given to us in its fullness when our sonship is manifested?

2 Corinthians 5:5

(5) Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the **earnest\*** of the **Spirit**.

Note that "earnest" in this verse is Strong's G728 (arrabon) – *a pledge or down-payment for that which will subsequently be paid in full.*

Romans 8:22-23

(22) For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.

(23) And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the **firstfruits\*** of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, **waiting for the adoption**, to wit, the redemption of our body.

Note that "firstfruits" in verse 23 is Strong's G536 (aparkha) – *the **first** portion of the dough from which the sacred loaves were to be prepared.*

Does not verse 23 indicate that the completion of this adoption process is simultaneous with the redemption of our body which is yet future?

Compiling these verses, we can see that this "earnest" "firstfruits" of the Spirit of adoption provided for us is the guidance we are given to PRODUCE the sacred loaves – the matured "sons" of God we are expected to be – sons that will be manifested in appropriate glory at the appearing of Y'shua when the redemption of our bodies will occur.

Would Father's household rules then not be what this Spirit writes upon our very hearts so we would not turn from them and our adoption as sons could be manifested?

2 Corinthians 3:3

(3) Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.

Would not the Spirit of adoption sent by Father then lead us to obey the voice of our Father as obedient sons, observing the rules of His household

that He provided for us in Torah?

1 Peter 1:22

(22) Seeing ye have purified your souls **in obeying the truth through the Spirit** unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently:

We are not to quench the Holy Spirit that Father gave us to help us overcome.

1 Thessalonians 5:19

(19) Quench not the Spirit.

Paul clearly understood that we must choose whether to embrace the power granted to us by Father's Spirit and walk in that power, OR to quench the voice of Father's Spirit and walk in the power of the sin nature.

Galatians 5:16-17

(16) This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.

(17) For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.

While some want to focus on only the spiritual part of our being and ignore the physical, does not Paul indicate the necessity to continually address the physical so the overcoming process will continue?

Does he not explain that we have a choice in our walk whereby we can succumb to walking in the flesh or overcome that desire and elect to walk in the Spirit?

Does he not teach us that any aspect of spiritual growth must acknowledge and overcome the carnality of the flesh while we still reside in these flesh and blood bodies – that while we yet remain in them, the two are inseparable?

Romans 8:1-8

(1) There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, **who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.**

(2) For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the **law of sin and death.**

(3) For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin,

condemned sin in the flesh:

(4) **That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.**

(5) For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit.

(6) For **to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life** and peace.

(7) Because **the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.**

(8) So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.

Paul tells us in verse 7 that when we have a mind focused on the flesh (a carnal mind) we are UNABLE to attain to the law of God (Torah). This carnal mind state is at enmity toward God, - the mode of **death**. Conversely though, when we choose to walk in the Spirit (according to the Law of God - Torah) we are in **life!**

Since there are only two choices here, if we are not walking in Torah, does that not (by default) indicate that Father sees us as being at least somewhat locked into a carnal nature of enmity toward Him?

## 26 – FROM NEW TO OLD?

If we believe that the entire Believer has been made into a totally new creature that can no longer fall under condemnation, then how do we reconcile that belief to references such as 2 Peter 2:21-22 and Hebrews 10:26-31 which indicate that some **Believers** have fallen into the depraved state they were in before, and why does this speak of their condemnation?

2 Peter 2:21-22

(21) *For it had been better for them not to have known the **way of righteousness**, than, after they have known it, to **turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.***

(22) *But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.*

Hebrews 10:26-31

(26) *For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins,*

(27) *But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.*

(28) *He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses:*

(29) *Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?*

(30) *For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, **I WILL RECOMPENSE, saith the Lord.** And again, **THE LORD SHALL JUDGE HIS PEOPLE.***

(31) *It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.*

If making us into Y'shua's image is all accomplished by God upon our belief, does the departure of some back to these "old man" things mean that God has failed? If he were solely responsible wouldn't that be the case?

Maybe there is considerable misunderstanding with that ideology. There is no confusion if we understand that it is merely God's job to guide us, and it is man's choice whether or not to receive that guidance in his walk.

How does this belief that the new creature is a completely done deal ALSO contend with repeated warnings in the word to abstain from sin and overcome our sinful nature?

Why admonish Believers to overcome, if they have no choices to make - no part to play - in the process of their spiritual development?

How does the converse of Revelation 3:5 speak to this? Does it not indicate that failure to overcome can lead to our names being blotted out of the book of life by Y'shua?

*Revelation 3:5*

(5) **He that overcometh**, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and **I will not blot out his name out of the book of life**, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels.

*Revelation 2:7*

(7) He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; **To him that overcometh** will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.

What does this "overcoming" consist of if not overcoming the temptation to depart from Father's commandments which inclines us to transgress them? Is this not made clear by this "Tree of Life" reference yet again in Revelation 22:14?

*Revelation 22:14*

(14) **Blessed are they that do his commandments**, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.

## 27 – COVERED IN THE BLOOD

There is a teaching today that Father doesn't see our sins. He only sees the blood of Y'shua when he looks at us.

If we embrace that theory, then how does He know how to chasten us? Does He just dish up chastisement randomly, or does He actually see our shortcomings and disobedience so He knows how to work with us?

If He never sees our failures and deals with them, then are we not viewed as bastards rather than sons by Father?

*Hebrews 12:5-8*

*(5) And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him:*

*(6) For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.*

*(7) If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not?*

*(8) But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.*

## 28 – Y'SHUA'S VIEW OF THE LAW

If we believe that Paul taught that Father's Law had been done away with, how does such teaching by Paul relate to Y'shua's own words?

Matthew 5:17-18

(17) **Think not** that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.

(18) For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

The Greek word for "fulfill" is Strong's G4137 (pleroo) – *fill to the full, supply liberally, fill to the brim, accomplish, carry out, execute, **render perfect.***

Did Y'shua not emphasize over and over again how much He revered Father's Law? Did He not carry it through perfectly, exhibiting to us how we are also to strive to do so – even as we are being conformed to His image? If we believe that we are to be conformed to Y'shua's image, should we not strive to follow the Law as Y'shua followed it to perfection, applying both the literal and the spiritual application of it?



## 29 – DINING OPTIONS

Some believe Y'shua cleansed all animals, and made them fit for consumption; so, they contend that the Torah prohibition to abstain from consuming pork, shellfish, etc. became obsolete at that time.

If we cling to that ideology, how do we explain Isaiah 66:17 which is yet future?

*Isaiah 66:17*

*(17) They that sanctify themselves, and purify themselves in the gardens behind one tree in the midst, eating **swine's flesh**, and the **abomination**, and the mouse, shall be consumed together, saith the LORD.*

Did Y'shua make these unclean animals clean, then they became defiled yet again before the Millennial Kingdom days – OR - were they ever really cleansed in the first place?

How do we explain the condemnation of this consumption yet future?

How do we justify putting things into the temple of our human body that which Father sees as being an abomination and tells us to view likewise?

*Leviticus 11:11*

*(11) They shall be even an abomination unto you; ye shall not eat of their flesh, but ye shall have their carcasses in abomination.*

Would such consumption of the unclean defile the altar of our body temple?

Might it (on a spiritual level) be somewhat akin to the physical defiling of the altar of the Temple when Antiochus sacrificed a pig on the altar?

Considering the spiritual significance of this, what does Paul say about the one who defiles his body temple?

*1 Corinthians 3:17*

*(17) If any man defile the temple of God, **him shall God destroy**; for the temple of God is **holy, which temple ye are.***

Is it not mixing the clean with the unclean, the holy with the profane?

*Ezekiel 22:26*

*(26) Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things:*

*they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they shewed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and **I AM PROFANED AMONG THEM.***

## 30 - SABBATH

Especially considering this last verse, if we conclude that Sabbath is no longer something we need to honor, how do we deal with the fact that Father hallowed it perpetually?

*Exodus 20:11*

(11) *For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day, and **hallowed it**.*

*Exodus 31:16*

(16) *Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, for a **perpetual covenant**.*

*Genesis 2:3*

(3) *And God blessed the seventh day, and **sanctified it**: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.*

Did He hallow it, then unhallow it after Y'shua came, then re-hallow it when the Millennial Kingdom was about to begin? How do we explain why people still honor it in Isaiah 66, yet future?

*Isaiah 66:23-24*

(23) **And it shall come to pass**, that from one new moon to another, and from one **sabbath** to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the LORD.

(24) *And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.*

John says that sin is transgressing Torah:

*1 John 3:4*

(4) *Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.*

So - who are those that Isaiah says here are in the fire, and how have they "transgressed" against God if Torah is no longer a consideration?

We know this is yet future, in the time called the Millennial Kingdom because, it tells us that the wolf and lamb will eat together and lions will eat straw:

*Isaiah 65:25*

*(25) The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: and dust shall be the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the LORD.*

That certainly isn't happening yet!

## 31 – FALLING AWAY

Does all of this help us to see that there may indeed be two opposing and contradictory gospel messages [ 1) atonement by Y'shua's blood is ALL you need to waltz into the Kingdom – VERSUS – 2) atonement by Y'shua's blood is what you need to BEGIN your sanctification journey to enter into full restoration to the Kingdom]?

Number 2 aligns to the total gospel of Truth throughout the ages, latter aspects of Truth emerging from and rooted in the initial Truth given to Moses for mankind by God Himself. This initial truth was THE Torah (Scriptural) Truth of that Paul's audience had known from childhood (2 Timothy 3:16). Number 2 even aligns to many warnings in the New Testament which make no sense if Number 1 was the valid gospel message.

When all of Paul's epistle writings are compiled to provide complete context for his thoughts, which of these two gospel messages is he actually teaching? On the other hand, which was "another gospel" in reference to "another Jesus" that he warned about - a gospel message in which Peter says the divine Truth of God will be "evil spoken of" that many people will follow?

*Galatians 1:6-7*

(6) *I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto **another gospel**:*

(7) *Which is **not another**; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.*

*2 Peter 2:2*

(2) *And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of **whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.***

If the divine Truth of God that Peter says will be evil spoken of is the Truth that Torah instructions were never abolished, and the need for obedience is key in our walk to restoration, indeed this Truth IS OFTEN derided, ridiculed and "evil spoken of" today! Woe be to those who do so!

*2 Thessalonians 2:1-3*

(1) *Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him,*

(2) *That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.*

(3) *Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition;*

## 32 - FEASTS

Though Paul indicated the need to implement a more spiritual approach, he still expressed the need to “keep” Unleavened Bread.

*1 Corinthians 5:8*

(8) Therefore **let us keep the feast**, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

Didn't he AND the disciples endeavor to keep the feasts as well?

*Acts 20:16*

(16) For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia: for he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost.

*1 Corinthians 16:8*

(8) But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost.

*Acts 2:1*

(1) And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.

Didn't even Y'shua keep the feasts – attending them even when the Jews were a concern?

*John 7:10-11*

(10) But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.

(11) Then the Jews sought him at the feast, and said, Where is he?

Leviticus tells us that the feast days are **the Lord's days**, and Father asked us to keep them.

*Leviticus 23:1-2*

(1) And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

(2) Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, **Concerning the feasts of the LORD**, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, even **these are MY feasts.**

So - why would we not want to keep them? If we love Father and want to please Him, why would we turn down His personal invitation to spend that precious time with Him in holy convocation?

If we conclude that the feasts have no place in our present time, then why are people going to worship on the feast days during the Millennial Kingdom which is yet future?

Zechariah 14:16

(16) And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to **keep the feast of tabernacles.**

### 33 – THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE

If we conclude that Paul preached a release from observance of the Law today, then how do we explain such a radical departure in God's ways from days gone by to current time? Does God change?

*Malachi 3:6*

(6) *For I am the LORD, I change not; ...*

*Colossians 2:8-9*

(8) *Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.*

(9) *For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.*

*Hebrews 13:8*

(8) *Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever.*

*John 14:10*

(10) *Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.*

The Bible is clear that neither the Father NOR the Son (that speaks only what the Father instructs) change!

If Father instructed Y'shua in everything He spoke, would Y'shua's message not have been consistent with the ways of Father recorded by Moses?

*John 12:49-50*

(49) *For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.*

(50) *And I know that **his commandment is life everlasting**: whatsoever I speak therefore, ***even as the Father said unto me, so I speak***.*



## 34 – HE IN ME

Likewise, who is the entity called “one God” that is within us per Ephesians?

*Ephesians 4:4-6*

(4) *There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling;*

(5) *One Lord, one faith, one baptism,*

(6) **One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.**

*John 14:23-24*

(23) *Jesus answered and said unto him, **IF** a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and **WE will come unto him, and make our abode with him.***

(24) *He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: **and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me.***

Is not the “we” of verse 23 both Y’shua and the Father? Did Y’shua not promise that BOTH of them would abide with us IF (conditional) we love and obey God properly? If Father is to abide with us, why would we want to flaunt any of His commands?

Actually, Y’shua’s promise in verse 23 that both He and the Father would make their abode with us was conditional. That conditionality was that we would LOVE Him. Numerous times the proof that one LOVES Y’shua/the Father is the keeping of the commandments, such as:

*John 14:15*

(15) *If ye love me, keep my commandments.*

*1 John 5:3*

(3) *For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous.*

So – if that is the condition for indwelling, then are we doing so? If we are not, then how can we expect Him to fulfill the other end of this promise to us?

We have a temple within us – a home that was designed for God to dwell.

*1 Corinthians 3:16*

(16) Know ye not that **ye are the temple of God**, and that **the Spirit of God dwelleth in you**?

Combining all of these verses, is it not the Father, the Son, AND the Spirit that dwell within us, all as ONE? How then does the Son or the Spirit pit us against the precepts which the Father provided for our parameters?

Are all three within us, but pitting themselves against each other in disharmony, or are they ONE, unified in essence and message from beginning to end?

If we conclude that the purpose for Y'shua's coming was simply to forgive our sins, how do we deal with Y'shua's words about why He came?

*John 18:37*

(37) Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. **To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.** Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.

What does Y'shua say this Truth is that He came to bear witness to?

## 35 – Y'SHUA'S OBJECTIVE OF TRUTH

*John 17:17*

(17) Sanctify them through thy truth: **thy word is truth.**

Maybe Y'shua said He WAS the Truth – because He came to bear witness to the Truth of His Father's Word in everything He taught!

Could that be why we cannot get to the Father any other way than adhering to that Truth of the Father?

*John 14:6*

(6) Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, **the truth**, and the life: **no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.**

Maybe it is this very Truth – this singular, unified, fluid Truth - that is expounded from Torah through Revelation that takes us from our unbelief, to the cross, through the guidance of the Spirit, to the ultimate restoration to Father and His Kingdom!

## 36 – NEED FOR COMMITMENT

Could the redemption purchased by Y'shua's blood actually be for the sole purpose of that restoration?

*Matthew 10:38*

*(38) And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me.*

Did Y'shua atone for our sins so we could continue to live in them - OR - is it necessary to overcome the beast within in order to get from the cross into Father's Kingdom? Might the blood need to be properly applied in order for us to be saved (as pictured by the Passover Lamb)?

*Exodus 12:7 & 13*

*(7) And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it.*

*(13) And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and **when I see the blood, I will pass over you**, and the plague shall **not** be upon you **to destroy you**, when I smite the land of Egypt.*

Could believing Father's full Truth and walking in obedience to its precepts be our spiritual equivalent to applying the blood to the door of the house (the heart and mind)? Might it be our sacrifice to Father in gratitude for the sacrifice of Y'shua?

*Romans 12:1*

*(1) I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.*

Does a failure to apply this blood properly not set us up for certain judgment by God and some pretty uncomfortable consequences?

*Hebrews 10:27, 30 & 31*

*(27) But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and **fiery** indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.*

*(30) For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.*

*(31) It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.*

Is this fiery indignation limited to the here and now?

*Mark 9:43-44*

(43) *And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched:*

(44) ***Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.***

Does this not appear to be a very real place during the Millennial kingdom?

Isaiah 66:24

(24) *And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have **transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched;** and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.*

If we believe that Y'shua is all love and would not send anyone to that fire, how do we explain the parable wording about Y'shua as found in Luke?

Luke 19:27

(27) *But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and **slay them before me.***

Luke 3:17

(17) *Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff **he will burn with fire unquenchable.***

If all men are ultimately to be "saved", might there be some "fire" on the other side of the veil that will straighten out our errant beliefs and ways?

1 Corinthians 3:15

(15) *If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be **saved; yet so as by fire.***

2 Peter 2:9

(9) *The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and **to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished:***

Who are the godly here, and who are the unjust?

### 37 – SAVED AND JUSTIFIED; SAME OR NOT?

Did Paul say we can never be saved by the law, or did he say we can never be justified by the law?

*Galatians 2:16*

*(16) Knowing that a man is not **justified** by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be **justified** by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be **justified**.*

Why did he not use the word "saved" here, and why do theologians teach as though he did? Might not "justification" be only the first step in the total restoration process? Might justification simply be the coming of us to Y'shua by faith, where obedience to the Law is not yet a factor?

## 38 – PAST AND FUTURE SINS

*Romans 3:25*

*(25) Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are **past**, through the forbearance of God;*

Maybe this justification relates to our sins BEFORE coming to Y'shua – our "sins that are past", having been committed before.

If the absolution of our past sins (justification) was the start of the process, then what might the end of it be, and how might it relate to our sins AFTER coming to Y'shua? Might that not be where 1 John 1:9 comes into play?

*1 John 1:9*

*(9) **IF** we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.*

Doesn't this conditional ("IF") instruction assure us that sins AFTER coming to Y'shua can also be forgiven when we are striving to walk in Father's ways but slip up, confess, and seek forgiveness with repentant hearts? Is that not a major part of what Paul meant when he instructed us to "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling"?

*Philippians 2:12*

*(12) Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation **with fear and trembling.***

### 39 – BY GRACE, THROUGH FAITH

Maybe the working out of this personal salvation process be what is meant by “sanctification” in Paul’s vocabular.

*Ephesians 2:8*

*(8) For **by grace** are ye saved **through faith**; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God:*

Maybe justification is merely the “by grace” part of the equation, and sanctification is the “through faith” part of the process.

Could it take both factors to complete this complete personal salvation process that restores us to the Father and His Kingdom?

It is awesome that Father not only gave us His grace to provide us with justification, but that He gave us His Spirit to dwell within and empower us to overcome as we walk out our sanctification! His Spirit actually equips us with the POWER to “BECOME Sons of God” - because we were helpless to do it on our own!

*John 1:12*

*(12) But as many as received him, to them gave he **power to become the** sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:*



## 40 - SANCTIFICATION

It seems that our sanctification is achieved progressively AFTER coming to Y'shua - as we choose to yield to Father's Spirit within.

If our sanctification was automatic after coming to Y'shua, why did Paul have to pray for God to sanctify us "wholly", (which indicates a process) so we would be blameless before Him in body, soul, and spirit?

1 Thessalonians 5:23

(23) And the very God of peace **sanctify you wholly**; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Paul indicates that this same sanctification "process" when he instructs us to control our body vessel in order to bring honor to the Father and to ourselves.

1 Thessalonians 4:4

(4) *That every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in **sanctification** and honour*;

It appears that a proper understanding of Father's divine, united, and progressive Truth as found in the entirety of His Word is important to this process of sanctification.

John 17:17

(17) **Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.**

Paul's words seem to echo this concept.

Ephesians 5:25-26

(25) *Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;*

(26) *That he might **sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water **by the word****,*

Peter unites this walk with the idea of applying Y'shua's blood to the doorposts (hearts and minds) of our body Temple.

1 Peter 1:2

(2) *Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, **through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: ...***

Where does wisdom and righteousness enter into this picture?

According to Paul, this **sanctification** work of the Spirit through us may be the process by which we achieve **wisdom** (see again 2 Timothy 3:15), come to understand Father's **righteousness** (obedience to His precepts), and ultimately find our **redemption** (restoration to Father and His kingdom).

*1 Corinthians 1:30*

*(30) But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us **wisdom**, and **righteousness**, and **sanctification**, and **redemption**:*

Could this mean that our final salvation (redemption) is contingent upon our walking out this sanctification process and maintaining a proper understanding of God's divine Truth?

*2 Thessalonians 2:13*

*(13) But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to **salvation through sanctification** of the Spirit and belief of **the truth**:*

Is it not obvious that this sanctification process (walk of faith) unto salvation is not totally accomplished from above, but requires our cooperation and our determination to make the right choices, and concludes only when we depart from this realm?

*Galatians 6:4*

*(4) But **let every man prove his own work**, and THEN shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another.*

*1 Peter 1:9*

*(9) Receiving the end of your faith, even the **salvation of your souls**.*

Is not the completed course (or the end) the intent from the beginning?

Our justification points to the desired conclusion - our successful journey of sanctification and our ultimate completed salvation unto restoration.

## 41 – NOTHING NEW

Is this process a new thing, or has it always been Father's intent?

Though it was not what was meant by the immediate context of his words, Solomon might have been showing us that God's general patterning always moves from the old to advance to and through the new.

*Ecclesiastes 1:9-10*

(9) The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no **new** thing under the sun.

(10) Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? **it hath been already of old time, which was before us.**

Some would say that we just need to take Paul's words for "what they say". It is important though to remember that we are not reading the words of Paul in their pure form when we read our English Bibles. Accordingly, "what they say" in our English language might be far removed from what he meant when he actually said them. To fully understand Paul's words for "what he intended them to say", we might want to go back to the original source for those words in the manuscripts, along with all their cultural implications and Torah basis. Only then can we hope to actually understand them for what he meant them to say. Maybe the only thing that is new under the sun is our English mangling of Paul's true intent!

Do we feel that REALLY understanding Paul is worth some extra effort, or do we just want to accept our English translation and run with our Anglicized concepts, using a few verses that are taken out of context to form our belief systems?

## 42 – FALSE PROPHETS

Is perceiving God's unified and divine Truth worth the effort to dig a little bit, or do we want to simply accept the voices of theologians today who could easily be the wolves in sheep's clothing Y'shua warned us would come?

*Matthew 7:15*

*(15) Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.*

Do we want to cling to the words of these theologians as they teach the excessive bias of God being "love"? Is not this "love" (by their standard) being totally nonjudgmental and complacent toward wrongdoing, abounding in grace, and never being upset with Believers? How does this compare with Paul's words?

*Romans 11:22*

*(22) Behold therefore **the goodness AND SEVERITY** of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.*

Maybe Paul understood what would evolve, when he cried for three years, warning the people about the deception to come – even from within the body of Y'shua!

*Acts 20:29-31*

*(29) For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.*

*(30) Also of your own selves shall men arise, **speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.***

*(31) Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.*

*2 Corinthians 11:13-14*

*(13) For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ.*

*(14) And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.*

Did not Paul's epistles speak over and over again of all of the upheaval of the Jews who did not want the new converts from the Gentile ranks to share their special place in God's plan?

Likewise, did he not struggle with the new Gentile converts who wanted to do things their own way rather than adhere to Hebraic ideology?

Have we lost sight of why Paul would have been so concerned - that as the new converts from the Gentile rank and file would separate from their Jewish counterpart Believers, they would lose the Truth these Jewish Believers embodied about Father's precepts?

*2 Thessalonians 2:7*

*(7) For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way.*

Can't we begin to see by this that Paul understood that the splintering and separation of the new Gentile converts away from their Jewish counterpart would have a dire effect, the arising of a false gospel message among the "church" he held so dear? Did he not realize that dividing the Gentiles who became Believers from the roots of the faith they were entering into would keep them in the dark so they could believe the lie - an immoral corruption, a perversion of the teachings of the first Believers?

*Galatians 1:6-7*

*(6) I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto **another gospel**:*

*(7) Which is **not another**; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.*

*2 Corinthians 11:3-4*

*(3) But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so **your minds should be corrupted** from the simplicity that is in Christ.*

*(4) For if he that cometh preacheth **another Jesus**, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive **another spirit**, which ye have not received, or **another gospel**, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him.*

Did he not realize that this other gospel would corrupt the minds of the "church" he so loved?

Did he not perceive that the wolves in sheep's clothing would present **another Jesus** (who would be construed to denounce the need to align to Father's precepts), **another spirit** (who would not insist on allegiance to Father's ways), and **another gospel** (which would remove Believers from the simplicity of the Kingdom gospel that Y'shua taught)?

Did he not understand that this foreign gospel message would focus almost exclusively on the blood atonement, to the exclusion of the restoration to the ways and Kingdom of the Father?

Was this restoration not the simplicity of Y'shua's message (2 Corinthians 11:3 above) as well as the mandate we are given?

Luke 4:43

(43) *And he said unto them, **I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent.***

2 Corinthians 5:18

(18) *And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and **hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;***

## 43 - RECONCILIATION

If our ministry of reconciliation is to draw mankind back to Father, will the TRUE Spirit of God then lead us into entertain the very things Father views as abominable?

Did Father want us to come back to Him on our terms or on His?

If we are to conform to the image of Y'shua, why would we want to live by different standards than the precepts of Father that Y'shua Himself embraced?

If we are viewed as perfect in Father's eyes due to our belief in the blood of Y'shua, why would the authors of the New Testament text have put such a determined emphasis on pleading with us AS BELIEVERS to walk in the Spirit rather than the flesh?

Why would they have warned of consequences if we choose instead to walk in the flesh?

What values will the Spirit of the Father that emanates from the Father maintain? Will they be the values that Father embraces, or those that He detests?

What then does Father's true Spirit write on our hearts?

Conversely, which voice (spirit) is it that engenders abomination in God's eyes by rolling out a red carpet to compromise with the world's system instead of aligning to God's chosen path?

If Father's Spirit is obligated to guide us **TO all truth** (John 16:13), would His Spirit then lead us to oppose Father's Truth as expressed in His Word to us?

*John 10:2-5*

(2) *But he that entereth in **by the door** is the shepherd of the sheep.*

(3) *To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear **his** voice: and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out.*

(4) *And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for **they know his voice**.*

(5) *And a **stranger** will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers.*

Putting all of this together, we might begin to see that when we come to

belief in Y'shua, we are obliged to be a set apart people. We are to be set apart **TO God** and His ways – to serve HIM in HIS ways. We are NOT to be set apart **FROM God** and His way to serve the god of this world in his ways – being righteous by **the world's standards** instead of Father's!

*Isaiah 64:6*

*(6) But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away.*

Can't we see that if our righteousness does not align with Father's Law, it is (in all reality by His sight) nothing but sin?

*1 John 3:4*

*(4) Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.*

Can we not realize that Father doesn't suddenly **condone sin** when we come to believe on Y'shua, but that by Y'shua's sacrifice He **allows for forgiveness of it** by His own forebearance (tolerance, patience)?

*Romans 3:25*

*(25) Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, **through the forbearance of God;***

Will we come to terms with the reality that to simply deny that the carnal nature has no further part in our lives is not an honest assessment?

Will we begin to see the need to consciously choose to overcome carnality by the power available for us to do so through the Father's Spirit within?

*1 John 1:8-10*

*(8) **If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.***

*(9) **IF we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.***

*(10) **If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.***

Can we begin to see that the idea that we walk in continual purity after coming to Y'shua is refuted by this passage and many others; that the need to express this truth is so important that John spells it out twice here (verses 8 and 10)?



Is he not showing us that we must **choose** to walk in the light of the Spirit, confessing our sins and turning from them as we do so?

How do we recognize our sins if not by Torah?

Romans 7:7

(7) *What shall we say then? **Is the law sin? God forbid.** Nay, **I had not known sin, but by the law:** for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.*

It is not then through the foundational Words of Father's Law that we can identify and repent of our sins and be cleansed anew?

1 John 1:9

(9) *If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.*

Are we not to walk in Torah's light, even as Y'shua did?

Proverbs 6:23

(23) *For the **commandment** is a lamp; and **the law is light**; and **reproofs of instruction are the way of life:***

1 John 2:4-6

(4) *He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.*

(5) *But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him.*

(6) ***He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.***

Since it is the Father's Spirit that leads us to His Truth, would not keeping His commandments be akin to walking in the light of the Spirit / walking in His righteousness?

Galatians 5:16

(16) *This I say then, **Walk in the Spirit**, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.*

1 John 1:7

(7) *But if we **walk in the light**, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.*

*Psalms 119:105*

(105) ***Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.***

If we believe the Spirit single-handedly and instantaneously transforms us into a righteous state, then why does Paul seem to indicate that we have a choice in the matter? Do we not have to choose to walk in righteousness?

*Romans 8:4*

(4) *That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.*

Do we bear a responsibility for unrighteous choices as defined by Father's Divine Law?

*1 John 5:17*

(17) All unrighteousness is sin: ... .

Could that be because the definition of "righteousness" is linked to obedience to the Father's Law?

Almost all New Testament references to righteousness are Strong's G1343 (dikaiosyne) - *integrity, virtue, purity of life, correctness of thinking and acting*. This Greek word is derived from Strong's G1342 (dikaios) - *observing divine laws, keeping the commandments of God*, which shows that the integrity, etc. of dikaiosyne is based upon divine commandments of God.

The other Greek word for "righteousness" is Strong's G1345 (dikaioma) - *established and ordained by law*, which also emphasizes the Law. It is found in Revelation 19:8.

*Revelation 19:7-8*

(7) *Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and **his wife hath made herself ready.***

(8) *And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints.*

She "made herself ready" by walking in obedience to His Law, choosing to listen to Father's Spirit, and allowing the Spirit to lead her through the walk of faith to complete her sanctification!

*1 John 3:24*

(24) *And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.*

## 44 - CLOSING THOUGHTS

Beloved Brethren, in closing, we would stress that this writing has been an act of love – love for those who have been brought into the household of faith through the blood of our living Lord. Though we realize that it has probably been hard to read, there is no easy way to present these challenges. If you have aligned to either the Calvinist or Armenian doctrinal teachings, we know pretty much where you are and the basics of your belief structure. Being intimately familiar with both Baptist and Methodist instruction, it has been a challenge to emerge from those teachings to embrace the fuller truth of the entire Biblical message. However, this challenge has been so very rewarding, opening our eyes to see Biblical counsel in its fullness. It has allowed us to become more spiritually astute and mature, enabling us to be a part of Y'shua's actual mission – the restoration of Father's people to His kingdom.

There is not a great deal more that can be said to encourage your understanding in this area, but we feel it urgent to express how important such understanding is today, and how dangerous it is to maintain the mainline belief system and reject God's fuller Truth. We have tried to provide a meaningful springboard to help you along your way, and hope that by doing so we are also keeping our hands clean:

*Ezekiel 3:18*

*(18) When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to **warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life**; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand.*

Please know that our reference to this verse in no way implies that we see our brothers and sisters in mainline Christendom as being wicked!! We do, however, see many as falling into a wicked deception that could result in them being seen by Father as wicked - according to His definition of the word. (Father's actual standards of holiness and wickedness may be different than what we have come to believe.)

Many today try to stand on 2 Chronicles 7:14 to say that the prayers of the "church" can bring healing to this nation. The verse reads:

*2 Chronicles 7:14*

*(14) **If my people**, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and **turn from their wicked ways**; then will **I** hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and **will heal their land.***

This word wicked is closely aligned with the Hebrew word for "wicked" in Ezekiel 3:18 above. Can we really expect God to view His people as "turning" from their "wicked" ways when they continue to disregard His specific instructions to mankind? Shouldn't we start viewing "wickedness" from HIS perspective? Might this failure to turn from the world's ways to HIS ways be an indictment not only on an individual basis, but on the nation as a whole? Oh if people could get a grip on this!

We completely understand that many in mainline Christendom today actually do desire to draw nearer to Father, but we hope this has proven that to actually DO so is intimately linked with keeping the very commandments that Christendom today tells us are null and void.

We hope to be able to pull the body of Messiah out of the quicksand that is inherent with mainline instruction today – even one member at a time. Sinking down into this quicksand is the trap that leads to fiery judgment.

*Jude 1:22-23*

*(22) And of some have compassion, making a difference:*

*(23) And others save with fear, **pulling them out of the fire**; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.*

This is our effort to grasp your hands and free you. Please take our hand and emerge into the reality that will set you free from the confines of the world's deception and bring you into the joy of enduring relationship with Father on His terms through His Spirit.

*John 15:10-11*

*(10) **If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love.***

*(11) **These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.***

*Jude 1:24*

*(24) Now unto him that is **able to keep you from falling**, and to, present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy,*

It is only when we come to realize that obedience and relationship are not exclusive of one another, but are integrated in unity with one another that we can develop the relationship with Father that He wants us to have with Him. (It must be "both, and" rather than "either, or"!) By developing relationship THROUGH obedience, we are worshiping Father in "**spirit**" (submission to the Holy Spirit) **AND in "Truth"** (obedience to the axioms

that are specified in the Old Testament and carried forward into the New).

*John 4:23-24*

*(23) But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father **in spirit AND in truth**: for the Father seeketh such to worship him.*

*(24) God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in **spirit AND in truth**.*

The Holy Spirit validates the axioms of the written Word by writing Father's ways on our hearts. It is then up to us to listen to the still small voice of the Holy Spirit and tune out the stronger voice of the world and deceptive instruction, so we can walk in Father's ways appropriately. As we submit to the guidance of Father's Spirit in these matters, we develop the full relationship with Father that we were meant to have.

We must desire to abide in the fullness of Divine Truth. A loving relationship is a two-way street, and we can't show Father the love that is due Him if we don't do what He said to do, or care about pleasing Him. This is not about EARNING His love, as His love is unconditional. It is about evidencing our love for Him properly (according to Biblical instruction), and to love one another as He would have us to do.

Our motivation for keeping the commandments should never be impure - to get to heaven or make points with God - rather than a spontaneous act of endearment toward Him out of appreciation for all He has done for us. Neither should one choose to try to develop that relationship APART from abiding in Father's precepts! Y'shua spelled it out pretty well!

*John 14:15-23*

*(15) **If ye love me, keep my commandments.***

*(16) And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, **that he may abide with you for ever**;*

*(17) Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; **for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.***

*(18) I will not leave you comfortless: **I will come to you.***

*(19) Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also.*

*(20) At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.*

*(21) **He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and **I will love him, and will manifest myself to him.*****

*(22) Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?*

*(23) Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: **and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.***

None of that sounds to us like keeping the commandments prevents a relationship with Father, but rather that it is the verified and concrete way to develop it.

*2 John 1:6*

*(6) And this is love, that we walk after his commandments. This is the commandment, That, **as ye have heard from the beginning, ye should walk in it.***

Some would say that keeping the commandments is a cold and legalistic approach to religion. Conversely, we can personally affirm that as we conscientiously strive to overcome the flesh and maintain Father's ways, we sense a progressively enriching and fulfilling relationship with the Father and with His Son, Y'shua.

Some feel validation that the commandments aren't necessary because they feel a warm relationship with God without going that route. It may be that Father is just showing some of his beloved children that He loves them WHILE He is guiding them to His fuller Truth.

A real danger, however, is the tendency to mistakenly embrace the voice of the world and deceptive instruction as being the voice of the Holy Spirit – when it is (in reality) nothing but the voice that Paul warned of in 2 Corinthians 11:4 as “another spirit”. The message of this voice is very subtle, and it will imitate the Holy Spirit. It delights in making us feel very warm and secure while we are embracing deception. We cannot take solace in our emotions, as they can very beguiling, and can easily lead us astray.

It is our conviction that the warmth and comfort elicited by our feelings and emotions can be (and typically is) from the wrong source! If Y'shua said that He and Father would abide with us WHEN we keep His commandments, who then will abide within us INSTEAD of the Father and the Son WHEN we choose instead to reject Father's commandments? It is a heavy-duty question to ponder. Paul's reference to “another spirit” is very real, and until one understands how the soul is influenced by this spirit, deception can be rampant in the body of Messiah.

We have written about Paul's reference to “another spirit” (which we call the

“contra spirit”) in our two-volume book set called Two Trees, Two Kingdoms, and Two Kings. It would expand greatly upon the thoughts presented here, which deals directly with many of the misconceptions regarding Paul’s epistles on an individual basis. It is also a rather extensive study regarding the spirit and the soul, which differentiates between them to help you understand how each one plays a part in the redemptive process. PLEASE understand that what looks like a plug for the book here is NOT an attempt to promote sales for economic gain. The books are yet another hand to lift the body from the quicksand and promote a great deal more depth in studying to show ourselves approved, but that can’t happen unless they get into the reader’s hands. If you desire to or are willing to swim in deeper water, they can be purchased through Amazon. There is a link on our webpage to do so.

In the interim, please do consider these things URGENTLY dear ones before you go any further down the path of mainline Christendom’s doctrinal instruction. We only pray it is not already too late. Today’s version of Christianity has a LOT right, but the error that comes packaged in the same bundle can be deadly. The lies of the enemy are not believable if they are not wrapped in a great deal of truth, and that might be the case with the gospel message that is common today. So - be careful what you swallow!

We have such a love for the brethren, and seek only your collective and individual best good! Father does too, and He so wants you to understand the fullness of His Truth and His plan for each of you! May you find it and never look back!

These are notes by Bill and Karen Bishop – copyright protection applies as it may soon be integrated into a published work. Your comments may be addressed to [returningtothegarden.com](http://returningtothegarden.com) or to Bill and Karen Bishop, P. O. Box 64, Glasgow, KY 42142.