

Yes, it *IS* written, *with (Re-Direct)*

Black = by: “Danny” - *Red = Re-Direct by: Bernie Besherse, CJ*

Contents

Contents	1
FOREWORD	2
Excerpt from Wikipedia.org – First Council of Nicea.....	10
Introduction.....	12
The authority of the New Testament.....	20
Genealogies, not chronologies.....	36
<i>Almah</i> in context.....	45
Biblical parallels are kind of a thing	52
Love your enemy?	56
Lord of the Sabbath	58
Is blood sacrifice REALLY not needed?	60
Did Jesus say He was a false prophet?	72
Can you say “communion”?	79
“They” thrust “Him” Through.....	89
Three days and three nights, indeed... ..	93
Were they all false prophets?	97
Conclusion	104
CLOSING ARGUMENTS	107
About the TITLE of THIS document:	109
What is the bottom line?.....	110
YHWH’s plan for Forgiveness of Sin (Salvation)	112
APPENDIX - Yes, It IS Written (by Danny)	114

This edition is formatted for 8.5 x 11 inch, Letter-sized paper.

FOREWORD

Danny's original document for rebutting my "For it is Written, - or IS it?" was 40 pages, double-spaced. This "Re-Direct" document is single spaced, and I use a larger font for my insertions, but even so, this document is 110 pages (150 pages, with the insertion of his complete, "original" document as an Appendix).

It is my prayer that anyone who reads this document, *actually looks up ALL bible references*, mine and Danny's, and spends some time praying and contemplating the meaning.

Bernie Besherse, Chief Justice, Beyt Din Hillel

Danny's text is in black (generally). My response text in red bold (generally).

[Danny begins his critique/response to "For it is Written, - - - or IS it?"]

An informal Christian response to the paper "For it is written..." – or is it?" by Bernie Besherse For the word of God is living and effective and sharper than any double-edged sword, penetrating as far as the separation of soul and spirit, joints and marrow. It is able to judge the ideas and thoughts of the heart. – Hebrews 4:12

I have "sanitized" this document by removing his identifying data and characterizing the response as being to someone that I am calling "Danny," because of my admiration and respect for the patriarch, Daniel, who faced lions and came forth victorious. I'm hoping and praying that this "Danny," who is the 22 year old son of a friend, emulates the patriarch Daniel, and also comes forth from HIS lion's den with greater knowledge and understanding, and with a firm and steadfast TRUST in the Almighty ONE of Israel.

My writings in this document are mostly in red. I left Danny's writing mostly in BLACK, and not bold. When I insert something of my own into Danny's writing (for maintaining context), it is enclosed in [square brackets], in the manner stipulated in the United States Government Styles Manual. My legal writing makes this more or less of a habit, and when explained to readers, it does add clarity and precision, even for people with no legal experience.

I also liberally sprinkle BLUE and RED text in various places, as well as underlining, *italics*, and ALL CAPS, for attracting attention to those words and phrases.

I am not making any attempt, AT ALL, to protect anyone's delicate sensibilities by being "politically correct." I cite scriptures as scriptures, I identify my own thoughts as being my thoughts, and I identify the thoughts of other men/women as something other than scripture, or else let them speak for themselves.

When my writing appears condescending (*as it will, at times*), please *look at the scriptures that I cited in the original work, look at the citations or the LACK of citations that Danny made, and see whether or not, if the shoe were on the other foot, you would think that it was Danny who was showing contempt or condescension. Following that, you would have to determine if I was really showing contempt for my friend's son, who I knew in the year 2005 CE as a delightful, intelligent, polite, respectful, eight year old boy, or if the contempt that I am showing is for the pathetic research practices that Danny had been encouraged to employ in order to arrive at and defend a pagan consensus in accord with his fellow Christians, Moody Bible Institute, Rome, et alia.*

I am not trying to turn anyone into a clone of myself. What I am trying to do is encourage people to develop some of their own Critical Thinking Skills, learn how to *evaluate evidence*, and to read and obey what is *actually* in the Tanakh, instead of what *they have been brainwashed into wanting to believe should be* there. I hope to be just barely abrasive enough that when someone is stimulated to open their eyes, it will be because of *YHWH's Word*, not *my words*.

Matthew 23:15 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one **proselyte**, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the **child of hell** than yourselves.

This appears to be a recognition by the *consensus* of the Council of Nicea regarding *the fate of the people propagating pagan propaganda*. The verse would apply equally against *Christians who follow their Roman Religion (Ba'alism)*, as it would against *Orthodox Jews who follow the Talmud and Oral Torah*. It is amazing that the creators of Christianity had the *arrogance and conceit* to actually put this into their *own*, pagan sourcebook! I guess that the trick is to blame others first, for *your own* worst faults.

Take a look at 1 Corinthians 9:19 – 22.

19. For though I be free from all *men*, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I **might gain the more**. [Paul admits to **seeking proselytes**.]
20. And unto the Jews **I became** as a Jew, that I might **gain** the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might **gain** them that are under the law; [One cannot **"become"** what one already **"IS,"** therefore, we have cause for **reasonable doubt** that the person or people who wrote as "Paul" was/were even Jewish.]
21. To them that are **without law**, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might **gain them** that are without law. [Now, he is **admitting to being an outlaw**, following his Roman Religion. Further, Paul is **taking personal credit**, AND, claiming that **he, Paul**, is the one who **"gains"** them.]
22. To the weak became I as weak, that I might **gain** the weak: **I am made all things** to all *men*, that I might by all means **save some**. [Paul admits to being an **opportunist**, but

tries to cover his tracks by saying that it is for the greater good of saving souls. Again, taking personal credit, like the self-aggrandizer that he is. He is like an Ishtar Temple prostitute saying that she does what she does in order to protect the young virgins and keep the *predators* away from them.]

Paul is telling us that he will *do virtually anything* and *assume virtually any identity* in order to win over a proselyte, and in so-doing, his own man-god says that Paul is putting them into the same garbage dump (gehenna, hell) to which Paul is going.

I realize that “Danny” is under a *very large disability* by not having a background in *how to evaluate evidence* in a logical, consistent manner, as people do who have a background in scientific research or in law, either in an investigation, litigation, or judicial capacity. If Danny had such a background, he may have arrived at some very different conclusions. At least, Danny should learn such terms as “Chain of Custody,” “Admissible Evidence,” “Irrelevant Evidence,” “Best Evidence Rule,” and “Burden of Proof.”

When a party demands proof of a fact, then evidence must be presented in support of that fact that conforms with the rules of evidence, and in most countries such as England, the USA, the Philippines, and India, there are official codes that specify how such evidence must be gathered, transported, and preserved. When there are failures in the method of *gathering*, *transporting*, or *preserving* the evidence, then the evidence may well be ruled as being “*irrelevant*” by a court, and thereafter, that evidence must not be used in the case under consideration.

Normally, certified copies of documents, bearing a notary seal, or a facsimile of an original document that is presented in good faith, and has no objection, is considered as meeting the requirements for admissible evidence. When there is an *objection*, then the one who raises the objection can demand evidence that conforms with the “Best Evidence Rule.”

Wikipedia - The best evidence rule is a legal principle that holds an **original copy** of a document as **superior evidence**. The rule specifies that secondary evidence, such as a copy or facsimile, will be not admissible if an original document exists and can be obtained.^[1] The rule has its roots in 18th century, British law.

In the case of written documents, the best evidence is the absolute original document. in the case of the books of the bible, it would require the original work, written *by the hand* of Moses, Aaron, David, Jeremiah, Hosea, or whoever. In the absence of the *absolute original*, then the “Best Evidence” *cannot* be the original, therefor there are other, established methods of determining which of the *available* evidence is the BEST evidence..

The best existing copies of the Torah (and Tanakh) have been preserved by the Hebrew scribes. The Hebrew scribes *were and are* so diligent in making their copies that their professional code was *and IS* that “*Not only is the book sacred, but each page is sacred. Not only is each page sacred, but each paragraph is sacred. Not only is each paragraph sacred, but each sentence is sacred. Not only is each sentence sacred, but each word is sacred. Not only is each word sacred, but each letter sacred. Not only is each letter sacred, but even the spaces between the letters are sacred.*” Hebrew scribes do not even allow their fingers to touch the surface of the paper or parchment on which they are writing, because in so-doing, they may perhaps get some oil off of their skin onto the writing surface that may change the appearance over the next centuries, and cause the writing to be misread or become illegible.

At this point in history, the accuracy of the Hebrew scribes is established so that there exist only *FOUR LETTERS* in the *ENTIRE TORAH* about which there have been semi-legitimate *questions* raised. In all four instances, the question relates with either a yud (ך) or a waw (vav) (ם) that may *possibly* be the other. The only difference between them being how far down toward the line the writer drew the tail on the letter. In all four of these cases, the difference between the use of a yud or a waw would not have changed the translated meaning of the word, only the numerical value. (copy this link to your browser)

http://www.torah-code.org/controversy/the_accuracy_of_our_written_torah.pdf

We must have some kind of standard for evaluating the reliability of evidence, so I’m sharing my standards. If you have *different standards*, then please share your standards and references, so they can be logically evaluated.

In the U.S. Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 901 (8), it says that:

(8) *Evidence About Ancient Documents or Data Compilations.* For a document or data compilation, evidence that it:

(A) is in a condition that **creates no suspicion** about its authenticity; [*rules out Dead Sea Scrolls because of condition, and Council of Nicea for authenticity*]

(B) was in a place where, if authentic, **it would likely be**; and

(C) is at least 20 years old when offered.

In the case of some book of the bible *other than Torah*, such as a Scroll of Isaiah, there *is* such an authentic scroll in the catacombs under the Vatican, in Rome, that was copied / created during the years of the Kings of Israel and Judah. There also exists a photograph of each and every page of that scroll, *photographed on location* in the catacombs under the Vatican by (now) Rabbi Stanley Fretwell, who was at that time a very young student working on an

archeology dig in Israel with Dr. Vendyl Jones (*Dr. Jones's dog's name was Indiana*). The Scroll was removed out of Israel at some time during the Roman occupation of Palestine, and had been preserved in very good condition by the Catholic Church, in Rome. The Vatican copy is identical in every letter and space between letters as the current scrolls of Isaiah that are in Jerusalem and in general use by Orthodox Jews. In the same room with the Isaiah scroll, there were many other original documents and artifacts that had been relocated out of Israel. The photographs of the Vatican Isaiah Scroll would conform with the Rules of Evidence, *as long as* they were accompanied by a *notarized affidavit* by Rabbi Fretwell. This is the way that we can determine, *and have confidence*, that we are looking at the Best Evidence that is available.

Comparing the quality of the evidence and chain of custody of the books of the Tanakh with the history of the documents that now make up what is called “The New Testament,” we see a huge gap in credibility and confidence. Most of the “original documents” that make up the New Testament are not complete books, but rather, collections of document fragments. This is true even in the oldest versions of the New Testament, called the Aramaic Peshitta, where some of the examples of the published books of Peter are *TWICE* the size of those same books in other Peshitta versions. Thus, there is a remarkable *lack of consensus* on what each book or any of the books should contain. This information can be found, among other places, in the foreword of George Lamsa's *own* translation of the Aramaic Peshitta.

Given the extremely shaky history of the New Testament, it would be very difficult for *anyone* to CERTIFY the content of *any* of the New Testament books or versions. Contrast this with the stability of the content of the Torah, and *one can see why the Jewish position is so easy to defend*, and why the Christian position is so lacking in *legitimate* support. When *chain of custody* is lost, and *accuracy cannot be assured*, what used to be called “*evidence*” has now become “*irrelevant*.”

There are also “Legal Maxims.” There are hundreds, if not, *thousands*, of Legal Maxims. Maxims are standards that are so old that they are usually written in Latin. A Maxim is a general expression or cliché that focuses the mind on a self-evident concept. A Maxim rates somewhere between a *rebuttable* presumption and a *conclusive* presumption, but is much closer to a conclusive presumption. A good definition for Maxim, out of Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Ed, page 883 is included here:

Maxim. Maxims are but attempted general statements of **rules of law** and **are law** only to extent of application in adjudicated cases. Swetland v.

Curtiss Airports Corporation, D.C. Ohio, 41 F.2d 929, 936. An established principle or proposition. **A principle of law universally admitted as being a correct statement of the law, or as agreeable to reason.** Principles invoked in equity jurisdiction; e.g. "equity treats as done what ought to be done." The various maxims of law appear in alphabetical order throughout this dictionary.

One of the most important Maxims of law that should be understood by Christian Apologists is “Expressio Unius est exclusio alterius,” as defined below, in Black’s Law Dictionary, 5th Ed., page 521:

Expressio unius est exclusio alterius A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that the **expression of one thing is the exclusion of another**. Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 1 69 S.W.2d 321 , 325; Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d 1097, 1100. **Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another**. When certain persons or things are **specified** in a law, contract, or will, an **intention to exclude all others from its operation may be inferred**. Under this maxim, if statute specifies **one** exception to a general rule or assumes to specify the effects of a certain provision, **other exceptions** or effects are **excluded**. [*emphasis added*]

Christian Apologists continually use what they call “Types & Shadows,” but I call “Smoke & Mirrors.” Types & Shadows are alleged to be veiled references to the Messiah that are *concealed* in various (*convenient*) statements that they find in the Tanakh. One example of such Smoke & Mirrors is Genesis 3:15, and is a reference to the heel of the seed of the woman and the head of the snake. Another example of “Smoke & Mirrors” is the reference to Abraham, Isaac, and the ram that was given as a sacrifice, during the test of Abraham in Genesis 22:1 - 18. When there is nothing specific in a statement in the Tanakh that *specifically includes* the Messiah, then for evidentiary purposes, it can be legitimately inferred that the statement *specifically excludes* the Messiah.

Another example of judicial standards on how to logically evaluate evidence that I am going to share at this time is an excerpt out of a letter written by George Mercier, in 1984, to a man named Armen Condo. George Mercier was widely believed to have been a New York Appellate Court Judge, but in reality, he was a very knowledgeable law clerk for a judge of that court.

“... there is a fundamental principle underlying American jurisprudence you must be aware of as background material to understand what follows. This principle is a **hybrid corollary and consistent extension** of the **evidentiary doctrine** that **specificity** in evidence will **always overrule generalities** in evidence, even when they are in direct conflict with each other. For example, the statement by one witness to a crime that...

"I saw a **woman** run around the corner, **it wasn't a man...**" (and therefore the defendant, who is a man, isn't the criminal).

that statement **would be overruled** by this statement from another witness...

"The person I saw run around the corner **had long hair, a beard, and something like a tattoo on his neck..."**

Hence, **conflicts in testimony** are always **resolved** by giving the **greater weight** to the **most specific statements**. This is also the way equity grievances in contract disputes are settled -- the **most specific, detailed clause** governing the disputed circumstance is construed to be the statement **meant to govern** the disputed circumstances -- **even though** broader, **more general statements** can be found in the contract and **may favor the other party.**"

Therefore, all it takes to *positively eliminate* a suspect is to discover as few as only one, *solid, provable*, difference between the description of a perpetrator and the description of a suspect, and it eliminates that suspect as the perpetrator.

When we find ten, identifiable characteristics required of the Messiah, and a *potential* Messiah fails by *not fulfilling* as few as only one of those ten, then that man is conclusively eliminated from being the Messiah. The *extremely vague* statements made in the New Testament are going to be *over-ruled* by the *specificity of the Tanakh*, every day of the week.

If the *Jesus story* is *really* based upon the Tanakh, then why do Christians find it so difficult to adhere to the *solid* scripture that is found in the Tanakh and instead, *they resort to smoke & mirrors or the works of men*???

At the time that the book of Hebrews (*cited above, by Danny*) was *allegedly* written, the only "scriptures" or "word of God" for the *Hebrews*, was the Tanakh, and for *Karaites*, *it still is*. Paul's book for the Hebrews was *allegedly* written in 67-69 CE. The very earliest New Testament book was James, *allegedly* written in 44-49 CE. The "Gospels" were allegedly written in:

Matthew-- 50-60 CE, Mark-- 50-60 CE, Luke-- 60-61 CE, John-- 80-90 CE

So the three Gospels *other than* John could have *possibly* been written before Hebrews, but it is *highly doubtful* that hand-written copies could have been made and distributed throughout the "*Christian*" world by 67 – 69 CE, so those *Jews* who received Paul's letter to the Hebrews would only know of the Tanakh. The *pagans* who received Paul's letter would have thought that the "*word of god*" was referring to their own, *pagan*, written works. Further, even the people who hold the position that the actual authors were *not* at the Council of Nicea in 329 C.E., also place the authorship of the books of Second Peter, Jude, First John, Second John, Third John, and The Revelation of John most likely at a *later* date than the book of Hebrews.

Eight of the New Testament books codified and canonized at Nicea were *allegedly* written by Paul, and Paul is credited with the authorship, but *nowhere* is *any evidence* presented wherein Paul is shown to have passed any tests for being a Prophet anointed by YHWH. Quite the contrary. Paul would have *failed the test for a Prophet of YHWH* because Paul, by his own boasting, was a perpetual speculator, a proselytizer, and a prevaricator.

For the first century C.E. Jews, the Tanakh would have been the writings to which Paul was referring IF the book of Hebrews had been written by Paul, at a date between 67 and 69 of the common era. For Christians to *arbitrarily* include the *entire* New Testament within the scope of the “word of God” as mentioned in the book of Hebrews, would be more than a little bit of a stretch, under *any* conditions.

I say “*possibly been written*” because there is *admissible* evidence showing that these “New Testament” books were compiled and canonized in their *present-day form* at the Council of Nicea, and assembled between 325 - 329 CE, about 250 years *after* Paul allegedly wrote the book of Hebrews.

The Council of Nicea was brought together by Emperor Constantine for the express purpose of working on the creation of a standardized religion for the Roman Empire. They worked at this task for more than four and a half years. Even so, in their finished product, the writers still had *many irreconcilable differences*, such as the difference in dates and timing of events. There is a decided *LACK of consensus* regarding such things as which day and at what hour of the day that Jesus was allegedly arrested, and when and how he was allegedly tried, when he was allegedly killed, and *when/where* they observed his final Passover that they now call “The Lord’s Supper.”

Also, because the 1,786 pagan priests were comparing and revising 2,231 pagan books at the same time that they were canonizing the New Testament, the compilers of the books attributed to Paul *were most likely including some or ALL of the pagan sourcebooks* along with the Tanakh as the “scripture” that Paul allegedly said was “*sharper than a two edged sword.*” There are also several alleged references to prophecies that simply do not exist in the Tanakh, so we must presume that the referenced prophecies were either made up out of thin air, or are (more likely) to be found in their *pagan* sourcebooks.

We know, *from their own, written letters*, that the Roman church *despised* the Hebrew traditions and writings and they preferred their historic Ishtar (Easter) customs instead of the Passover Laws given to Moses by YHWH, and that the Romans progressively proliferated their pernicious practices. Ishtar,

or **Astarte**, was a goddess of fertility, and there were temple prostitutes who plied their trade in the temples that were built in honor of their goddess.

I cannot tell you how surprised I was to actually find the word “**Easter**” in the **King James Version** of the bible, because *Torah-observant Jews do not make it a practice of speaking the names of foreign gods, or even derivatives of the names of foreign gods.*

Exodus 23:13 And in all things that I have said unto you take ye heed; and **make NO mention of the name of other gods**, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth.

And in the NT, we find *this*:

Acts 12:4 And when he had apprehended him, he put *him* in prison, and delivered *him* to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after **Easter** to bring him forth to the people.

This is more evidence that the New Testament authors were **not** Jews who diligently obeyed the Laws of YHWH. Other words that describe this state of non-observance are “**lawless**,” “**disobedient**,” and “**sinful**.” Many years after I discovered that the word “**Easter**” is in the New Testament, I discovered **WHY** the pagan goddess’s name could be found in the New Testament, at all. In the case of the book of Acts, a lawful remedy would have been to simply substitute the word “**Passover**,” but the authors **chose not** to use that word.

Excerpt from Wikipedia.org – First Council of Nicea

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Council_of_Nicaea (in the *Overview*, we read:)

“Another result of the council was an **agreement** on when to celebrate **Easter**, the most important feast of the ecclesiastical calendar, decreed in an epistle to the **Church of Alexandria** in which is simply stated:

“We also send you the good news of the settlement concerning the holy pasch, namely that in answer to your prayers this question also has been resolved. **All the brethren in the East who have hitherto followed the Jewish practice will henceforth observe the custom of the Romans and of yourselves and of all of us who from ancient times have kept Easter together with you.**^[13]

“Historically significant as the first effort to attain **consensus** in the church through an **assembly** representing **all of Christendom**,^[5] the Council was the first occasion where the technical aspects of **Christology** were discussed.^[5]—Through it a precedent was set for subsequent general councils to adopt **creeds** and **canons**. This council is generally considered

the beginning of the period of the First seven Ecumenical Councils in the History of Christianity.” [footnote numbers are from Wikipedia.org] [some emphases added]

This shows that ANY work coming out of Alexandria for the previous several centuries (at least) would have been subjected to the corrupting, pagan influences of the Roman Religion, because the priests in Alexandria had “kept Easter together with” the Romans, “*from ancient times.*” These works would include the Septuagint translation of the Tanakh. The pagan influences of Alexandria are sufficient for raising a legitimate objection to certification of the Septuagint as admissible evidence.

When modern-day *Christian apologists* arrive at a consensus, it has all of the BIBLICAL authority of the consensus that was arrived at by the Council of Nicea, i.e., - **NONE!!!** It is just another consensus. Only by citing the Hebrew Tanakh can one lend either **credibility** OR **strength** to a position. You might have stimulating conversations over the *applications* of the words in the Tanakh, like Danny does between the words “Almah” and “Bethulah,” but you *cannot* argue about *which words* were used, or argue over the *meanings* of the words. We will talk more about these two words, in context, below.

With that being said, another Christian quote that I’m going to cite at this time, is:

"For on a time when a cardinall Bembus did move a question out of the Gospell, the Pope gave him a very contemptuous answer saying: All ages can testifie enough how profitable that fable of Christe hath ben to us and our companie." The Pope in this case being Leo X. Later accounts of it exist, as recorded by Vatican Librarian, Cardinal Baronius in the Annales Ecclesiastici (1597) a 12-volume history of the Church.

You will note that this is *not* something that was written and preserved by *Protestants* or *Jews*, but in their own, Catholic history of their own, Catholic church, saying that Jesus is not only a fable, but a profitable fable for the Catholic church.

Danny cites unspecified works of his heroes among the Christian authors. I will cite and share a work of one of my favorite “*ex-Christian*” authors, who was a biblical scholar and a printer from Lansing, Michigan, Claude A. Biggs. This is an excerpt out of his work called “Why I gave up Jesus,” reprinted out of “United Israel Bulletin” By: M. Alfandari, Jerusalem, Israel.

In 325 A.D. Constantine gathered together from the various nations some 1786 “learned men” who brought with them 2231 “legendary books” of pagan origin.

He had these men select from this medley of man's creations all that was "*best and good*" and "*worded so as to be well remembered by mortals.*" Then this Constantine, the first monarch to accept **Christianity**, had these "selections" bound into one book called **the New Testament**. The bewildered and fearful men labored **four years and seven months** doing this work. Not having as yet selected a god from among the many represented in the great assembly, they started balloting to "**vote in**" the god they would have rule over them! After the **first ballot** the number stood at **thirty-eight chief gods** and twenty-two lesser ones which had received a small number of votes. Finally, the **number was reduced to five**, namely, **Jove, Kriste (Christ), Mars, Crite, Siva**. Something had to be done to get out of the dilemma. **Constantine turned to his spirits** and asked for a **sign**. He got a "**fiery cross, smeared with blood and war,**" and he accepted this as a token **that Krist of the cross had to be the one**. **The Council agreed to reject all the other gods**. Thus at this Council of Nicea in 325 A.D. the Grecian "**Iesous**" in the form of Jesus was **brought into godhead** by the adoption of the former **pagan** idea of the **three-god doctrine** commonly termed the **trinity** still believed in by millions all over the world. **And at this Council, also, only those booklets revolving around this story were incorporated into the work that came to be known as the New Testament, not** by the authority of a prophet of YHVH, but by the **vote of fearful and fallible men**.

The above is the testimony of Claude Biggs, a devout believer in YHWH (not an atheist), based on the result of HIS research, giving HIS reasons for giving up Christianity.

Proverbs 20:10 Divers weights, and divers measures, both of them are alike abomination to the LORD.

Introduction

[Danny asks] Have you ever wondered why Jesus is not accepted as the Messiah in Judaism? **[I answered this question for Danny and everyone else, in "For it is Written, - or IS it?" Jews do not accept Jesus as the Messiah because the only place where you find the real qualifications for the real Messiah are in the Tanakh, and Jesus did not qualify.** In all honesty, I've never dedicated the time to this kind of research before. I always **assumed** my faith was well founded in historically sound manuscripts perfectly dated shortly after the death of Jesus. I've doubted just about everything except that for some odd reason. I always thought that basically the Bible says the Messiah would be rejected, and that's all there was to it. **[Danny is still assuming, and still unwilling to accept that the reasons for the rejection of Jesus as the Messiah could possibly be sound reasons, just like the reasons were for the rejection of all of the other people who were thought that could possibly be the Messiah, but were not.]** Well it's not. There's so

much more to it that I had never even wondered before. **Judaism has a problem with Jesus** as the Messiah for many different reasons, many of which can easily make you second guess your faith **if you don't know why you believe what you believe.**

The people who believe in Jesus have a problem with the Truth, i.e., - the Tanakh, not the other way around. Of course Jesus would qualify under their pagan criteria, but unfortunately for Christians, the Tanakh sets the standard, not the Council of Nicea. Jesus did not qualify under the Tanakh to be the Messiah. NO problem for the Karaite Jews. BIG problem for the Christians.

In an attempt to challenge my faith and bring me to the realization of the “truth”, I’ve been confronted by the Karaite Jewish paper “*For it is Written...*” – *or is it?* by **Bernie Besherse**. Karaite Judaism essentially means a dismissal of everything outside the Old Testament as NOT the word of God. It’s a very interesting way to view things and **in that sense it agrees with Orthodox Judaism**. The difference between them is that Orthodox Jews, who self-identify with the Pharisees from the time of Jesus, **also rely on** what’s called the **Talmud**, which is the written Rabbinical interpretation of the Old Testament also known as the **Oral Law**. **[So, more accurately, Danny, you are saying that Karaite Judaism does not agree with Orthodox Judaism. Orthodox Judaism uses sourcebooks (Talmud, Kabballah, Zohar) other than the Tanakh that the Karaites hold as being secular works of men. The Christian New Testament was either created by or modified at the Council of Nicea so Karaites also hold Christian documents as being secular works of men.]** Karaite Jews rely on **nothing but the Old Testament**. It’s a valid argument, which is why I now have this conversation with Mr. Besherse, but when it comes to faith, I believe it’s a dangerous thing to be wrong about.

Yes, Danny, it is a VERY valid position to rely upon nothing but the written word of YHWH, but it is perilous in the extreme to be wrong about being justified by substituting “faith” in the death of a man, Jesus, as a vicarious sacrifice for your sins, when such belief contradicts the written word of YHWH in His Tanakh. The prophecies were written before the man was born or died, so it is up to the man to conform with the prophecies, not up to the prophecies to be amendable to support belief in the man.

Psalms 118:8 It is better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in man.

It appears to others that in the mind of Danny, the words “belief” and “faith” could be equated to the term “blind acceptance of Jesus, who may well have been a complete construct of the Council of Nicea.”

As a Christian I believe all 66 books of the Bible were inspired by God. **[Yeah, but YHWH needed the pagans at Nicea to actually compile the New Testament and canonize it? GIVE ME A BREAK!!!]** I believe Jesus is the Messiah, come to first be sacrificed for the sins of the world, as described in Isaiah **[There is no chapter and verse from the**

Tanakh given as a reference. Why? (a rhetorical question: No scripture supports the position.)], and later to resurrect the dead for judgment and establish His Heavenly Kingdom of perfect peace in the presence of God [*Again, why is there no reference found in the Tanakh? (Again, rhetorical; same reason.)*]. The moment you question the New Testament's validity [*Aren't we obligated to question, until the validity of the N.T. is established?*], you create many gaps in the Old Testament that you must simply deem "uninterpretable". You simply don't know what they mean and I'd argue that without divine inspiration, you can never know. [*Or is it your private interpretation? 2 Peter 1:20 Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. This is right out of your sourcebook.*] You have a full explanation in Jesus that you must now ignore completely even though it really looks like He fulfilled scripture. [*Balance that with: Proverbs 18:17 [JPS 1999] "The first to plead his case seems right till the other party examines him." In other words, you cannot arrive at Truth without serious, honest examination and cross-examination, which Danny has not been willing to do. You can know that Jesus fulfilled NO Messianic prophecies, just by reading the words of the prophets, and seeing no fulfillment. There are also many instances (as cited in "For it is Written, - or IS it?") where one can find no prophecy that even remotely predicts an event or statement that the New Testament authors claimed to have been prophesied and fulfilled; e.g. –*

John 7:38 He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.

We are left having to presume that because such citations *are not in the Tanakh* they must be found in the sourcebooks of the other religions that were present at the Council of Nicea.] You have a humongous rupture with the logical order of things and your only reconciliation is to resort to conspiracy theories that allegedly "prove" that the New Testament is nothing but a human fabrication based on ancient mystery cults like Mithraism and others.

When the Christians, who have *already* dedicated themselves to the position that the New Testament is viable, cannot find support in the Tanakh for their "belief," their *cognitive dissonance* causes them to resort to inventing "types & shadows," and then give those *inventions* the *very same weight* that we give to the actual, written prophecies that contradict their *assumptions*.


We do not have to "resort to conspiracy theories" for support that the Christian religion is based in *the pagan religion of Rome*, because we have the actual writings of the very *founders* of Christianity, in their very own, written history about the formation of the early Christian church. Please re-read the extended quote of the letter to Alexandria, quoted on **page 10** of this document, and **highlighted in yellow**.

Danny continually places the cart before the horse. Danny begins his arguments with the *assumption* that the New Testament is *true*, and then *defies* anyone to prove that his *assumption* is *false*. This is not a difficult task, but because Danny does not want to believe the evidence, the facts are lost on Danny. I feel no obligation to get into the *Christian fiction*, but I do feel that I have an obligation to provide scripture from the Tanakh as *evidence* that can set the story straight for serious students who might be reading this document. Christian “*logic*” is completely bass-akwards.

1. There are *NO* verses in the Tanakh that talk about *Jesus*, son of Joseph, as being The Messiah.
2. There are *NO* verses in the Tanakh that talk about *Jesus*, son of Joseph, as being THE son of, or even A son of, ANY god, much less YHWH.
3. There are *NO* verses in the Tanakh that talk about *The Messiah* as being THE son of, or even A son of, any god, much less YHWH. Only a lineal descendant of David.
4. *NONE* of the prophesied actions, identifying characteristics, or accomplishments of the prophesied Messiah were fulfilled by Jesus.
5. When you feel free to *ignore the Law of YHWH* and substitute your own “consensus,” (see: page 10) you can *rationalize ANY* position.
6. The plans for *salvation, resurrection, and eternal life* for mankind are complete in the Tanakh, and the *existence or non-existence* of Jesus can neither add onto nor take away from the complete plan of salvation that we find in the Tanakh. [Ezekiel 18:27-28; Psalm 51; Second Chronicles 7:14, and many others]
7. Check out the link to: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/In_hoc_signo_vinces (ctrl + click)
8. I have found only ONE reference in the Prophets that *might* point to Jesus, or at least to Christianity. Christians might not want me to bring it up, but here it is, anyway.

Isaiah 44:8 – 22

8. Fear ye not, neither be afraid; have I not announced unto thee of old, and declared it? And ye are My witnesses. Is there a God beside Me? Yea, there is no Rock; I know not any.
9. They that fashion a *graven image* are all of them vanity, and their delectable things shall not profit; and their own witnesses see not, nor know; that they may be ashamed.
10. Who hath *fashioned a god*, or molten an image *that is profitable for nothing*?

11. Behold, all the fellows thereof shall be ashamed; and the craftsmen skilled above men; let them all be gathered together, let them stand up; they shall fear, **they shall be ashamed together.**
12. The smith maketh an axe, and worketh in the coals, and fashioneth it with hammers, and worketh it with his strong arm; yea, he is hungry, and his strength faileth; he drinketh no water, and is faint.
13. The **carpenter** stretcheth out a line; he marketh it out with a pencil; he fitteth it with planes, and he marketh it out with the compasses, and **maketh it after the figure of a man**, according to the beauty of a **man**, to dwell in the house.
14. He heweth him down cedars, and taketh the ilex and the oak, and strengtheneth for himself one among the trees of the forest; he planteth a bay-tree, and the rain doth nourish it.
15. Then a man useth it for fuel; and he taketh thereof, and warmeth himself; yea, he kindleth it, and baketh bread; yea, **he maketh a god, and worshippeth it; he maketh it a graven image, and falleth down thereto.**
16. He burneth the half thereof in the fire; with the half thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth roast, and is satisfied; yea, he warmeth himself, and saith: 'Aha, I am warm, I have seen the fire';
17. **And the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image; he falleth down unto it and worshippeth, and prayeth unto it, and saith: 'Deliver me, for thou art my god.'**  **[Doesn't this sound like Christians?]**
18. **They know not**, neither do they understand; for **their eyes are bedaubed**, that **they cannot see**, and their hearts, that **they cannot understand.**
19. And none considereth in his heart, neither is there knowledge nor understanding to say: 'I have burned the half of it in the fire; yea, also **I have baked bread upon the coals thereof; I have roasted flesh and eaten it; and shall I make the residue thereof an abomination?** Shall I fall down to the stock of a tree?'
20. He striveth after ashes, a **deceived heart** hath turned him aside, that **he cannot deliver his soul**, nor say: 'Is there not a lie in my right hand?'
21. Remember these things, **O Jacob, and Israel, for thou art My servant**; I have formed thee, **thou art Mine own servant; O Israel**, thou shouldest not forget Me. **[Who is the servant? He tells us twice. Can you remember it?]**
22. **I [YHWH]** have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins; return unto **Me [YHWH]**, for **I [YHWH] have redeemed thee.**

YHWH is our Savior, NOT Jesus, Ba'al, Yeshua, or any idea or crucifix that was concocted at, before, or after Nicea. We can find the identity of our Savior in Isaiah 33:22

For יהוה is our Judge, יהוה is our Lawgiver, יהוה is our King; He יהוה will save us (is our savior)

And in Isaiah 43:11 I, even I, am יְהוָה; and beside me there is no saviour.

Now, back to Danny.

If all these conspiracy theories are false, and **[if]** it turns out things actually did happen the way the New Testament describes, we can **then** say that we have a perfectly valid fulfillment of scripture.

They are not conspiracy theories. It did NOT happen like the New Testament describes. And until then, Danny, all that Christians have are *vain imaginings*. In any fair hearing your allegation would be *stricken* for lack of foundation In order to establish any of your allegations as evidentiary facts, you have your job cut out for you. You must:

- 1. Find some kind of independent evidence that *proves* that things actually *did happen* as the New Testament describes that is *not* tainted by the obvious bias of the Council of Nicea.**
- 2. The burden of proof falls upon you to prove that the above records of the Council of Nicea are *conspiracy theories*, because the evidence that we have says that the Council was creating a non-Torah-compliant religion.**
- 3. And again, Danny, you have to overcome *yet another* instance of YHWH, with the pen of Isaiah, saying that Israel is YHWH's servant and His firstborn son. You must come up with evidence showing that Isaiah expressly called Israel the servant in chapter 44 and then *perjured himself* and said that Jesus is the Servant in chapter 52 and 53. [*Expresio unius est exclusio alterus*] **The Servant is not the Messiah, and certainly *not Jesus*.****

1 Corinthians 15:15-17 (HCSB) [It is really verses 15 - 19, and I had to re-format for Danny]

15. In addition, we are found to be *false witnesses* about God, *because* we have testified about God that He raised up Christ – whom He did not raise up **if** in fact the dead are not raised.

16. For **if** the dead are not raised, Christ has not been raised.

17. And **if** Christ has not been raised, **your faith is worthless; you are still in your sins.**

18. Therefore, those who have fallen asleep in Christ have also perished.

19. **If** we have put our hope in Christ for this life only, **we should be pitied more than anyone.**

The opposite also applies. **If** I reject Jesus as the Messiah and **[if]** it turns out He is, **then** I'm essentially telling God that I don't need the grace that He offers us in the atonement through Jesus's sacrifice.

Danny acknowledges that Ezekiel is a tested, proven, and recognized prophet of YHWH, yet Danny totally *ignores* and *negates* what this Prophet of YHWH said in Ezekiel 18:27-28. Instead, he rests the future of his eternal soul

on the word “**IF**.” Danny expresses and implies the word “**if**” *more than 40 times in his document, not including the times that “if” is used in his citations of the New Testament verses.*

Using the JPS 1999 translation, we see in Ezekiel 18, that -

27. And if a wicked person turns back from the wickedness that he practiced and does that which is just and right [or, simply, - obeys Torah], such a person shall save his life.
28. Because he took heed and turned back from all the transgressions that he committed [i.e., - quits disobeying Torah], he shall live; he shall not die.

The terms “live” and “not die” as well as “save his life,” carry an *eternal* connotation, not just a temporal limitation. The verses clearly establish that eternal life depends upon obedience to Torah, not upon mere “belief” in the life, or death, or purpose of the death of an alleged man-god.

When one rejects the Torah, and rejects the word of the tested, proven, and recognized Prophets of YHWH, they *really are lost*, so Christians *really are more to be pitied than anyone*. At least, according to a tested, proven, and accepted Prophet of the Eternal ONE. (*Whatever that is worth. ☺*)

I'd like the reader to ask him or herself this question in regards to this view that the Karaite Jews have of the Bible, whether it's Mr. Besherse himself, or someone else reading this: **If two people read the Old Testament, and [IF they] draw different conclusions, is one person automatically wrong for consulting other Bible scholars and determining what makes more sense?**

This is a very sophomoric question. When the passages under discussion have some built-in “wiggle room” or latitude, it could be that both are right or both are wrong, but *seeking a consensus could not change the facts*. What *both* people *should* be looking for is the most accurate information about the meanings of the words, not at what other Christians say that conveniently *supports their own position*. *Consensus*, by itself, can in *no way* be equated with truth. The most that it can do is make you feel comfortable. When consensus is sufficient to make you comfortable, then you will never go on and seek the *actual Truth*, and be forever stuck in a position of error.

Please understand that writings like “*For it is Written*” – *or is it?* and even *Yes, it IS Written* are **interpretations**. The difference is that as Christians, we consider the things we read and **disregard** what we determine to not be from God [even in the Tanakh, obviously] based on [Nicean] scripture and what we know [or *think that they know*] about God's character. In the case of Mr. Besherse, he must resort to the **hope** that pro-Jesus writings are wrong. He depends 100% on the New Testament being 100% false.

In reality, Christians rely 100% on the writings that came out of the Council of Nicea, and they must reject virtually ALL of the teachings of the Tanakh. Christians consider what they *feel* and *believe*, NOT what is written in the book that they *allegedly believe* is the sourcebook for the prophecies regarding their Messiah. When the real sourcebook (Tanakh) says something different from what came out of the Council of Nicea, they deal with the Tanakh by simply *disregarding it*, or calling the other viewpoint an “*interpretation*.”

A small disclaimer: Due to the fact that I keep fairly busy, I often resort to debates easily found on the internet because it's a great way to get good speakers on two opposing views and do a side-by-side comparison. **[and unless you credit a known source, it is also *plagiarism*.]** You get to be the judge of what makes more sense without reading volumes upon volumes of different writers' works. Keep this in mind as you read. I will try and show you why I **believe** what I **believe**: that **if** the New Testament is true, **[and IF]** we have Old Testament fulfillment and a definitive Messiah. **If** not, we have countless **gaps** that have no explanation.

And do you really believe that when your *beliefs* are *not* supported by the *factual evidence* and WORDS in the *Tanakh*, that you are free to invent your own “*facts*” to fill the *gaps* and still be justified in the sight of YHWH? Sorry, **Danny. Everyone is entitled to their own *opinions, interpretations, and beliefs*, but they are **not** entitled to their own *facts*.**

This is my review and response to “*For it is Written...*” – *or is it?* by Bernie Besherse.

****Note:** Unless otherwise noted, the translation of the bible is from the Holman Christian Standard Bible for a couple simple reasons. The name **Yahweh** and the word Messiah are both used according to the original text and I like that element, and also it's an easy version to read and understand. It's very similar to other very common versions most people are familiar with, like the New International Version. **[Yahweh is not the pronunciation of יהוה. As far as I have been able to determine, the two-syllable word “Yahweh,” is not even a legitimate, Hebrew word derived out of the letters YHWH, but I doubt if the real pronunciation would make any difference to Danny, because it does not line up with what *Danny* wants to *believe*, and he is not seeking *Truth*.]**

****Note:** There are a **couple** points made in Mr. Besherse's paper that **I didn't bother contesting** for lack of time and **irrelevance** of the **accusations**.

There are many, *important*, and *relevant* points for which *Danny* had no answers, so he *ignored* them. The sad thing is that according to both the **Rules of Evidence and **basic logic**, even a single, **solid** Messianic Prophecy that **Jesus *did not* fulfill**, and for which there is **no reasonable explanation out of the *Tanakh***, shoots down the entire theory that **Jesus could *even possibly* be the Messiah that was promised *in* the *Tanakh***. There have been many people through the ages who have been thought might possibly be the Messiah, but**

some detail lacking in their performance has disqualified each and every one of them.

Having pagans in Council at Nicea reach a *consensus* cannot make their paganism somehow be transformed into Truth.

The authority of the New Testament

Throughout the text, there are **claims** made **against** the New Testament. **Accusations** against both the writers themselves and the “corrupt” canonization process, **allegedly** designed by a group of pagans gathered to **adapt** Christianity to their own pagan beliefs, control the masses, and carry out their pagan agendas.

For goodness *SAKE*, Danny!!! Don’t you know how to read, or do you just *refuse* to read? There are *written records* of the proceedings at the Council of Nicea, who was there, from where, what religion they represented, and what they discussed. The true lover of wisdom seeks not only to prove, but to disprove, even his most cherished theories. Claude Biggs only gave a VERY brief summary of the high points of the Council of Nicea.

How can you feel free to *accuse me* of ignorance and faulty logic because I referred to the work D. M. Murdock, Claude A. Biggs, *and others*, (along with the Tanakh), when your critique of my paper was written with citations *only* from people who are using the *pagan sourcebooks* from the Council of Nicea, and misquotes or faulty understanding of what you *did* take out of the Tanakh (*types and shadows / smoke and mirrors*)?

What do you think that Jeremiah meant when he said in Jeremiah 10:2:

Thus saith the LORD, Learn not the way of the heathen, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the heathen are dismayed at them.

Emperor Constantine’s method of breaking the multi-dimension tie for their “Savior,” was his *spirit-induced* “*vision*” of a fiery cross, smeared with blood and war, whereupon he said that the *Christ of the Cross* was going to be their *new god*, and “*in this sign, you will conquer.*” Where can you find ANY justification or *parallel*, even in your “*types & shadows*,” for a decision to select *Jesus* as the god of the Roman New Testament in the manner that was employed by Emperor Constantine? I’ve really *GOT* to see *THIS!!!*

Do you *REALLY* think that Constantine and his puppets used an adequately pure and holy process for deciding that the material allegedly

written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, Johnny, Paul, Pete, Jude, Timmy, Jimmy, and John the Divine was *authentic and inspired by YHWH*? Where can you find a parallel (*types and shadows or smoke and mirrors*) in the Tanakh? *Even if there was any evidence that the documents used by the Council of Nicea had originally been written about some event or events that had been predicted in the Tanakh, the fact that such pagans even touched the documents that became the New Testament shows that the New Testament is unclean and unfit (not kosher) for instruction in righteousness. It is like trying to wrap a “koshered” Porterhouse Steak in pig bacon, fry it in lard, serve it on a platter alongside a lobster, and still think that it is kosher.*

Even Paul, the main writer of the New Testament, in the greatest act of conversion in the entire Bible, who had his eyes opened by God Himself, is **accused** of growing up in Mithraism and bleeding his pagan poison into the Bible, thus being one of the nullifying elements of the New Testament. I have **two fundamental** questions: Where did this information come from[1] and why haven't the atheists of the world exploited it yet?[2]

Let's think logically[???] here. **If** these claims are true, then why haven't the blood-thirsty, all-knowing, enlightened, free-thinking **atheists** come to the rescue and released all the poor and entrapped Christians from their bankrupt belief system, supposedly based on the very pagan cults they oppose? The immediate logical[???] answer is because that's a **not very well proven theory**, or it's based on information found to be somewhat unreliable or seemingly as fabricated as what it claims the New Testament is. That would be **my guess** right off the bat.

Answering your two, fundamental questions in reverse order, [2] the atheists of the world would have very little interest in the fables of Christianity. The people who do have an interest are the people who love Truth, and love YHWH. It is the lovers of YHWH who are really annoyed by the lies that are told by those who try to cross-connect the paganism of the Roman Religion with the Messiah of the Tanakh. We have exposed the pagan connection between the Council of Nicea and their corrupt New Testament. Repeatedly. Many times, over many centuries. Die-hard Christians, however, will use every kind of twisted logic at their command to continue in their belief that they should be able to have their sins forgiven in advance, by some miraculous system that does not require that they have sincere Remorse, Repentance, and Restitution whenever they disobey the written Torah. They ignore the Law and the Prophets, and want to live with their totally pagan idea that “Jesus paid it all.” Ezekiel says (many times) that one man cannot die for another man's sin, but this makes no difference to Christians, because they, - (dramatic pause and drum roll) - “BELIEVE!!!”

Christians are told that they must believe that Jesus was a man-god. They are told that they must believe that Jesus was all man, and at the very same

time, they must *believe* that Jesus was all god. They say that the god-part of Jesus *could not die* because he was all god. Their doctrine says that it was only the man-part of Jesus that died for their sins, but his man-part was brought back to life.

It is intellectually dishonest and flies in the face logic, reason, and common sense, then, to *deny* that what YHWH told us through Ezekiel about “one man cannot die for another man’s sins” would not also prevent the man part of Jesus from dying for Danny’s sins, or for the sins of *the world*. Ask yourself if the man-part of Jesus was really all man. Wouldn’t he have to be just a tiny part god? OOPS! That would mean that he could not die, wouldn’t it? After all, even in their own fable, they admit that the *god-part* of Jesus could *not die*, either for their sins, or anyone else’s sins. This would be true *even if there was anything in the Tanakh* that says that the only way for mankind to be saved was to have a man or a god die for him, *but there isn’t*.

You either *believe* that the very same YHWH who created the heavens and the earth also gave the *Law* to Moses and the *visions* to the Prophets, or you *do not believe* it.

When you *do not believe* that YHWH gave the Law to Moses or the visions to the Prophets, then your theories claiming that your false Messiah, Jesus, has some kind of connection to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob all *fall flat on their face for irrelevance*. There would be no reason for YOU to even *attempt* to connect the Roman deity with the Tanakh, because YOU do not believe *that the Tanakh is valid*. By your disbelief in the Tanakh, no sacrifice described in the Tanakh as a remedy for the sins of either one man or the sins of the world would be relevant. Your Roman Religion would have been sufficient.

On the other hand, if you *do claim* to believe that YHWH gave the *law* to Moses and the *visions* to the Prophets, then the fact that the Tanakh *prohibits* there being a man-god who could be a sacrifice for your sins will either free you from the clutches of the Roman Religion called Christianity, or it will introduce such a strong state of cognitive dissonance that you may even end up in an institution for the insane, because you cannot resolve the conflicts. It has happened.

The [1]answer to the FIRST FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION (*above*) is that when it is *uncontested* that Mithraism WAS the religion of Tarsus, and it is *uncontested* according to the New Testament “experts,” that Paul grew up in Tarsus, then this is not a mere *accusation*. In Acts 21:39, and 22:3, Paul allegedly says that he is “*a Jew of Tarsus*,” and “*a Jew, born in Tarsus*.” If this could be refuted, you would welcome it as something on which *you can score at*

least one point. Just provide facts, and refute it. If you had facts that could counter or even off-set my facts, you would be elated, not defensive.

Danny is still failing by not providing a single verse in the Tanakh showing that *a god must die for a man, or that a man must die for a man, in order that the sinner-man might be saved.*

I showed YHWH's simple plan of salvation to Danny, and Danny rejected YHWH's plan of salvation. Danny rejects the Three R's that have abundant scriptural support, and accepts "the Jesus plan" that has no Tanakh support. Danny seems to want to be able to sin all that he wants, and have someone else pay for the sins. That is not the plan that YHWH gave to us. We must obey Torah, which Danny seems to find either inconvenient, invasive, or contemptible.

Then, Danny gave us another very sophomoric and poorly thought-out guess. The atheists are not out to save the world, like the enlightened, all-knowing, blood-thirsty (communion BLOOD drinking), free-thinking Christians are motivated to do.

Again, it is not a mere CONSPIRACY THEORY, as we showed on page 10 of this document. It is a FACT that Christianity is the result of rule by consensus of pagans who held (hold) the Torah of YHWH in contempt.

We've got to clarify here that because the **majority believe** something, we cannot **conclude** it is true. [Or conclude that it is false, either. The mere belief by the majority of Christians that the Israel is NOT the first born son of YHWH does not mean that their choice of god IS a son of YHWH. Conclusions require evidence.] But it is a very strong indicator when the majority looks at the evidence for something (in this case the New Testament) and draws the conclusion that it is true. **If** your conclusion is different, you have more than a billion people **you** now **suddenly need to explain yourself** to. And **you can't rely on difference in Old Testament interpretation because it's not sufficient; it is exactly that: interpretation.**

Let me see, now.... How many billion Muslims are there in the world?

You are saying that the fact that they all believe in the Koran does not make it true, but (using your logic[???]), because YOU disagree with the MUSLIMS, then YOU suddenly have a need to explain yourself to THEM. Is this what you mean?

Sorry, Danny, but it is NOT just a difference in interpretation. It is a difference in words. The words are in the Torah, and you are choosing to either ignore or choosing not to believe them. Your refusal to believe anything other than your narrow, myopic fantasy that the New Testament is an extension of the Tanakh does not make it anything other than a narrow, myopic fantasy. It

is not only an interpretation of words, either, because the result of the misinterpretation has eternal consequences. Where you spend eternity and whether you might need air-conditioning in that location is a direct result of today's selection of consequences by the decisions that you make, today.

This is different than, say, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who faced the “majority” of folks blindly worshipping a pagan deity. That’s a clear case of the majority being wrong. This is different than Galileo, who faced the “majority” of folks arbitrarily and blindly believing that the stars in the sky were nothing more than holes punched in a veil God put around the Earth through which the light from Heaven shined. That’s a clear case of the majority being wrong. **[It was no clearer to the majority at that time than the pagan nature of Christianity is clear to you, right now, because you substitute what you believe in place of verifiable, admissible evidence.]** We are discussing the most studied literary document in the history of the planet. **[Possibly true, but it has the power of the largest bank in the entire world backing it (Vatican Bank, or Holy See), and they have a financial interest in keeping your beliefs in line, so they can have your obedience. Their story is tantalizing to you, because you get to sin, and have someone else pay for your sin.]** Needless to say, it’s quite challenging to come up with new information. **[We don’t need new information. You need to learn how to assess admissible evidence and hold fast to that which is true. When you want us to change our assessment of the facts, you need to provide us with more complete and different facts. We must Embrace the Evidence and Ditch the Drivel.]** You are now opposing extremely learned and knowledgeable scholars who have studied deeply and sincerely the credibility of the New Testament and found it to be true. **[Not at all, Danny. They only believe it to be true, just like you do. Findings require facts and evidence.]** Even the secular scholars who study the New Testament find it compellingly true (like Lee Strobel or J. Warner Wallace who both became Christians after studying the reliability of the New Testament in depth). At the very least, there is no indication of the NT being false testimony to the historical life of Jesus. **[??? Where is there a reliable record of Jesus in any contemporaneous, historical work? The only “records” of Jesus are inside of the New Testament, which was compiled by pagan priests at the Council of Nicea. There is a lot of information on what is and what isn’t in the Dead Sea Scrolls, at: <http://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/category/daily/biblical-artifacts/dead-sea-scrolls/> Most of the pages of the Dead Sea Scrolls are so badly eroded that they are not possibly a definitive source of information. Even the alleged note in Flavius Josephus about Jesus is recognized by christians as being a forgery by Father Eusebius. In fact, some of the things that Father Eusebius said about himself being an opportunist are almost word-for-word what they had Paul saying about himself in the book of Acts! When the Word of YHWH is subjected to manipulation by pagans, then there are no verifiably clean words left in the documents they touch. Nothing that is touched by a pig is kosher, and nothing sacred that has been touched by pagans remains sacred. What is your theory of what happened**

at the Council of Nicea, and on what evidence do you rely? Show me evidence, not conjecture or consensus.] Drs. James White, Michael Brown and William Lane Craig have very good defenses for the NT that I would suggest visiting, aside from Lee Strobel and J. Warner Wallace's writings.

The only reason why Danny is not citing scripture from the Tanakh is because the Tanakh testifies against the New Testament. He demonstrates that his belief is based in a consensus of men, not the word of YHWH.

If I were to study Dr. James White, Michael Brown, Lee Strobel, J. Warner Wallace, and William Lane Craig, then I might become an expert on the beliefs of Dr. James White, Michael Brown, Lee Strobel, J. Warner Wallace, and William Lane Craig, but when I want to become an expert on the Tanakh, I need to study the Tanakh, and so does Danny. No wisdom is gained by studying what Danny's heroes wrote. All that I see are the silly excuses that they make for ignoring the written words of YHWH in the Tanakh.

Continuing in our **logical[???**] train of thought, let's briefly go over a couple of extra documents cited to me by Mr. Besherse to try and show what **atheists** like Dan Barker call the "fabric" from which Christianity and most other ancient religions are woven. **[Dan Barker was a Pentecostal preacher and singer. The entire Pentecostal mind-set is at cross-purposes even with the rest of New Testament Christianity, and has absolutely no basis in the Torah, Prophets, and Writings. I have been able to do a limited amount of research on-line regarding Dan Barker, but it is my understanding that Dan Barker is now classifying himself as an Atheist because he is no longer classifying himself as a Christian. Not being Christian is not equal to being an Atheist. I have not been able to discover what Barker's attitude might be toward the simple belief that Karaite Jews have of the Tanakh. If a reader of this document can direct me to an on-line statement by Dan Barker regarding his opinion of Karaite Judaism, I would greatly appreciate it.]** I will discuss the direct opposition to the NT suggested by Mr. Besherse, but first I must address the criticism against the NT authors, which is based on these extra documents and some others related. **[The opposition is based upon what is written in the New Testament, and either written or not written in the Tanakh, not on anything else.]** These papers are *The Origins of Christianity and the Quest for the Historical Jesus Christ* and *Mithra: The Pagan Christ*, both by Dorothy Milne Murdock (whose dates of birth and of death are coincidentally December 25th, 1961 and 2015, **but that's beside the point**).

Dorothy Milne Murdock was born on March 27, 1960, not December 25th, 1961. You were WRONG on that, Danny, but that's beside the point. It does show us a little bit about Danny's research and reporting skills.

You can get some basic information about D. M. Murdock at:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Acharya_S

Another site about D. M. Murdock is:
<http://www.truthbeknown.com/author.html>

Dorothy Milne Murdock spoke, read, and/or wrote English, Greek, Hebrew, French, Spanish, Italian, German, Portuguese and a smattering of other languages to varying degrees. She could read Euripides, Plato and Homer in ancient Greek, and Cicero in Latin, as well as Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales* in Middle English. She also cross-referenced the Bible in the original Hebrew and ancient Greek.

D. M. Murdock did *her own* research, in libraries in Greece, where she lived for many years, and most likely had access to older, more, and better resources than her critics and fault-finders among the established *Christian Apologists* in the United States. Did the Christian critics of D.M. Murdock speak/read those languages and do their research in the libraries that hold the ancient texts? There is no indication that their research is better than that of D. M. Murdock. They do not disagree with the sources or methods. They only disagree with her conclusions. No surprise.

There are a couple things here that need to be pointed out, the first being that this woman was a diehard atheist with a very pronounced bias who used the arguments of her writings to try and disprove the Old and New Testaments alike. [Evidently, the word “atheist,” to Danny, means only that she is not a Christian. And Danny is a die-hard Christian (pagan), so what is the difference? Danny ignores any verses in the Tanakh, any verses in the New Testament, and any words in historical documents that cast any doubt on his cherished theory that he can violate the laws of YHWH and have someone else pay for his own sins. Danny admitted in *his own* document that YHWH says that *to obey is better than to sacrifice*, yet Danny has the contrarian belief that he can present his body a living sacrifice to Jesus and not have to obey the written law of YHWH. How screwed up is that?

“1 Samuel 15:22 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.”

Danny thinks that Christians can *deliberately* disobey the Torah law *against getting a tattoo* (mark in the skin) in Leviticus 19:28, and think that he is presenting his body as a living sacrifice to Jesus. We could almost paraphrase 1 Samuel 15:22, saying “to obey the law about not getting a tattoo is better than to present your body as a living sacrifice.”

Leviticus 19:28 Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, **NOR** imprint ANY marks upon you: I am the LORD.

There is a stipulation in each case. In the case of cutting your flesh, the stipulation is “for the dead.” In the case of marks on the skin, it is “not make ANY.” Is this just a case of *interpretation*, or is it a case of *reading the words*? People need to learn how to read.

The remaining question is, “Even though it is incontrovertible *SCRIPTURE* (that, according to Danny’s citation above is sharper than any two edged sword), is Danny willing to obey the laws of YHWH?” **Evidently not.] It is as **unwise** as it is **contradictory** for a Jew to use these kinds of sources against a Christian such as myself because those same writings are used against the beliefs of Judaism as well. It just doesn’t make sense.**

How about letting YHWH make the rules for Jews, and you make the rules for Christians? Would you be OK with that? The Truth has no need to fear *anything*. We do *not use* Murdock as a basis for our understanding of our belief system. We use the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings. You are the one who uses the words of man, like Lee Strobel, Michael Brown, etc.

The next problem I have with these papers is in the sources used to argue these points. For example, *The Origins of Christianity and the Quest for the Historical Jesus Christ* has many many quotes by **Barbara G. Walker**, who is an **atheist** feminist, graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a degree in journalism and whose specialty and primary writing topic was knitting. (Yes, a feminist woman whose specialty was knitting.) **[Do you have a source cite?]** She has much to say regarding her disapproval towards the entire Bible, both Old and New Testament because she has a clear pro-women bias and interprets the entirety of scripture as a sexist, morally skewed piece of fiction, heavily influenced by ancient cultures, religions and cults. **[First of all, we do not use these authors as a basis for our beliefs, but even if we did, would it be any worse than Danny’s “unclear, pro-Jesus bias” that *interprets everything by its consensus* between the creators of the work-product of the pagans at the Council of Nicea as a basis for his *belief system*? Basing our beliefs in the writings of those women WOULD NOT BE RIGHT, but it would be *no worse* than what Danny does. Danny uses one set of rules for himself, and a different set of rules for non-Christians.]** Are these really the things a Jew wants to use to discredit the Christian worldview?

No, Danny. A Karaite Jew has *no need* to find a *consensus* with people like D. M. Murdock or Barbara G. Walker. We depend on the Tanakh. The Tanakh discredits the Christian worldview *much* better than Murdock or Walker could ever do. You either *cannot* or *will not* counter the citations that I have given you out of the Tanakh by using other citations of the Tanakh. Because Christian apologists cannot seem to find anything other than “*types and shadows* or *smoke and mirrors*,” I gave them some other sources. It does not seem that you can find anything solid that will rebut Dan Barker’s or D. M. Murdock’s statements either, so you resort to *personal attacks*. How sure are

you that your Christian Apologist heroes would stand up to the same kind of scrutiny that you give to Murdock? If you recognize YHWH as the Lawgiver, Judge, and King [Isaiah 33:22], then you recognize that using two sets of weights and measures is an abomination.

The small fragment from Nicea that I quote on page 10 of this rebuttal is just the tip of the iceberg. If you want to really learn what Christianity is all about, get the [all](#) of the records on the Council of Nicea that are available. Why don't you see how much is available in the library of the Moody Bible Institute? I wonder how much they might have in their library, and if they can refrain from mucking up the evidence with their own *commentary and consensus*?

Ms. Walker is not the only person cited, of course. There are many bibliographical references. There's also a reference to *The Origins of the Mithraic Mysteries* by David Ulansey, who admittedly has a more convincing resume, but when *his* references are checked, we see that the most recent document he cites is from 1987. Almost all the other references are significantly older than that, going back all the way to the late 1800s in Europe.

Because the sources are older does not mean that they are less valid today, does it? After all, the document that you continually defend was created in or about the year 329 of the common era. Or do you only criticize anti-Christian sources that are more than 20 years old?

What's the significance of this? Dr. William Lane Craig in a number of talks he gives, points out a very important point regarding this scenario: Many of the comparisons between ancient mystery cults and Christianity were brought up between the late 1800s and the 1930s by anti-Semitic European scholars, many of which were German theologians. OF COURSE they're going to scavenge history for any hint and minor indication that maybe, just maybe, all of these Judeo-centered world views are fraudulent. [And maybe not, too. Where is your evidence, either way?] Are these really the things a Jew wants to use to discredit the Christian worldview? [Why not? You cannot seem to find any real evidence in the Tanakh for me not to take criticisms by Murdock and Ulansey seriously.]

The very first thing it says in *Mithra: The Pagan Christ* is that it's an article adapted from a chapter in *Suns of God: Krishna, Buddha and Christ Unveiled* as well as excerpts from *The Origins of Christianity* and *The ZEITGEIST Sourcebook*. Well it just so happens that D.M. Murdock wrote all of those papers and we've already gotten to see what kinds of sources Ms. Murdock accepts.

Yes. She accepted sources that she read in the original languages, in the libraries in the countries in which they were written. What is your problem with that?

To give you an example of the type of **ridiculous** claims made by these papers, *The ZEITGEIST Sourcebook* goes on to claim that Jesus is just a pagan sun god, adapted from ancient myths, and that we call Him God's Son when He was originally conceived as "God's Sun". All of us English-speakers just flipped out because obviously this means that the son-sun homophone is universal, right?

If you want to ignore the similarity between the words sun and son, it is no problem. To me, it is an “after-the-fact” anomaly. More important similarities include the miraculous birth, sacrificial death, walking on water, healing the sick, raising the dead, having disciples, Eucharist, and bunches of other parallels, few of which even have parallels in the Tanakh, and NONE of which are prophecies to be fulfilled by The Messiah!

Wrong. And there are many other fantastical claims made in these papers. There are comparisons from all kinds of ancient mystery cults and pagan religions. I’ve even heard comparisons between Jesus and Odysseus. One comparison that’s very common in these kinds of books is Jesus’s virgin birth versus that of characters like Mithra. Folks like to throw that around, saying Mithra was also born of a virgin in a cave, witnessed by shepherds. The reality is that records of Mithra’s birth tell that he emerged from a rock. I suppose it could be said that the rock was a virgin...

Basically what they are trying to imply is that a few people in the first centuries of the Common Era (maybe their names really were Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, and maybe not) conspired to create a new religion designed to control the masses and become very wealthy people. For this I recommend seeing just about any video on YouTube refuting the claims in the Zeitgeist Addendum movie (which is the almost identical documentary of the book). Additionally, to get an idea of the “**parallelomania**” that goes on in these kinds of investigations, I strongly recommend a debate between **Dan Barker and James White**, available on YouTube.

Where is your link?

Isn’t this an excellent example of Christians denying people like Murdock and Ulansey the same right to use parallels, smoke & mirrors, and types & shadows that Christians use? When you complain about Murdock and Ulansey doing what YOU do, you are using *two sets of weights and measures*.

In that debate, **Dr. White** brings up a point that’s very important. What these writings expect us to believe based on their **questionably biased and unreliable sources** is that **Mark and the gang were sitting around an adobe house one day in 1st Century Palestine and they got this brilliant idea.** “Why don’t we make a new religion? To do so, we’ll take some principles and characters from Greek mythology, and Egyptian mythology, and Roman mythology, and some Eastern mystery cults, change the names a bit, and make one brand new religion out of it!” And so they do just that. But the problem with that theory is this: Contextually, what this is saying is that the gospel writers, being the brilliant educated writers they allegedly were, thought it would be realistic to expect the extremely prejudiced Jews of Palestine, who detested all pagan cultures (we know this especially from the relationship they had with the Romans and Samaritans and other people groups at the time) and were familiar with the pagan gods, mythologies, and deities held by other people around them, to accept this Christ that was so “evidently” cut out from all these pagan mythological fables. **If** you ask me, that’s **pretty farfetched**.

Yes. I agree with you. Dr. White’s fantasy IS pretty farfetched. In all of my reading, I have never heard such a preposterous story concocted about the creation of the New Testament! It was not a group of future apostles who were

just bored with sitting around with no new religions to create. What actually happened is a matter of record, and requires no speculation, conjecture, or fantasy. It was Emperor Constantine who convened the group of 1,786 pagan priests and scholars, who brought 2,231 pagan documents from their own countries. They created a religion by consensus, but had a difficult time deciding on which of five, major god-figures to use for their new “god.” it was only after Constantine consulted his spirits [151 Rum? Bufo toad skins?] and had his dream [hangover nightmare?] that the members of the Council were finally unanimous in deciding that the “Christ of the Cross” would be their new “god.” At that point, they must have worked very hard trying to deify that man.

You, Dr. White, Rome, and even Moody Bible Institute, cannot find evidence negating these historic facts. All details of this new “god” were then codified in what is now called “The New Testament.” As with the result of most decisions by committees, they made some very glaring errors, so one does not need any outside information in order to prove that there are some serious problems with connecting the Tanakh with the N.T. With the knowledge of some of the events surrounding the Council of Nicea, we can see that the errors come from blending various pagan religions with the religion of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which is absolutely prohibited in the Torah, so all of Christianity is unclean. Can you remember the story of Phinehas?

Deuteronomy 18:10 11

10. There shall not be found among you *any one* that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, *or* that useth divination, *or* an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch,
11. Or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer.

Please, Danny, find some Torah-citations of your own that explain how to make your sourcebook, the New Testament, clean enough to use for instruction in righteousness, after it was touched by Constantine.

If that’s not enough, any scholar trying to get to the bottom of these anti-Judeo texts will ask, “Alright, the sources are questionable, and have already been very thoroughly refuted[?] [There is a world of difference between “questionABLE” and “thoroughly refuted.” Anything is “questionable.” Your favorite sourcebook, the N. T., has been thoroughly refuted.] What publishing company was behind all of these D. M. Murdock publications?” That scholar will likely feel no surprise when he or she reads that the publishing company is one called Stellar House Publishing, founded by the very D. M. Murdock herself. Is this really a reliable source that’s telling you the truth, or is this a biased person who seems to have a grudge against just about any organized theistic religion, who would go out of her way to fabricate lies and even create her own publishing company to make sure her stories are divulged?

[And in Danny's case, all roads lead back to the Roman Religion, and the Council of Nicea.]

Title 5 U.S. Code 556(d) **says that the proponent of any rule or order bears the burden of proof, which is a secular law codification of the Torah commandment requiring two witness in order to establish a fact. When you make the allegation, then you are required to provide the evidence (proof),, or else you are subject to charges of bearing false witness. Please, before you make an allegation, substantiate each and every allegation, from the Tanakh. This way, you avoid offering mere speculation and conjecture, and condemning yourself under the laws of YHWH.**

Reader, you've got to know what it is you're reading and preferably know why you **believe** what you **believe** before diving into some of these things. I insist that the most important thing we can try and determine for this paper is **whether or not the New Testament is truthful** (Dr. James White has a number of talks regarding this very topic online). There is much evidence in favor of the New Testament, and only a handful of **anti-Semitic atheist** writings that have been greatly refuted by believers and non-believers alike. Please check these things before you go believing any old lie you stumble across on the internet. I almost fell for the D.M. Murdock trap back when I heard these things for the first time in **2012**, and I never felt dumber in my whole life than when I heard the debunking of her theories.

It would have been more productive if you had spent more time learning now to evaluate evidence, examine evidence, and cross-examine evidence. You allowed yourself to be distracted by personalities and emotion, without ever really studying the actual prophecies regarding the promised Messiah. I know that this is true, because you are still depending upon emotion and personalities, and you have virtually zero offers of evidence or Tanakh scriptures in support of your theories, only speculation and conjecture.

I **think** Paul is the only one, having grown up in Tarsus, that a case could be made against because in Tarsus he could've had more exposure than any other apostle to pagan religions and Eastern mystery cults. But even so, **there's no evidence** that suggest **different to what he says** in his own writings, that **he was a devout Jew his whole life**. [Oh, REALLY? 😊] He, too, would have found those pagan religions to be completely repulsive. [Then why don't you find it so?] On the other hand, there is evidence showing that the New Testament writings were in circulation as early as the beginning of the 2nd century CE (might I suggest **googling "p52"**), literally hundreds of years before the famed Council of Nicea and we know that the gospels were accepted eye-witness accounts of the life of Jesus that many Jews were even accepting because they had heard and seen for themselves the wonders that Jesus performed. Had they been falsehoods, they would have been denounced.

Please look at the actual words, not the emotions, and certainly not just at Paul's own claims of piety, especially when they are so obviously self-serving and contrary to the Laws of YHWH, in the Torah.

Torah is Forever, and to borrow a phrase from The Dread Pirate Roberts in A Princess Bride, “Anyone who tells you differently is selling something.” ☺

Deuteronomy 4:1 Now therefore **hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments**, which I teach you, for **to do them, that ye may live**, and go in and possess the land which the LORD God of your fathers giveth you.

Deuteronomy 4:2 Ye shall **not add unto the word** which I **command** you, **neither shall ye diminish ought from it**, that ye may **keep the commandments** of the LORD your God which I command you.

Isaiah 40:8 The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but **the word of our God shall stand for ever**.

Psalms 105:8 He hath remembered his covenant **for ever**, the word *which* he commanded **to a thousand generations**.

Psalms 119:89 LAMED. **For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.**

Psalms 119:160 Thy word *is true from the beginning*: and **every one of thy righteous judgments endureth** for ever.

So we have words directly out of the Law, the Prophets, AND the Writings that Torah is forever, and further, that we have no permission, power, or right to add to that Law or take away from it, but the New Testament adds many new laws, and Paul even declares that *the Law had ended!* How could this be *anything except a violation of Torah?* Please tell me, but if you attempt to tell me, you must show me with admissible evidence.

1. Where do you find a parallel between “being a devout Jew” and Paul’s position in 1 Corinthians 15:56 “The sting of death IS sin; and the strength of sin IS the law”?

When A = B and B = C then A = C. Paul says that the death = sin = law. In reality, it is obedience to the law is the only thing that can give us eternal life. It is by obeying the Torah law that we save our soul alive. Ezekiel 18:27 – 28

2. Where do you find a parallel between “being a devout Jew” and Paul’s position in Galatians 2:21 “I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain”?

The ONLY place that righteousness comes from is by the law!!! In a parallel to what Paul said, - “When righteousness does come by the law, then Christ IS dead in vain.” Just another dead Jew.

3. Where do you find a parallel between “being a devout Jew” and Paul’s position in Galatians 3:21 “*Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law*”?

The Law is where life does come from, but *Paul missed it*. Again, look at Ezekiel 18:27 – 28.

4. Where do you find a parallel between “*being a devout Jew*” and Paul’s position in Galatians 5:3 “For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law”?

We are all required to obey only the laws THAT APPLY TO US. In the case of a non-Levite male, that might be as many as 275 laws. Even the Levites only have about 700 laws to obey. Circumcised men are NOT required to obey the laws regarding menstruation or childbirth. This yoke *IS easy and this burden IS light*.

5. Where do you find a parallel between “*being a devout Jew*” and Paul’s position in Galatians 5:18 “But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law”?

We are ALL under the law. The law is *FOREVER*.

6. Where do you find a parallel between “*being a devout Jew*” and Paul’s position in Hebrews 9:22 “And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission”?

Patently *false*. There is no blood sacrifice stipulated for any sins of rebellion, and even for some sins of oversight. *Fine flour* can be accepted as a sacrifice for some sins, and the sins are forgiven.

2 Chronicles 7:14 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.

Where is the blood in 2 Chronicles 7:14? All that I see are the Three R’s, - Remorse, Repentance, and Restitution.

Paul (if he lived) was not a devout Jew. Paul (if he was a Jew) was a rebellious Jew. Paul (if he lived) was a pagan, and the above citations of scripture, both Tanakh and the New Testament, show that *Paul taught paganism and open rebellion against the Law of YHWH*.

Daniel 9:11 Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God, because we have sinned against him.

At the council of Nicea, what they discussed was the deity of Jesus and the opposition was unanimously voted against. They were not concerned about the NT writing because by then they already had the complete NT!

Your statement that “... the opposition was unanimously voted against” is a mutually-exclusive condition, but in your fanaticism, you most likely missed it. What the Council of Nicea actually discussed was how to *create a new*

*religion, and the one they eventually created, was centered around someone that they called Ieasus (Jesus). Even so, Jesus was not god. Jesus, (if he lived), was a man. The Jesus character was only one of the five people who made it to the final round of voting by the Council of Nicea. The Council could not even reach a *consensus* on the *name* for their new god, so they had to wait for Constantine's "spirit vision" before they could even decide on which god they were going to deify. With that being the case, where, and in what century, was it decided by Christian Apologists that "the opposition was unanimously voted against"? Certainly not in the year 329 C.E. The only time that *anything* became unanimous at Nicea was after they were ordered by Emperor Constantine to use *Christ of the cross* as their new god. Some people need to re-assess their "facts," and one of those people is Danny.*

And what about P52, the oldest preserved NT writing? It's important to note that P52 is written on both sides, **suggesting** it was a part of a sewn codex rather than a manuscript, which in turn **suggests** that by the second century CE (**if** not sooner), parts of the NT were in circulation. In the **hypothetical** event that the Council of Nicea **DID meddle** with the NT texts, you will find I am not easily convinced that they sat down and **fabricated the whole thing** as a lie to control masses.

On the Internet, it says this about P52.

The Rylands Library Papyrus P52, also known as the St. John's fragment and with an accession reference of Papyrus Rylands Greek 457, is a fragment from a papyrus codex, measuring only 3.5 by 2.5 inches (8.9 by 6 cm) at its widest; and conserved with the Rylands Papyri at the John Rylands University Library Manchester, ...

P52 is a tiny fragment of paper. It is not a book. It is not even an entire page of a book. What **WORDS** are on the scrap of paper? The words are similar to passages in the Gospel of John. When was it written? Unknown, but by someone's guess at the writing style, it may have been from the second century, CE. Maybe later, but maybe even 200 years earlier, but when someone is already looking for excuses in support of the Jesus myth, they are not going to let any opportunity go to waste.

No one is suggesting that the entire New Testament was fabricated at the Council of Nicea. In fact, it should be clear to everyone by now that the New Testament was an adaptation of the 2,231 earlier works that had been brought to Nicea by the 1,786 pagan priests.

*In fact, fragment P52 may even have been a fragment of one of the earlier pagan works. After all, from what we DO know about the work-product of the Council of Nicea, the N.T. was built by adapting other work. With no more of that fragment available than that little scrap, it requires a lot of *conjecture and speculation* in order to build an entire Gospel of John, exactly as we find it*

today. That is like an evolutionist building an entire “missing link” by studying a single tooth or a bone fragment. Especially when the Council was *known* to have such little respect for the Tanakh and the Law of YHWH.

Did they turn the Hebrew *Passover* into their own, historic, pagan *Easter*, or not? Their own documents say that *they did*. The Council of Nicea also *admits* that they had been keeping the Roman religious customs “*since ancient times*,” right along with Alexandria, Egypt. They were pagan for centuries *before* the Council of Nicea. They were pagan *during* the Council of Nicea. And they were pagan *after* the Council of Nicea, right up to the present day.

Lastly, most of the apostles were **martyrs**, including Paul. Christians were persecuted all through the third century CE. Why would they **fabricate** things that would get them all killed? There was no high status or fortune to be gained from writing something like the NT, only death and persecution.

I am not saying that “Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul” “**fabricated**” anything for the sole purpose of getting themselves killed. That is an unworthy argument even for a *High School* sophomore. The only evidence that they *existed* is contained within the documents compiled and canonized at the Council of Nicea. The most obvious conclusion is that the compilers of the New Testament wrote about the deaths of their martyrs into their fable for the purpose of creating a mythos that would hold the people together and make them more loyal Roman citizens. People support unpopular causes and die for them, all the time. Your argument has no strength, logic, or validity.

With that out of the way, I’ll proceed to a **point-by-point** analysis of Mr. Besherse’s accusations against Jesus and the New Testament based on the Tanakh (Old Testament).

You can see how many citations that Danny could find in the clear wording of the Tanakh that support his *belief* in the work-product of the Council of Nicea.

ZERO.

Smoke & Mirrors or Types & Shadows are conjecture, not evidence.

Genealogies, not chronologies

To start off, Mr. Besherse's very first **attack** on Jesus as the Messiah brings the gospel genealogies to the center of the stage. We are told that Matthew's account of the genealogy is clearly fraudulent because it is missing people, [**The first set of 14 is missing three people. The last set of 14 is missing one man. Why do you avoid this obvious lie, Danny? It is, at best, a gross inaccuracy. My guess is that it is because you want to avoid the truth, just like you avoid so many other truths that are not convenient to your pre-conceived interpretations and belief.**] and yet they are counted in three sets of **14** to try and **deceive** the reader of the time (most likely a Jew) into believing there is some connection with the Davidic number: **14**. [**It was Matthew (not Bernie), allegedly a Jew, who allegedly counted the generations and HE (not Bernie) came up with the number 14 in each case. Please do not blame me for Matthew's mistakes. He got it right on only one out of three. Why do you think that Matthew is anything but a liar when HE made the claim, and HIS claim can easily be proven false? How can Matthew be right sometimes, and wrong at others, and you still think that he is a competent witness? Where else is he wrong? At the minimum it is "perjury by inconsistent statements."** I am going to again cite a section out of the **civil law of the United States, not** because it is the **authority**, but because it **makes sense**.

Title 5 US Code § 556(d) "...the proponent of a rule or order has the burden of proof."

[**Matthew made the claim that there were 14 generations in all three cases, so Matthew has the burden of proof. You assert that there are excuses for this, but none of your excuses make sense.**] Then we are told there are a couple more problems to deal with. Jesus would have to be of the seed of David, through the royal line of Solomon to be considered eligible for kingship, which He's not because He was **supposedly not** the **biological** son of Joseph. The third problem with Jesus's candidacy is that even **if** He *was* Joseph's son, his bloodline is traced back through **Jeconiah** who brought a very explicit curse upon himself and his family in **Jeremiah 22:18-30** that prohibits himself and his children from reigning **over Israel**.

Now, please sit tight while I work through these **apparent** problems. Mind you, these are **not excuses**, but rather **explanations**. Even in the worst case scenario of **not** finding a clear cut answer to questions of the Bible, as **John Piper** says, we should be slow to throw out a book that has **proved[???**] itself over and over for thousands of years as the mighty, saving, transforming word of God, even in the face of **seeming** contradictions.

That is really lame. Bernie needs a rational reason to believe something, and Danny only needs an excuse not to believe something. Danny is willing to believe something that is false, just because he accepts no reason not to believe it.

Danny introduced the difference between Genealogy and Chronology, but did not define Chronology. Here is a definition for Chronology:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chronology>

Chronology (from [Latin](#) *chronologia*, from [Ancient Greek](#) *χρόνος*, *chrónos*, "time"; and *-λογία*, *-logia*)^[2] is the [science](#) of arranging events in their order of occurrence in [time](#). Consider, for example, the use of a [timeline](#) or [sequence of events](#). It is also "the determination of the **actual temporal sequence** of past events".^[3]

Chronology is part of [periodization](#). It is also part of the discipline of [history](#), including [earth history](#), the [earth sciences](#), and study of the [geologic time scale](#).

Danny's Christian Apologist sourcebooks tell him that it is a "chronology." OK. A chronology is a [sequence of events](#). In this case, [Matthew arranged the sequence of events along timelines that were measured in "generations."](#) How accurate was Matthew? Either Danny admits that his holy sourcebook starts out with some glaring errors, or Danny does not admit that his holy sourcebook starts out with some glaring errors, but it is a fact that the New Testament starts out with glaring errors whether Danny admits it, or not.

Deuteronomy 18:20-22 says that we are not to fear false prophets. We have no reason to fear or respect *anything* written in the book of Matthew unless Matthew is **100% in line** with the Tanakh. It is abundantly obvious in just the first and second chapters of Matthew that the book is not **100% in line** with the Tanakh, so, even if Matthew was claiming to be a *prophet*, then he was a *false prophet*, and we are *commanded* not to fear him. Where does Matthew claim to be a Prophet? Where is he *acclaimed by others* to be a prophet? If Matthew was **NOT** claiming to be a prophet, then Christians should **not** find it difficult to question anything that might be an error or falsehood. Why so difficult?

o understand the Bible as a whole, not only the **genealogies**, we must take into consideration the fact that it was written *with intent*, a concept I had known, but hadn't quite put together the relevance until speaking with my pastor recently. This basically means that the writers of the Bible, including the gospels, had a **specific message from God** [You now *appear* to be *alleging* that Matthew *IS* writing *prophecy*! Can't your god count? Do you think that it is OK to tell a lie in the first century, just because the book is written for a future generation?] to communicate to a **specific** audience. We learn from the Bible to this day though we are thousands of years and thousands of kilometers removed, but each book was written at a **specific** time for a **specific** audience.

If what your pastor told you was *true*, then *logic dictates* that there are *portions* of your bible that were *not* written for *this* specific time, for *this* specific audience, and therefore is *not* "sharper than a two-edged sword," or written "for reproof and instruction in righteousness (*Torah obedience*)" for *this time* and *this audience*. **QUESTION:** Which parts are not written for you, in this day?

According to Paul, and perhaps your pastor, the Torah was not written for you. Is this what you believe?

What do you make of:

2 Timothy 3:16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

Which was it? All, or part, or none? This is out of your book, not mine. I am just wondering how you will answer.

If it makes sense to you to throw away the Torah, *what is preventing you from throwing away anything and everything that appears to you as being Messianic Prophecy, Types & Shadows, and Smoke & Mirrors, so you are not bothered by any of it?* This way, you could be *more comfortable, even as a complete and total degenerate.*

So what does that have to do with anything? Well, because of that and the **context** we read in books like the gospels, we can know that Matthew and Luke had **specific audiences** in mind when they wrote their books. Luke even says in his opening statement that he is directing his investigative narration to **Theophilus**, who is **believed to be** a **Roman** man **who hired Luke** to make an **impartial[??]** study on the stories of a man that he had heard of named Jesus. Based on the details **Matthew** highlights in his account, it is believed that his target audience was **the Jewish population**.

Who is it that believes that the word “Theophilus” refers to a Roman man (with a Greek name?) that hired Luke? Where did this information come from? What is the evidence? I am not denying a Roman (Ba'al) connection (assuming that Luke was a real person) between Rome and what Luke may have written and what he may have done, but I am asking for *evidence* of how *this theory* came into being. Do you have any evidence, or do you just – (drum roll) *believe*?

The word “Theophilos” is a Greek word, #G2321 in Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance, and means “*Friend of God*.” It is **much** more likely that the compilers/revisers/creators of the book of Luke dedicated that work to **anyone** who is a *Friend of* [their pagan] *God*.

This kind of difference in understanding is the result of failing to translate a book or document, and merely transliterating, instead. There are many examples of this kind in the various versions of the bible. If you would like to spend a delightful afternoon with me, drinking organic coffee and munching on tropical fruits, we could find a bunch of examples of “**failure to translate**” and learn what some people and place names *really* mean. Did you know that Isaac’s name means something like “**Laughing Boy**”?

Also, this may come as a surprise for you, it's **extremely** common for genealogies in the Bible to jump from a person A all the way to a descendant B several generations down the line and say that A was the father of B. This happens because **maybe** the writer isn't interested in pointing out every single person in the middle. **[Why would the number 14 be so important to Matthew, then, that he stipulated 14, 14, and 14, and yet be wrong two out of three times? There is no evidence that there was an intentional skipping of generations. Quite the contrary. Because the number 14 was important to Matthew, then it would also be important that the count be accurate. Numbers are as important as words are in the Hebrew language. Matthew did get it right 1 out of 3 times.]** **Maybe** the writer is pointing out specific ancestors that have some common factor of interest, or **maybe** nobody is familiar with those others so there's no point in mentioning them. **[Lame, lame, lame. If what you allege were true, then why mention ANY of them? If "maybe" is a legitimate argument, then "maybe" Matthew was too drunk to keep his numbers straight.]**

There are even times when, for example, **if** a man dies, his brother will marry his widow and the children of that marriage will be considered children of the deceased man. **[Is there ANY evidence of this in Matthew's selection of names? When there isn't, then the only reason for mentioning it is because you are desperately searching for an excuse for Matthew's errors.]** And then you have the added complication of people having more than one name or a changed name. Abraham was Abram, Israel was Jacob, Paul was Saul, Peter was Simon, Matthew was Levi... The list goes on. **[Is there ANY evidence of this in Matthew's selection of names? When there isn't, then the only reason for mentioning it is because you are desperately searching for an excuse for Matthew's errors.]** What I'm trying to say is genealogies are not the same as chronologies and shouldn't be held to the same rigidity. **[Can you give me a really good reason why not in the case of Matthew chapter one, other than; 0: because YOU are alleging that it is a chronology 1: because you can find no other answer, and 2: because it does not fit in with your beliefs, or 3: you have to have the illusion that you did not lose an argument to a Jew?]**

Instances like these are all over the Bible. Take, for example, Zilpah in **Genesis 30:9-13** and **Genesis 46:18**. Did she bare two children or sixteen, or did the first two bare the sixteen that followed?

In those instances, did the author stipulate the number of generations in the same manner that the book of Matthew does, naming each father and son, and then fudging on the names in order to force the count to come out to their pre-determined number? You do not have to answer if it proves to be too embarrassing or might tend to incriminate you. To the objective observer, you appear to be searching for evidence and having to settle for lame excuses.

As pastor Wayne McKellips points out, **Matthew 1:8** says Joram fathered Uzziah, but the first book of **Chronicles 3:11-12** says Joram fathered Ahaziah, who fathered Joash, who fathered Amaziah, who fathered Azariah, who we learn in **2 Chronicles 26:1-2** was

also called **Uzziah**. I think that **if** Matthew wanted to skip a few people in his genealogy account, **that's perfectly fine**, [**"Fine" in order to justify Wayne McKellips' beliefs, maybe, but when it is Matthew, himself, who lists an even 14 for the middle group, and arbitrarily misses on the other two groups when he did have access to the names, then the McKellips argument fails, miserably.] and **if** he wanted to illustrate the Davidic number in the process, **even better!** [**A lying argument is as offensive as "kill for peace," "lie for truth," & "fornicate for chastity."**] It would be no different from genealogy tradition **up until that point**.**

Oh, yes it is! And your point is???

In Matthew's genealogy account, can you prove that this happened? Or are you just trying to win an argument? Where is the search for **TRUTH?**

We know, and Matthew knew, the accurate number of generations between Adam to Noah to Abraham to Jeconiah to the days of Jesus, because the Hebrew historians and scribes brought us the accurate list of names and years and children's names and years. Getting *sloppy* with memorizing genealogies *was not the way it worked*, especially before they started writing things down. Even some of the old, American Indian chiefs, like Chief Joseph of the Shoshone (*in the USA*), could trace their genealogy all the way back to Israel. They learned from their grandparents and taught the names to their children, *accurately*, or they would not have been able to do that. The same happened among many other cultures, including Polynesia. In Matthew's case, he knew the correct number of generations, and chose to write down the wrong number, and supported the wrong number with false data. How do you justify that?

Moving on, we find that within Matthew's genealogy account, a particular name is mentioned and the average onlooker may not realize who it is. **Chapter 1:11-12** mentions these names in Jesus's ancestry:

11 and Josiah the father of Jeconiah [that is, **Jehoiachin**] and his brothers at the time of the exile to Babylon. **12 After the exile to Babylon: Jeconiah was the father of Shealtiel, Shealtiel the father of Zerubbabel...**

What Mr. Besherse, and other **Jews** who claim Jesus is not the Messiah, have a problem with here is the appearance of Jeconiah (or Jehoiachin) among the forefathers of Jesus because of what it says in **Jeremiah 22:24-30** (NIV).

24 "As surely as I live," declares the Lord, "**even if you, Jehoiachin son of Jehoiakim king of Judah, were a signet ring on my right hand, I would still pull you off.** **25** I will deliver you into the hands of those who want to kill you, those you fear – Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon and the Babylonians. **26** I will hurl you and the mother who gave you birth into another country, where neither of you was born, and there you will both die. **27 You will never come back to the land you long to return to.**"

28 Is this man Jehoiachin a despised, broken pot, an object no one wants? Why will **he and his children** be hurled out, cast into a land they do not know?

29 O land, land, land, hear the word of the Lord!

30 This is what the Lord says: “**Record this man as if childless**, a man who **will not prosper in his lifetime**, For **none of his offspring will prosper**, **none will sit on the throne of David or rule anymore in Judah.**”

This is a **very explicit** passage in which it **seems** God declares the entire gene pool from Jeconiah downward **ineligible to rule Israel**. Notice that Matthew specifies Shealtiel, Jeconiah’s son, and Zerubbabel, Jeconiah’s grandson as ancestors of Jesus’s earthly father. Thus, **the immediate conclusion is that Jesus is ineligible to be the Messiah 1)** because he’s technically **not directly of the seed of David, but rather the alleged Son of God** and **2)** because **if** He is the son of Joseph, then He is a **descendant of Jeconiah** and **is not able to be the King. [BINGO!!!]**

But before we jump there, let’s see what other passages have to say, and consider the merciful character of God in the midst of all of this. Turn with me to **Haggai 2**.

20 The word of the Lord came to Haggai a second time on the twenty-fourth day of the month:

21 “Speak to **Zerubbabel, governor of Judah**: I am going to shake the heavens and the earth.

22 I will overturn royal thrones and destroy the power of the Gentile kingdoms. I will overturn chariots and their riders. Horses and their riders will fall, each by his brother’s sword.

23 On **that day**” –this is the declaration of the Lord of Hosts– “I **will take** you, **Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel, My servant**” –this is the Lord’s declaration– “**and make you like My signet ring, for I have chosen you.**” This is the declaration of the Lord of Hosts.

Now, **clearly**, this is an indication that, as promised, the Messiah’s kingship would come through David and through **Zerubbabel [Where?]**, and there are other passages that speak similarly, like **Zechariah 4:7**. And since the royalty was transferred through Solomon, it only makes sense for the Messiah to eventually come through Zerubbabel because his is, to my knowledge, the last and furthest recorded list of descendants of David in the Old Testament.

If Karaites were allowed the use the Christian standard for claiming “types & shadows,” “speculating and guessing,” “smoke & mirrors”, and “political correctness,” etc., as being equal to actual prophecy, is it not equally possible that Zerubbabel and Shealtiel might possibly have been “love children,” or the result of cases of rape of, incest, and/or adultery by Jeconiah’s wife, and not the actual blood-line of Jeconiah, at all? I am not claiming this, just pointing out that using two sets of weights and measures is an abomination, and that your “consensus” should be given no more favorable weight than a Karaite Jewish consensus, or even a Talmudic, Rabbinic, Hassidic, or Orthodox Jewish consensus. All forms of consensus FAIL when compared with the WORDS in the Tanakh.

The history of the kings of Israel and Judah show that Jeconiah was *the last of a dynasty*. The word in Haggai 2:21 that the KJV translates as “governor” is “pechah” and refers to a prefect, captain, deputy, or a governor, but not to a KING.

The word “governor,” in Strong’s at H6346, says:

pechâh; *peh-khaw'* Of foreign origin; a *prefect* (of a city or **small** district): - captain, deputy, governor.

Total KJV occurrences: 28

So, we can see *clearly* that Zerubbabel and Shealtiel were not going to be Kings of Judah or Israel.

The word “King” however, is Melek. In Strong’s at H4428, it says:

Melek; *meh'-lek* From H4427; a *king*: - **king**, royal.

Total KJV occurrences: 2521

Therefore, Zerubbabel and Shealtiel being *governors*, cannot be used as evidence that YHWH is a liar, or that Jesus is somehow qualified for being the Messiah and KING.

Notice **it is clearer**[?] now than before that Jeconiah’s curse was much shorter term than what Mr. Besherse would like us to impulsively believe based on Jeremiah 22 alone. God pronounced him childless, but he had children. God declared he would not prosper in his lifetime, and yet the 2 Kings 25:27-28 tells us that he was given a very exalted seat of honor **in Babylon**. God pronounced his children would not rule over Judah, yet we just read about his grandson Zerubbabel being the **governor** of Judah, and not only that, but God calling him His chosen **signet ring**.

That terminology is no accident, as God calls Jeconiah a removed signet ring in Jeremiah 22:24.

JPS 1999, Haggai 2:23 says:

Haggai 2:23 In that day, saith the LORD of hosts, will I take thee, O Zerubbabel, My servant, the **son** of Shealtiel, saith the LORD, and will make thee as a signet; for I have chosen thee, saith the LORD of hosts.' [all are **future tense**. **When is THAT day?**]

This is obviously *has not happened yet*, because Jehoiachin was the end of the dynasty. *Neither* Shealtiel nor Zarubbabel were kings over Israel or Judah, so what is your point?

Jesus was a king over neither Israel nor Judah. And, because Jesus has now been dead for the past 2,000 years, he will *never* be king of Israel or Judah in the future, regardless of what you **BELIEVE**. Just maybe, someone named Shealtiel or Zarubbabel will be given governorship over Costa Rica or El Salvador, but not **Kingship** Israel or Judah.

It is self-evident that the book of MATTHEW makes the specific claim that there were 14 generations, but there were actually 17. Danny has expressed his speculations and conjectures very strongly, but what does he prove? SPECULATION or CONJECTURE on his part, or on Wayne McKellips' part, is no substitute for an evidentiary fact. Danny used the word "maybe" TWICE, and the word "if" FOUR TIMES in his preceding seven paragraphs, and he has the unmitigated gall to suggest that MY religious beliefs as a Karaite are on shaky ground??? Evidence and proof are not compatible with the words MAYBE and IF.

I am sure that it is much easier to live with his fantasies, though, when he does not bother to do the simple research needed to determine the meanings of the words on which he hangs the fate of his eternal soul.

To go even further, Genesis 3:14-15, considered [by consensus of pagans, not by the actual words] the very first Messianic prophecy, tells us this:

14 Then the Lord God said to the serpent:

Because you have done this, you are cursed more than any livestock and more than any wild animal. You will move on your belly and eat dust all the days of your life.

15 I will put hostility between you and the woman, and **between your seed and her seed. He will strike your head, and you will strike his heel.**

I've known this to be a Messianic prophecy for a long time, but I hadn't quite connected the **dots** on it. [There is nothing in the wording of verses 14 or 15 that indicate that it is Messianic Prophecy. It is a continuing prophesy or a curse, that has been true on a daily basis, beginning with the day of the curse. When you are absolutely CERTAIN that you "know" something is true, but it "just ain't so," it is called either "delusion" or "cognitive dissonance." There are no dots to connect regarding this verse, other than imaginary dots. Not even unsubstantiated dots!] We're not being told that man's seed will strike the head of the serpent, but the woman's seed. God Himself is declaring the woman's seed the valuable asset in this whole ordeal. This **gives us a license** to trace Jesus's bloodline through His mother, which happens to be what Luke does in his genealogical account. [Except that women do not have seeds. They have eggs. Also, when you claim "license," you are claiming the right/power to do something that is illegal or immoral.]

Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Ed. Page 829

License. The permission by competent authority to do an act which, without such permission, would be illegal, a trespass, or a tort. People v. Henderson, 391 Mich. 6 12, 2 1 8 N.W.2d 2, 4.

[When you are claiming "license," then I have a right to examine the license (where you got it, limits, restrictions, etc.), through voir dire and cross-examination.] We have Jesus traced back to whom? David. [Tracked back to no

one, because of the loss of four ancestors out of the genealogy. When lost or missing evidence is grounds for dismissal of an indictment, there is also insufficiency of evidence to establish a connection between Jesus and David.] And Jesus is eligible for kingship of Israel because his earthly father is traced through whom and to whom? Through Solomon, to David. So we see that Jesus is, in fact, [Sorry, it is by speculation or conjecture, not admissible as evidence.] a blood-descendant of David, worthy of kingship both by **adoption** into the line of Solomon and by divine appointment in Luke 1:26-38, not to mention all the other Old Testament prophecy.

Luke 1:27 To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name *was* Mary.

First of all, one is **not** eligible for kingship through **adoption**. Whoever told you that it is possible did **NOT** substantiate the claim with any verses out of the Tanakh. Second: the last time I looked, Luke's genealogy was through Joseph, not Mary. The following is the final few generations as shared by the writers of the book of Luke, and it ends in Joseph, who here, is said to be the son of Heli. In Matthew, Joseph was said to be the son of Jacob. And Third, the Messiah will be a *genetic descendant* of David, **NOT** an *adopted heir*. In Luke, the final generations are identified as:

Luke 3:23 And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was *the son of Heli*,

Luke 3:24 Which was *the son of Matthat*, which was *the son of Levi*, which was *the son of Melchi*, which was *the son of Janna*, which was *the son of Joseph*,

In Matthew, the final generations are identified as:

Matthew 1:15 And Eliud begat Eleazar; and Eleazar begat Matthan; and Matthan begat Jacob;

Matthew 1:16 And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

Contrary to the allegations that Luke's genealogy is through Mary, Luke 3:23 identifies Jesus as being the supposed son of JOSEPH, the HUSBAND of Mary, who was the SON of Heli, the son of Matthat. So Joseph was the grandson of Matthat. The genealogy in Luke is the genealogy of JOSEPH.

Matthew identifies Jesus as being the son of Joseph, the son of Jacob, who was the son of Matthan. Here, Joseph is the grandson of Matthan. The similarity between Matthat and Matthan is close enough to raise a legitimate question about whether or not they were different spellings of the same name, and therefore, Joseph, husband of Mary and father of Jesus is quite possibly the same man, but at least, distant cousins.

So we are left wondering if Heli had two names or changed his name to Jacob, but in both cases, the genealogy is traced through the *father*, Joseph, and

Mary's name is NOT included in either genealogy as anything other than the mother. Do you remember the genealogical gymnastics and speculation regarding names of the 14, 14, & 14, even bringing up that someone may have even raised up children for his brother in order to justify his continued belief in Jesus? Well, here, we have enough admissible evidence that WE could even get it into a court. Let's see how he explains this away!!!

Almah in context

Mr. Besherse brings up the original text of the **virgin birth prophecy**[?] in **Isaiah 7** and clearly indicates to us that the word that it uses, *almah*, doesn't literally mean virgin but rather "**young maiden of marriageable age**", not necessarily a virgin. A review of Strong's most recent Expanded Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible reveals that in context it **clearly** refers to a young **virgin** woman.

It is the common practice in writing a dictionary that *the most common usage* of the word is the **first** in a list of possible definitions. Following any other convention or practice would lead to a lot of confusion. In Strong's definition for **Almah**, the first word listed is "**lass**," and the second is "**damsel**," neither of which specifically denotes a virgin, but *would* indicate a female that is *older than an infant and younger than a grandmother*.

The first word listed for **Bethulah** is "**virgin**," and the second is "**bride**," which *also* denotes a virgin. By Hebrew law for a first marriage, the lady *should* definitely be a virgin (evidently *not* the case for Mary, wife of Joseph in both the Matthew & Luke genealogies).

ALMAH, *in context*, means a "**lass**," a "**young woman**," or a "**damsel**," usually of marriageable age. If she has never been married, I would *hope* that she is a virgin, but virginity is not a requirement for being an **Almah**.

עַלְמָה 'almâh al-maw'

Feminine of **H5958**; a **lass** (as *veiled* or private): - **damsel**, maid, virgin.

Total KJV occurrences: 7

BETHULAH, *in context*, means "**virgin**." Even when she is eighty years old, when she is called a Bethulah, then she is a virgin. There is no specific connotation of being *young* woman.

בְּתוּלָה b^ethûlâh *beth-oo-law'*

Feminine passive participle of an unused root (**H1330**) meaning to *separate*; a virgin (from her *privacy*); sometimes (by continuation) a bride; also (figuratively) a *city* or *state*: - **maid, virgin.**

Total KJV occurrences: 50

So, in the King James Version of the bible, the word “almah” is used only SEVEN TIMES, and in exactly ONE of those cases, ha_Almah (the specific young woman) is mistranslated to mean a (non-specific) virgin. This mistranslation *came via the Septuagint and Latin Vulgate*, which are corrupt translations of the Tanakh made in Alexandria, Egypt, by followers of the Roman Religion. Ha_Almah means **this, the, or that specific young woman. The “ha” prefix is the “**definite article**” as opposed to “**a young woman, or any young woman.**” It is obvious in Isaiah 7:14 that Isaiah is specifying *a particular young woman*.**

Also in the King James Version of the bible, the word “bethulah” is used FIFTY TIMES, with *each and every* occurrence referring to a virgin (of any age), or else to a *beloved city or homeland*.

End of story.

[In Strong’s, the word “virgin” is the last of three, possible uses of the word “almah.” NOT all of those three possible uses/applications are EQUAL. “Virgin” is the LEAST likely, AND, as in the case of Rebecca, the “almah” (infra) had already been called a “bethulah.” The word “virgin” is included in the definition for “almah” most likely as an example of how it was mistranslated and USED in the KJV, not because that is what the word means. There are other examples of absolute mistranslation in the KJV, such as for the word “file,” in 1 Samuel 13:21. They have discovered that the word translated as “file” was actually the money that it took to pay for the sharpening, not the tool used for sharpening, so you can’t justify the SINGLE CASE where “virgin” is translated out of “almah” by mere allegation.] It is the word used to refer to Rebekah in Genesis 24:43 [In verse 24:16, Rebecca had already been called a **Bethulah**, so Rebecca had already been stipulated as being a virgin, and was described in 24:43 as being an **Almah**, i.e., a young lady (who in this case was also a virgin), as opposed to an old lady (who was a virgin).] and it is the word used to refer to virgins in Song of Solomon 6:8 and **its most common use** in the Bible is to describe a virgin. [Not so, but dream on. **Almah was used only seven times in the entire KJV. Bethulah was used 50 times, and when referring to a woman, always means “virgin” or beloved homeland.**] A Hebrew reading this in context would have interpreted the word to mean “virgin”, so **if** you want to **interpret** it

differently, that's fine, but you have less basis for the **theory** that *almah* was referring to a young woman and not a virgin.

Wrong again, but stay asleep. The word Bethulah had already been used to describe Rebecca. Genesis 24:43 just identifies her as the **YOUNG virgin identified in 24:16, as opposed to an **OLD** virgin.**

Isaiah was familiar with the word “bethulah” and he did use it to specify that a woman is a virgin. Isaiah used the word “Almah” in Isaiah 7:14, because Isaiah’s wife (the young woman of whom he spoke), was not a virgin, but was going to give birth to the child of whom Isaiah spoke. The four verses below are the other 4 of the 5 times that the word “virgin” is found in Isaiah, in the KJV. In all of the below verses (*in black*), the word “virgin” is translated out of the word “bethulah,” and means either a *virgin* or a *beloved city or beloved homeland*. You can bounce around to Solomon’s Songs and other books, as you wish, but *right here in Isaiah*, it shows that *Isaiah* used the words “bethulah” to mean “virgin” and “almah” to mean “young woman” (except in the corrupted Septuagint translation, *of course*). It is *only* in the Septuagint that Isaiah’s pregnant wife is **magically transformed back into a virgin.**

Isaiah 23:12 And he said, Thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed **virgin**, daughter of **Zidon**: arise, pass over to Chittim; there also shalt thou have no rest. **[referring to a beloved homeland]**

Isaiah 37:22 This *is* the word which the **LORD** hath spoken concerning him; The **virgin**, the daughter of **Zion**, hath despised thee, *and* laughed thee to scorn; the daughter of **Jerusalem** hath shaken her head at thee. **[Again, a beloved homeland]**

Isaiah 47:1 Come down, and sit in the dust, O **virgin** daughter of **Babylon**, sit on the ground: *there is* no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans: for thou shalt no more be called tender and delicate. **[Again, a beloved homeland]**

Isaiah 62:5 For *as* a young man **marrieth** a **virgin**, *so* shall thy sons marry thee: and *as* the bridegroom rejoiceth over the **bride**, *so* shall thy God rejoice over thee. **[specifically, referring to a virgin bride, but again *we are to infer* a beloved city or nation.]**

The prophesy in Isaiah 7:14 could not possibly be a *Messianic* prophesy, because it was fulfilled *in the very next chapter* (Isaiah 8:3 – 4), with the birth of Mahershalalhashbaz. The name “Immanuel” is used in connection with Mahershalalhashbaz in Isaiah 8:8 as a transliteration, and the meaning of the name “Immanuel” is written out as a translation in Isaiah 8:10.

Isaiah 8:1 Moreover the LORD said unto me, Take thee a great roll, and write in it with a man's pen concerning Mahershalalhashbaz.

Isaiah 8:2 And I took unto me faithful witnesses to record, Uriah the priest, and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah.

Isaiah 8:3 And I went unto the prophetess; and she conceived, and bare a son. Then said the LORD to me, Call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz.

Isaiah 8:4 For before the child shall have knowledge to cry, My father, and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria. [*specifically refers to the child who fulfills the prophesy in Isaiah 7:16. No other child could fulfill this prophesy.*]

Isaiah 8:8 And he shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach *even* to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, **O Immanuel.** [*transliterated*]

Isaiah 8:9 Associate yourselves, O ye people, and ye shall be broken in pieces; and give ear, all ye of far countries: gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces; gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces.

Isaiah 8:10 Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand: for **God** *is* with us. [*Immanuel, translated. In the KJV, words in italics are supplied by the translators. The word “is” in this verse, is italicized, therefore the phrase “God is with us” is a direct translation of “Immanuel.”*]

This happens even in our day. Let’s say my wife walks in the room and I say to her, “How was your day, baby?” Thousands of years from now, someone may look back and think I am calling my wife an infant, but the reality is that, in context, that word doesn’t literally mean “very young child”. **If** I were to walk out of my locked house without my keys, I may very well exclaim, “Oh crap!” Thousands of years later, people may recall that exclamation and think I’m talking about literal excrement, when that is not the case. From the rest of the Bible, we can know that *almah* is a perfectly viable term used to mean *virgin*. [**But only when that young woman is also a virgin. The words “almah” and “bethulah” are not interchangeable, as Danny would like to have you believe. They are used for further refining the status of a lady.**]

Analyzing this passage, we come to **Isaiah 7:13**

13 Isaiah said, “Listen, **house of David!** Is it not enough for you to try the patience of men? Will you also try the patience of my God? **14** Therefore, the Lord Himself will give you a sign: The virgin will conceive, have a son, and name him Immanuel.

Based on context, you could even interpret that this sign of a virgin birth was NOT the sign intended for Ahaz because when told to ask for a sign and refusing to do so, Isaiah fumes at him and starts prophesying to the whole **house of David**. Based on how chapter 8 immediately picks up with the birth of an actual child of Isaiah named *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* (whose name was commanded by God for a reason and has a clear direct relation to the sign of Ahaz), **I personally find it much easier** to say that that is the sign God meant for Ahaz, and not the prophecy in **Isaiah 7:13-25**. Even **Isaiah 8:5** and beyond seems separate from the first four verses of the chapter, as **if** there are other things completely unrelated to Ahaz that God is showing Isaiah. [**The sign was to the house of Israel that Israel was not going to fall to the two northern kings.**]

Spin, spin, spin. Maher-shalal-hash-baz was Immanuel, who in Isaiah 8:4 fulfills the prophecies in Isaiah 7:15 - 17. One of the problems for people who read this in any language OTHER THAN Hebrew is that the words and names are transliterated, not translated.

These setting “jumps” shouldn’t come as a surprise considering **Isaiah 8:14** makes a leap to a very direct prophecy of how the Messiah would be a **sanctuary**, but to the two houses of Israel He would be a stumbling stone. These jumps are not unusual and I hope Mr. Besherse doesn’t take it as an **excuse** on my part. **Just look at Isaiah 8:18**, which seems to jump to a completely different scenario, starting right in the middle of the chapter.

Spin, spin, spin. The ONLY reason why Isaiah 8:18 does not make sense to Danny is because he refuses to accept that Jesus was **NOT the Messiah. Verse **18** clearly says that it is Isaiah, and Isaiah’s children (*possessive plural*), *including Mahershalal-hash-baz*, who were given for signs and wonders, and the wording is clear that it is *present tense* (*to Isaiah*), *not a prophecy* for a few centuries into the future, for **ONE MAN** (*singular*), who was **NOT** related to Isaiah.**

Do you remember the Legal Maxim “Expressio unius est exclusio alterus” from earlier in this document? *The expression of one is the exclusion of ALL others.*

While it is true that Christians *make these claims*, the claims do not rise to the level of *evidence* that can establish that Jesus even lived, let alone that he fulfilled any Messianic prophecies. There are simply too many things stacked up *against* Jesus being the Messiah. When you *believe* that the Tanakh is the word of YHWH, then you *cannot* believe that the word of YHWH could be contaminated by the Council of Nicea and still bring truth to us. When you believe the word of YHWH in the Tanakh, then you are on your guard and *can spot* the falsehoods in the work-product of the Council of Nicea.

OK. Let’s look at Isaiah 8:18. Isaiah is saying:

“Look at this. I and the children [*plural*] whom YHWH has given to me [Isaiah] are for signs and wonders in Israel from YHWH of hosts, which dwell in mount Zion.”

Isaiah is saying “I and MY children.”

Isaiah is *NOT* saying “I and only the first child of Joseph and Mary, several centuries into the future,” or even Jesus, along with Jesus’s brothers and sisters.

And Isaiah had just said, in Isaiah 8:3, that he, Isaiah, was the father of Mahershalalhashbaz, who was also the one who was known as “God with us” who fulfilled the prophecies in Isaiah 7:15 – 17.

Isaiah 8:3 And I went unto the prophetess; and she conceived, and bare a son. Then said the LORD to me, Call his name Mahershalalhashbaz.

Using Strong’s concordance, we see that can be interpreted as:

mahêr shâlâl châsh baz mah-hare' shaw-lawl' khawsh baz

From H4118 and H7998 and H2363 and H957; *hasting* (as he (the enemy) to the) *booty*, *swift* (to the) *prey*; *Maheer-Shalal Chash-Baz*; the symbolical name of the son of Isaiah:
- Maher-shalal-hash-baz.

Further, Isaiah is saying “I and the children whom the LORD hath given ME,” not the “children given to King Ahaz,” or the children given to anyone else. The Christian Apologists really apply the elastic to these verses.

Perhaps further reading and understanding will change the way I see these passages. But even if Isaiah 7:14 refers to a young maiden who will give birth to a son as a sign for Ahaz right in that time period, but **I don't believe** there is enough information to be able to say it **only** refers to a maiden of the day of Ahaz, or of the Messiah born of a virgin, or even both. **It is common for prophecies to have both short and long term fulfillments, after all.**

??? Where? OH!!! I'm sorry. It was lost on me for a minute. You are referring to the “Types & Shadows” again. You are citing things that never were prophecies, or prophecies that were already fulfilled, or else historical events, and claiming that they are somehow prophecies that refer to Jesus (to the exclusion of all others) being the fulfillment of the prophesied Messiah. Sorry, Danny, but that dog don't hunt. Expressio unius est exclusio alterus.

If that's the method with which God chooses to bring about the Messiah, what is man and his *interpretation* of prophecy to say otherwise. Once again, what I'm trying to point out here is that Jesus shouldn't be discredited based **solely** on the interpretation of Bernie Besherse of the Old Testament Prophecies. **[I agree, wholeheartedly. NEITHER should credit be given based solely on any interpretation by Danny. What I think (or what Danny thinks or believes) doesn't amount to a hill of beans. What counts are the WORDS of YHWH as written in the Tanakh. This is why Danny avoids citing the Tanakh. The words of the Tanakh do not support the Roman Religion of the New Testament.]** And we've already been over the **atheist** claims that Jesus's virgin birth is plagiarism from other ancient religions. Horus was the son of Isis, who was married to her brother Osiris, **not a virgin**. **[Why not? Mary got pregnant out of wedlock, and yet you think (believe) that Mary was a virgin. What is the difference?]** Mithra spawned from a rock, not a virgin. **[According to one of the Mithra legends, yes, but maybe it was a virgin rock. ☺** Dr. Badi Badiozamani says that a “person” named “Mehr” or *Mithra* was “born of a virgin named Nahid Anahita (“immaculate”)” and that “the worship of Mithra and Anahita, the virgin mother of Mithra, was well-known in the Achaemenian period [558-330 BCE]...” “Well known to scholars, the pre-Christian divine birth and virgin mother motifs are documented in the archaeological and literary records, as verified by Dr. Marguerite Rigoglioso in *The Cult of the Divine Birth in Ancient Greece* and *Virgin Mother Goddesses of Antiquity*.” - Mithra: The Pagan Christ] And **I don't know** who else was allegedly born of a virgin, but by that point the **source's credibility** has already gone down the drain. **[Joining yours? You are wanting some company, there?]**

Be careful, Danny. When you are so quick to throw some of the critics of Christianity under the bus because of disparity of identity of various deities who were claimed to have been born of virgins, you had better make sure that *your own mythology* is in order, or YHWH will condemn you for the abomination of using two sets of weights and measures. Your own New Testament says that with what judgement YOU judge, YOU will be judged. Danny, you are allowing your Christian apologists, above, to use poetic license and expand on concepts, but will not allow the same license for the other side. Why? The mother of Mithra changes, depending on whether you are in India, Persia, or Rome. One of the common threads in ALL of the pagan religions is that there was something miraculous and un-natural about the conception or birth of their god/savior. One of their gods even burst full-grown out of the side of his father's head. Not a virgin birth, but something rather startling. *An ERROR in the Jew's position does not automatically VALIDATE the Christian position.* Bottom line, if Jesus had been born of a virgin, he would have been a female, because there would have been no male, "Y" chromosome contributed to his genetic makeup.

Strong's Exhaustive Concordance is published by *Christians*, and the primary version of the bible that they used for compiling their concordance was the King James Version (KJV) of the bible. The KJV is based in the Septuagint, which uses the word "virgin" in Isaiah 7:14. The only reason that I can see for the word "virgin" being used in Strong's as a definition for "almah," is to explain away the single instance of that word in Isaiah 7:14, and not because "virgin" is a valid translation of the word "almah."

The corruption of this translation is most likely the meddling of Saint Jerome, who can also be tied to the mistranslation in the Psalms 22:16 wherein he attempted to tie the heathens molesting David like lions around his feet to Jesus's cruci-fiction, by changing the words to "... they pierced my hands and feet." Every other time that word was used it was translated "like a lion," not "pierced." This has Roman Revision written all over it. This mistranslation surfaced in the Vulgate and Septuagint, but is NOT in the Hebrew text.

In any case, Isaiah 7:14 is NOT a messianic prophecy, is NOT a prophecy of a virgin birth, and does not even use the Hebrew word for "virgin." The virgin birth fable falls flat on its face for many reasons.

Biblical parallels are kind of a thing

Mr. Besherse is very quick to point out what **he interprets** as clear misreads of the Old Testament and **unforgivable errors** by Matthew in **chapter 2**. Here is one of the passages he points out:

¹⁵ He stayed there until Herod's death, **so that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled: Out of Egypt I called My Son.**

I personally fail to see the confusion here and I'll tell you why. This is a reference to **Hosea 11:1**, which says:

When **Israel** was a **child**, I loved him, and **out of Egypt I called My son**. **[BINGO!]** **Clearly** this is a reference to **Israel** and in context it **seems** it's referring **undoubtedly** to the Exodus from Egypt and goes on to talk about the love and compassion God feels for His people despite their departing from Him, sacrificing to Baals, and burning offerings to idols. **[BINGO!]** Honestly now, do we *really* think Matthew didn't know this beforehand? Of course he did! What he's doing in his account of the life of Jesus is **draw the parallel** between Israel and Jesus, saying that both Jesus and Israel were called children of God. You and I are also called children of God. No problem so far.

Matthew explicitly says that it was a prophesy, not a parallel. Matthew had it wrong. And Danny has it wrong, too.

IF Matthew was a Jew, and IF Matthew wrote the book, then of course Matthew would have known and have no excuse for getting it wrong. Allegations do not create facts or evidence. The point is, that because this is a totally off-point attempt at trying to cite a historical event as if it were a prophesy, it is one of the hundreds of pieces of evidence that we have that the compilers of the New Testament at the Council of Nicea really lacked a depth of knowledge of Hebrew and the Tanakh. Their contempt does not make up for their lack of knowledge of the Tanakh.

Hosea 11:1 is a true, historical event, and of course YHWH loves His set-apart people. What the writers/compilers of Matthew were doing was finding a phrase in the Hebrew scriptures that they thought could augment their Jesus story, and then they "force-fit" it into the book of Matthew. The historical statement in Hosea 11:1, is obviously not a prophesy, and therefore it is ridiculous to try to use it for support of the Jesus myth. The pagans who wrote the New Testament at Nicea knew that they were writing the books for people who, like Danny, want sooooo much for it to be true, that they refuse to see the truth that is right in front of their nose. They refuse to look at and accept the words, but instead, stick with their beliefs, feelings, "might have," "why couldn't it?," and their ever dependable anchor, - "IF."

Either the words that YHWH directed the scribes/prophets to write mean something, or else the words are totally irrelevant. I respect and trust the Tanakh. The Tanakh is clear. The N.T. twists the words of the Tanakh. There can be no religious fellowship between the pagans and the lovers of The Eternal

ONE (YHWH). Pagans include, among others, those who *disregard* the simple plan of salvation of YHWH, and opt, instead, for the complicated, twisted, blood-thirsty (*cannibalism and blood-drinking*) Romans Religion. We might be able to be friends, but how can someone who is trying to remain kosher attend Christian religious services with his children, when the Christians are having a ceremony dealing with drinking human blood and eating human flesh (*even though it is just pretending*)? Couldn't the church members also swap mates for the night with the understanding that they are only *pretending* to commit adultery in honor of **Ishtar (Easter), or pretend to commit any other violation of Torah? *I don't think so.***

As with much of the New Testament text, we're told immediately by Mr. Besherse to disregard this as error. **[Is it true or false? What do the WORDS say? I just ask you to trust *your* eyes, and not trust your *Rabbis*. Psalm 118:8 - 9]**

Matthew 2

16 Then Herod, when he saw that he had been outwitted by the wise men, flew into a rage. He gave orders to massacre all the male children in and around Bethlehem who were two years old and under, in keeping with the time he had learned from the wise men. 17 **Then what was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet was fulfilled:**

18 A voice was heard in Ramah, weeping, and great mourning, **Rachel** weeping for her children; and she refused to be consoled, because they were no more.

Verse 18 is **almost** a word-for-word quote of **Jeremiah 31:15**. Mr. Besherse is very fast at accusing Matthew of Tanakh ignorance, but let's look at this for a moment. In context it would **initially seem** that what Jeremiah is talking about is the return of Israelite captives and the **figurative** lament of Rachel.

Mr. Besherse points this out as one more **fatal mistake** by Matthew, who I guess couldn't recognize that the Jeremiah passage refers to God liberating the captives of Israel and not to the killing of Bethlehem infants by Herod. Ok, that's one way to look at it. It seems this is yet another example of Mr. Besherse's to point things out as mistakes instead of looking a little deeper.

Danny quotes Matthew, when Matthew says that the murder of all of those children is the SPECIFIC fulfillment of a SPECIFIC prophecy, and then calls Matthew a liar, saying that Matthew did not actually cite a prophecy, only a parallel event. He is saying that Rachel's lament is a figurative lament. Why?

How many of you knew that **Rachel** was **buried in Bethlehem** when she died? **Genesis 35** tells us:

19 So Rachel died and was buried on the way to **Ephrath** (that is, **Bethlehem**). 20 Jacob set up a marker on her grave; it is the marker at Rachel's grave to this day.

Bet Lechem (Beth-lehem) means "House of Bread," or a bakery. There is an unincorporated community in Wasco County, Oregon, called "Bakeoven." [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bakeoven, Oregon](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bakeoven,_Oregon) (I have been through there, many times.) Translated into Hebrew, this town could have been called "Bethlehem."

Was there only one bakery in all of Israel? Of course not. There were most likely several towns named Bethlehem. We know for a FACT that there was a Bethlehem Judah, where Jesus was allegedly born, as well as a Bethlehem Ephratah. They were about 70 miles apart. Rachel was buried in Bethlehem Ephratah.

So I have a quick question. If Jeremiah figuratively described the passing of many Israelites as the lament of **Rachel**, *does that mean* no one else can? **[Jerry was talking about a different town. And Matt was citing a historical event as if it were a prophecy.]** Can Matthew not use the same comparison when Israelite infants are being killed in the town where she was buried, or does that make him an ignorant blaspheming manipulator of scripture? **[Bethlehem Judah, the place where Jesus was supposedly born and the murders supposedly took place was 70 miles away from Bethlehem Ephratah. If there was a real Matthew, who knows what he would have written? When the entire book was subjected to the revision and manipulation of the pagans at the Council of Nicea, anything is possible, even total fabrication. One thing that we do know is that no contemporaneous historian recorded any event even remotely like what is claimed in Matthew. Some of those historians were very critical of the Roman ruler, and would have jumped on a story like this with glee.]** You be the judge. **Was it prophecy per se? [NO!!! Not even remotely, and Matthew was provably wrong.]** Doesn't look like it. But has Matthew revealed his "**true ignorance of scripture**"? **Definitely not. [More delusion and cognitive dissonance. If Danny cannot learn to recognize the need for truth in everything, at all times, then there may not be any hope for him.]**

Your opinion, Danny, is not supported by facts. To quote (inter alia) Hitlery Rotham Clingon, "Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not to their own facts."

Someone's ignorance is revealed. Let's start with the ignorance of the people who believe the stupid statements in the book of Matthew showing that he did not even know that Bethlehem Judah was 70 miles away from Bethlehem Ephratah.

The way I see it, in the best case scenario, you could even make an argument that Jeremiah 31:15 actually is prophetic since when you read it, it could seem to you that it doesn't quite fit the verses around it. **[You cannot have it both ways, Danny. It is either a prophecy, or Matthew told a lie worthy of death. It is a translation. In translations, a lot of things seem awkward. A prophecy is specific and undeniable. NO WAY could Jeremiah 31:15 be A PROPHECY (as declared by Matthew) referring to the wiping out of children of Bethlehem Judah, and especially anything to do with Jesus. NOTHING fits!!! The children in Jeremiah actually do return. They were not dead.] Everyone is joyful and blissful coming out of captivity except **Rachel**, which is odd at the very least. And worst case**

scenario, it's not prophetic at all and it's talking about something entirely different than Matthew, but the situation with Herod killing infants reminded Matthew of the lament of Rachel in the book of Jeremiah. Either way, he had to be very familiar with scripture in order to pull out that kind of reference, so ignorant is definitely not how I would describe Matthew.

Matthew was very ignorant of geography, for someone who allegedly lived in Israel. Is it Bethlehem Judah or is it Bethlehem Ephratah? That is a REAL, 70 mile stretch!!! Are you taking up Yoga? There is no corroborating evidence that Herod actually killed ANY children, especially a whole generation of them. Danny, are you conveniently forgetting that it was Matthew, himself, who allegedly said that THIS event was THE fulfillment of a SPECIFIC prophesy? I did not realize that cognitive dissonance would allow someone to deceive themselves so strongly.

Matthew 2:17 **Then** was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying,

Matthew 2:18 In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping *for* her children, and would not be comforted, **because they are not.**

Matthew says “THEN it was FULFILLED ...”. Not “then there was a parallel event that mirrored the fulfillment ...” etc. Matthew is saying that the prophesy was fulfilled at that exact moment, not before or after, and NOT TWICE.

Why not read on, to Jeremiah 31:16-17?

Jeremiah 31:16 Thus saith the LORD; Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for **thy work shall be rewarded, saith the LORD; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy.**

Jeremiah 31:17 And **there is hope** in thine end, saith the LORD, **that thy children shall come again to their own border.**

This is NOT a prophesy that Rachel would see her children again after they all rose from the dead, but that those same children will return to their own border.

Besides, **parallels in scripture** happen ALL THE TIME! And yes, in the Old Testament, too! Look at **Genesis 18:28** and **Numbers 16:22**. Look at **Exodus 14:21** and **2 Kings 2:14**. God chose Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and David (all the youngest and most seemingly unfit for greatness) to take on some of His most amazing tasks. Over and over, and within the Old Testament itself, there are similar scenarios that repeat themselves. There are recurring trends that seem to reappear. They are not prophecies; they are parallels, and it's completely normal for them to show up in the Bible. Is Matthew not allowed to draw these parallels for some reason?

More spin. More types & shadows. Matthew did not say that he was drawing a parallel. MATTHEW said that he was citing a prophesy. Big difference, Danny!!! Get your stories in order!!! Quit lying to yourself.

Life continues to proceed. Attempting the assignment of miraculous meanings to trivial drivel is foolish fantasy. Are you saying that because David was the youngest of his brothers that the youngest of any set of brothers is going to be like unto David? That would be not “logic.” What you are doing is “grabbing at straws.”

I see no issue here.

You wouldn't, because if you allowed yourself to believe what you see, you might have to think of yourself as having “lost an argument with a JEW.”

Love your enemy?

When discussing **Matthew 5:43**, I **personally** think it's very important to note Jesus did NOT say, “It is written.” He said, “You have heard that it was said...”

The passage goes like this:

⁴³“You have heard that **it was said**, Love your neighbor and hate your enemy. ⁴⁴But I tell you, love your enemy and pray for those who persecute you, ⁴⁵so that you may be sons of your Father in heaven. For He causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous. ⁴⁶For if you love those who love you, what reward will you have? Don't even the tax collectors do the same? ⁴⁷And if you greet only your brothers, what are you doing out of the ordinary? Don't even the gentiles do the same? ⁴⁸Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

So what are we seeing here? **Mr. Besherse seems to think** that “the writer of **Matthew**” (here Bernie **hints** that it wasn't even Matthew who wrote it) **either didn't really know Torah law or was making up clever additions for it**, because the book of **Leviticus** actually **says** this in chapter 19:

17 “you must not harbor hatred against your brother. Rebuke your neighbor directly, and you will not incur guilt because of him. ¹⁸Do not take revenge or bear a grudge against members of your community, but **love your neighbor as yourself**; I am Yahweh.

Danny, totally mischaracterized what I said. What I actually said had a lot more in common with what he said. In fact, he almost plagiarized some of what I wrote!!! His mischaracterization is either showing that he lacks the mental capacity to understand what I wrote (which I do not believe), or he was deliberately mischaracterizing what I wrote, to try to convince some of his friends how much smarter he is than an old, Karaite Jew.

What I did say in the original article, was:

OK. I will admit it. Jesus did **not** say “*it is written in the Torah that we should hate our enemies.*” He did use the same phrase when calling Moses a false prophet regarding the divorce laws. **Maybe you**

should ask yourself, why is someone who is revered as the son of god, and as being a god incarnate, wasting his time with mere rumors? Because he already said that the Torah would not pass away, **why did he not merely cite the Torah and Prophets**, so the Jews of his day and Karaites, 2,000 years in the future would not argue with him?

One of the silliest things about Danny's attempted "response" is that Danny did not address what I did say!!! But he did distract the readers with more *smoke & mirrors*, didn't he? Check this out!!!

So I pose the question for you: Is it **written** to love your neighbor and hate your enemy, or was it **said** to love your neighbor and hate your enemy? **If** you want to be extremely literal, Jesus wasn't quoting scripture word for word, but rather quoting some oral saying that was common at the time. As a matter of fact, by **being this legalistic** about the New Testament, and condemning it every two phrases because of a disagreement regarding **interpretation**, Mr. Besherse is harming his own position. Just read **Psalm 139:21-22** and then we'll talk about whether people were loving or hating their enemies in the time of Jesus, and even way before that.

There were two points, Danny.

One is that IT IS not a commandment, merely gossip, that *anyone* said to love our friend and hate our enemy.

The other point is that under no conditions could loving your enemy be called a NEW commandment.

There was nothing NEW about it, at all. So was Jesus either lying about it being a NEW commandment, or else being an egomaniac and seeking attention, or else those who were at the Council of Nicea were depending on no one ever being able to check and verify their own incompetence? Please re-read the above.

Citing Psalm 139:21-22 is completely off point, because those verses are not talking about our own enemies, but about enemies of YHWH, and those who hate YHWH.

Psalm 139:21 Do not I hate them, O LORD, that **hate thee**? and am not I grieved with those that rise up **against thee**?

Psalm 139:22 I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them **[as if they were] mine** enemies.

You did exactly what the normal Christian Apologists do when they are desperate. You grabbed a verse that had some favorable words, and used a sledge hammer to try to force them to fit some place where they don't belong.

Exodus 23 and **Proverbs 24 and 25** explicitly tell us to aid our enemies when we can, to feed them when given the opportunity, and to **not rejoice when our enemies fall**. Strange wording or not, this passage cannot be used to accuse Jesus or Matthew or Matthew's ghost writer of adding to the Torah law or misconstruing it in any way. Rather, Jesus is found once again **reaffirming** the law He said He was here to fulfill and not to destroy.

The words are the words. You might not like what the words say, because when you take the time to actually READ them, they do not support the *Christian Fiction*, but the words are still the words of YHWH, anyway.

Was it a NEW commandment, or wasn't it? yes no

Danny's own citation of verses in the Tanakh (finally), show that *he knows* it was NOT a new commandment, just like I said, and Danny is now admitting that he knows that Jesus was a liar.

Being a liar, Jesus would then be subject to the penalties of being a false prophet. Danny's own citations of Exodus 23 and Proverbs support my objective conclusion. Live with it.

Lord of the Sabbath

Many of us may be familiar with the passage in Matthew 12 regarding the time when Jesus and his disciples picked grain to eat on the Sabbath and were confronted by the Pharisees. They accuse Jesus and His followers of breaking the law of the Sabbath, but Jesus goes on to defend himself and his disciples by saying, "Haven't you read what David and those who were with him did when he was hungry – how he entered the house of God, and took and ate the sacred bread, which is not lawful for any but the priests to eat? He even gave some to those who were **with** him. (...) The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath."

Jesus not only **quotes silencing scripture** [???], but goes on to make the bolder claim that He is the **Lord of the Sabbath** [???]. He claims **ownership** of one of the holiest and the most ancient **statutes** of Jewish **tradition** [???], and we are told in the scripture that the Pharisees did not even try to contest Him when He said that.

In his paper, Mr. Besherse quotes the Old Testament in an **attempt** to argue that the books of Matthew and Mark were "most likely written by Greeks or Romans who only had a **rudimentary understanding** of the Tanakh" because, according to Bernie, in the original passage (1 Samuel 21) David was **clearly alone** and there was no one with him for him to have shared the bread with, contrary to what Jesus describes.

The problem with Bernie's theory is that, taken out of context, it would seem as though 1 Samuel 21:1 would discredit Jesus's version of the story. That sometimes happens when you read only one verse. It seems curiosity didn't bring Mr. Besherse to read the very next verses, where it says:

² David answered **Ahimelech** the priest, "The king gave me a mission, but he told me, 'Don't let anyone know anything about the mission I'm sending you on or what I have

ordered you to do.' **I have stationed my young men at a certain place.** ³ Now what do you have on hand? Give me five loaves of bread or whatever can be found." ⁴ The priest told him, "There is no ordinary bread on hand. However, there is consecrated bread, but **the young men may eat it only if they have kept themselves from women.**" ⁵ David answered him, "I swear that women are being kept from us, as always when I go out to battle. **The young men's bodies are consecrated even on an ordinary mission, so of course their bodies are consecrated today.**" ⁶ So the priest gave him the consecrated bread, for there was no bread there except the bread of the Presence that had been removed from the presence of the Lord. When the bread was removed, it had been replaced with warm bread.

This is what I actually wrote in "For it is Written, - - - or IS it?" to which Danny is reacting.

"David eating the shew-bread.

"In Mark 2:25, Jesus is made to say to the Pharisees, "**Have ye never read what David did when he had need, and was an hungered, he and they that were with him?** How he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar, the high priest, and did eat the shew-bread, which is not lawful but for the priest, and gave also to them that were with him?" This is reinforcing evidence that the writers of Mark did not know what is in the Tanakh, because David **did not** go to Abiathar, he went to Ahimelech, the *father* of Abiathar. See 1 Samuel 21:2 [21:1], "And David came to Nob to Ahimelech the priest;" and ibid chapter 22:20, "And one of the sons of Ahimelech, the son of Ahitub, named Abiathar, escaped and ran after David."

"Nor did David come to Ahimelech with any of his men with him, as the above quote taken from Mark clearly states. Ahimelech asked David 1 Samuel 21:2 [21:1], "**Why art thou alone, and no man with thee?**"

"This is another instance showing that the books of Matthew and Mark were most likely written by a Greeks or Romans who only had a rudimentary understanding of the Tanakh.

"Lots of excuses are needed, here, so maybe **3 tally marks** on page **Six**? Plus one tally mark for each of the men you might guess that Mark might have thought were with David? **Mark** is making things up, so why don't you get into the spirit of things?" 😊

A quick summary:

- 1. Mark says that the high priest is Abiathar.**
- 2. Samuel says that the high priest was Ahimelech.**
- 3. Mark says that David ate of the shew bread, and *those that were with him*.**
- 4. Ahimelech says that David is all alone, and no man is with him.**
- 5. Samuel says that Abiathar is a son of Ahimelech (*actually, a grandson*).**
- 6. Samuel says that Abiathar escaped and ran after David.**

[back to Danny] Would this be considered context **enough** for Jesus's version to be considered valid?

NO. There still was no one with David when he was given the showbread, so the conversation could not have taken place, even if Abiathar had been the Kohane Gadol.

I would sure hope so, since Mr. Besherse has challenged the reader (and me directly in our communication) to demonstrate with Old Testament that his deductions are incorrect. It's unfortunate he is so quick to call any Christian response an **excuse**; a simple reading of subsequent verses was all it took this time.

Read the WORDS, Danny, evaluate the EVIDENCE, and quit going on emotion, faith, and *belief*.

Is **blood** sacrifice **REALLY not** needed?

Repeatedly Mr. Besherse **makes claims against** Christianity that, at first glance, will cause those who don't take a second glance to stutter in their faith. **Another example of this is when we're told that there is no verse prescribing the shedding of blood in any form of offering to atone for sins. [This is a BOLD-FACED LIE, Danny. In the same section of scriptures I cited that describe how bloodless, fine flour can be used as a sacrifice for sin, we are told that birds (*containing blood*) can also be offered, and *the sins are forgiven*. I quoted all of Leviticus 5:11-13. My written comment was: "In your research, you will find that the only sin sacrifices are for sins of oversight, i.e., - for forgetting to obey some ordinary task, or some routine thing that is not a sin of conscious, knowing rebellion against the laws of YHWH."]** In this case, a **third glance** may be necessary because at the second glance I confirmed that this is true. No Old Testament verse will guide you on how to perform **blood sacrifices to atone for sins[???**] because the atonement that is instructed in the Torah is for the event of **unintentional sins**. The first few verses of **Leviticus 4** are a great example of this. A case could be made for the scapegoat of **Leviticus 16**, but still that is not a blood sacrifice.

Danny is obviously and absolutely wrong!!! There ARE blood sacrifices that atone for sins. Animal blood, and for sins of oversight. I'm trying to be generous, here, and asking if he just forgot to insert the words "of rebellion" where the red [???] is at the end of the blue text in his sentence in the preceding paragraph preceding this red text. There are *two* other options. Nope. *I was wrong*. If there is no apology forthcoming for his bearing false witness against me, then here are a total of four more options.

- 1) he either *forgot* that he had admitted that blood was specified for sins of oversight in another part of his rebuttal, or
- 2) made a *typographical error*; or
- 3) he *cannot accept* the fact that I could possibly understand the scriptures *because I'm a Jew*; or
- 4) he is *deliberately trying to mislead* a person who is reading his critique that *has not read or does not have access to my original work*, and if this is the case, *then shame on him*.

Bernie directs us to a great example showing repentance and the turning away from previous transgressions as sufficient for the forgiveness for sins: **Ezekiel 18:27-28**. Just as the Christian **believes** repentance and, given that we now have the New Testament, **confession of faith in Jesus as Messiah** is all that's required for salvation. [Sorry. Ezekiel was a tested, proven, and accepted Prophet of YHWH. No one who is/was a tested, proven, and accepted Prophet of YHWH has ever declared that confession of faith in Jesus as Messiah is all that is required for Salvation. In fact, your “confession of faith” is a denial that the Three Rs (*Remorse, Repentance, & Restitution*) was, is, and always will be the ONLY remedy for forgiveness of sins of rebellion. The “confession of faith in Jesus” is an abomination that came out of the Council of Nicea (or before).] The addition of Jesus Messiah to the salvation formula poses no conflict for the Old Testament because, clearly, there was no Messiah for people to believe in before Jesus. [And there still isn't a Messiah. Regardless of your belief. The promised Messiah is not going to save anyone from their sins (or even IN their sins). The promised Messiah is going to lead us into battle against the pagan governments, and re-institute the Torah as the governing law for the whole world, which will bring peace. And besides, Torah says that we can make no additions onto nor take anything away from the Torah. It is a huge conflict for men to “add” “Jesus Messiah” to the “salvation formula.” It is a comprehensive violation of Torah, and invokes the curse of violating the law set before mankind, and it is a sin of rebellion. Reader, please remember, the idea of “blood sacrifices not atoning for sin” is Danny's invention, and not found in the evidence that I presented or cited.] That is a simple matter to deal with.

Now, back to **blood sacrifices not atoning for sin**. Numbers 25 tells us:

⁶ An Israelite man came bringing a Midianite woman to his relatives in the sight of Moses and the whole Israelite community while they were weeping at the entrance to the tent of meeting. ⁷ When Phinehas son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest, saw this, he got up from the assembly, took a spear in his hand, ⁸ followed the Israelite man into the tent, and drove it through both the Israelite man and the woman – through her belly. Then the plague on the Israelites stopped, ⁹ but those who died in the plague numbered 24,000.

¹⁰ The Lord spoke to Moses, ¹¹ “Phinehas son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest, has turned back My wrath from the Israelites because he was zealous among them with My zeal, so that I did not destroy the Israelites in My zeal. ¹² Therefore declare: I grant **him** My covenant of peace. ¹³ It will be a covenant of perpetual priesthood for **him** and **his** future descendants because he was zealous for his God and **made atonement for the Israelites.**”

Let’s learn about Phinehas. A good digest of events can be found on-line.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phineas_Priesthood (CTRL + Click accesses link)

“The Phineas Priesthood is named for the Israelite [Phinehas](#), grandson of [Aaron](#). [Numbers 25:7](#) According to Numbers 25, Phineas personally executed an [Israelite](#) man and a [Midianite](#) woman while they were together in the man's tent, running a spear through the two and ending a plague sent by God to punish the Israelites for intermingling sexually and religiously with the Midianite [Baal](#)-worshippers. Phineas is commended for having stopped Israel's fall to idolatrous practices brought in by Midianite women, as well as **for stopping the desecration of God's sanctuary**. [Yahweh](#) commends Phineas through [Moses](#) as zealous, gives him a "covenant of peace," and grants him and "his seed" an everlasting priesthood. This passage was cited in Hoskins' book as a justification for using violent means against interracial relationships and other forms of alleged immorality.”

Only the most myopic Christian apologist could fail to see that these murders (*shedding of blood*) took place outside of the Temple and they were NOT sin-sacrifices that are stipulated in the Torah. There is *no prescribed manner of performing the sacrifice of a human being on OR off the altar, by Levites*.

This was an act of pure vigilantism (good OR bad). Zumri was not a “sin sacrifice” ordered either by YHWH or any prophet. Only after the fact, Phineas’s offspring (who were already Levites) were made priests, but there was NEVER an order given to take the law into their own hands in a perpetual manner, throughout all generations, killing whoever marries outside of their race. After all, Moses, himself, married a Midianite woman, outside of the family of Israel, as did Judah and many others, **before and after Phineas. The sin was in adopting the pagan religious practices (*like the Roman Religion called Christianity*) and desecration of the Temple, not in mixing races. **If it was a sin to mix races, Danny, then there would be no hope for either you OR for me.****

The sin sacrifices, as well as all other prescribed sacrifices, such as blood sacrifices, trespass sacrifices, menstruation sacrifices, birth sacrifices, and commemorative sacrifices, that are performed at regular intervals, and in a very tightly controlled, prescribed manner, of specified gender/age/species of animals. There is never an instance of a non-kosher food being used as a sacrifice.

Why couldn't the rebellious Israelites just say sorry? **Why couldn't** this rebellious man whose name, **Zumri**, is only mentioned a little later, just apologize? **Why did** his blood need to be spilled for the **atonement** of Israel?

1. According to the JPS 1999 translation, the word "*expiation*" is more suitable than the word "*atonement*." The Hebrew word that was used is "*Kaphar*," and the best translations, *in order*, according to Strong's, are "*expiate, placate, cancel, appease, make an atonement, cleanse, disannul, forgive, etc.*"

2. *Zumri* was not given an *opportunity* to apologize, was he? And

3. Are you not going to offer an alternative theory? And

4. Why did *Zumri's* blood need to be shed? The obvious answer is that *Zumri* was not offered as a sacrifice for Israel, he desecrated the Israelite tabernacle and was punished for violating Torah. *Zumri* was not an innocent animal, without spot or blemish, who was offered as a sacrifice for any kind of sin. *The Tabernacle must be kept holy*. Does that adequately answer Danny's questions?]

QUESTION: Is Danny *really* saying that he believes that this killing of *Zumri* and his woman is *a comparable sacrifice* to *Jesus dying on a cross* for Danny's sins? *Zumri* was guilty of the sin of desecrating the Temple. Is Danny saying that *Jesus* is also guilty of desecrating the Temple? Maybe so. Let *Danny* explain.

If so, was *Jesus* represented by *Zumri*, or was *Jesus* represented by the *woman*? In either case, this couple had obviously sinned, not by mixing Midianite blood with Abrahamic blood, but by mixing Midianite religion with the religion of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*.

If the death of *Jesus* is going to be honestly compared with the death of *Zumri* and his woman, then *Jesus* must have also been a sinner, so the remaining question would be: Did *Jesus* represent the *man* or the *woman*? Remember, it is *Danny* who is dragging in the story of *Phinehas* as being somehow a justification for a human sacrifice that pays for all sins, *in advance*.

The man and woman killed by *Phinehas* were no more of a prescribed sacrifice than any other man or woman who dies in battle, dies in an accident, is murdered, or dies as a result of willful or negligent manslaughter, or dies as punishment for a crime. Prescribed blood sacrifices are *always* innocent, kosher animals, who are without spot or blemish.

When given a Fair Hearing, the whole concept of any human sacrifice being required by Torah for forgiveness of the sins of the world just has sooooo many bugs crawling all over it that it just won't work.

The next objection to this **rejection of the need of a saving Messiah** is further countered by Old Testament passages such as **Isaiah 52-53**. This is regarded as one of the greatest Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament, so I'm sure Mr. Besherse is

familiar with it. I will include the entire passage here so that it can be reread in its entirety:

Chapter 52

¹³ See, **My Servant** will act wisely; **He** will be raised and lifted up and greatly exalted.

¹⁴ Just as many were appalled at You [other translations read "Him"]— **His** appearance was **so disfigured that He did not look like a man**, and **His form did not resemble a human being**—

¹⁵ SO **He will sprinkle many nations**. Kings will shut their mouths because of **Him**, for **they will see what had not been told them, and they will understand what they had not heard**.

Isaiah 52:13 is talking about a servant of YHWH and all of the words “he” or “him” refer to the servant. The Servant is Israel, in past and future tense, and there is NOTHING about these verses that indicate that they are a Messianic prophesy, or even end-times prophesy.

Exodus 4:22 And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh: Thus saith the LORD: **Israel is My son, My first-born.**

Exodus 4:23 And I have said unto thee: Let **My son** go, that **he may serve Me**; and thou hast refused to let him go. Behold, I will slay thy son, thy first-born.' -

So here, you have the iron-clad, Torah definition and identity of “MY SERVANT” in Isaiah 52:13, but it is also solidly established right here in the prophets:

Isaiah 44:1 - 2.

- 1** Yet now hear, O **Jacob my servant**; and **Israel**, whom I have **chosen**:
- 2** Thus saith the **LORD** that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, *which* will help thee; Fear not, O **Jacob, my servant**; and thou, **Jesurun**, whom I have chosen.

H3484 יֵשׁוּרֻן *yeshûrûn* **yesh-oo-roon'**

From **H3474**; **upright**; *Jeshurun*, a symbolical name for **Israel**: - *Jeshurun*.

Total KJV occurrences: 4

You can argue with my conclusion if you want to, but the logic is much more solid than the attempt at identifying the curse placed upon the snake in Genesis as being Messianic prophesy. It would be more productive use of your time to speculate on how the snake got around before he crawled on his belly. Some people speculate that he flew around on wings, like a dragon. Some might even think that he walked like a man. You can even speculate that he bounced on his tail like a pogo stick, but there is still no indication that the verse is a messianic prophesy. It was a curse.

Chapter 53

¹ Who has believed what we have heard? And who has the arm of the Lord been revealed to?

2 He grew up before Him like a young plant and like a root out of dry ground. He didn't have an impressive form or majesty that we should look at Him, no appearance that we should desire Him.

3 He was despised and rejected by men, a man of suffering who knew what sickness was. He was like someone people turned away from; He was despised, and we didn't value Him.

4 Yet He Himself bore our sicknesses, and He carried our pains; but we in turn regarded Him stricken, struck down by God, and afflicted.

5 But He was pierced because of our transgressions, crushed because of our iniquities; punishment for our peace was on Him, and we are healed by His wounds.

6 We all went astray like sheep; we all have turned to our own way; and the Lord has punished Him for the iniquity of us all.

7 He was oppressed and afflicted, yet He did not open His mouth. Like a lamb led to the slaughter and like a sheep silent before her shearers, He did not open His mouth.

8 He was taken away because of oppression and judgment; and who considered His fate? For He was cut off from the land of the living; He was struck because of my people's rebellion.

9 They made His grave with the wicked and with a rich man at His death, although He had done no violence and had not spoken deceitfully.

10 Yet the Lord was pleased to crush Him severely. When You make Him a restitution offering, He will see His seed, He will prolong His days, and by His hand, the Lord's pleasure will be accomplished.

11 He will see it out of His anguish, and He will be satisfied with His knowledge. My righteous Servant will justify many, and He will carry their iniquities.

12 Therefore I will give Him the many as a portion, and He will receive the mighty as spoil, because He submitted Himself to death, and was counted among the rebels; yet He bore the sin of many and interceded for the rebels.

This is a very obvious picture of how well accepted [the Israelites](#) and the religion of [Abraham](#), [Isaac](#), and [Jacob](#) has been received by the pagans over the centuries since Abraham went on his journey.

When you are claiming that the “suffering servant” is a prophesy of Jesus, then you are *creating a very big problem for yourself in verse ten*. What YOU are claiming is prophesy of Jesus, says that [this servant will see his seed](#), and [his days will be prolonged](#). How many children did Jesus have? How long were Jesus's days prolonged after his alleged crucifixion? When you admit that it is talking about Israel, there is no problem.

I feel as though I could not add a single thing to this that could make it more evident that what is being described **is the crucifixion of Jesus**, His utter physical destruction, His beatings, His lashings, His suffering... All of this, as said in verses 4-6 and **10-12**, for the sins, transgressions, iniquity, and restitution of all. As **Paul boldly boasted** in his weakness and the strength of the resurrection of Jesus, so I will declare right now

that there is not a single person, man or divine, past, present or future, who fits this description better than Jesus of Nazareth.

Yes, Paul really *was* a braggart, wasn't he? He wanted everyone to know just how holy and blessed he was, even though most of his stories didn't make sense.

Is Danny forgetting that Christians are famous for comparing Jesus to the Passover Lamb?

The Christian *mantra* is that Jesus was “the perfect Passover Lamb,” isn't it? Well, the Passover Lamb, and ALL of the sacrifices, had to be in perfect shape *when killed*. *No spot or blemish*. If Jesus had been *beaten bloody*, as the New Testament alleges, and as Danny and others are suggesting by attempting to identify Isaiah 52 and 53 as Messianic prophesy, then that, *all by itself*, would eliminate Jesus as being a proper sacrifice. You would not even have to know that **killing and eating a human being was a complete abomination.**

Ba'al Worship (*re-named as Christianity*), makes a lot more believable story when you don't bring in the authentic laws on sacrifices or prophecies about the *real* Messiah. ☺

Did you catch the blood reference in 52:15? It's a **clear** reference to verses like Exodus 24:8, Ezekiel 43:18, and a great many others all throughout Leviticus and other books. I'll give you a hint on what they're sprinkling: It's red, thick, and every one of us has it inside. Mr. Besherse challenges the readers of his papers to present Old Testament (Tanakh) references to support our disagreements. I hope he will sit through my paper and **objectively** consider his positions.

There is nothing clear about Isaiah 52:15 being a reference to Jesus.

What is it about the WORDS in Isaiah 52:15 make the sprinkling NOT refer to Exodus 9:8, Leviticus 14:15 – 16, Leviticus 14:26 – 27, Numbers 8:7, Numbers 19:18 – 19, and especially Ezekiel 36:25? Because it is not talking about sprinkling on the altar, Isaiah 52:15 bears much more kinship with Numbers 19:19 and Ezekiel 36:25, doesn't it?

The rest of the verses surrounding the Messianic prophecies in Ezekiel show us that when the Messiah gets here, they will again be doing blood sacrifices for sin (and all of the other reasons) on the altar, in Jerusalem.

Ezekiel 43:18 And He said unto me: 'Son of man, thus saith the Lord GOD: These are the ordinances of the altar in the day when they shall make it, to offer burnt-offerings thereon, and to dash **blood** against it.

It is my expectation that when the Messiah arrives, and re-institutes the sacrifices, including the sacrifices for sin, that the biggest source of organized resistance and war against the REAL Messiah will be all of the enraged Christians who “BELIEVE**” that their salvation is the result of the vicarious**

sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, which they “**BELIEVE**” ended sin and death, forever. The Christians will want to kill the *real* Messiah, because they will believe that the *real* Messiah is an *imposter*, even though he IS fulfilling all of the *authentic* Messianic prophecies.

Also, I propose a follow up **explanation** (not an **excuse**, as Bernie would like to call it) for the **fact** that there is no Old Testament offering for intentional transgression:

Did you catch that? Danny just admitted that he knows that there are no blood sacrifices that are prescribed for sins of rebellion.

Had there been such a thing as an offering for intentional sin, then Jesus would not have done anything for the sins of those who lived before Him. **[BINGO! He didn't. Or even after he allegedly lived.]** All the Israelites who were faithful to the Judeo rituals would have spent their life earnings, savings and inheritances in sacrifices to atone for their unrighteousness, but in the end, would have been considered just as blameless and perfect as Christ. **[It isn't that expensive to make sacrifices for sin. All you have to do is not sin. Even the New Testament recognizes that there were people who were absolutely BLAMELESS under the Mosaic Law.]**

The simple, obvious explanation is that there was no offering because no offering was needed. They already had the Three R's, - Remorse, Repentance, & Restitution. If Jesus lived or died, it did nothing for people who lived or who died either before him, OR while he was allegedly here, OR after he died.

This sounds to me, based on God's character, omnipotence and omniscience, that He had a plan from the very beginning. **[Of course He had a plan, - The Three R's.]** Scholars like **John Piper** even argue this was the plan from before Creation itself. There was no Messiah in the days of Noah, or the patriarchs, or Moses, or David, or Isaiah, for anyone to declare Savior and King of Kings, but the fact is that **since Christ's blood is the only one that can redeem all sins**, **[John Piper might say it, but where does the Torah say this? Or is it to be found in one of the 2,231 pagan documents used by the Council of Nicea? Cite a credible source, please. What do you find wrong with the blood sacrifices that WERE sufficient for having sins forgiven between the giving of the Law to Moses and the destruction of the Temple in 72 CE?]** there could be no other redeeming blood sacrifice before Him. **[Now, you are saying that Moses was a liar, because Moses said that the sins were forgiven. If Moses was a liar, then why would you believe that there is even going to be a Messiah? There was no Messiah, but there WAS a plan of salvation. Blood was not needed in all cases, because YHWH had provided the Three R's.]** No other offering could be worthy. **No other blood could clean the entire planet. [John Piper might say it, but where does the Torah say this? Or is it to be found in one of the 2,231 pagan documents used by the Council of Nicea? Cite a credible source, please.]** No other act could have demonstrated the love of the Father for His children, the love of the Son for His friends. **[We have still not been shown a single**

verse, or even a combination of verses, in the entire Tanakh that says that the blood of either a god *OR* a man is needed for salvation of either a single man or the entire planet. We may be able to find such a verse in Ba'alism literature, Zoroastrian literature, or some other pagan literature, but *not in the Tanakh.*] So until His coming, God accepted plain repentance and confession because in His timeless realm, Jesus had already been sacrificed in payment for iniquity. [Where is your citation of a verse in the Tanakh that supports your *belief*? I have already cited that YHWH is the same, yesterday, today, and forever. Therefore, the Three R's are effective for forgiveness yesterday, today, and forever.]

And *exactly* where do you find the verses in the Tanakh that describe Jesus's alleged substitutionary sacrifice, that, if it were true, would be the single, most important thing in the entire Tanakh? It isn't there, Danny, which is why you resort to smoke & mirrors. IF IF IF YHWH accepted "plain repentance and confession because in His timeless realm, Jesus **had already been sacrificed** in payment for iniquity" before Jesus died, then IF IF IF their God were YHWH, He would still accept the Three R's, because YHWH never changes and His Law never changes.

YHWH accepted the Three R's because *that is HIS* plan of salvation. Having created the Three R's as the plan of salvation, there was absolutely, **ABSOLUTELY**, no need for Jesus to have even lived, let alone died in any particularly horrible manner. The "*Jesus Plan*" is only *one* of the several fake plans that were created by fearful, fallible men.

Say what you want about **no blood sacrifices being necessary** in the Old Testament. [That is *Danny's* contention. *He did not get that idea from anything that I wrote, but from what one his heroes, the Apostle Paul, wrote.*] This prophecy draws a perfect picture of Jesus's sacrifice for the sins of the world and the only "excuses" I've heard from Judaism for **Isaiah 53** are very unsatisfactory. There's Abraham, who wasn't tortured or crushed for the sins of anyone. And then there's the nation of Israel, which, granted, has undergone incredible torture and disfiguration, but could NEVER be considered the **perfect Lamb of God** due to its generalized secularity and inherent sinful humanity. In spite of the unbelievable and unshaking Jewish faith that has survived throughout the millennia, the fact is the nation itself of Israel and the culturally Jewish people around the world are largely atheistic. [Danny is injecting his "**Lamb of God**" theory into Isaiah. Isaiah NEVER calls Israel or the Messiah the "**Lamb of God.**" It was Mithra that was known as the "*Lamb of God,*" not *anyone* in the Tanakh. See above for the "**perfect lamb of God**" theory. If anyone tried to take a lamb to the temple for a sacrifice that was beaten, bloody, and mistreated as Christians believe that Jesus was, the Levites would have been *horrified*, and *terrified* of their OWN punishment if they were to accept such a brutalized beast as being acceptable for atonement.] Therefore, the global **Jewish community** that has suffered harsh persecution and segregation **is not fit to atone** for

the sins of the many. **[Neither is the blood of any man or group of men. There is nothing in the Tanakh that says that any man, or even all Jews, can be sacrificed for the sins of the world. Maybe you could have found something in the religions of Rome, Greece, and Egypt before and around 240 CE that taught this, but you cannot find it in the Tanakh. More to the point, Isaiah 52 & 53 are talking about the servant, which is Israel, and in no place in the entire book of Isaiah does Isaiah indicate that “the servant” is anyone other than “am Israel,” the people of the nation of Israel.]** It would be easier to explain the woes of the Israelites in the last hundred years as **judgment for yet again turning away from the Father** than it would be to justify calling them the servant referred to in **Isaiah 52 and 53. [This argument is one of the MOST typical of all of the Anti-Semitic Positions [link], i.e., - that Israel is being punished for their rejection and murder of Jesus as the Messiah, even though there is absolutely nothing that Jesus did that qualifies him to have fulfilled any of the Messianic prophecies. Christians have been brainwashed well. Isaiah, himself, calls Israel the Servant in Isaiah 49:3, so why can't Christians?]**

I would implore both you, the reader, and Bernie Besherse, to see in the entirety of the Bible how God continually does things in such a way that no other person or thing can be worthy of credit. Look at how God brings Israel out of Egypt and into the Promise Land. Look at how He brought down the walls of Jericho in such a way that no person can claim even partial credit. Look at how he reduced Gideon's army to 300 before defeating the Midianites. The most any of us can claim credit for is obedience, but the power behind any miracle is foreign to us and can only be credited to God. To Him and Him alone be all the glory.

One other point Mr. Besherse tries to make against Jesus is that **no prophecy foretells of the miracles He allegedly performed**, but **why is that such a shocker**, considering all the other times God has done ANY direct intervening in the pages of human history? **[Christians SHOULD BE shocked, because it is their own New Testament, itself, that says that the miracles of Jesus were prophesied, therefore, the New Testament told lies. The fact that Christians are not shocked means that their brains are completely washed by their pagan priests. Danny could not find a single prophecy of either the Messiah OR Jesus healing the sick, raising the dead, walking on water, or Jesus's other alleged miracles. Yes, YHWH has performed many miracles, but nowhere are there any prophecies that the Messiah will do the miracles they allege that Jesus did. The question that is obvious to the observers is: “Are Christians so blinded by belief that they cannot see that the New Testament is telling bald-faced lies?” Apparently so. The proof is in the words. Read them!!!]** Look at God's **immutable** character from beginning to end: that of a powerful father paining for his children. **Malachi 3:6** and **Numbers 23:19** speak of a **God who does not change. [Yes, and YHWH's plan of salvation did not change, either. It is still the Three R's. It did not and never has become the Ba'al / Roman plan of “salvation by human sacrifice,” in spite**

of the *consensus at Nicea.*] I beg you to look at His character and judge for yourself. God RARELY does things the way man first pictures them and **ALWAYS demands the faith** from His followers before carrying anything out. **[YHWH always demands obedience, and there is no ambiguity about the meaning of His law. Read it.]** God ALWAYS displays **His**, and **ONLY HIS**, glory in His interventions, all throughout the OT and NT so that **nobody** can take **His** place. **[Even Jesus.]** The coming of Jesus being different from what Jewish **tradition** **[??? It was Torah Law and Real Prophecy, not just tradition.]** expected **MAKES SENSE**. **The fact that no blood sacrifice ever covered anything more than accidental sin** is yet another example of God bringing the glory of His grace back to Him, **rather than solely on our repentance** and the **virtue in OUR humility**. Look at His character, then look at Jesus, and see for yourself what the face of God looks like.

Now, Danny is admitting that blood sacrifices can only be accepted for forgiveness of accidental sins, or sins of oversight. This, at least, is an improvement, but he still finds words that negate the fact that the forgiveness was actual and real. Was David forgiven of his sins of rebellion (adultery & murder), or was he not? Did YHWH create in David a clean heart [Psalm 51], or did He not? Adultery and murder were and are sins of rebellion, and YHWH did forgive, through the three R's, therefore, Jesus was NEVER needed for forgiveness of an individual's sins, OR the sins of the world. YHWH is the same, yesterday, today, and forever. Or do you believe that YHWH was lying about this, too? When will people quit walking on the Word of YHWH and rolling in the Roman Religion?

And to finish on this particular point of discussion brought up by Bernie, **Ezekiel's** description of a magnificent temple is referred to as **an image straight from our afterlife in the presence of God**. Indeed, **it would be very strange** for us to **have a temple set apart for sacrifices after the coming of the sacrificed Messiah**. There is one problem, though: It is not said at any time to have been an apocalyptic prophecy. Some scholars have concluded that it is, but again Mr. Besherse is taking something **out of context** and adding **his own interpretation** to it **to prove a point that's not really there**. **[There is no better example of taking something out of context and adding one's own interpretation (spin) than those who allege that the bruising of the head of the snake and the bruising of the heel of the seed of the woman in Genesis 3:15 are prophecies that point to Jesus, to the exclusion of all others.**

The second-best example taking things out of context would be Danny's statements that the Messianic prophecy of the building of the Temple, in Ezekiel, would NOT be a temple for sacrifices, because it would be "after the coming of the sacrificed Messiah." **Danny is trying to trivialize the Temple, and relegate it to some nebulous, spiritualized interpretation that denies its nature as**

a Messianic prophesy. This shows a *state of total denial* by the *deluded Christian Apologists*, on who's *consensus* Danny relies for salvation of his eternal soul.

The words, dimensions, location, and procedures are clearly specified, and there is **nothing** in the wording in Ezekiel that supports the assumption that the new Temple is *not an actual* Temple, and the tables on which the offerings are butchered are *not actual* tables. Denial, in the face of evidence, seems like it is *nothing short of a form of willful rebellion all of its own*. Can *anyone* give me a rational explanation why Christians will believe all of the “*types & shadows*” and “*smoke & mirrors*” are *actual* prophecies that point to Jesus to the exclusion of all others as being the Messiah, and yet when there is something as **solid and unequivocal** as Ezekiel's description of blood sacrifices for sin in the temple that will be built by The Messiah, the prophesy from YHWH is trivialized and relegated to having some kind of “*spiritualized*” meaning? To me, such techniques are *basically dishonest*, use two sets of weights & measures, and are abominable. I'm praying for Danny's enlightenment.

This *interpretation* is the result of Christian apologists not being willing to admit and accept that *no one can* die for Danny's sins, *no one has* died for Danny's sins, or *no one will* die for Danny's sins until **Danny** dies for *his own* sins. He must have Remorse, Repent, and make Restitution in order to be forgiven. There is no “*sacrificed Messiah*.”

This does, however, refer again to what I mentioned above about how violent the Christians will react when the *real* Messiah shows up (*for the first and ONLY* time) and begins to fulfill the prophecies of re-instituting the sacrifices. Danny characterizes it as being “*strange*,” but in actuality, **Danny** will consider it blasphemy. **Danny** will want to try to *kill* the Real Messiah, and **Danny** may well even die in the process of fighting the real version of what he has been worshiping all of his life. Danny would just be one more pagan soldier who dies in process of the Messiah re-instituting Torah law over the whole earth.] It is definitely harder to conclude, **based on no reference at all**, that this is a **prophecy of the Messianic Era** than it is to conclude, based on **factual events** recorded in the New Testament pertaining to the life and death of Jesus, that **Isaiah 52** and **53** have been fulfilled in **Him**. [There is no doubt that the rebuilding the Temple (*in Ezekiel*), is Messianic Era, and the description is precise, leaves *no doubt* that the prophesy is Messianic. **Isaiah 52 – 53**, having the servant *previously identified* in **Isaiah 49:3**, and numerous other places around the Tanakh, as being **Israel**, and *not* the Messiah or Jesus, leaves *nothing* to the imagination or *interpretation*. We need no *smoke & mirrors*, or *types & shadows*. We just read the words written by the prophets. The “*factual events*” Danny speaks of in the N.T. were only codified and canonized at the *Council of Nicea*.

There were 1,786 Pagan Priests participating in this canonization process. If you can't trust your favorite Pagan, then who *can* you trust? And yes, *I AM being sarcastic.*] Read that sentence again, think about it, and see **if** you **agree**. [Right!!! In the very same spirit of accepting the Roman version of the Easter celebration and ditching the Hebrew version, let's seek a *consensus with other pagans* and *totally ignore* the words that YHWH left us in Ezekiel regarding the new Temple! *By all means!!!* And yes. *This time I am being really sarcastic.*] In light of the already come and gone Messiah, **I'm much more inclined** to accept a different interpretation than this Messianic Era view of Ezekiel's vision.

Of course you are so inclined! It fits with your current belief system, so you don't have to read or activate your brain cells. Most of all, you don't risk losing your girlfriend or your support group.

Did Jesus say He was a false prophet?

I find that this paper is continually easier to rebut because each claim is more fantastic and far-fetched than the previous one, and relies on stranger and stranger verses, **all taken out of context**. This is the kind of paper that I implore readers to double check because **if** you take these kinds of claims at face value, you're bound to have a **totally unnecessary** spiritual identity crisis. [It is continually easier, because as long as you can avoid cross-examination, and you continue to talk only to yourself, you can avoid confronting the fact that the Tanakh does not support the Roman version of the Messiah, and *even condemns your false messiah*. And if you want to be *really comfortable*, you can just stay asleep.]

We have to remember the Bible itself tells us **the Messiah** would be sacrificed, rejected by His people, **beaten to the point of not resembling a person...** [Christians like to *interpret it that way*, but the bible, in Isaiah 52 & 53 **DOES NOT SAY THAT**. The bible, itself, says that the **servant**, who is positively identified as **Israel**, would be despised and rejected. Because the Prophets *did not* say that either the Messiah or Jesus was the servant, there are **no verses** that support your theory that the servant is *either* the Messiah or Jesus. You can retain your fantasy, if you wish, but "*it just ain't so.*" If the Christians want to prove that their version is correct, then let the proponents of the position find a verse in

Torah saying that that *any animal that is beaten, bruised, and bloodied can be an acceptable sacrifice, for sin sacrifice, for a commemorative sacrifice, or for any other kind of sacrifice.*] These are things that we just read in the scriptures I included above, and there are others like it. It is to be expected that people of **Jewish belief** will go to **fantastic lengths** to try and **disprove and reject** what prophecy says they will: **the Messiah**.

So, to correctly apply one of Danny's favorite phrases that encourages people to disregard evidence, - *this is merely Danny's "interpretation."* Those who study the Tanakh and keep the Torah *will not try to disprove and reject the real Messiah, but the pagans (Christians) and the disobedient Jews certainly will.* In fact, in the last section, Danny, himself, indicates that he will *strongly reject the actual Messiah, because anyone who rebuilds the Temple and re-institutes the sacrifices for sin will be providing positive proof that Jesus could NOT have been the Messiah, that Jesus DID NOT die for Danny's sins, and that Christians are above all men, most miserable.*

Mr. Besherse next **argues** that Jesus Himself claims to be a **false prophet**, once again using **out of context** and **misinterpreted verses** to prove his point. It's even odd for me to read a text like Mr. Besherse's, where **the New Testament is so undervalued** and yet **quoted** as **if** the text does, indeed, bear weight. **Matthew 26:31** is the next passage used:

Then saith Jesus unto them, "All ye shall be offended **because of me** this night: **for it is written**, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. (KJV)

Please, Danny, tell me where is my misinterpretation. Which word? Which phrase? Which verse? You, and your support group, seem to be the only people to whom I have shown these verses who are in such a state of denial that they cannot at least admit that Jesus is identifying himself as the stricken shepherd. Don't merely *allege* that I am in error, Danny, *be specific* in where I made a misinterpretation, because *I want to be correct and this means that when I am wrong, I must change what I believe.* My ego is not involved, at all.

It would also really be nice if you could **stay on point and on the subject**. First, you bring up that scene in the garden on the night of his alleged arrest where Jesus says that the prophesy about the shepherd who would be stricken and his flock would be scattered *applies to him*, and then, because I quoted the section *where Jesus said that he was the shepherd*, you switch gears and scold me for quoting your own, pagan sourcebook!!! That kind of argument is very low class, and I had expected much better. This is not being "*College sophomoric*," it is "*High School sophomoric*." In a real, live debate, you would lose a lot of points by going this far *off-point and off topic and making personal attacks*.

I quoted the New Testament as a **pagan sourcebook**, because the pagans are trying to connect *their sourcebook* with the Tanakh. *The connections are*

not valid, but in order to show that their claims are invalid, I must show what their claims are, by using their sourcebook so I am being precise about what being rebutted. Do you understand, now? Would you admit it if you did?

We are next led to believe **simply because Bernie says so** in the next sentence that it is evident that Jesus is calling Himself the shepherd and his disciples the sheep, and that the “bad guy” doing the smiting is either Herod of Rome or the Jews, depending on whom one wishes to cast the blame for the death of Jesus.

I repeatedly give scripture and ask for scripture. I never ask that anyone take my word for ANYTHING, unlike Danny. Danny may be 22 years old, but he has yet to learn that by pointing a finger at me, he is pointing three others back at himself. Danny, you cannot *really* be trying to say that Jesus is *not* identifying himself as the shepherd!!! I am going to insert all four verses, for completeness, and see if *any* reader can honestly determine that Jesus was *not* identifying *himself* as the *stricken shepherd*:

Mat 26:31 Then saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended (*scandalized*) because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.

Mat 26:32 But after I am risen again, I will go before you into Galilee.

Mat 26:33 Peter answered and said unto him, Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended.

Mat 26:34 Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice.

They have Jesus saying “You will be offended (*scandalized, or caused to sin*) because of ME,” not anyone else. Then, Jesus, himself, ties it to the Zechariah prophesy with the words “for it is written,” and YHWH is saying that HE would smite the shepherd (*a keeper of a flock of sheep*) and that the sheep of the flock would be scattered abroad. Is there anyone *other than* Jesus who is indicated in *Matthew* that *might be* the stricken shepherd? I see no other names or indications. Then, in verse 32, Jesus goes on to say that “But after I am risen again, . . .”. He is saying that he, Jesus, will rise again, after being stricken down. I will issue two challenges to Danny, and to any Christian who is in consensus with him, - FIRST, please find me the name of any other person who Jesus could have been calling the stricken shepherd. When you *cannot* find a name that receives approval of a *consensus* of your fellow Christians, then the SECOND challenge is to find a way to admit that Jesus is saying that he is the one that the prophesy says would be stricken, without admitting that Jesus was declaring himself to be a false prophet. I really have to see this explanation!!! In another location, *within this very document*, Danny admits that Jesus IS claiming to be the stricken shepherd, and at that point Danny acts as if this is all his own idea!

Now, let's get back to Danny's document.] We get the original passage from **Zechariah 13:7**, which says this in context:

God's People Cleansed

¹ **“On that day** a fountain will be opened for the house of David and for the residents of Jerusalem, **to wash away sin and impurity.** ² On that day” – **this is the declaration of the lord of Hosts** – **“I will erase the names of the idols from the land, and they will no longer be remembered. I will remove the prophets and the unclean spirit from the land.** ³ **If a man still prophesies, his father and his mother who bore him will say to him: You cannot remain alive because you have spoken falsely in the name of Yahweh.** When he prophesies, his father and his mother who bore him will pierce him through. ⁴ On that day every prophet will be ashamed of his vision when he prophesies; they will not put on a hairy cloak in order to deceive. ⁵ He will say: I am not a prophet; I work the land, for a man purchased me as a servant since my youth. ⁶ If someone asks him: What are these wounds on your chest? – then he will answer: I received the wounds in the house of my friends.

⁷ **Sword, awake against My shepherd, against the man who is My associate** – this is the declaration of the Lord of Hosts. **Strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered; I [YHWH] will also turn My hand [YHWH's hand] against the little ones.** ⁸ In the whole land – **this is the Lord's declaration** – two-thirds will be cut off and die, but a third will be left in it. ⁹ **I will put this third through the fire; I will refine them as silver is refined and test them as gold is tested. They will call on My name, and I will answer them.** I will say: They are My people, and they will say: Yahweh is our God.”

I have yet to see where we are expected to interpret that the one doing the smiting is Herod or the **Jews** and I'm not sure what Bernie intended by mentioning that **interpretation.** **[It means that in the Tanakh, it is definite that YHWH was ordering the striking of the shepherd and the flock. In the New Testament, it says that Jesus was supposedly killed by the Romans, with the approval and direction of the Jewish priesthood. In reality, even though the prophesy did NOT refer to Jesus, it appears that the Pagans at Nicea thought they could augment their Jesus story by including it.]** But what Bernie goes on to explain next is that **this passage refers specifically to the false prophets and their smiting by God. [BINGO!!! AND it was Jesus who was saying that he was identifying himself as being the FALSE prophet.]** We are told that this is important because it is “**most likely**” a Messianic Era prophecy, which **in all honesty** may or may not be, first of all. This is just another indication that **whatever Bernie's interpretation of scripture and prophecy are, they're precisely just that: his personal interpretation,** subject to his own moral beliefs, to his own doubts, and his own logic. **[What it means is that when the Tanakh is definite, Bernie is also definite. When the Tanakh is not definitive, then Bernie is not going to try to bluff his way through and get you to believe something that cannot be proven. When the authors of the N.T. have Jesus, himself, identifying himself as being the false prophet in those verses, what right does Danny have to attempt to overturn the word of his own god? My main point, anyway, was NOT that Jesus may have actually done any of these things,**

but that the people who compiled and canonized the book of Matthew at Nicea were so ignorant of the Tanakh that they did not realize that they were having their own “god” declare himself to be a false prophet!!! In this case, in the light of the **Jesus Experience**, we can now see that, indeed, in this “era”, as Bernie likes to refer to it as, there will be a washing away of sin and impurity. **[It appears as if Danny is being argumentative just for the sake of being able to find fault with a Jew. Instead of making personal attacks against me, he should be using scripture. I do not risk myself in an article like this. I offer scripture, so any attack must be against the Word of YHWH, and not against me. I am quite secure that my Protector is YHWH and my protection is in my obedience. Danny places himself at great risk by speaking or writing falsehoods against the Word of YHWH. Now, responding to the rest of what Danny said, - - Was there a washing away of the sins during Jesus’s day? Nope. Ergo, the “*strike the shepherd*” prophecy did not and *could not* refer to either Jesus or the Messiah. It is an *end-times* prophecy, and definitely *not* for the days of Jesus, regardless of what Jesus said. Jesus lied again.]** Next, it would seem as though this is referring to the Messiah because God uses terms like “My shepherd” and “My associate” to describe Him. Would God call a false prophet His shepherd and associate? He says, “Strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered” and later Jesus confirms this is the correct interpretation. **[Now, Danny is saying that Jesus IS calling himself the shepherd!!! Danny can’t seem to make up his mind! Who does the Tanakh say strikes the shepherd? YHWH. Who does the New Testament say strikes Jesus? Either the Romans or the Jewish religious aristocracy.]** Because no matter who killed Jesus, God was the one behind it, allowing it to take place. **[Yes, of course YHWH allowed it. That was not even the question. The question is, who did it? You must be getting seasick, Danny, because you are trying to spin these passages both directions at once. Your *cognitive dissonance* is soooo strong that you simply cannot *believe* that Jesus (if he existed) was not the Messiah, and Christians will invent any spin that it takes in order to justify their continued belief. Even in his (alleged) last night on earth, Jesus was telling more lies.]** Do you need an Old Testament passage to tell you that? **How about Job 1-42? How about Genesis 35-50? How about any Old Testament passage in which something terrible happened to one of the Bible’s “good guys” and that God had clearly allowed so that some good would come from it. [How about we stick to the subject?]** This is NOT God striking down this **false shepherd** and scattering the sheep underneath him. This is God **allowing** the striking of **the Messiah** to wash away sin and impurity and moreover we can definitely say there has been a removal of prophets since then, as this **Zechariah** passage seems to indicate. **[And now Danny is admitting that he believes that Jesus is saying that this is a prophecy referring to the Messiah, and that Jesus is the messiah! Earlier, he was not willing to admit this. Unfortunately, he also felt compelled to insert his interpretation (unsupported by scripture) that the shepherd (a false prophet) prophecy is for the days of Jesus, which is not**

supported by the words in *either Isaiah or Zechariah*. *He is so wishy washy! It was YHWH ordering the striking down of the false prophet, and saying “I will also turn My hand against the little ones.” There is absolutely no indication that this false prophet’s death could wash away the sins of the world. Read the words! Believe the words, not the fables. It was not a “cause and effect” indicating that the striking of the shepherd would cause the erasing of the names of the idols and the removal of the false prophets. They will occur somewhat concurrently, maybe, but if there is any cause and effect, it would be that the removal of the false prophets would include the striking of the shepherd, who was also a false prophet.]* Give me the name of one person considered a prophet since the coming of Jesus. [This is way off point, but sorry, I don’t know of any. The last prophet that I know of was Nehemiah, who wrote his book of prophesy sometime between 424-400 BCE. Jesus didn’t qualify because of his lies and false prophesies. Remember, even one false prophesy would qualify Jesus or his disciples to be stoned to death. Back on point, - please give me one verse that says that the false prophet’s death would wash away the sins of the world.] Have there been spiritual revelations? No doubt. Have there been premonitions from God? Sure, why not? Have there been brilliant men and women who have been called by God to take the Gospel around the globe and even witness miracles? Absolutely. Have I personally heard of a single prophet who literally speaks the words from God’s mouth in the last 2000 years? No, not even one. **This sounds to me like further evidence that Jesus is the Messiah and that this “Shepherd” referred to is none other than the same suffering Savior of the world.**

That is what Danny says, but what does YHWH say?

Isaiah 43:11 I, even I, am יהוה; and beside me there is no saviour.

Danny obviously thinks that יהוה is a liar.

Again, Danny admits that his understanding is that Jesus is referring to himself as the stricken shepherd!!! Is this not an example of “Perjury by inconsistent statements?” I have a hard time carrying on a conversation with someone who has no love for the Truth, and has so little respect for me that he thinks that he can lie to me or mislead me and not have his lies pointed out.

And again, Danny is giving his interpretation, but his interpretation totally lacks support in the words of the Tanakh. The only support is in his imagination, and to a lesser extent, in the work-product of the Pagan Priests at Nicea. Because the last prophet, Nehemiah, was about 2,440 years ago, Danny’s inclusion of the alleged “Jesus” shows that his trust is in the consensus of the Pagans at the Council of Nicea more than he trusts YHWH, the Eternal ONE, who alone is our Savior. For Danny, the god of the Council of Nicea comes before the Eternal ONE, which is a clear violation of what is commonly called

“The First Commandment,” – *Thou shalt have no other elohim (mighty ones) before me.*”

As a side note to this, I find Mr. Besherse is **inconsistent** in what he believes regarding New Testament. He seems to quote it at convenience and when inconvenient, he simply dismisses it as falsehood and pagan/political concoction from the pagan Constantine government. This is just Mr. Besherse taking what he thinks is convenient for his point so he can say Jesus actually admitted to being a false prophet when that is not the case. **[Danny is like many other *UNPRINCIPLED WRITERS* who are having to deal with an exchange of information over which he has no control. He cannot control or change the wording of the Tanakh in a manner that makes it justify his Roman-based religion, so *he attacks the messenger* instead of *the message*. I quote from the New Testament in order to show the reader *the errors of that book*. The *erroneous* information in the N.T. is then compared with the *factual* information in the Tanakh, and offered to the reader. Why would Danny feel that it is necessary to attack the messenger, for *any other reason* than that it is *much easier* than facing the facts, i.e.: 1) that *he has no admissible evidence in his favor*; and 2) that *his conclusions are wrong*; and 3) that *he is beginning to realize that his faith is vain*?]** Why would the **power-hungry** NT authors write that Jesus called Himself a false prophet? **I see a very biased selection of verses being chosen.**

What you see is that some *very stupid pagans* picked the *wrong verses* to quote out of the Tanakh and insert into their *poorly-written Greek Tragedy*, to try to describe their own *pagan man-god’s* activities and conversations during his last days on earth. You can argue with me all you want, but you cannot argue with the **WORDS in the Tanakh or the **WORDS** that they put into your New Testament. *It looks like the only way for you to defend the Council of Nicea and Emperor Constantine is by saying that they were *smart pagans, barely smart enough to know how to read and write but not quite smart enough to know how to keep their stories straight.****

Can you say “communion”?

It seems to me that **Bernie is missing the point** when it comes to **Exodus 12:46** and **Numbers 9:12**. He is **completely right in saying this is not prophecy**, but the point he is missing is the reason Jesus’s bones were not broken. What John is saying in chapter 19 is that **due to the nature of the sacrifice of Jesus, He is taking the place of the Passover lamb** (remember that we just went over **parallels** in Scripture). The Passover sacrifice’s bones were not to be broken and, therefore, Jesus’s bones were not broken either.

Exodus 12:46 In one house shall it be eaten; thou shalt not carry forth ought of the flesh abroad out of the house; neither shall ye break a bone thereof.

Numbers 9:12 They shall leave none of it unto the morning, nor break any bone of it: according to all the ordinances of the passover they shall keep it.

What else was done to the Passover lamb? **Its meat is eaten!** Are we to eat the meat of Jesus every year? By no means! It just so happens that **Jesus** gave instructions for this in **Luke 22:14-20** when the first communion is described. **Believers** in Christ are also instructed to keep the practice alive **in remembrance of Jesus** and His sacrifice. This essentially **does away with the Passover sacrifice** because **Jesus is that sacrifice** now.

The Torah says that the Passover lamb’s bones were not to be broken, but it never says that Jesus’s bones or the Messiah’s bones, were not to be broken. If I am wrong, show me the verse. So it appears that Danny is again substituting belief in the work of Nicea for obedience and trust in the law of YHWH. The Passover, which we are told to keep throughout our generations, Danny throws in the garbage heap. Instead, Danny believes in Jesus and celebrates Easter just like the Romans finally convinced the Eastern Orthodox to do, as shown on page 10 of this document.

This is all information I’m sure Mr. Besherse is completely aware of, but would dismiss it as an **excuse** when **in reality, everything connects** and it is he who is **rejecting the Messiah** he claims to be waiting for along with **most every other Jew**.

I don’t know why Danny does not read what is before him, but in the document that I sent to Danny, there is a list of other papers that I have written, edited, and/or formatted. One of them goes into explicit detail regarding why Jesus could not be any kind of substitute for the Passover Lamb. Christians make the assumption that Jesus is a substitute for the Passover Lamb, so I will take some time to discuss the actual requirements for the Passover Lamb, and we will see how well Jesus fits the requirements.

The Passover lamb was a commemorative sacrifice. The lamb was killed by the head of the household, and the blood was placed on the doorposts and lintel of the door of the home of the obedient, not disobedient, by the head of the household, NOT BY A LEVITE OR A PRIEST.

The blood was **not** dashed against the altar, or poured out at the base of the altar, or burned. It was put on the doorposts and lintel.

The blood of the Passover Lamb was to **protect the obedient**, not save the **disobedient** either *in* their sin or *from* their sin.

Even Israelites who failed to properly fulfill **all** of the requirements, *in advance of Passover*, for selecting, caring for, killing at the proper time and in the proper manner, cooking in the proper manner, eating in haste, and burning the leftovers before daylight, the Israelites were subjected to the *same penalty* as the Egyptians. Only **the obedient in advance** were **protected**, therefore it was specifically **not** a sacrifice for *forgiveness of sins that had been committed*. If it had been a sacrifice for **sin**, it would have forgiven **the sins of the sinners**, who in this case were Pharaoh and his servants.

Also, *sin sacrifices are not eaten by the one who brings the sacrifice*. **Nowhere** does the Tanakh say that the Passover lamb was a *sacrifice for sin*. Where did the idea of being a sin sacrifice come from? It had to come from somewhere *other than* YHWH's word, and because of the similarities of the rhetoric, the source appears to be a consensus of the pagans at the Council of Nicea, adapting the rituals of the Roman religion (Mithraism).

The Passover had to be celebrated with a **kosher animal**. This is *stipulated*. Was Jesus a **kosher animal** that would qualify? **Nope**.

The Passover animal was **less than one year** of age. This is *stipulated*. **How old** was Jesus? The best guesses are that Jesus might have been about **33 years old**. Does Jesus fit the description of the Passover lamb? **Nope**.

The Passover lamb could either be a male **lamb** (sheep) or a male **kid** (goat). This is *stipulated*. No one had the right to change the requirement to a pigeon or a dove that was less than a year of age, did they? Was Jesus either a lamb *or* a goat? **Nope**.

The Passover lamb had to be selected **out of the flock**. This is *stipulated*. This means that the lamb or kid had to be compared with all of the rest of the animals that would potentially qualify, and the **very best** of the flock was the one that *they would eat* at Passover. Was Jesus compared with other potential sacrifices by the ones who would be eating him, and selected as being the best? **Nope**.

The Passover lamb had to be selected **FOUR DAYS** (*no more, no less*) **before** Passover. This is *stipulated*. When was Jesus selected? Some people allege that Jesus was *selected at the foundation of the world*, before there was

any flock out of which he could be selected. **IF that could be verified, does this qualify Jesus as the Passover lamb? Nope. It would *positively eliminate* him.**

After being selected, the Passover lamb was taken into the home of the family that was going to kill him, cook him, and EAT him, and treated with a lot of *calm pampering*. This is *stipulated*. Is this what happened to Jesus? **Nope.**

Jesus was yelled at, cussed at, and they “gnashed upon him with their teeth.” Depending on if “gnashing” means “gnawed,” he may have even had chunks bitten out of his flesh. Does this qualify Jesus for being a substitute for the Passover lamb? **Nope.**

According to the Christian belief that **Isaiah 52 – 53** applies to Jesus and that the New Testament says, Jesus was beaten bloody and disfigured, making him *totally unfit* for being a sacrifice even if Jesus *had been* a baby billy-goat. When the Passover animal was sacrificed, it had to be *without spot or blemish*. Would this have described Jesus at his death? **Nope.**

The Passover lamb had his throat cut, and *died of blood loss*. This is *stipulated*. Jesus died of *suffocation* (similar to strangulation), on the cross (or stake), and after he was dead, his side was pierced, and then, *some* of his blood came out, looking like blood and water. This means that *even if* Jesus had been a kosher animal of *less than one year of age*, he would have been *totally unfit* to eat. Does this mean that the bread and wine that you eat at communion are *also filthy, and unfit to eat*? *Think about it*. Did the “Jesus sacrifice” die of blood loss? **Nope.**

According to **Deuteronomy chapter 16**, after the building of the Temple, the Passover lamb (or kid) was to be taken to the Temple by each family, where it was killed by the Levites, and cooked by the Levites. Jesus was killed outside of the Temple, on the hill of Golgotha, by Romans (not Levite priests). Was Jesus killed in the same manner as stipulated for the Passover lamb? **Nope.**

Jesus was **not cooked**, at all, either roasted with fire *OR* boiled in water. Does this conform in any way with the stipulations regarding the Passover lamb? **Nope.**

The Passover lamb was eaten by all in the household. In 1 Corinthians 11:27 – 34, and ENTIRELY different procedure was given for who could eat Jesus. The Passover lamb was eaten as nourishment for the journey for the first few days, of the Exodus, to get out of Egypt. Paul, on the other hand, says that if anyone is hungry, let him eat at home. Does this describe the Passover seder and the Passover lamb? **Nope.**

There is no record of Jesus *being eaten*, at all, other than *perhaps* in the “*Secret Gospel of Mark*,” but you can “Google” that, and *speculate* on that for yourself. Some info is at: http://www.religioustolerance.org/chr_miss5.htm Then again, in 1 Corinthians 11:24, Jesus did say that this is my body, *EAT ME*.

The Passover lamb was to be killed “*between the evenings*,” which is generally accepted as meaning between the time that the sun went down and when it was full dark. This is *stipulated*. Jesus was killed at about 3:00 PM. Does this conform with the requirements for the Passover lamb? It depends on your understanding of the meaning of “between the evenings.” Most likely *NOT*.

After the Passover lamb was eaten, or at least as much of it as could be eaten that night, the rest of the body was burned with fire before dawn, until it was *completely consumed by the fire*. This is *stipulated*. Is this what happened to Jesus? *Nope*. They say that Jesus was placed in a tomb of someone who may have been a rich uncle of his, *even before the sun went down*.

The Passover lamb was a *commemorative* sacrifice that was *specifically* supposed to be *eaten* by the *household* providing the lamb. The Passover lamb was *NOT* a *sin* sacrifice. There has never been even a single verse pointed out in the Torah that gives directions for the Passover Lamb to be used as a *sin* sacrifice. *Nor* are there directions regarding a Passover Lamb that at least part of the lamb was *not* consumed for nutrition by people (*including non-Levites*). So, in order to represent *a lamb* as a *sin sacrifice*, Jesus would have to represent the lamb described in Leviticus 4:28 – 35. The *sin sacrifice* lamb was a *female* lamb. Read the verses if you do not believe me. Are you still going to claim that Jesus was the perfect Passover lamb who *paid for the sins* of the world?

Was Jesus a female? You tell me. *IF* humans were a proper species for being sacrificed, and *IF* Jesus was going to be a *sin* sacrifice, wouldn't he have had to be a real, perfect, *unmutilated* female, not a tranny or just a cross-dresser? You tell me. And show me the verses in the Tanakh that support it.

You noticed how specific *each detail* is regarding the sacrifices for *normal* sins. If there was a sacrifice that could possibly be made that would forgive the sins of the entire universe, *do you think that the details would be any less specific?* Or would they be *more specific?* Any answer to these questions would require *speculation and conjecture*, because there are absolutely no verses in the Tanakh that stipulate the requirements for performing *any human sacrifice*.

Why would a *female lamb* be stipulated for forgiveness of *one man's sin*, and a *male human* be *assumed* to be an acceptable sacrifice for the world's sins? Wouldn't it be a *virgin maiden?* *How could Jesus qualify?* Can you find

directions in the Torah for this sacrifice? Where did this idea come from when it is totally foreign to the Torah? Could it possibly be that it was adapted from the pagan practices of the participants in the Council of Nicea? I see no other reasonable conclusion, and in the absence of written directions, my *speculations* are as valid as your *speculations*.

So, because all of the other stipulations regarding the Passover lamb have been covered, and *nothing* written above about Jesus qualifies him to be a commemorative, Passover sacrifice that was to be eaten by everyone in the household, all that is left that may have been similar between Jesus and the Passover lamb is that he may not have ever had a broken bone. He may not have had any broken bones, but the standard way of nailing an ankle to a cross was to put the nail through the ankle bone. There is simply *not enough evidence*, one way or the other, to say whether Jesus had broken any bones in his life or at his death *to support a conclusion*. Neither *your belief* nor *mine* can make up for *lack of evidence* that would support a *conclusion* regarding the broken ankle bone, but it does not take a rocket scientist to see that Jesus could *not possibly have been any kind of substitute for the Passover Lamb*.

Remember, it is the Christians, *not the Jews*, who are the ones inventing the theory that Jesus is the Perfect Passover Lamb, which was *never to be for the forgiveness of sin*. The *only lamb* to be used as a *sin sacrifice* was FEMALE.

Let me draw your attention to **Hosea 6**:

¹ Come, let us [plural] return to the Lord. For He [YHWH] has torn us [plural], and He will heal us [plural]; He has wounded us [plural], and He will bind up our [plural] wounds [plural].

² He will revive us [plural] after two days [no more, no less], and on the third day [no more, no less] He will raise us [plural] up so we [plural] can live in His presence.

³ Let us [plural] strive to know the Lord. His appearance is as sure as the dawn. He will come to us [plural] like the rain, like the spring showers that water the land.

And what is the point to this quote out of Hosea 6? Are you trying to build a case for the claim that there was a prophecy that YHWH would raise Jesus (to the exclusion of all others) up on the third day, after three days AND three nights in the earth? If so, then your claim falls flat on its face, just like when the New Testament says it.

The Lord's First Lament

⁴ What am I going to do with you, Ephraim? What am I going to do with you, Judah? **Your loyalty is like the morning mist and like the early dew that vanishes.**

⁵ This is why I have used the prophets to cut them down; I have killed them with the words of My mouth. My judgment strikes like lightning.

6 For I desire loyalty and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings.

7 But they, like Adam, have violated the covenant; there they have betrayed Me.

What is this then? Yahweh, God, our Heavenly Father, who communicated basically the entire Jewish culture directly to Moses, with feasts and rituals and sacrifices included, **all of a sudden** desires **loyalty and not sacrifice**? For us to know Him **instead of give burnt offerings? There's a novelty!** Maybe it does make sense for Jesus to take the place of these sacrifices after all, if God is ultimately **not** interested in those things as much as a relationship with us. **Psalm 51:16 says God does not want a sacrifice**, that He is not pleased with a burnt offering but rather with a broken spirit and a humbled heart. Furthermore, **Hosea 6:6** tells us that God desires loyalty and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings. **Micah 6:8** tells us that **God requires only that we act justly, love faithfulness and walk humbly with Him.**

If Danny had read the Torah, he would have seen Deuteronomy 11:26 – 28. How can Danny profess surprise that YHWH is more desirous of obedience than He is of sacrifice?

Deuteronomy 11:26 – 28

26. Behold, I set before you this day a **blessing** and a **curse**:

27. the **blessing**, if ye shall **hearken unto the commandments** of the LORD your God, **which I command you this day**;

28. and the **curse**, if ye shall **not** hearken unto the commandments of the LORD your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after **other gods**, which ye have not known.

If Danny had read First Samuel 15:22, he would have seen the reaction of YHWH as relayed through Samuel when Saul thought that he knew better than YHWH about how to deal with spoils of war. Maybe this example can relate with Christianity, in that Christians think that they know better how to please the Almighty ONE than YHWH, Himself, tells us how to please Him.

1 Samuel 15:22 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.**

If Danny had read Psalm 51, a psalm of David, regarding David's forgiveness for his crimes of rebellion (adultery and murder), for which there are no blood sacrifices that are stipulated for these crimes, yet *David was forgiven*.

Psalms 51:16 - 17

16. For Thou delightest not in sacrifice, **else would I give it**; Thou hast **no pleasure** in burnt-offering.

17. The sacrifices of God are a **broken spirit**; a broken and a **contrite heart**, O God, Thou wilt not despise.

Because Danny, and most other Christian Apologists can understand the words saying that “*To obey is better than to sacrifice,*” they are without excuse for not knowing *and admitting that the alleged sacrifice of their man-god was totally unnecessary, and contrary to the will of YHWH.*

We are dealing with a deeply personal God who desires a faithful relationship with us. We are not talking about some far off feudal sky-overlord who collects taxes from His people and walks away. This is our Creator and Father, who created us free of sin, free of sacrifices, but with the option to choose to follow Him or follow our own hearts. We chose the latter, and from the OT we see that sin has trickled down to you and me today.

If you stick to nothing but the OT, what is next? God stopped inspiring Holy Scripture almost **2500** years ago and **your** messiah still hasn't shown up. **[The Messiah has not shown up for anyone else, yet, either.]** **Your** nation has forgotten its God and **your** people are scattered around the whole planet. **What if I told you that Messiah really came already and desires for you to see that.** **[Is there any chance that you would be likely to try to spin a story like that? If you did, what evidence would you be able to show me in the Tanakh that such a thing were even possible under the law or prophecies of YHWH?]** He wants it so bad that **He paid the price of your sin** and asks only that you acknowledge it. He's placed people in your life, maybe including me, to tell you this so that you can know what He did for you and you can love Him as well.

How egotistical can you get? All the way through the Tanakh, YHWH shows us that *we qualify ourselves for eternal life by obedience to Torah,* and it is nowhere more clearly stated than in Ezekiel 18:27-28.

If God is a just God, which we know He is, then **He must punish wrongdoing.** His nature demands it, His goodness sanctions it and our sin warrants it. **[Then you should begin preparing for your punishment, because no one else can pay for your sin, other than you, yourself.]** **Of course He won't accept sin sacrifices before Jesus, because if He did, He wouldn't get the chance to pay for our sins Himself. [YHWH is not a liar. Why do you call YHWH a liar? YHWH tells us in the Torah that when people took their sacrifices to the priests, either **blood sacrifices OR fine flour,** that their unintentional sins were forgiven. The Christian Fiction fables to the contrary are *blasphemy.* Where, in all of the Tanakh, does YHWH say that HE wants to pay for our sins, HIMSELF? **It doesn't!!!** YHWH said in Ezekiel 18:4 that “*the soul that sinneth, it shall die.”* **If Jesus lived and died, he died because he was a *sinner,* and *he died dead.* Some of the 2,231 *sourcebooks* that your Pagan Saints used at the Council of Nicea said that *their gods can die for the sins of man,* but the Tanakh *does not say that.*]** And in His omniscience, **we know** that's been the plan since **Genesis 1:1** when He commanded light to come forth and shine upon our void Universe. Find me another god who has done the same and I will be truly shocked.**

None of your pagan gods has ever done ***anything*** useful, even though they did claim to have died for our sins. It was YHWH, The Eternal ONE, who created all of the universe and everything in it. He said that when He created the universe, there was **no one** beside Him. “NO ONE” includes Jesus. When YHWH created the universe, HE said that it was GOOD. Now YOU are saying that it was BAD?

I’ve already mentioned briefly that the Ezekiel vision of the Temple and the tables for the offerings **cannot definitively** be categorized as Messianic; that is an **assumption**. [Danny did share that opinion and his interpretation, but he is **wrong**. It is not an assumption. It is a **prophecy**. All Danny does is **make a desperate attempt** at trying to bolster his claims that obedience to Torah, which is YHWH’S plan of Salvation, was **superseded** by something that the Romans and Alexandrians had believed in since ancient times. He is substituting his pagan beliefs in the place of the word of YHWH.] As far as this Mithraic influence on Paul’s explanation of Jesus’s salvation, I’d like to see the real sources for that information, because it is false that Mithraism and Zoroastrianism proposed the same dying “Savior” type deity. [The real sources? The fast way is to read the information on **page 10** that was taken off of the Wikipedia.org site about The First Council of Nicea, and then read the Tanakh. When you **cannot** find the Christian doctrines **in the Tanakh**, then **wherever else they might have come from is irrelevant**. The Tanakh has the Truth. If it is not in the Tanakh, then it is not important for our salvation. Learn how to read Hebrew, Danny, and I don’t mean just the marks that you had punched into your skin in open **defiance of and contempt for** the laws of YHWH.] In any case, by the time Paul was around writing epistles right and left, Christianity was already spread throughout the region. [So **they said, at the Council of Nicea**. Now YOU see if you can **prove it, one way OR the other**.] Peter was already traveling and sharing the Gospel. And besides, Mr. Besherse, **wasn’t the New Testament put together at the Council of Nicea?** [That is what **history** says.] Which is it? **Did Paul write blasphemy** to fool the ignorant or **did the pagans in Nicea invent Paul** and everyone else in the NT to control the masses?

If Paul was a real man, then it could be either one or the other. Maybe a little of both, because Paul’s **alleged birthplace was** a hotbed of Mithraism. The New Testament is **not consistent with the Word of YHWH** in the Tanakh, so take your pick, Danny. In **either** case, the “Jesus teaching” is **contrary to the teachings of the Tanakh**. No matter how you slice it, it **still** comes out baloney.

In case you cannot remember the quote from the Council of Nicea that I pasted into **page 10**, I’ll share it again, **here**.

Extracted out of Wikipedia.org – First Council of Nicea

“Another result of the council was an agreement on when to celebrate Easter, the most important feast of the ecclesiastical calendar, decreed in an epistle to the Church of Alexandria in which is simply stated:

“We also send you the good news of the settlement concerning the holy pasch, namely that in answer to your prayers this question also has been resolved. All the brethren in the East who have hitherto followed the Jewish practice will henceforth observe the custom of the Romans and of yourselves and of all of us who from ancient times have kept Easter together with you.^[13]

“Historically significant as the first effort to attain consensus in the church through an assembly representing all of Christendom,^[5] the Council was the first occasion where the technical aspects of Christology were discussed.^[5] Through it a precedent was set for subsequent general councils to adopt creeds and canons. This council is generally considered the beginning of the period of the First seven Ecumenical Councils in the History of Christianity.”

Inserted note:

This is an admission that the Christian Practices of Easter (*all* of them) are of Roman (Ba'al) origin. NOT EVEN ONE of them has an origin in the Tanakh, even the using of the name “Easter” (a foreign goddess) instead of “Passover.” They, like *modern* Christians, seemed to think that a *consensus* among men is equal to or greater than the written Law of YHWH. [BB]

To finish with this topic, **Galatians 3** has a great explanation for the law:

Galatians 3 says this:

19 Why then was the law given? It was **added** because of transgressions until the Seed to whom the promise was made would come. The law was put into effect through angels by means of a mediator. **20** Now a mediator is not for just one person, but God is one. **21** Is the law therefore contrary to God’s promises? Absolutely not! **For if a law had been given that was able to give life, then righteousness would certainly be by the law. 22 But the Scripture has imprisoned everything under sin’s power, so that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe. 23** Before this faith came, **we were confined under the law, imprisoned until the coming faith was revealed. 24** The law, then, was our guardian until Christ, so that we could be justified by faith. **25 But since that faith has come, we are no longer under a guardian, 26** for you are all sons of God **through faith in Christ Jesus.**
No further comment on this for the moment.

What is so unusual about people who are guilty trying to hide their guilt by inventing excuses and alternative explanations that are not supported by evidence? Remember, Paul was NOT a tested and approved prophet of YHWH. *Paul’s word is not sufficient.* What Danny believes is no more relevant

than what Bernie believes. What is relevant is evidence. Do you have any evidence that *Paul was right*, while the *Psalmists* and the *tested-and-proven Prophet, Isaiah*, were *wrong*? They cannot both be right.

Psalms 105:8 He hath remembered his covenant **for ever**, the word *which* he commanded to a thousand generations.

Psalms 119:89 LAMED. **For ever**, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.

Psalms 119:160 Thy word *is true from* the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments *endureth* **for ever**.

Isaiah 40:8 The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.

How long? Forever.

How long is forever? I'll give you a hint.

It is a lot longer than the 400 odd years between Nehemiah and Jesus.

Was there a need for Jesus? Nope.

Please put aside your ego, and OBEY YHWH.

“They” thrust “Him” Through

The next assault on the Messiah comes from **Zechariah 12**, which is ironically, like some of the other verses Mr. Besherse brings up to try and disprove Jesus, another Messianic prophesy that supports His claim.

10 “Then I will pour out a spirit of grace and prayer on the house of David and the residents of Jerusalem, **and they will look at Me whom they pierced**. They will mourn for Him as one mourns for an only child and weep for Him as one weeps for a firstborn.

Let’s ignore the glaring Trinitarian argument that could come up from reading this verse because that’s not what we’re debating here... Actually, let me just paste Mr. Besherse’s preferred **unnamed version of this verse** and use that instead:

10 And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication; and **they shall look unto Me because [according to my copy of the Masoretic text, this “because” is not there, just saying] they have thrust him through**; and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born. (Unknown)

This is a named Translation:

Zechariah 12:10, JPS 1999

10 But I will fill the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem with a spirit of pity and compassion and **they shall lament to me about those who are slain**, wailing over them as over a favorite son and showing bitter grief as over a first-born.

This is not Messianic prophesy. However, it is another excellent example of the Christian practice of always getting an arrow into the exact center of a circle by drawing the circle around the arrow after it hits the target. Christianity is basically dishonest.

I’ll give an opinion of my own, now.

Honesty is *not* the BEST policy.

Honesty is the ONLY policy.

Anything else is suicide.

I will now ask the same questions asked by Mr. Besherse, with his answer to the *left* and mine to the *right*:

Who is doing the piercing?	
In Zechariah, probably Israel, or at least an Israeli.	Zechariah seems to indicate that it was Israel who thrust through this person.
In John 19:36 , who was it that is said to have pierced Jesus’s side? A Roman!!! Even if this were prophesy	Bernie claims this definitely shows this is not a prophesy of Jesus because it was a Roman who pierced the side of Jesus. But tell me

<p>about the death of a messiah (which it certainly does not appear to be), then this essential detail would rule out applying this to Jesus (if Jesus were a messiah). Also, the nation of Israel <u>did not mourn</u> when Jesus died.</p> <p>In Zechariah, the false prophet was NOT <u>falsely accused</u>. He was a false prophet who had <u>earned</u> the wrath of YHWH.</p> <p>Regardless of how many words Danny uses, Danny has no answer for this.</p>	<p>something. If a person is being wrongly put to death because you falsely and purposefully accused him/her, should the person hold you accountable for that, or the judge who is only carrying out the death sentence based on what you say?</p> <p>I believe it's perfectly fine to hold the Jews accountable for "thrusting through" Him, whether it was the spear or the nails that pinned Him to the cross. As a matter of fact, we non-Jews who believe include ourselves among those who thrust through Jesus and killed Him. Our sinful nature sent Him to the cross after all.</p> <p>And Danny says he is not an anti-Semite!!!</p>
<p>Who is doing the "looking on"?</p>	
<p>In Zechariah, probably Israel.</p> <p>In John 19:36, the Romans were looking on. This would not fulfill anything, even if this were a messianic prophesy.</p> <p>There was a Roman Centurion looking on, and others gambling for his garments. This was cited for completeness. I guess Danny doesn't like to read the whole story.</p>	<p>Actually John doesn't really specify who was looking on in 19:37. This parallel was only mentioned in passing while the central fulfillment in verse 36 is the Passover bones not being broken.</p> <p>Looks like Bernie took it a little out of context to try and give a certain point more strength than it actually has.</p>
<p>Who are they looking at or unto?</p>	
<p>In Zechariah, the Almighty ONE.</p> <p>In John 19:36, they are looking at Jesus, a self-described false prophet.</p> <p>Read the JPS 1999, above. A false prophet was looked upon.</p> <p>You do not "<u>establish</u>" an issue by <u>alleging it into existence!!!</u></p> <p>You establish something by using <u>EVIDENCE</u>.</p>	<p>Now this would really have to depend on the version you used, wouldn't it?</p> <p>Obviously I'm not reading every single version, but I haven't found a version that words it the way Bernie's quote does. They all seem to indicate that God was pierced and looked upon. The Trinitarian Christian has no problem explaining that one, but I'd love to hear Bernie's excuse for it.</p> <p>Also, we've already established that Jesus wasn't calling Himself a false prophet; that's a gross stretch of the scripture to prove something that isn't said at all.</p>

<p>Jesus DID place himself in the role of a false prophet, whether you choose to <u>admit</u> it, or not.</p>	<p>Danny changed his mind and agreed that Jesus WAS calling himself the stricken prophet, now he switches back!!! Soooo wishy washy!!!</p> <p>He does not know. He <u>WILL</u> not read, and he lacks research skills to learn the truth.</p>
<p>Why are they looking at this one?</p>	
<p>In Zechariah, because they need the grace and supplication provided by the Almighty ONE because they have pierced, either figuratively or literally, some man.</p> <p>In <u>John 19:36</u>, the <u>Romans</u> are looking upon Jesus, with <u>contempt</u>, not <u>supplication</u>.</p> <p>How do you clean up that mess, Danny? I don't see how you can rationalize that, but I'm sure you will find a way to <i>YOUR</i> satisfaction.</p> <p>OH!!! You clean it up by alleging that it is <u>not a prophesy</u>. I see.</p> <p>I thought that you were sharing your personal interpretation, and now I see that you are using a <i>private interpretation</i> of Timothy McHyde, from the Timothy McHyde sourcebook.</p> <p>Thank you, though, for admitting that Jesus did <u>not</u> fulfill something that you think is a prophesy. EVERY TIME that Danny says "I believe (this or that)" Danny is inserting his personal opinion.</p>	<p>Personally, I don't think this prophecy has been fulfilled yet.</p> <p>Bernie is allowed his personal interpretation of scripture, so I will share <u>mine</u>.</p> <p>In context, it's referring to Israel being opposed by every nation of the Earth (v. 2, 3) and then God basically demolishing everyone who rises against it (v. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9). Then in v. 10, the house of David will receive a spirit of grace poured upon it because they will turn unto God and mourn over the Messiah, whose death is directly laid on their hands and they now realize what they've done.</p> <p>I draw this conclusion because of prophecy books I've read by people like <u>Timothy McHyde</u> and from the fact that <i>none of what is described here happened in the days of Jesus.</i></p> <p>Regardless, John 19 doesn't quite say who's looking on.</p>
<p>Who was pierced?</p>	
<p>This might possibly refer to the false prophet in Zechariah 13, but you will have to decide this for yourself. As for me, I am simply reserving judgment until there is sufficient evidence to make up my mind who was pierced.</p>	<p>Depending on the version of the Bible you read, God Himself was pierced. But at the very least, the reader can decide if what I'm saying makes more sense in context than what Mr. Besherse is saying. His interpretation is even left with a gaping hole because he can't say who this person is.</p>

<p>Now, Danny is so fragile that he cannot handle the fact that I'm waiting for evidence.</p> <p>One of the HUGE differences between the systems of understanding of Karaite Jews and of Christians is that Karaites read a passage in the Tanakh, and ask for guidance by the Ruach ha_Kodesh on how to understand what YHWH is telling us.</p>	<p>Danny cannot cite verses on who the one is who was pierced, he just <i>(drum roll)</i> – BELIEVES!!! And then he has the gall to accuse me.</p> <p>Christians read a passage in the Tanakh and ask themselves <i>and each other</i> how they can reach a <u>consensus</u> on how this can be used to support their doctrinal beliefs.</p>
<p>Why was he pierced?</p>	
<p>I would have to again reserve judgment, as above. I'm not going to make up a story to make these passages fit a pre-conceived belief that Jesus was or wasn't the messiah. It isn't intellectually honest. Either for me OR for you.</p> <p>You have previously provided your statements of belief, but still provide <u>no scripture</u>.</p> <p>You are referring to corrupted, disproven, <u>alleged references</u> in Isaiah 52 & 53 that try to <u>change the Servant of YHWH</u>, who Isaiah had previously identified in <u>Isaiah 49:3</u> as being <u>Israel</u>, and make people believe that it is <u>Jesus</u>.</p> <p>Nope, you have <u>not covered previously any O.T. prophecy that refers to a man-god suffering and dying for the sins of mankind</u>, and neither are you citing even one verse showing that it is even possible that one man can die for another man's sin. BB</p>	<p>Christ was tortured in a great many number of ways, one of which was to be pierced by nails, pinned to the cross on which he died for the sins of the world, as described by the Old Testament prophets we've covered previously.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">JPS 1985</p> <p><u>Zechariah 12:10</u> But I will fill the House of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem with a spirit of pity and compassion; and they shall lament to Me about those who are slain, wailing over them as over a favorite son and showing bitter grief as over a first-born.</p>

Three days and three nights, indeed...

The last **accusation** brought up by Mr. Besherse in this writing has to do with **Matthew 12:39-40** (HCSB).

39 But He answered them, “An evil and adulterous generation demands a sign, but **no sign will be given** to it **except** the sign of the prophet **Jonah**.

40 For as Jonah was in the belly of the huge fish three days and three nights, so the **Son of Man will be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights**. [emphasis added to Danny’s quote by BB]

If you’re a Christian, chances are you’ve heard this passage before. After casting out a demon, Jesus is accused of using satanic power to accomplish it. He rebukes those around Him and is asked for another sign (by His reaction, it’s probably safe to say it was requested with clear sarcasm). **His next answer is the foretelling of His death and resurrection as the greatest sign that will be given.** We’ve already seen this **allured**[sp?] to in **Hosea 6:2**. Any one of us would say it’s important for Him to get it right.

When I am trying to have a serious discussion with someone, about a serious subject, it is virtually impossible to get anywhere when the other party cannot even keep his evidence straight. Danny’s god says that NO sign will be given other than him being in the heart of the earth (assumed to be in a grave) for three days AND three nights.

Danny IMMEDIATELY changes the words of his own god from the ONLY sign into “the GREATEST sign.” The word “greatest” is a word of *comparison*. Examples of comparisons are like “good, better, and best.” Good, is a descriptive word, but not necessarily comparative. Comparing something else to something that is good, it would be either *better* or *worse*. Out of a group of three or more, you could have something that is good, something that is *better*, and something that is *best*. Therefore, “greatest” means best of *three or more*. Using the word “greatest” means that *there are at least two other signs*.

Let’s see, - The New Testament says “**NO other sign**,” meaning “**the ONLY sign**” and Danny says “**Three or more**.” Which is right? Can they both be right? **No**. Can it be that *neither one* is right? *It sure can*. One thing that is obvious is that **Danny is not satisfied** with the words spoken by his own lord and savior. What else does Jesus say that Danny disagrees with, or Danny thinks that he can improve upon? Maybe we can look at statements in **Matthew 5:17-19** about the law **NEVER** passing away? Is Danny going to side with **Pagan Paul** on this one and say that the law *has* passed away?

Romans 10:4 For Christ *is* the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

Hosea 6:2, you will remember from above, talks about Israel, not about either the Messiah or Jesus. There are similar words and phrases in Matthew 12:39-40, but the mere presence of a few words does not mean that the burial and resurrection of Jesus was foretold in Hosea 6:2, et seq. Real messianic prophecies, like the Temple in Ezekiel, leave nothing to doubt.

Jesus is foretelling His death and resurrection after three days. You might think back to that one week a year when we celebrate things like Palm Sunday, Good Friday, and **Easter** Sunday... You think back to Jesus being crucified on **Friday**, and count **Saturday** the second day, and **Sunday** the third day, and there you have it. Three days and Jesus's prophecy came true. But where did you put the third night? **The Jew stops there** and says, "Behold, your 'messiah' speaks lies." **The honest Christian [as opposed to a dishonest Christian?]** digs a little bit deeper. Bear with me because this isn't your typical Sunday School **Easter** story.

Turn with me to Leviticus 23:5-8

⁵ The Passover of the Lord comes in the first month, **at twilight** on the fourteenth day of the month. ⁶ The **Festival of Unleavened Bread** to the Lord is on the fifteenth day of the same month. For seven days you must eat unleavened bread. ⁷ On **the first day** you are to hold a sacred assembly; you are **not to do any daily work**. ⁸ You are to present a fire offering to the Lord for seven days. On the seventh day there will be a sacred assembly; you must not do any **daily work**.

This is crucial and here's why. Nowhere in the Bible does it say that Jesus was crucified on Friday. Here's what we know: We know that the day after the crucifixion was a Jewish Shabbat, day of rest, on which no work could be done (which is why it's assumed that He was crucified on Friday, but even the New Testament suggests otherwise). We know that the Jewish tradition initiates days at sunset the day before. **We also know that Jesus was taken in by the Jews who wanted to crucify Him on Passover.** Now let us begin piecing the evidence together.

Evidently, he blames all Jews (including me) for the death of a man that he worships as his god.

A 7th day Sabbath has certain rules. The laws for the first and last days of the Week of Unleavened Bread have other and different rules. The first & last days of the Week of Unleavened Bread rules say that you cannot work at your normal vocation, but there seems to be no prohibition against anointing a dead body or traveling more than enough distance to feed your livestock at your farm outside of your village.

Matthew 26:5, **Mark 14:2**, and **Luke 22:2** all speak of a clear knowledge that the day after Passover is the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which means there were two "extra" *Shabbats* that week and the next. For this reason, when verses like **Luke 23:56** and **John 19:42** refer to **preparation**, we can know it refers to preparation for the first day of the Feast, which is a technical Sabbath.

Preparation day is Friday, during the day. Preparation Day is for getting ready for the Saturday Sabbath, which begins at sundown on Friday. Sabbath-Keepers *still* do this. Friday, called “Preparation Day,” is the only other day of the week that was and is routinely called by a name as well as a number. Sabbath is the seventh day and Preparation Day is the sixth day of the week.

Furthermore, it is **strongly believed** that Jesus was born in the year **4 A.D.**, based on the descriptions of the political sphere and the Herod’s census timing, etc. And we know He was killed at about the age of **33** (it doesn’t ever say He was exactly **33** either, but that’s inferred), so we can know His death likely occurred in **37 A.D.** Of course, it may not be the most accurate of measurements [Why? Because it is (*gasp*) Jewish?], but if you look at online Jewish date converters, the 14th of Nisan (the first month as described in **Leviticus 23**) of the year **37 A.D.** fell on a Wednesday.

So using that, we can reasonably conclude that at sun down on **Tuesday**, which was already **Wednesday** according to Jewish tradition, **Jesus and His disciples celebrated Passover** in the famous scene of **the Last Supper**. On **Wednesday**, which was still **Passover** and **preparation day for the Feast of Unleavened Bread**, He was crucified. **Thursday** was the first day of the feast and a technical *Shabbat*. **Friday** went by, likely filled with much mourning over the death of Jesus. The actual weekly Sabbath came and left, and then on Sunday, the first day of the week, we’re told in **Matthew 28:1**, **Mark 16:2**, **Luke 24:1**, and **John 20:1** that the two Mary’s went to the tomb and found it empty.

Let me get this straight. Danny is saying that at sundown on Tuesday, Jesus and his 12 were violating Torah (sinning) by having their Seder in a private dwelling, instead of at the Temple, as stipulated in:

Deuteronomy 16:5 - 6

-
- 5 - Thou mayest not sacrifice the passover within any of thy gates, which the LORD thy God giveth thee:
 - 6 - But at the place which the LORD thy God shall choose to place his name in, there thou shalt sacrifice the passover at even, at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt. [emphasis added]

It causes ME no additional stress to recognize that Jesus and his 12 were committing this willful sin of rebellion against the law of יהוה, the Eternal ONE, but I can see why it might stress Christians out.

The first day of Creation was the first day of the week. The Seventh Day is the Sabbath. There was only one day that could be called the **First Day of Creation**, and there is therefore only one day that can be called the **Seventh Day**. The First day of the week is always, ALWAYS, Sunday, the day following the 7th day Sabbath. The days of the week had no names for other than for the day for preparing for Sabbath, and the Sabbath. The other days were the 1st day, 2nd day, 3rd day, 4th day, 5th day, & 6th day, which was sometimes called “preparation day.” That is true even to this day.

One last time, let's check and make sure we haven't lost any days or nights...

Wednesday sundown to Thursday sundown = 1 day + 1 night
Thursday sundown to Friday sundown = 1 day + 1 night
Friday sundown to Saturday sundown = 1 day + 1 night = 3 days + 3 nights ...and **then He was raised**. Three days and three nights later, indeed.

Excuse me! HELLO IN THERE!!! There are 24 hours in a day, maybe a few minutes more or a few minutes less on subsequent days. Three days and three nights is 24 x 3, or roughly 72 hours. You are saying perhaps 84 hours.

One thing we do agree on, and that is the time that they claim that the ladies went to the tomb. That was Sunday morning, the first day of the week, at daybreak. There is a few inconsistencies between the gospels, but not many.

Matthew 28:1 In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. **[Sunday morning]**

Mark 16:2 And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun. **[This can be no other time than Sunday morning at daybreak.]**

Mark 16:9 Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. **[Sunday morning]**

Luke 24:1 Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain *others* with them. **[Sunday Morning]**

John 20:1 The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. **[before dawn, Sunday morning]**

The crucial timing, therefore, is determining the day that Jesus died, to initiate the count of three days and three nights (72 hours).

Another crucial point is, Are the Christian apologists saying that although Friday (*preparation day*) was a normal day, yet the women DID NOT go to the grave to anoint the body? *Why not?* Do you think they wanted to let the dead body “ripen” until Sunday? Under Danny’s “Wednesday” scenario, there is no need to wait until Sunday morning to anoint the dead body.

It seems to be totally lost on Danny is that the only thing that is *prohibited* on the first day and last day of the Week of Unleavened Bread is your usual vocation, unless something else is specifically listed. I can think of no reason why anointing a dead body would be something that would be prohibited on that Friday, unless you touch the body, whereupon you would become unclean for seven days, but, you are free to do your own study on that. If you do, please share your results with me.

Scenario ONE:

According to the timing of a normal week, Jesus died in the midafternoon on Friday (about 3 PM, according to *one version* of the story) and was buried just *before* sundown on Friday. Sundown Friday to sundown Saturday would make one day and one night, or 24 hours in the earth. Sundown Saturday to dawn on Sunday would make a total of one day and two nights, or 36 hours in the earth. Where did the other 36 hours go?

Scenario TWO:

Humoring *Danny's* guesses that his god was born in the *year four* in the CE, lets run the options for the *FOURTH* year, and Jesus was sinning by taking Seder in a private dwelling on Tuesday evening, arrested on Tuesday night, killed on Wednesday afternoon at 3:00 PM and buried Wednesday evening, just before the sun went down.

Wednesday PM to Thursday PM	24 hours
Thursday PM to Friday PM	+ 24 hours = 48 hours
Friday PM to Saturday PM	+ 24 hours = 72 hours
Saturday PM to Sunday AM	+ 12 hours = 84 hours
	Equals 3 days and FOUR nights

According to the normal time table, Jesus came up 36 hours short of his own prophesy of 72 hours in the heart of the earth.

Danny's timetable of 84 hours in the grave comes up 12 hours more than Jesus's prophesy of 72 hours.

Jesus is still a false prophet, so even in his death he suffers an ignominious defeat.

Were they all false prophets?

As Bernie recalls, **Deuteronomy** actually gives us instructions for determining if someone is a false prophet or if someone is truly speaking in the name of Yahweh. **[I was not just "recalling" this, and relying on my memory. I cited and pasted in the actual verses, like you do, here.]**

Deuteronomy 18:20-22

20 But the prophet who dares to speak a message in My name that I have not commanded him to speak, or who speaks in the name of other gods – that prophet

must die.’ ²¹ You may say to yourself, ‘How can we recognize a message the Lord has not spoken?’ ²² When a prophet speaks in the Lord’s name, and the message does not come true or is not fulfilled, that is a message the Lord has not spoken. The prophet has spoken it presumptuously. Do not be afraid of him.

We’ve already looked at what **Zechariah** has to say about the Messiah, based on the same verses Mr. Besherse tries to use *against* Jesus, but was **Isaiah** lying in chapter 42?

²⁴ Who gave **Jacob** to the robber, and **Israel** to the plunderers? Was it not the lord? Have we not sinned against Him? They were not willing to walk in His ways, and they would not listen to His instruction.

²⁵ So He poured out on **Jacob** His furious anger and the power of war. **It surrounded him with fire, but he did not know it; it burned him, but he paid no attention.**

We could go in order, and just point things out left and right.

Isaiah 43:22

²² “But **Jacob**, you have not called on Me, because, **Israel, you have become weary of Me.**

²³ You have not brought Me your sheep for burnt offerings or honored Me with your sacrifices. **I have not burdened you with offerings or wearied you with incense.**

²⁴ You have not bought Me aromatic cane with silver, or satisfied Me with the fat of your sacrifices. **But you have burdened Me with your sins; you have wearied Me with your iniquities.**

²⁵ “**It is I [YHWH] who sweep away your transgressions for My [YHWH’s] own sake and remember your sins no more.**

²⁶ Take Me to court; let us argue our case together. State your case, so that you may be vindicated.

NONE* of those verses mention Jesus, or prophesy of either Jesus or the Messiah. Why do you waste everyone’s time? That is rhetorical. You waste our time because you have *no verses in the Tanakh that say that a man or a man-god, or a god must die for our sins, and that by merely accepting and believing in that sacrifice (without the 3 Rs), we will be saved. There are NO verses in the Tanakh that say that there will ever be an end of the Law. Even in the selection of verses, in verse 25, YHWH says that it is HE who will sweep away the transgressions.

I’m perfectly willing to meet you in front of an impartial judge who will examine your admissible evidence, and mine, that is taken out of the Torah, Prophets, and Writings, and anything else that does not violate the Torah by adding to or taking away from the Torah. I am ready and willing to state my case. When will you be ready, Danny?

I don’t know about Karaite Jews, but the Orthodox Jews claim the servant in **Isaiah 53** (which I’ve already referred to earlier in this paper) is **Israel the nation**, who is to be beaten and disfigured beyond human form for the sins of many. What about **Isaiah 49**?

5 And now, says the Lord, **who formed me from the womb to be His Servant**, to **bring Jacob back to Him** so that **Israel might be gathered to Him**; for I am honored in the sight of the Lord, and my God is my strength –

6 He says, “It is not enough for you to be **My Servant** raising up the tribes of **Jacob** and restoring the protected ones of **Israel**. **I will also make you a light for the nations, to be My salvation to the ends of the earth.**”

7 This is what **the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, his Holy One**, says to **one who is despised**, to **one abhorred by people**, to **a servant of rulers**: “Kings will see and stand up, and princes will bow down, because of the Lord, who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel – and He has chosen you.”

Thank you, Danny, for opening the door, here so I can apply the “Completeness Rule.”

Completeness rule. *Rule of evidence which permits further use of a document to explain portion of document already in evidence.* Camps v. N. Y. City Transit Authority, C.A.N.Y., 26 1 F.2d 320. See also Open (Open the door). Black’s Law Dictionary 5th Ed., pg 258

and

Open the door. *If one party to litigation puts in evidence part of document or correspondence or conversation which is detrimental to the opposing party, the latter may introduce balance of document, correspondence or conversation in order to explain or rebut adverse inferences which might arise from the fragmentary or incomplete character of evidence introduced by his adversary. This is known as Rule of Completeness. U. S. v. Corrigan, C.C.A.N.Y., 168 F.2d 641, 645. See also Fed.Evid. R. 106. Black’s Law Dictionary, 5th Ed., page 983*

Why start at verse 5? It looks like you intentionally skipped verse 3, so let’s read a bit more of that chapter. Isaiah 49:1 – 10 (JPS 1999)

1. Listen, O coastlands, to me [Israel, not Jesus], and give heed, O nations afar; The LORD [YHWH, not Jesus] appointed me [Israel, not Jesus] before I [Israel, not Jesus] was born. He [YHWH, not Jesus] named me while I [Israel, not Jesus] was in my [Israel, not Jesus] mother’s womb.
2. He [YHWH, not Jesus] made my [Israel, not Jesus] mouth like a sharpened blade. He [YHWH, not Jesus] hid me in the shadow of his hand, and he made me [Israel, not Jesus] like a polished arrow; He [YHWH, not Jesus] concealed me [Israel, not Jesus] in His [YHWH, not Jesus] quiver.
3. **And he said to me, “You are My servant, Israel, in whom I glory.”**
4. I thought, “I have labored in vain, I have spent my strength for empty breath.” But my case rested with the LORD [YHWH, not Jesus], my recompense was in the hands of my God [YHWH, not Jesus].
5. And now the LORD [YHWH, not Jesus] was resolved—He [YHWH, not Jesus] who formed in the womb to be His servant—To bring back Jacob to Himself

[YHWH, not Jesus], that **Israel** may be restored to Him [YHWH, not Jesus]. And I have been honored in the sight of the LORD [YHWH, not Jesus], my God [YHWH, not Jesus] has been my Strength.

6. For He [YHWH, not Jesus] has said: “It is too little that you should be My [YHWH’s, not Jesus’s] **servant** In that I [YHWH, not Jesus] raise up the **tribes of Jacob** and **restore** the **survivors of Israel**: I [YHWH, not Jesus] will also make you [Israel] a light of nations, that **My** [YHWH’s, not Jesus’s] salvation may reach the ends of the earth.”
7. Thus said the **LORD** [YHWH, not Jesus], The **Redeemer of Israel**, his Holy One [Israel’s Holy One], To the despised one, To the abhorred nations, To the slave of rulers: kings shall see and stand up; Nobles, and they shall prostrate themselves—To the honor of the LORD [YHWH, not Jesus], who is faithful, To the Holy One of Israel [YHWH, not Jesus] who chose you.
8. Thus said the LORD [YHWH, not Jesus]: In an hour of favor I [YHWH, not Jesus] answer you, and on a day of salvation I [YHWH, not Jesus] help you— I [YHWH, not Jesus] created you and appointed you a covenant people— restoring the land, allotting anew the desolate holdings,
9. Saying to the prisoners, “Go free,” To those who are in darkness, show yourselves.” They shall pasture along the roads, and every bare height shall be their pasture.
10. They shall not hunger or thirst, Hot wind and sun shall not strike them; For he who loves them will lead them, He will guide them to springs of water.

Israel will not be the one saving itself. God will. **God has!** [YHWH says that [He WILL](#). *Future tense. Your enthusiasm leads you astray, again.*] In the midst of a sinful and dispersed Israel, Yahweh is saying HE will be the one sweeping away the sin. HE will be the one bringing rebellious Jacob back to Himself. And not only that, but it will be His Servant, the one despised, abhorred by people, a servant of rulers, who will bring the salvation of God to the ends of the earth, Jews and gentiles alike!

His servant is Israel, as it says in verse 3. Why don’t you just believe what YHWH says through the pen of Isaiah, in chapter 49? You cited the chapter, but it looks like you didn’t even read it. BEFORE you start talking about a mere difference in *interpretation*, PLEASE find your favorite dictionary and *interpret* the words according to a *known and competent* sourcebook. Don’t just tell me (*again*) that you don’t believe what the bible plainly says, and therefore, I (the Jew) am wrong and I am going to go to hell because you (*a non-believer*) interpret the bible differently.

The knife-bearing hand of Abraham was coming down upon his son Isaac, and Yahweh said, “**STOP!! Do not lay a hand on the boy. I will provide!!**” 2000 years ago, He did just that, [**WRONG! YHWH provided a fully-grown, mature ram, that very hour. Not a human sacrifice, centuries later.**] and just as he foretold in Isaiah, his Servant was despised to the point of being killed by the hands of the lost souls He came to save. [**WRONG! Open your eyes, please!** **Were all the sacrifices in the laws of Moses intended for unintentional sin? [That’s what it says. You have found**

nothing else.] This was an **unintentional sacrifice** that washed away the rebellious, intentional sins of the world. The salvation promised to Israel and beyond. Jews and Christians both await the victorious Messiah who will shatter the chains of this world and release the prisoners. **[WOW!!! Where is the verse that says there are unintentional sacrifices? Who brings them? What species/gender? What is done with the various parts of the body, i.e., the fat, the fat of the kidneys, the shoulder, the blood? I've gotta see this!!!]** The difference is we accepted Him **2000** years ago, **[WRONG! You have accepted a pagan imposter that was arrived at by consensus at the Council of Nicea about 1,750 years ago.]** while **IT IS WRITTEN**, as Mr. Besherse graciously pointed out in **Zechariah 12**, that **the Jews** will realize what they've done when it's late (not too late, but late). **They will look upon God with bitterness like for a dead firstborn son, and say, "Oops, we're sorry."**

This is Danny's private interpretation, perhaps in consensus with other Christians, but he again fails to recognize that the firstborn son of YHWH is solidly identified as Israel, on several occasions (as I have pointed out, using *SCRIPTURE*, not opinion). Neither Jesus nor the Messiah is ever identified as "the servant" or "My servant" or the "firstborn son," however, Danny's contempt for Jews is becoming very obvious.

In a moment of divine foresight, the psalmist wrote these words in the **118th psalm**:
21 I will give thanks to **You** because **You** have answered me and **have become my salvation**.

22 **The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone.**

23 This came from the Lord; it is wonderful in our eyes.

REAL Messianic prophecies leave nothing to imagination. In the verses that Danny selected, there is no mention of Jesus, and there is no mention of the Messiah. Instead of copying in the entire chapter, under the Rule of Completeness, I will just ask that any reader who has a sincere desire to understand and obey the will of YHWH to read the entire chapter for themselves, and please tell me an objective, impartial, unbiased way of determining how and why Danny chose to switch the "You" in verse 21 from meaning "YHWH," and have it refer to Jesus, to the exclusion of all others. Also, how does the referral to the stone, in verse 22, become a reference to Jesus, to the exclusion of all others, when the Rock of Israel has always been YHWH?

Because there IS a mention of salvation, and because beside YHWH there is no Savior, then the word "You" MUST mean YHWH.

There is a mention of "the stone," and the Psalmist gives us this verse:
Psalm 78:35 And they remembered that God [Elohim] was their rock, and the high [Elyon] God [El] their redeemer.

YHWH is the Rock, and YHWH is the Redeemer and Savior, - NOT Jesus. It is in the WRITTEN WORDS, not in the imagination.

And all this not to mention **Isaiah 53** yet again! I ask you now, were these **all false prophets and prophecies**? This is the rejection of the Messiah that we are told about. And **there can be no confusion** as to who this is referring to. This is clearly talking about the Messiah, the Servant, the Salvation, the Rejected Cornerstone, the Abhorred, the Despised.

In the *Tanakh*, they are not false prophets. The confusion is in the minds of the people who do not believe the *Tanakh*. The confusion is in the minds of the people who believe the things that Pagan Paul taught about Jesus being the end of the Law, along with all of his other *anti-Torah* and *anti-YHWH* teachings.

No confusion at all. Isaiah 52 and 53 refer to either YHWH or Israel, in the WORDS of the *Tanakh*. The words of the *pagan sourcebooks* are *irrelevant*. All that the *pagan sourcebooks* do is confuse people like Danny.

Were all of these people **false prophets** [At the Council of Nicea, most definitely, **YES.**] with **hidden pagan agendas** [not very *well* hidden” at Nicea, but “*pagan*” agendas, **CERTAINLY.**], all of them deserving of death? [That’s what Deuteronomy says. Are you *still* arguing with YHWH?] Are you waiting for the “real Messiah” so that you can reject him instead? [Danny, you were *not* always this *contemptuous* and *scornful*. Are all Christians this contemptuous of the Word of YHWH? Of course I am waiting for the real Messiah. Everyone is waiting for the real Messiah. The Temple has not been rebuilt. There is no world peace. None of the governments of man (even the State of Israel) recognize Torah law as supreme. The heads of state do not make the mandatory journeys to Jerusalem for the prescribed feasts, and when they *do NOT* attend the feasts, their country is not denied rain for a year. This *will change* when the Messiah gets here. There are many prophecies that will be *fulfilled only* in the coming of the real Messiah, and no one has yet shown up that has fulfilled the prophecies. YOU are still waiting for the REAL messiah, also. The one that you think was The Messiah was just a pagan construct of the Council of Nicea. When the REAL Messiah shows up, you will want to KILL him, because he will re-institute the blood sacrifice for sins of oversight, and you will consider this to be blasphemy.] Or do you think yourself **too righteous** and close to God that SURELY you are not among those who **rejected** the Messiah? [Contempt is for the contemptuous. With what judgement you judge, you will be judged. Be careful who you hold in contempt. I cannot reject a messiah who has never appeared. When the real messiah gets here, a few of the Christians will recognize him and then they will have *real Remorse*, they will really *Repent*, and they will make *Restitution*, and “They will look upon God with bitterness like for a dead firstborn son, and say, “Oops, we’re sorry” [a quote from Danny, *supra*], but THEN, they will actually **MEAN** it.] Here’s a news flash you may have heard before: We ALL have rejected Him. The difference is that the Christian acknowledges it and accepts the forgiveness in the sacrifice. Let it not be said that our repentance brought our salvation,

but that the great I Am desired for us to know Him rather than sacrifice to Him; that He stepped down and bore the sin we couldn't take and the punishment we couldn't withstand, so that Sin and Death would no longer be the divide between the created and the Creator.

Danny wants to become like the most high. He is obviously worshipping a pagan god that is *absolutely foreign* to the word of YHWH. I guess I have to say it again, - According to the words in the Tanakh, as long as there was a Temple and Levites to perform the sacrifices, you could receive complete forgiveness for sins of oversight by offering the correct sacrifice in the correct manner, whether it was a blood or flour sacrifice. When there is *again* a Temple with Levites for performing the sacrifices, you will *again* be able to receive forgiveness of sins of oversight by taking *the proper animal* that is without spot or blemish, *or fine flour*, and receive forgiveness of sin. Equally, *before, during, OR after* the existence of the Temple, our forgiveness for *sins of rebellion* come from the Three R's. In the absence of the Temple and Levites for performing sacrifices, the Three R's are all that we have for either kind of sin, *and it is sufficient for forgiveness.* 2 Chronicles 7:14

You notice that Danny is still citing no verses in the Tanakh that say that any man can die for another man's sins, nor any verses that say that it takes a god or a man-god to die for the sins of the world. That is because *the only place* those ideas are found are in the pagan sourcebooks used for creating Christianity, at the Council of Nicea.

The religion of the Tanakh, as given to us by the Eternal ONE, says that HE created us in His image. We all have the ability to think and *we are all responsible for our own behavior*. We are the ones who are in charge of our own destiny through the choices that we make. We have to learn to make the choice to obey the Torah that was given to us by YHWH for our protection. We cannot deliberately sin, and be forgiven merely by believing that someone died a substitutionary sacrifice *for us*. In order to be forgiven, we must, *individually*, have Remorse, Repent, and perform Restitution. Without these, *we are still lost in our own sins, not the sin of Adam*.

Praise be to Yahweh, who so loved the world that He gave **His only begotten Son** so that whosoever should **believe** in Him would not perish, but have everlasting life.

Danny still *refuses* to read the words. The Son of YHWH is still Israel. The Firstborn (or "only begotten") Son of YHWH is still Israel. This is stated more than once in the Tanakh. Exodus 4:22-23; Hosea 11:1 It is never stated in the Tanakh that the Messiah will be a savior, because *beside YHWH we have no other Savior*. I pity the lost Christians.

None are so blind as those who *will not see*.

Conclusion

If you agree with Bernie Besherse, then I have just laid out an array of excuses. **Page 5 [now page 6]** of Mr. Besherse's paper has a space to put tally marks for each **excuse** the reader has to make for the New Testament contradictions and you're probably sure that **page 5** of my copy of "For it is Written..." – or is it? must be filled with tally marks. **It's not.**

This just means that you either lack the humility to learn, or you are so arrogant that you are boasting that in 22 years of being a parrot, you are smarter than The Eternal ONE, who directed His Prophets to write the Tanakh, in which YHWH says that the Law is forever. Your pagan sourcebooks tell a different story, and the ends thereof are the ends of death. Old, worn-out arguments, or mere opinions and interpretations without scripture to back it up is just a waste of time. It is just another consensus of pagans.

I haven't been presented **sufficient evidence** to conclude the New Testament is false, and therefore have no reason to think the events in the New Testament didn't happen.

If they DID happen, then I think it's safe to say Jesus is the Messiah.

So, you are saying that the words of YHWH are not enough. You ALSO need a consensus of other pagans like yourself, who share your contempt for the Word of YHWH. And because your "IF" condition has never been fulfilled, Danny, YOU are totally lost.

1 Corinthians 15:17

And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is worthless; you are still in your sins.

You **not believing** Jesus is the Messiah based on **your own interpretation** of Old Testament is **irrelevant**. **[One of the BIG differences between Danny and me is that I KNOW that what I believe is TOTALLY irrelevant. All the way through Danny's document, one of his most heavily-used words is "believe." Another is "IF." Danny obviously has no concept that what HE BELIEVES makes no difference when compared with REALITY of what is WRITTEN in the Torah. I have the humility to know that the ONLY thing that is relevant is the word of YHWH. I am not perfect, yet, and until I am, change is mandatory. And Danny's "believing in Jesus" is irrelevant, also. Everything hangs on the words of the Tanakh, which, when one refuses to read them, and one lacks the desire to understand them because of willful negligence, that one is L O S T.]** Everything hangs on whether or not Jesus **was raised**. **If** He was, then he successfully accomplished **Isaiah 53** down to the last syllable. **[But Jesus wasn't raised from the dead, and Isaiah told us that the suffering servant is Israel. Your disbelief does not change what YHWH told Isaiah to write.]** Your Old Testament **interpretation** hole is a lot bigger and a lot deeper if you don't have Jesus to fill it. **[Cute, but corny.]**

Also, it strikes me as a **lack of humility** on the part of **Judaism followers** in general to see this and still say, “**No, it HAS to be the way Jews interpreted prophecy for centuries!**” **[We see what you are saying, and understand what you are saying, but we also read and understand what YHWH directed to be written, and prefer to subjugate our own selfish desires and follow the written Word of YHWH.]** Tell me this: Did God include a footnote for each prophecy where it **interpreted** the whole thing for us?

Nope.

Danny must think that YHWH needed the footnotes provided by the Council of Nicea. ☺ **Evidently, Danny thinks that the Council of Nicea’s footnotes supersede the Tanakh, - like the one that they sent to the Church at Alexandria bragging about getting the Eastern church to abandon the Jewish practice of observing Passover, and joining with Rome and Alexandria in their pagan celebration of Easter. So be it. It is your choice, and like Rome and Alexandria, you lose the protection of the Almighty ONE, and will spend your future of outer darkness.**

All we can do is read, look to what we have around us and see if it fits, even if it may not have been the way **we** expect it. **[You forgot “and seek a consensus with my fellow pagans.”]** **In all honesty, God doesn’t always speak clearly in His word, including but not limited to prophecy. [I don’t think that the problem is that YHWH is not speaking clearly. I think that the problem is that you have your fingers in your ears and are not hearing clearly. You have to be willing to listen to what the WORDS are saying before you can understand the message. YHWH had it written as plain as day.]** Why is it we have so many **debates** regarding whether or not homosexuality is OK, or smoking marijuana is OK, or drinking is OK? Because you can make sound arguments based on scripture for both! (Note: I am not condoning any of the above examples.)

Simple, Danny. The Christians are the modern extension of the Mystery Cults (by whatever name) of Tarsus, the Mediterranean, and the middle east, and it is natural for them to enjoy the male and female temple prostitutes of the Temples of Ishtar (Easter), and all of the other hedonistic practices. They feel that they are forgiven in advance, so they go on ahead and do whatever feels good at the time.

My point is this: At the end of the day, all Mr. Besherse can offer is his **interpretation** of the Old Testament. I’ve presented **the reasons** why I disagree with **his interpretations** and stick to **my own**. I see a **man** who **fulfilled** the **prophecies** and then some; **[Danny is DEAD WRONG on at least one, minor point. While all that anyone (including Danny) is entitled their own interpretation, my interpretations are based on the words written in the Tanakh, whereas Danny’s interpretations are based in beliefs are diametrically opposed to the Tanakh. The point is, I offer my opinion, plus substantiation in the Word of YHWH.**

Where is the world peace that the real Messiah *must* bring when he comes? It was *not fulfilled* in Jesus. When were the swords beaten into plowshares? It was *not fulfilled* in Jesus. When was the Temple rebuilt? It was *not fulfilled* in Jesus. When were all of the *filthy things thrown out of Israel*? It was *not fulfilled* in Jesus. We know this, because *they are still there!!!* You are just fooling yourself, and are above all men *most miserable.*] I see a God who made it so that at the name of Jesus every knee would bow and every tongue confess that He is Lord. Let's **hypothetically** say Jesus wasn't the Messiah. We would still be waiting for him to come from the **seed of David** (good luck trying to find that out). He would have to come and establish **perfect peace in the world** and we would then have the entire world go to Hell and **the Jews rubbing it in all our faces.** [We will know who the Messiah is when he fulfills the prophecies that we read in the Tanakh, not by our imaginations, or his genealogy, or our dependence upon *pagan sourcebooks.*] We would not have a viable solution for sin because **it would be too late for that**, and all of **these Messianic scriptures would not be fulfilled**, but the **Jews would be happy.** [We have *always* had a viable solution for sin. The solution is the Three R's, - Remorse, Repentance, and Restitution. Only the obedient will be happy (*Jew or Goyim*). You can despise the Jews all you want, but the Jews *who are obedient* will have eternal life, and the Christians who commit sins of rebellion and *believe* that "*Jesus paid it all*" will never even see a need to feel Remorse, never Repent, and therefore never make Restitution, and will never have a place in the world-to-come.]

Instead, we have God Himself providing His own son, **who fulfills scripture**, does away with the problem of past, present, **and future sin**, suffers and is rejected for our sake so that no man, not even the heroes of the Old Testament, can say they aren't underneath that salvation. [The word of YHWH says that the son of YHWH is *Israel, not Jesus.* If all future sin has been remedied, as you claim to believe, then *why are you so worried about me*, other than that you *know that your religion is false, and your faith is vain?*]

Interpret as you please. At the end of the day, **if** Jesus was truly risen from the grave, any opposition is void. [and when Jesus *did not* rise from the grave, you are above of all people *most miserable.*]

CLOSING ARGUMENTS

By: Bernie Besherse, Chief Justice, Beyt Din Hillel

Reading and re-reading re-re-reading Danny's document and my responses, it became obvious that Danny was *NOT* engaged in this conversation so he could *learn anything*. He was not *even looking* for verses that could either clarify his position or rebut my positions. Danny seems to be only interested in *winning an argument*, and his most obvious technique is to never admit that he does not have all knowledge. He also seems to believe that the other party (*Bernie*) is at a distinct position of *weakness* because *not only* is Bernie *not a Christian*, but Bernie *is a Karaite Jew*, one of the killers of his god.

Nowhere is it more obvious that Danny is *NOT* seeking knowledge and understanding than in his statement a short way above, where he says:

Let's hypothetically say Jesus wasn't the Messiah. We would still be waiting for him to come from the seed of David (good luck trying to find that out). He would have to come and establish perfect peace in the world and we would then have the entire world go to Hell and the Jews rubbing it in all our faces.

The obvious problems that Danny has with arrogance, anti-Semitism, and blindness to the faults of his Roman Religion are that:

1. He is showing lack of good faith in offering his alleged "hypothetical" situation, the prophecies that Jesus did not fulfill, and offer his excuses.
2. Danny has offered nothing but *speculation* that the Messiah *DID* come 2000 years ago.
3. *Everyone* is still waiting for someone who can and does fulfill the requirements for the Messiah, one of which Danny even cites in his paragraph, and he knows that Jesus did not fulfill, -- (World Peace).

Black's Law Dictionary, 5th edition, page 669

Hypothetical question. A combination of assumed or proved facts and circumstances, stated in such form as to constitute a coherent and **specific** situation or state of facts, upon which the opinion of an expert is asked, **by way of evidence** on a trial. A hypothetical question is a form of question framed in such a manner as to call for an opinion from an expert based on a series of assumptions claimed to have been established as fact by the evidence in a case. It should be so framed as to recite all the facts in evidence which are relevant to the formation of an opinion and then, assuming the facts recited to be true, the witness should be asked whether he is able to form an opinion therefrom and if so to state his opinion. McMurrey v. State, 145 Tex.Cr.R. 439, 168 S.W.2d 858, 860; Fed.Evid. R. 703, 705.

4. Danny does not include in his hypothetical question the evidence that we presented showing that Jesus failed by not fulfilling even a single Messianic prophesy.
5. Danny cites no evidence showing that a Messiah has come and brought all of the nations under Torah law. His belief is not classed as evidence.
6. YHWH created the world and created mankind, each for the symbiotic use of each other. The earth needs us to dress and keep it, and we need the fruits of the land in order to live. We do not leave the earth and go to a “heaven” up in the stars. Only pagans look forward to that.
7. Danny reveals his own *attitude* about *learning something new* (that *he* might characterize as “*losing this argument*”) as his fear of having the Jews rub his face in the FACT that *he is* WRONG.
8. Danny, like many Christians, seems to think that *by not admitting to men that he has something to learn, that he can fool the all-knowing YHWH into not punishing him for his unforgiven sins of rebellion and oversight.*

I am very thankful for this exchange between Danny and myself. He brought me verses that I had never before studied in depth, and I appreciate it. It would have been even nicer if I had been able to actually change some of the positions that I have held for a while, but finding more verses and words that more strongly support the positions I hold is an acceptable substitute.

I have sanitized this document by removing all identifying names and details, and I am offering this document for the edification of anyone who wants to study how strongly the *Roman Religion* can warp someone’s objectivity. It will show people *how irrational the arguments can get* when someone is so bound by *cognitive dissonance* and *delusion* to the point where are not willing to admit to themselves or others that they had learned that even one of their defenses for their belief that Jesus was the Messiah is even weak. (Even though one of his favorite words is “if.”)

About the TITLE of THIS document:

When witnesses and evidence are presented in a Fair Hearing, the first round of presentation is started by the Prosecutor or Claimant, and is called "Direct Examination." The first witnesses and evidence are called and presented by the Prosecutor or Claimant.

Proverbs 18:17 (JPS 1999) says "The first to plead his case seems right until the other party examines him," meaning that *the truth comes out on cross examination*. Therefore, as each witness gives testimony regarding facts or exhibits, the Defense Attorney or Respondent is allowed to "Cross-Examine" the witness who gives testimony regarding the facts or exhibits.

Danny was presented with a wonderful opportunity to cross-examine, and attempt to destroy the evidence that I presented. Danny had this opportunity, and missed it. At the conclusion of the longest court case in which I was a peripheral party, I assisted the defense attorney in destroying the prosecution's case so well that in the re-trial, the defense attorney did not even have to call any of his own witnesses or present any of his own evidence. The prosecution's case fell *completely* apart upon cross-examination.

Sometimes, though, the Defense attorney just muddies the waters, and therefore, the Prosecutor is afforded an opportunity to reexamine the evidence. This is called "Re-Direct."

When new issues are raised on Re-Direct, the Defense attorney is afforded an opportunity to answer the new issues. This is called "Re-Cross." All of these opportunities are clearly delineated because of your SECURED RIGHT of confrontation and cross-examination of any witness or evidence that is presented against you (or your position). I raised new issues in this Re-Direct, so now Danny is afforded the opportunity to do an effective re-cross. We will see if he is up to the challenge.

In this case, I am hoping that at some point in the future, Danny begins taking the LORD's work seriously, and can he offer *something out of the Tanakh for re-cross* that can challenge and improve our understanding of the Truth about the sanctity of the Torah. Danny might change his mind about a few things, or even reject Christianity at some point, but that is neither my *objective* nor my *concern*. My *objective* is to get him to take a much smaller step, and that is to learn how to recognize and accept *TRUTH*.

The ultimate beneficiary of this writing and research exercise should be you, the reader.

This is *not* just about "*winning an argument*."

What is the bottom line?

If you still think that Karaite Judaism is too “legalistic,” and that you cannot be bothered to study, follow, and teach the simple Laws of YHWH in the Torah, then *there is an alternative*. Best is to follow Torah, of course.

Option #1: FOLLOWING TORAH,

A non-Levite man might have as many as 275 laws that he would have to observe in order to “Save his soul alive,” as stated in Ezekiel 18:27 – 28. If you were a Levite, you might have somewhere between 600 and 800 laws. If it is found that you have the marker gene of a Kohane, you might have a few more restrictions. If you are a woman or if you take the oath of a Nazarite (Numbers 6:2, et seqq.) then there would be a few other laws, but in general, the yoke of the Law is easy, and the burden is very light.

Option #2: FOLLOWING ANYTHING ELSE,

Reading First Samuel 8:4 – 19, you can see that selecting any ruler other than YHWH amounts to a rejection of YHWH as your king, so there is not a lot of difference in the end result when you reject YHWH.

If you cannot humble yourself, submit to, and obey the Law of YHWH, then one, easy alternative would be to throw away the entire bible, both Tanakh AND the poorly-written Greek Tragedy that is called the “New Testament,” and buy a set of books called The Tales of the Cthulu Mythos, which, like the New Testament, is a collection of stories by various authors, but this one was pioneered by H. P. Lovecraft. H. P. Lovecraft wrote the most terrifying of all horror stories. There would be even less accountability for you than having to confess a belief in someone’s vicarious sacrifice, in order that someone else could pay for your sins of rebellion, and at least, being written in more modern English than the King James Version, The Tales of the Cthulu Mythos would be easier to read.

You could completely cover yourself with tattoos of whatever pagan gods you wish, whatever blasphemous slogans you wish, in whatever language you wish. You could get pierced ears, nose, tongue, cheeks, genitals, hands, feet, and even a decorative tracheotomy, if you wish. There are even less rules to follow as a worshiper of Cthulu than there are of Ba’al, Jesus, Zoroaster, or Jove. By following Cthulu, you could turn your fantasies into reality by actually eating human flesh and drinking human blood. No playing around with make-believe communion, for Cthulu worshipers!

If you ever get tired of following Cthulu, it would be an easy matter for a Christian to again accept Jesus's sacrifice and have his sins forgiven, again. When you get tired of the disgusted looks that people give you for having all of the tattoos and body piercings, you could go back to your Cthulu group, and be comfortable, but when you again *feel* a need to have fellowship with your Christian brothers, you can get saved for a while, again. It is like a dog returning to its own vomit. Both directions. Over and over. Again and again.

If ever one of your Christian brothers were to question the sincerity of your acceptance of Jesus on your second, third, sixth, or twentieth time around, you can remind them that with the sacrifice of Jesus, all of your sins were forgiven *in advance*, forever, so your sins *are really forgiven*, no matter what *they* think. Also, if anyone makes an ugly scene, you can accuse them of having *incorrect interpretations* of the scriptures, *being judgmental*, and you can *question their own salvation*. You can find other Christians who are of like mind with you, and begin publishing material that shows your *consensus* with each other. When there are enough of you, it will become the *new "normality,"* and you will be able to eagerly anticipate a time when you can rule over both the Torah-Observant Jews and the old-line Christians who really have a bad attitude to your *new religious liberty* in Christ, or Cthulu, or both.

However, if you ever want to become a follower of the laws of YHWH, your path would *have to include sincere Remorse, Repentance, and Restitution*, which would *necessarily* mean that you would *never, ever, ever* go back to your old life, or return to your own vomit, or anyone else's. If you do go back, it is "*with knowledge,*" and *you go back to stay.*

The three R's is all that it has ever taken for salvation, because this has always been the *simple plan of salvation*, beginning at the time when YHWH was *all alone* in the universe, and He said "*Let there be light.*"

It is up to you.

YHWH's plan for Forgiveness of Sin (Salvation)

Blood sacrifices can be given, and forgiveness can be received for **sins of oversight** under the Laws of YHWH. **Sins of oversight, or accidental sins, are not planned in advance. There is no “malice aforethought” or pre-meditation.**

The purpose of the sacrifice is to remind the sinner that **it costs something** to be **forgetful**. When it costs something, and that amount is substantial, your memory will be much better about obeying the law *ALL* the time, not just because you believe that forgiveness should be free.

This becomes very obvious in the discussion about the acceptance of fine flour instead of a **blood sacrifice in Leviticus 5:11-13** that when someone **lacked** the financial ability to pay a larger amount, **YHWH** made it possible to pay a lower amount, but the sins were still 100% forgiven. Forgiveness of sins is not only for the wealthy. When the sin was accidental, an oversight, and not pre-planned, then the cost would also be something that was not pre-planned by the sinner, *either*, but the expense was enough that it would be remembered.

For sins of **rebellion**, on the other hand, even a **blood** sacrifice would *not* be an effective deterrent, because the *premeditated sinner* would **plan in advance** for both the **sin** and the **sacrifice**, and think that he/she was getting to **hurt someone** or **enjoy a forbidden pleasure**, and **the blood sacrifice is just part of the cost**. It is like the cost of a hotel room while committing adultery.

This is why sins of rebellion can only be forgiven when there is sincere **Remorse, Repentance, and Restitution**. You *cannot* plan your sins *in advance*, and **be forgiven, just by paying a fine**. You must feel *sincere* remorse, - be truly *aware of*, and *sorry* for committing the violation of the laws of YHWH, and for *damaging* whoever it was that you damaged.

You must *sincerely* repent. Repentance is when you spiritually *change your direction*, and absolutely purpose in your heart that you will **NEVER** commit those offenses again. Repentance cannot be trivialized to the level of a “*public confession of faith in Christ Jesus as my lord and savior.*”

There must be a *sincere* and *complete* restitution that remedies the wrongs that you have committed against **YHWH** and your fellow man, to the maximum extent that it is possible to do so. You cannot go to confession, weekly, and be forgiven for the same sins, over and over. You cannot “*get saved*” and then return to your previous ways, over and over. It is contrary to the laws of **YHWH**, as well as **abundant evidence** that *your remorse and repentance were not sincere*.

In the **absence** of Temple sacrifices, **ALL** sins *can be* forgiven by the **3 R's**, but they were the *only* remedy, *ever*, for the sins of **rebellion**, at any time.

Jesus's alleged sacrifice *was* and *is* totally unnecessary.

Please send any comments about this article to:

BeytDinHillel@GMail.com

Similar articles and papers that were written, formatted, or edited by Bernie Besherse:

1	How many in YahHead.pdf	24	Counting of the Omer.xlsx Spreadsheet)
2	Has THE Messiah Come.pdf	25	Counting of the Omer - scripture cites.pdf
3	Problems with the NT.pdf	26	Message to Friends about Omer.pdf
4	The Jesus Forgery.pdf	27	False Prophet Test.pdf
5	NT Disagrees With Itself.pdf	28	Who are the Rabbis?
6	Mithra: The Pagan Christ.pdf	29	Roman Tribute Coin
7	383 false Messianic Prophecies.pdf	30	Romans 13 & 1 Peter 2:13-14
8	Gentiles take hold of a Jewish Cloak	31	The accuracy of our written Torah.pdf
9	72 Jerusalem Jews translate Torah.pdf	32	Origins of the Jesus Mythos
10	Can Jesus be a ransom for our souls.pdf	33	Why I Gave Up Jesus
11	For it is Written, - or IS it?.pdf	34	Forgiveness of sin in the Tanakh
12	Yes, it IS written (Re-Direct).pdf	35	Does Christianity have Hebrew Roots?
13	Forgiveness of Sin without blood.pdf	36	No Not One
14	Ten Commandments & Los Lunas Stone.pdf	37	The Roman Road
15	Jesus, the Perfect Passover Lamb?	38	Examination of Two House Doctrine
16	Why Jesus Didn't Qualify as the Messiah.pdf	39	Karaite Believe
17	Why Jews Don't Believe in Jesus.pdf	40	Rise Of The Karaite Sect-Cahn 1937
18	Torah is Forever.pdf		
19	Virgin Birth IS possible.pdf		
20	Karaite discussion of Sukkoth in exile.pdf		
21	How do we celebrate Sukkoth		
22	Talmudic Logic – (a story, probably fiction)		
23	NT Contradictions.pdf		List Of Articles On Religious Topics

יהוה

The name of our Creator is made up of four, Hebrew **VOWELS**, Y H W H יהוה (source: Flavius Josephus - *Antiquities of the Jews*)

The letter ה (h) when used as a vowel, usually has the "ah," "ha," or the "huh" sound. The ה is the *definite* article, or **THE, SPECIFIC, to the EXCLUSION of ALL others.**

This is exemplified in showing the difference between the word "eretz," meaning land, and the words "ha Eretz," meaning **THE Land of Israel, to the exclusion of all others.**

In Hebrew, the letters י (y) and ו (v)(w) are used interchangeably, and when located in the first, second, or third position in a word, indicate the tense of the word, either past, future, or continuing. Being placed in the first and third positions, the י and ו indicate that the name is **both past and future**, or, - *Eternal*.

The ה preceding both the י and the ו means that the name is specifically, to the exclusion of all others, both *past* and *future*, or **THE Eternal**.

Furthermore, being *singular*, and *being found twice*, the ה would also allow the addition of the word, **ONE**, as a descriptor.

The Name, **YHWH**, could then be logically rendered as **The Eternal ONE**, because **He** has eternal existence, **to the exclusion of all others.**

It is pronounced in one, long breath, like the wind, with the accent on the middle syllable. .

eeeeeeaaaaa UUUUUU' waaaah

APPENDIX - Yes, It IS Written (by Danny)

by “Daniel” Maestro de Leones

An informal Christian response to the paper

“For it is written...” – or is it?

by Bernie Besherse

For the word of God is living and effective and sharper than any double-edged sword, penetrating as far as the separation of soul and spirit, joints and marrow. It is able to judge the ideas and thoughts of the heart. – Hebrews 4:12

What follows is the full, unbroken text of the rebuttal by “Danny.” I attempted to import the document from Adobe Acrobat to MicroSoft Word, and maintain the same lines per page as Danny’s original, so you can see HIS presentation of HIS ideas, but there was so much wasted space that I have shortened his space in between sections, and reduced some of his spaces in between paragraphs to a more standard 6 points, from his 12 points.

Contents

Introduction	3
The authority of the New Testament.....	5
Genealogies, not chronologies	9
Almah in context	13
Biblical parallels are kind of a thing	15
Love your enemy?	17
Lord of the Sabbath	18
Is blood sacrifice REALLY not needed?	20
Did Jesus say He was a false prophet?	25
Can you say “communion”?	28
“They” thrust “Him” Through	31
Three days and three nights, indeed... ..	34
Were they all false prophets?.....	36
Conclusion	39

Introduction

Have you ever wondered why Jesus is not accepted as the Messiah in Judaism? In all honesty, I've never dedicated the time to this kind of research before. I always assumed my faith was well founded in historically sound manuscripts perfectly dated shortly after the death of Jesus. I've doubted just about everything except that for some odd reason. I always thought that basically the Bible says the Messiah would be rejected, and that's all there was to it.

Well it's not. There's so much more to it that I had never even wondered before. Judaism has a problem with Jesus as the Messiah for many different reasons, many of which can easily make you second guess your faith if you don't know why you believe what you believe.

In an attempt to challenge my faith and bring me to the realization of the "truth", I've been confronted by the Karaite Jewish paper "*For it is Written...*" – *or is it?* by Bernie Besherse. Karaite Judaism essentially means a dismissal of everything outside the Old Testament as NOT the word of God. It's a very interesting way to view things and in that sense it agrees with Orthodox Judaism. The difference between them is that Orthodox Jews, who self-identify with the Pharisees from the time of Jesus, also rely on what's called the Talmud, which is the written Rabbinical interpretation of the Old Testament also known as the Oral Law. Karaite Jews rely on nothing but the Old Testament. It's a valid argument, which is why I now have this conversation with Mr. Besherse, but when it comes to faith, I believe it's a dangerous thing to be wrong about.

As a Christian I believe all 66 books of the Bible were inspired by God. I believe Jesus is the Messiah, come to first be sacrificed for the sins of the world, as described in Isaiah, and later to resurrect the dead for judgment and establish His Heavenly Kingdom of perfect peace in the presence of God. The moment you question the New Testament's validity, you create many gaps in the Old Testament that you must simply deem "uninterpretable". You simply don't know what they mean and I'd argue that without divine inspiration, you can never know. You have a full explanation in Jesus that you must now ignore completely even though it really looks like He fulfilled scripture. You have a humongous rupture with the logical order of things and your only reconciliation is to resort to conspiracy theories that allegedly "prove" that the New Testament is nothing but a human fabrication based on ancient mystery cults like Mithraism and others.

I'll briefly touch on why those theories are false a little bit further below, but as you can see, this is indeed something folks should try to get right. If all these conspiracy theories are false, and it turns out things actually did happen the way the New Testament describes, we can then say that we have a perfectly valid fulfillment of scripture.

1 Corinthians 15:15-17 (HCSB)

In addition, we are found to be false witnesses about God, because we have testified about God that He raised up Christ – whom He did not raise up if in fact the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, Christ has not been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is worthless; you are still in your sins. Therefore, those who have fallen asleep in Christ

have also perished. If we have put our hope in Christ for this life only, we should be pitied more than anyone.

The opposite also applies. If I reject Jesus as the Messiah and it turns out He is, then I'm essentially telling God that I don't need the grace that He offers us in the atonement through Jesus's sacrifice.

I'd like the reader to ask him or herself this question in regards to this view that the Karaite Jews have of the Bible, whether it's Mr. Besherse himself, or someone else reading this: If two people read the Old Testament, and draw different conclusions, is one person automatically wrong for consulting other Bible scholars and determining what makes more sense?

Please understand that writings like *"For it is Written" – or is it?* and even *Yes, it IS Written* are interpretations. The difference is that as Christians, we consider the things we read and disregard what we determine to not be from God based on scripture and what we know about God's character. In the case of Mr. Besherse, he must resort to the hope that pro-Jesus writings are wrong. He depends 100% on the New Testament being 100% false.

A small disclaimer: Due to the fact that I keep fairly busy, I often resort to debates easily found on the internet because it's a great way to get good speakers on two opposing views and do a side-by-side comparison. You get to be the judge of what makes more sense without reading volumes upon volumes of different writers' works. Keep this in mind as you read. I will try and show you why I believe what I believe: that if the New Testament is true, we have Old Testament fulfillment and a definitive Messiah. If not, we have countless gaps that have no explanation.

This is my review and response to *"For it is Written..." – or is it?* by Bernie Besherse.

**Note: Unless otherwise noted, the translation of the bible is from the Holman Christian Standard Bible for a couple simple reasons. The name Yahweh and the word Messiah are both used according to the original text and I like that element, and also it's an easy version to read and understand. It's very similar to other very common versions most people are familiar with, like the New International Version.

**Note: There are a couple points made in Mr. Besherse's paper that I didn't bother contesting for lack of time and irrelevance of the accusations.

The authority of the New Testament

Throughout the text, there are claims made against the New Testament. Accusations against both the writers themselves and the "corrupt" canonization process, allegedly designed by a group of pagans gathered to adapt Christianity to their own pagan beliefs, control the masses, and carry out their pagan agendas.

Even Paul, the main writer of the New Testament, in the greatest act of conversion in the entire Bible, who had his eyes opened by God Himself, is accused of growing up in Mithraism and bleeding his pagan poison into the Bible, thus being one of the nullifying elements of the New Testament. I have two fundamental questions: Where did this information come from and why haven't the atheists of the world exploited it yet?

Let's think logically here. If these claims are true, then why haven't the blood-thirsty, all-knowing, enlightened, free-thinking atheists come to the rescue and released all the poor and entrapped Christians from their bankrupt belief system, supposedly based on the very pagan cults they oppose? The immediate logical answer is because that's a not very well proven theory, or it's based on information found to be somewhat unreliable or seemingly as fabricated as what it claims the New Testament is. That would be my guess right off the bat.

We've got to clarify here that because the majority believe something, we cannot conclude it is true. But it is a very strong indicator when the majority looks at the evidence for something (in this case the New Testament) and draws the conclusion that it is true. If your conclusion is different, you have more than a billion people you now suddenly need to explain yourself to. And you can't rely on difference in Old Testament interpretation because it's not sufficient; it is exactly that: interpretation.

This is different than, say, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who faced the "majority" of folks blindly worshipping a pagan deity. That's a clear case of the majority being wrong. This is different than Galileo, who faced the "majority" of folks arbitrarily and blindly believing that the stars in the sky were nothing more than holes punched in a veil God put around the Earth through which the light from Heaven shined. That's a clear case of the majority being wrong. We are discussing the most studied literary document in the history of the planet. Needless to say, it's quite challenging to come up with new information. You are now opposing extremely learned and knowledgeable scholars who have studied deeply and sincerely the credibility of the New Testament and found it to be true. Even the secular scholars who study the New Testament find it compellingly true (like Lee Strobel or J. Warner Wallace who both became Christians after studying the reliability of the New Testament in depth). At the very least, there is no indication of the NT being false testimony to the historical life of Jesus. Drs. James White, Michael Brown and William Lane Craig have very good defenses for the NT that I would suggest visiting, aside from Lee Strobel and J. Warner Wallace's writings.

Continuing in our logical train of thought, let's briefly go over a couple of extra documents cited to me by Mr. Beshorse to try and show what atheists like Dan Barker call the "fabric" from which Christianity and most other ancient religions are woven. I will discuss the direct opposition to the NT suggested by Mr. Beshorse, but first I must address the criticism against the NT authors, which is based on these extra documents and some others related. These papers are *The Origins of Christianity and the Quest for the Historical Jesus Christ* and *Mithra: The Pagan Christ*, both by Dorothy Milne Murdock (whose dates of birth and of death are coincidentally December 25th, 1961 and 2015, but that's beside the point).

There are a couple things here that need to be pointed out, the first being that this woman was a diehard atheist with a very pronounced bias who used the arguments of

her writings to try and disprove the Old and New Testaments alike. It is as unwise as it is contradictory for a Jew to use these kinds of sources against a Christian such as myself because those same writings are used against the beliefs of Judaism as well. It just doesn't make sense.

The next problem I have with these papers is in the sources used to argue these points. For example, *The Origins of Christianity and the Quest for the Historical Jesus Christ* has many many quotes by Barbara G. Walker, who is an atheist feminist, graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a degree in journalism and whose specialty and primary writing topic was knitting. (Yes, a feminist woman whose specialty was knitting.) She has much to say regarding her disapproval towards the entire Bible, both Old and New Testament because she has a clear pro-women bias and interprets the entirety of scripture as a sexist, morally skewed piece of fiction, heavily influenced by ancient cultures, religions and cults. Are these really the things a Jew wants to use to discredit the Christian worldview?

Ms. Walker is not the only person cited, of course. There are many bibliographical references. There's also a reference to *The Origins of the Mithraic Mysteries* by David Ulansey, who admittedly has a more convincing resume, but when *his* references are checked, we see that the most recent document he cites is from 1987. Almost all the other references are significantly older than that, going back all the way to the late 1800s in Europe.

What's the significance of this? Dr. William Lane Craig in a number of talks he gives, points out a very important point regarding this scenario: Many of the comparisons between ancient mystery cults and Christianity were brought up between the late 1800s and the 1930s by anti-Semitic European scholars, many of which were German theologians. OF COURSE they're going to scavenge history for any hint and minor indication that maybe, just maybe, all of these Judeo-centered world views are fraudulent. Are these really the things a Jew wants to use to discredit the Christian worldview?

The very first thing it says in *Mithra: The Pagan Christ* is that it's an article adapted from a chapter in *Suns of God: Krishna, Buddha and Christ Unveiled* as well as excerpts from *The Origins of Christianity* and *The ZEITGEIST Sourcebook*. Well it just so happens that D.M. Murdock wrote all of those papers and we've already gotten to see what kinds of sources Ms. Murdock accepts.

To give you an example of the type of ridiculous claims made by these papers, *The ZEITGEIST Sourcebook* goes on to claim that Jesus is just a pagan sun god, adapted from ancient myths, and that we call Him God's Son when He was originally conceived as "God's Sun". All of us English-speakers just flipped out because obviously this means that the son-sun homophone is universal, right?

Wrong. And there are many other fantastical claims made in these papers. There are comparisons from all kinds of ancient mystery cults and pagan religions. I've even heard comparisons between Jesus and Odysseus. One comparison that's very common in these kinds of books is Jesus's virgin birth versus that of characters like Mithra. Folks

like to throw that around, saying Mithra was also born of a virgin in a cave, witnessed by shepherds. The reality is that records of Mithra's birth tell that he emerged from a rock. I suppose it could be said that the rock was a virgin...

Basically what they are trying to imply is that a few people in the first centuries of the Common Era (maybe their names really were Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, and maybe not) conspired to create a new religion designed to control the masses and become very wealthy people. For this I recommend seeing just about any video on YouTube refuting the claims in the Zeitgeist Addendum movie (which is the almost identical documentary of the book). Additionally, to get an idea of the “**parallelomania**” that goes on in these kinds of investigations, I strongly recommend a debate between Dan Barker and James White, available on YouTube.

In that debate, Dr. White brings up a point that's very important. What these writings expect us to believe based on their questionably biased and unreliable sources is that Mark and the gang were sitting around an adobe house one day in 1st Century Palestine and they got this brilliant idea. “Why don't we make a new religion? To do so, we'll take some principles and characters from Greek mythology, and Egyptian mythology, and Roman mythology, and some Eastern mystery cults, change the names a bit, and make one brand new religion out of it!” And so they do just that. But the problem with that theory is this: Contextually, what this is saying is that the gospel writers, being the brilliant educated writers they allegedly were, thought it would be realistic to expect the extremely prejudiced Jews of Palestine, who detested all pagan cultures (we know this especially from the relationship they had with the Romans and Samaritans and other people groups at the time) and were familiar with the pagan gods, mythologies, and deities held by other people around them, to accept this Christ that was so “evidently” cut out from all these pagan mythological fables. If you ask me, that's pretty farfetched.

If that's not enough, any scholar trying to get to the bottom of these anti-Judeo texts will ask, “Alright, the sources are questionable, and have already been very thoroughly refuted. What publishing company was behind all of these D.M. Murdock publications?” That scholar will likely feel no surprise when he or she reads that the publishing company is one called Stellar House Publishing, founded by the very D.M. Murdock herself. Is this really a reliable source that's telling you the truth, or is this a biased person who seems to have a grudge against just about any organized theistic religion, who would go out of her way to fabricate lies and even create her own publishing company to make sure her stories are divulged?

Reader, you've got to know what it is you're reading and preferably know why you believe what you believe before diving into some of these things. I insist that the most important thing we can try and determine for this paper is whether or not the New Testament is truthful (Dr. James White has a number of talks regarding this very topic online). There is much evidence in favor of the New Testament, and only a handful of anti-Semitic atheist writings that have been greatly refuted by believers and non-believers alike. Please check these things before you go believing any old lie you stumble across on the internet. I almost fell for the D.M. Murdock trap back when I heard these things for the

first time in 2012, and I never felt dumber in my whole life than when I heard the debunking of her theories.

I think Paul is the only one, having grown up in Tarsus, that a case could be made against because in Tarsus he could've had more exposure than any other apostle to pagan religions and Eastern mystery cults. But even so, there's no evidence that suggest different to what he says in his own writings, that he was a devout Jew his whole life. He, too, would have found those pagan religions to be completely repulsive. On the other hand, there is evidence showing that the New Testament writings were in circulation as early as the beginning of the 2nd century CE (might I suggest googling "p52"), literally hundreds of years before the famed Council of Nicea and we know that the gospels were accepted eye-witness accounts of the life of Jesus that many Jews were even accepting because they had heard and seen for themselves the wonders that Jesus performed. Had they been falsehoods, they would have been denounced.

At the council of Nicea, what they discussed was the deity of Jesus and the opposition was unanimously voted against. They were not concerned about the NT writing because by then they already had the complete NT!

And what about P52, the oldest preserved NT writing? It's important to note that P52 is written on both sides, suggesting it was a part of a sewn codex rather than a manuscript, which in turn suggests that by the second century CE (if not sooner), parts of the NT were in circulation. In the hypothetical event that the Council of Nicea DID meddle with the NT texts, you will find I am not easily convinced that they sat down and fabricated the whole thing as a lie to control masses.

Lastly, most of the apostles were martyrs, including Paul. Christians were persecuted all through the third century CE. Why would they fabricate things that would get them all killed? There was no high status or fortune to be gained from writing something like the NT, only death and persecution.

With that out of the way, I'll proceed to a point-by-point analysis of Mr. Besherse's accusations against Jesus and the New Testament based on the Tanakh (Old Testament).

Genealogies, not chronologies

To start off, Mr. Besherse's very first attack on Jesus as the Messiah brings the gospel genealogies to the center of the stage. We are told that Matthew's account of the genealogy is clearly fraudulent because it is missing people, and yet they are counted in three sets of 14 to try and deceive the reader of the time (most likely a Jew) into believing there is some connection with the Davidic number: 14. Then we are told there are a couple more problems to deal with. Jesus would have to be of the seed of David, through the royal line of Solomon to be considered eligible for kingship, which He's not because He was supposedly not the biological son of Joseph. The third

problem with Jesus's candidacy is that even if He *was* Joseph's son, his bloodline is traced back through Jeconiah who brought a very explicit curse upon himself and his family in Jeremiah 22: 18-30 that prohibits himself and his children from reigning over Israel.

Now, please sit tight while I work through these apparent problems. Mind you, these are not excuses, but rather explanations. Even in the worst case scenario of not finding a clear cut answer to questions of the Bible, as John Piper says, we should be slow to throw out a book that has proved itself over and over for thousands of years as the mighty, saving, transforming word of God, even in the face of seeming contradictions.

To understand the Bible as a whole, not only the genealogies, we must take into consideration the fact that it was written with intent, a concept I had known, but hadn't quite put together the relevance until speaking with my pastor recently. This basically means that the writers of the Bible, including the gospels, had a specific message from God to communicate to a specific audience. We learn from the Bible to this day though we are thousands of years and thousands of kilometers removed, but each book was written at a specific time for a specific audience.

So what does that have to do with anything? Well, because of that and the context we read in books like the gospels, we can know that Matthew and Luke had specific audiences in mind when they wrote their books. Luke even says in his opening statement that he is directing his investigative narration to Theophilus, who is believed to be a Roman man who hired Luke to make an impartial study on the stories of a man that he had heard of named Jesus. Based on the details Matthew highlights in his account, it is believed that his target audience was the Jewish population.

Also, this may come as a surprise for you, it's extremely common for genealogies in the Bible to jump from a person A all the way to a descendant B several generations down the line and say that A was the father of B. This happens because maybe the writer isn't interested in pointing out every single person in the middle. Maybe the writer is pointing out specific ancestors that have some common factor of interest, or maybe nobody is familiar with those others so there's no point in mentioning them. There are even times when, for example, if a man dies, his brother will marry his widow and the children of that marriage will be considered children of the deceased man. And then you have the added complication of people having more than one name or a changed name. Abraham was Abram, Israel was Jacob, Paul was Saul, Peter was Simon, Matthew was Levi... The list goes on. What I'm trying to say is genealogies are not the same as chronologies and shouldn't be held to the same rigidity.

Instances like these are all over the Bible. Take, for example, Zilpah in Genesis 30:9-13 and Genesis 46:18. Did she bare two children or sixteen, or did the first two bare the sixteen that followed?

As pastor Wayne McKellips points out, Matthew 1:8 says Joram fathered Uzziah, but the first book of Chronicles 3:11-12 says Joram fathered Ahaziah, who fathered Joash, who fathered Amaziah, who fathered Azariah, who we learn in 2 Chronicles 26:1-2 was also called Uzziah. I think that if Matthew wanted to skip a few people in his genealogy account, that's perfectly fine, and if he wanted to illustrate the Davidic number in the process, even better! It would be no different from genealogy tradition up until that point.

Moving on, we find that within Matthew's genealogy account, a particular name is mentioned and the average onlooker may not realize who it is. Chapter 1:11-12 mentions these names in Jesus's ancestry:

¹¹ and Josiah the father of Jeconiah [that is, Jehoiachin] and his brothers at the time of the exile to Babylon. ¹²After the exile to Babylon: **Jeconiah was the father of Shealtiel, Shealtiel the father of Zerubbabel...**

What Mr. Besherse, and other Jews who claim Jesus is not the Messiah, have a problem with here is the appearance of Jeconiah (or Jehoiachin) among the forefathers of Jesus because of what it says in Jeremiah 22:24-30 (NIV).

²⁴ "As surely as I live," declares the Lord, **"even if you, Jehoiachin son of Jehoiakim king of Judah, were a signet ring on my right hand, I would still pull you off.** ²⁵ I will deliver you into the hands of those who want to kill you, those you fear – Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon and the Babylonians. ²⁶ I will hurl you and the mother who gave you birth into another country, where neither of you was born, and there you will both die. ²⁷ **You will never come back to the land you long to return to."**

²⁸ Is this man Jehoiachin a despised, broken pot, an object no one wants? Why will **he and his children** be hurled out, cast into a land they do not know?

²⁹ O land, land, land,
hear the word of the Lord!

³⁰ This is what the Lord says: **"Record this man as if childless, a man who will not prosper in his lifetime, For none of his offspring will prosper, none will sit on the throne of David or rule anymore in Judah."**

This is a very explicit passage in which it seems God declares the entire gene pool from Jeconiah downward ineligible to rule Israel. Notice that Matthew specifies Shealtiel, Jeconiah's son, and Zerubbabel, Jeconiah's grandson as ancestors of Jesus's earthly father. Thus, the immediate conclusion is that Jesus is ineligible to be the Messiah 1) because he's technically not directly of the seed of David, but rather the alleged Son of God and 2) because if He is the son of Joseph, then He is a descendant of Jeconiah and is not able to be the King.

But before we jump there, let's see what other passages have to say, and consider the merciful character of God in the midst of all of this. Turn with me to Haggai 2.

²⁰ The word of the Lord came to Haggai a second time on the twenty-fourth day of the month: ²¹ "Speak to **Zerubbabel, governor of Judah**: I am going to shake the heavens and the earth. ²² I will overturn royal thrones and destroy the power of the Gentile kingdoms. I will overturn chariots and their riders. Horses and their riders will fall, each by his brother's sword. ²³ On that day" –this is the declaration of the Lord of Hosts– "I will take you, **Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel, My servant**" –this is the Lord's declaration– "**and make you like My signet ring, for I have chosen you.**" This is the declaration of the Lord of Hosts.

Now, clearly, this is an indication that, as promised, the Messiah's kingship would come through David and through Zerubbabel, and there are other passages that speak similarly, like Zechariah 4:7. And since the royalty was transferred through Solomon, it only makes sense for the Messiah to eventually come through Zerubbabel because his is, to my knowledge, the last and furthest recorded list of descendants of David in the Old Testament.

Notice it is clearer now than before that Jeconiah's curse was much shorter term than what Mr. Besherse would like us to impulsively believe based on Jeremiah 22 alone. God pronounced him childless, but he had children. God declared he would not prosper in his lifetime, and yet the 2 Kings 25:27-28 tells us that he was given a very exalted seat of honor in Babylon. God pronounced his children would not rule over Judah, yet we just read about his grandson Zerubbabel being the governor of Judah, and not only that, but God calling him His chosen **signet ring**.

That terminology is no accident, as God calls Jeconiah a REMOVED signet ring in Jeremiah 22:24.

To go even *further*, Genesis 3:14-15, considered the very first Messianic prophecy, tells us this:

14 Then the Lord God said to the serpent:

Because you have done this, you are cursed more than any livestock and more than any wild animal. You will move on your belly and eat dust all the days of your life.

15 I will put hostility between you and the woman, and **between your seed and her seed. He will strike your head, and you will strike his heel.**

I've known this to be a Messianic prophecy for a long time, but I hadn't quite connected the dots on it. We're not being told that man's seed will strike the head of the serpent, but the woman's seed. God Himself is declaring the woman's seed the valuable asset in this whole ordeal. This gives us a license to trace Jesus's bloodline through His mother, which happens to be what Luke does in his genealogical account.

We have Jesus traced back to whom? David. And Jesus is eligible for kingship of Israel because his earthly father is traced through whom and to whom? Through Solomon, to David. So we see that Jesus is, in fact, a blood-descendant of David, worthy of kingship both by adoption into the line of Solomon and by divine appointment in Luke 1:26-38, not to mention all the other Old Testament prophecy.

Almah in context

Mr. Besherse brings up the original text of the virgin birth prophecy in Isaiah 7 and clearly indicates to us that the word that it uses, *almah*, doesn't literally mean virgin but rather "young maiden of marriageable age", not necessarily a virgin. A review of Strong's most recent Expanded Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible reveals that in context it clearly refers to a young virgin woman. It is the word used to refer to Rebekah in Genesis 24:43 and it is the word used to refer to virgins in Song of Solomon 6:8 and its most common use in the Bible is to describe a virgin. A Hebrew reading this in context would have interpreted the word to mean "virgin", so if you want to interpret it differently, that's fine, but you have less basis for the theory that *almah* was referring to a young woman and not a virgin.

This happens even in our day. Let's say my wife walks in the room and I say to her, "How was your day, baby?" Thousands of years from now, someone may look back and think I am calling my wife an infant, but the reality is that, in context, that word doesn't literally mean "very young child". If I were to walk out of my locked house without my keys, I may very well exclaim, "Oh crap!" Thousands of years later, people may recall that exclamation and think I'm talking about literal excrement, when that is not the case. From the rest of the Bible, we can know that *almah* is a perfectly viable term used to mean *virgin*.

Analyzing this passage, we come to Isaiah 7:13

13 Isaiah said, "Listen, **house of David!** Is it not enough for you to try the patience of men? Will you also try the patience of my God? 14 Therefore, the Lord Himself will give you a sign: The virgin will conceive, have a son, and name him Immanuel.

Based on context, you could even interpret that this sign of a virgin birth was NOT the sign intended for Ahaz because when told to ask for a sign and refusing to do so, Isaiah fumes at him and starts prophesying to the whole **house of David**. Based on how chapter 8 immediately picks up with the birth of an actual child of Isaiah named *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* (whose name was commanded by God for a reason and has a clear direct relation to the sign of Ahaz), I personally find it much easier to say that that is the sign God meant for Ahaz, and not the prophecy in Isaiah 7:13-25. Even

Isaiah 8:5 and beyond seems separate from the first four verses of the chapter, as if there are other things completely unrelated to Ahaz that God is showing Isaiah.

These setting “jumps” shouldn’t come as a surprise considering Isaiah 8:14 makes a leap to a very direct prophecy of how the Messiah would be a sanctuary, but to the two houses of Israel He would be a stumbling stone. These jumps are not unusual and I hope Mr. Besherse doesn’t take it as an excuse on my part. Just look at Isaiah 8:18, which seems to jump to a completely different scenario, starting right in the middle of the chapter.

Perhaps further reading and understanding will change the way I see these passages. But even if Isaiah 7:14 refers to a young maiden who will give birth to a son as a sign for Ahaz right in that time period, but I don’t believe there is enough information to be able to say it only refers to a maiden of the day of Ahaz, or of the Messiah born of a virgin, or even both. It is common for prophecies to have both short and long term fulfillments, after all.

If that's the method with which God chooses to bring about the Messiah, what is man and his *interpretation* of prophecy to say otherwise. Once again, what I'm trying to point out here is that Jesus shouldn't be discredited based solely on the interpretation of Bernie Besherse of the Old Testament Prophecies. And we’ve already been over the atheist claims that Jesus’s virgin birth is plagiarism from other ancient religions. Horus was the son of Isis, who was married to her brother Osiris, not a virgin. Mithra spawned from a rock, not a virgin. And I don’t know who else was allegedly born of a virgin, but by that point the source’s credibility has already gone down the drain.

Biblical parallels are kind of a thing

Mr. Besherse is very quick to point out what he interprets as clear misreads of the Old Testament and unforgivable errors by Matthew in chapter 2. Here is one of the passages he points out:

15 He stayed there until Herod’s death, so that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled: Out of Egypt I called My Son.

I personally fail to see the confusion here and I’ll tell you why. This is a reference to Hosea 11:1, which says:

When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called My son.

Clearly this is a reference to Israel and in context it seems it’s referring undoubtedly to the Exodus from Egypt and goes on to talk about the love and compassion God feels for His people despite their departing from Him, sacrificing to Baals, and burning

offerings to idols. Honestly now, do we *really* think Matthew didn't know this beforehand? Of course he did! What he's doing in his account of the life of Jesus is draw the parallel between Israel and Jesus, saying that both Jesus and Israel were called children of God. You and I are also called children of God. No problem so far.

As with much of the New Testament text, we're told immediately by Mr. Besherse to disregard this as error.

Matthew 2

¹⁶ Then Herod, when he saw that he had been outwitted by the wise men, flew into a rage. He gave orders to massacre all the male children in and around Bethlehem who were two years old and under, in keeping with the time he had learned from the wise men. ¹⁷ Then what was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet was fulfilled:

¹⁸ A voice was heard in Ramah,
weeping, and great mourning,
Rachel weeping for her children;
and she refused to be consoled,
because they were no more.

Verse 18 is almost a word-for-word quote of Jeremiah 31:15. Mr. Besherse is very fast at accusing Matthew of Tanakh ignorance, but let's look at this for a moment. In context it would initially seem that what Jeremiah is talking about is the return of Israelite captives and the figurative lament of Rachel.

Mr. Besherse points this out as one more fatal mistake by Matthew, who I guess couldn't recognize that the Jeremiah passage refers to God liberating the captives of Israel and not to the killing of Bethlehem infants by Herod. Ok, that's one way to look at it. It seems this is yet another example of Mr. Besherse's to point things out as mistakes instead of looking a little deeper.

How many of you knew that Rachel was buried in Bethlehem when she died? Genesis 35 tells us:

¹⁹ So Rachel died and was buried on the way to Ephrath (that is, Bethlehem). ²⁰ Jacob set up a marker on her grave; it is the marker at Rachel's grave to this day.

So I have a quick question. If Jeremiah figuratively described the passing of many Israelites as the lament of Rachel, does that mean no one else can? Can Matthew not use the same comparison when Israelite infants are being killed in the town where she was buried, or does that make him an ignorant blaspheming manipulator of scripture? You be the judge. Was it prophecy per se? Doesn't look like it. But has Matthew revealed his "true ignorance of scripture"? Definitely not.

The way I see it, in the best case scenario, you could even make an argument that Jeremiah 31:15 actually *is* prophetic since when you read it, it could seem to you that it doesn't quite fit the verses around it. Everyone is joyful and blissful coming out of captivity except Rachel, which is odd at the very least. And worst case scenario, it's not prophetic at all and it's talking about something entirely different than Matthew, but the situation with Herod killing infants reminded Matthew of the lament of Rachel in the book of Jeremiah. Either way, he had to be very familiar with scripture in order to pull out that kind of reference, so ignorant is definitely not how I would describe Matthew.

Besides, parallels in scripture happen ALL THE TIME! And yes, in the Old Testament, too! Look at Genesis 18:28 and Numbers 16:22. Look at Exodus 14:21 and 2 Kings 2:14. God chose Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and David (all the youngest and most seemingly unfit for greatness) to take on some of His most amazing tasks. Over and over, and within the Old Testament itself, there are similar scenarios that repeat themselves. There are recurring trends that seem to reappear. They are not prophecies; they are parallels, and it's completely normal for them to show up in the Bible. Is Matthew not allowed to draw these parallels for some reason?

I see no issue here.

Love your enemy?

When discussing Matthew 5:43, I personally think it's very important to note Jesus did NOT say, "It is written." He said, "You have heard that it was said..."

The passage goes like this:

⁴³ "You have heard that **it was said**, Love your neighbor and hate your enemy. ⁴⁴ But I tell you, love your enemy and pray for those who persecute you, ⁴⁵ so that you may be sons of your Father in heaven. For He causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous. ⁴⁶ For if you love those who love you, what reward will you have? Don't even the tax collectors do the same? ⁴⁷ And if you greet only your brothers, what are you doing out of the ordinary? Don't even the gentiles do the same? ⁴⁸ Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

So what are we seeing here? Mr. Beshorse seems to think that "the writer of Matthew" (here Bernie hints that it wasn't even Matthew who wrote it) either didn't really know

Torah law or was making up clever additions for it, because the book of Leviticus actually says this in chapter 19:

¹⁷“you must not harbor hatred against your brother. Rebuke your neighbor directly, and you will not incur guilt because of him. ¹⁸Do not take revenge or bear a grudge against members of your community, but love your neighbor as yourself; I am Yahweh.

So I pose the question for you: Is it **written** to love your neighbor and hate your enemy, or was it **said** to love your neighbor and hate your enemy? If you want to be extremely literal, Jesus wasn't quoting scripture word for word, but rather quoting some oral saying that was common at the time. As a matter of fact, by being this legalistic about the New Testament, and condemning it every two phrases because of a disagreement regarding interpretation, Mr. Besherse is harming his own position. Just read Psalm 139:21-22 and then we'll talk about whether people were loving or hating their enemies in the time of Jesus, and even way before that.

Exodus 23 and Proverbs 24 and 25 explicitly tell us to aid our enemies when we can, to feed them when given the opportunity, and to not rejoice when our enemies fall. Strange wording or not, this passage cannot be used to accuse Jesus or Matthew or Matthew's ghost writer of adding to the Torah law or misconstruing it in any way. Rather, Jesus is found once again reaffirming the law He said He was here to fulfill and not to destroy.

Lord of the Sabbath

Many of us may be familiar with the passage in Matthew 12 regarding the time when Jesus and his disciples picked grain to eat on the Sabbath and were confronted by the Pharisees. They accuse Jesus and His followers of breaking the law of the Sabbath, but Jesus goes on to defend himself and his disciples by saying, “Haven’t you read what David and those who were with him did when he was hungry – how he entered the house of God, and took and ate the sacred bread, which is not lawful for any but the priests to eat? He even gave some to those who were with him. (...) The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath.”

Jesus not only quotes silencing scripture, but goes on to make the bolder claim that He is the Lord of the Sabbath. He claims ownership of one of the holiest and the most ancient statutes of Jewish tradition, and we are told in the scripture that the Pharisees did not even try to contest Him when He said that.

In his paper, Mr. Besherse quotes the Old Testament in an attempt to argue that the books of Matthew and Mark were “most likely written by Greeks or Romans who only had a rudimentary understanding of the Tanakh” because, according to Bernie, in the original passage (1 Samuel 21) David was clearly alone and there was no one with him for him to have shared the bread with, contrary to what Jesus describes.

The problem with Bernie’s theory is that, taken out of context, it would seem as though 1 Samuel 21:1 would discredit Jesus’s version of the story. That sometimes happens when you read only one verse. It seems curiosity didn’t bring Mr. Besherse to read the very next verses, where it says:

² David answered Ahimelech the priest, “The king gave me a mission, but he told me, ‘Don’t let anyone know anything about the mission I’m sending you on or what I have ordered you to do.’ **I have stationed my young men at a certain place.** ³ Now what do you have on hand? Give me five loaves of bread or whatever can be found.” ⁴ The priest told him, “There is no ordinary bread on hand. However, there is consecrated bread, but **the young men may eat it only if they have kept themselves from women.**” ⁵ David answered him, “I swear that women are being kept from us, as always when I go out to battle. **The young men’s bodies are consecrated even on an ordinary mission, so of course their bodies are consecrated today.**” ⁶ So the priest gave him the consecrated bread, for there was no bread there except the bread of the Presence that had been removed from the presence of the Lord. When the bread was removed, it had been replaced with warm bread.

Would this be considered context enough for Jesus's version to be considered valid? I would sure hope so, since Mr. Besherse has challenged the reader (and me directly in our communication) to demonstrate with Old Testament that his deductions are incorrect. It's unfortunate he is so quick to call any Christian response an excuse; a simple reading of subsequent verses was all it took this time.

Is blood sacrifice REALLY not needed?

Repeatedly Mr. Besherse makes claims against Christianity that, at first glance, will cause those who don't take a second glance to stutter in their faith. Another example of this is when we're told that there is no verse prescribing the shedding of blood in any form of offering to atone for sins. In this case, a third glance may be necessary because at the second glance I confirmed that this is true. No Old Testament verse will guide you on how to perform blood sacrifices to atone for sins because the atonement that is instructed in the Torah is for the event of **unintentional sins**. The first few verses of Leviticus 4 are a great example of this. A case could be made for the scapegoat of Leviticus 16, but still that is not a blood sacrifice.

Bernie directs us to a great example showing repentance and the turning away from previous transgressions as sufficient for the forgiveness for sins: Ezekiel 18:27-28. Just as the Christian believes repentance and, given that we now have the New Testament, confession of faith in Jesus as Messiah is all that's required for salvation. The addition of Jesus Messiah to the salvation formula poses no conflict for the Old Testament because, clearly, there was no Messiah for people to believe in before Jesus. That is a simple matter to deal with.

Now, back to blood sacrifices not atoning for sin. Numbers 25 tells us:

6 An Israelite man came bringing a Midianite woman to his relatives in the sight of Moses and the whole Israelite community while they were weeping at the entrance to the tent of meeting. **7 When Phinehas son of Eleazar**, son of Aaron the priest, saw this, he **got up from the assembly, took a spear in his hand, 8 followed the Israelite man into the tent, and drove it through both the Israelite man and the woman – through her belly. Then the plague on the Israelites stopped,** 9 but those who died in the plague numbered 24,000.

10 The Lord spoke to Moses, 11 “Phinehas son of Eleazar, son of Aaron the priest, has turned back My wrath from the Israelites because he was zealous among them with My zeal, so that I did not destroy the Israelites in My zeal. 12 Therefore declare: I grant him My covenant of peace. 13 It will be a covenant of perpetual priesthood for him and his future descendants because he was zealous for his God and **made atonement for the Israelites.**”

Why couldn't the rebellious Israelites just say sorry? Why couldn't this rebellious man whose name, Zumri, is only mentioned a little later, just apologize? Why did his blood need to be spilled for the atonement of Israel?

The next objection to this rejection of the need of a saving Messiah is further countered by Old Testament passages such as Isaiah 52-53. This is regarded as one of the greatest Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament, so I'm sure Mr. Beshorse is familiar with it. I will include the entire passage here so that it can be reread in its entirety:

Chapter 52

13 See, My Servant will act wisely; He will be raised and lifted up and greatly exalted.

14 Just as many were appalled at You [other translations read "Him"]— His appearance was **so disfigured that He did not look like a man, and His form did not resemble a human being—**

15 so **He will sprinkle many nations**. Kings will shut their mouths because of Him, for **they will see what had not been told them, and they will understand what they had not heard.**

Chapter 53

1 Who has believed what we have heard? And who has the arm of the Lord been revealed to?

2 He grew up before Him like a young plant and like a root out of dry ground. He **didn't have an impressive form or majesty that we should look at Him, no appearance that we should desire Him.**

3 He was **despised and rejected by men, a man of suffering who knew what sickness was**. He was **like someone people turned away from; He was despised, and we didn't value Him.**

4 Yet He Himself **bore our sicknesses**, and He **carried our pains**; but we in turn **regarded Him stricken, struck down by God, and afflicted.**

5 But **He was pierced because of our transgressions, crushed because of our iniquities; punishment for our peace** was on Him, and **we are healed by His wounds.**

6 **We all went astray like sheep; we all have turned to our own way;**

and the Lord has punished Him for the iniquity of us all.

7 He was **oppressed and afflicted**, yet He did not open His mouth. **Like a lamb led to the slaughter and like a sheep silent before her shearers**, He did not open His mouth.

8 He was **taken away because of oppression and judgment**; and who considered His fate? For He was **cut off from the land of the living**; He was **struck because of my people's rebellion**.

9 They **made His grave with the wicked** and with a rich man at His death, although **He had done no violence** and had not spoken deceitfully.

10 Yet the Lord was pleased to **crush Him severely**. When You make Him **a restitution offering**, He will see His seed, He will prolong His days, and by His hand, the Lord's pleasure will be accomplished.

11 He will see it **out of His anguish**, and He will be satisfied with His knowledge. **My righteous Servant will justify many**, and **He will carry their iniquities**.

12 Therefore I will give Him the many as a portion, and He will receive the mighty as spoil, because **He submitted Himself to death**, and was **counted among the rebels**; yet **He bore the sin of many** and **interceded for the rebels**.

I feel as though I could not add a single thing to this that could make it more evident that what is being described is the crucifixion of Jesus, His utter physical destruction, His beatings, His lashings, His suffering... All of this, as said in verses 4-6 and 10-12, for the sins, transgressions, iniquity, and restitution of all. As Paul boldly boasted in his weakness and the strength of the resurrection of Jesus, so I will declare right now that there is not a single person, man or divine, past, present or future, who fits this description better than Jesus of Nazareth.

Did you catch the blood reference in 52:15? It's a clear reference to verses like Exodus 24:8, Ezekiel 43:18, and a great many others all throughout Leviticus and other books. I'll give you a hint on what they're sprinkling: It's red, thick, and every one of

us has it inside. Mr. Besherse challenges the readers of his papers to present Old Testament (Tanakh) references to support our disagreements. I hope he will sit through my paper and objectively consider his positions.

Also, I propose a follow up explanation (not an excuse, as Bernie would like to call it) for the fact that there is no Old Testament offering for intentional transgression:

Had there been such a thing as an offering for intentional sin, then Jesus would not have done anything for the sins of those who lived before Him. All the Israelites who were faithful to the Judeo rituals would have spent their life earnings, savings and inheritances in sacrifices to atone for their unrighteousness, but in the end, would have been considered just as blameless and perfect as Christ.

This sounds to me, based on God's character, omnipotence and omniscience, that He had a plan from the very beginning. Scholars like John Piper even argue this was the plan from before Creation itself. There was no Messiah in the days of Noah, or the patriarchs, or Moses, or David, or Isaiah, for anyone to declare Savior and King of Kings, but the fact is that since Christ's blood is the only one that can redeem all sins, there could be no other redeeming blood sacrifice before Him. No other offering could be worthy. No other blood could clean the entire planet. No other act could have demonstrated the love of the Father for His children, the love of the Son for His friends. So until His coming, God accepted plain repentance and confession because in His timeless realm, Jesus had already been sacrificed in payment for iniquity.

Say what you want about no blood sacrifices being necessary in the Old Testament. This prophecy draws a perfect picture of Jesus's sacrifice for the sins of the world and the only "excuses" I've heard from Judaism for Isaiah 53 are very unsatisfactory. There's Abraham, who wasn't tortured or crushed for the sins of anyone. And then there's the nation of Israel, which, granted, has undergone incredible torture and disfiguration, but could NEVER be considered the perfect Lamb of God due to its generalized secularity and inherent sinful humanity. In spite of the unbelievable and unshaking Jewish faith that has survived throughout the millennia, the fact is the nation itself of Israel and the culturally Jewish people around the world are largely atheistic. Therefore, the global Jewish community that has suffered harsh persecution and segregation is not fit to atone for the sins of the many. It would be easier to explain the woes of the Israelites in the last hundred years as judgment for yet again turning away from the Father than it would be to justify calling them the servant referred to in Isaiah 52 and 53.

I would implore both you, the reader, and Bernie Besherse, to see in the entirety of the Bible how God continually does things in such a way that no other person or thing can be worthy of credit. Look at how God brings Israel out of Egypt and into the Promise Land. Look at how He brought down the walls of Jericho in such a way that no person can claim even partial credit. Look at how he reduced Gideon's army to 300 before defeating the Midianites. The most any of us can claim credit for is obedience, but the power behind any miracle is foreign to us and can only be credited to God. To Him and Him alone be all the glory.

One other point Mr. Besherse tries to make against Jesus is that no prophecy foretells of the miracles He allegedly performed, but why is that such a shocker, considering all the other times God has done ANY direct intervening in the pages of human history? Look at God's immutable character from beginning to end: that of a powerful father paining for his children. Malachi 3:6 and Numbers 23:19 speak of a God who does not change. I beg you to look at His character and judge for yourself. God RARELY does things the way man first pictures them and ALWAYS demands the faith from His followers before carrying anything out. God ALWAYS displays His, and ONLY HIS, glory in His interventions, all throughout the OT and NT so that nobody can take His place. The coming of Jesus being different from what Jewish tradition expected MAKES SENSE. The fact that no blood sacrifice ever covered anything more than accidental sin is yet another example of God bringing the glory of His grace back to Him, rather than solely on our repentance and the virtue in OUR humility. Look at His character, then look at Jesus, and see for yourself what the face of God looks like.

And to finish on this particular point of discussion brought up by Bernie, Ezekiel's description of a magnificent temple is referred to as an image straight from our afterlife in the presence of God. Indeed, it would be very strange for us to have a temple set apart for sacrifices after the coming of the sacrificed Messiah. There is one problem, though: It is not said at any time to have been an apocalyptic prophecy. Some scholars have concluded that it is, but again Mr. Besherse is taking something out of context and adding his own interpretation to it to prove a point that's not really there. It is definitely harder to conclude, based on no reference at all, that this is a prophecy of the Messianic Era than it is to conclude, based on factual events recorded in the New Testament pertaining to the life and death of Jesus, that Isaiah 52 and 53 have been fulfilled in Him. Read that sentence again, think about it, and see if you agree. In light of the already come and gone Messiah, I'm much more inclined to accept a different interpretation than this Messianic Era view of Ezekiel's vision.

Did Jesus say He was a false prophet?

I find that this paper is continually easier to rebut because each claim is more fantastic and far-fetched than the previous one, and relies on stranger and stranger verses, all taken out of context. This is the kind of paper that I implore readers to double check because if you take these kinds of claims at face value, you're bound to have a totally unnecessary spiritual identity crisis.

We have to remember the Bible itself tells us the Messiah would be sacrificed, rejected by His people, beaten to the point of not resembling a person... These are things that we just read in the scriptures I included above, and there are others like it. It is to be expected that people of Jewish belief will go to fantastic lengths to try and disprove and reject what prophecy says they will: the Messiah.

Mr. Besherse next argues that Jesus Himself claims to be a false prophet, once again using out of context and misinterpreted verses to prove his point. It's even odd for me to read a text like Mr. Besherse's, where the New Testament is so undervalued and yet quoted as if the text does, indeed, bear weight. Matthew 26:31 is the next passage used:

Then saith Jesus unto them, "All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. (KJV)

We are next led to believe simply because Bernie says so in the next sentence that it is evident that Jesus is calling Himself the shepherd and his disciples the sheep, and that the "bad guy" doing the smiting is either Herod of Rome or the Jews, depending on whom one wishes to cast the blame for the death of Jesus. We get the original passage from Zechariah 13:7, which says this in context:

God's People Cleansed

¹ "On that day a fountain will be opened for the house of David and for the residents of Jerusalem, **to wash away sin and impurity.** ² On that day" – this is the declaration of the lord of Hosts – "I will erase the names of the idols from the land, and they will no longer be remembered. I will remove the prophets and the unclean spirit from the land. ³ **If a man still prophesies, his father and his mother who bore him will say to him: You cannot remain alive because you have spoken falsely in the name of Yahweh.** When he prophesies, his father and his mother who bore him will pierce him through. ⁴ On that day every prophet will be ashamed of his vision when he

prophecies; they will not put on a hairy cloak in order to deceive. ⁵ He will say: I am not a prophet; I work the

land, for a man purchased me as a servant since my youth. ⁶ If someone asks him: What are these wounds on your chest? – then he will answer: I received the wounds in the house of my friends.

⁷ Sword, awake against **My shepherd**, against the man who is **My associate** – this is the declaration of the Lord of Hosts. **Strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered**; I will also turn My hand against the little ones. ⁸ In the whole land – this is the Lord’s declaration – two-thirds will be cut off and die, but a third will be left in it. ⁹ **I will put this third through the fire; I will refine them as silver is refined and test them as gold is tested. They will call on My name, and I will answer them.** I will say: They are My people, and they will say: Yahweh is our God.”

I have yet to see where we are expected to interpret that the one doing the smiting is Herod or the Jews and I’m not sure what Bernie intended by mentioning that interpretation. But what Bernie goes on to explain next is that this passage refers specifically to the false prophets and their smiting by God. We are told that this is important because it is “most likely” a Messianic Era prophecy, which in all honesty may or may not be, first of all. This is just another indication that whatever Bernie’s interpretation of scripture and prophecy are, they’re precisely just that: his personal interpretation, subject to his own moral beliefs, to his own doubts, and his own logic.

In this case, in the light of the Jesus Experience, we can now see that, indeed, in this “era”, as Bernie likes to refer to it as, there will be a washing away of sin and impurity. Next, it would seem as though this is referring to the Messiah because God uses terms like “**My shepherd**” and “**My associate**” to describe Him. Would God call a false prophet His shepherd and associate? He says, “**Strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered**” and later Jesus confirms this is the correct interpretation. Because no matter who killed Jesus, God was the one behind it, allowing it to take place.

Do you need an Old Testament passage to tell you that? How about Job 1-42? How about Genesis 35-50? How about any Old Testament passage in which something terrible happened to one of the Bible’s “good guys” and that God had clearly allowed so that some good would come from it. This is NOT God striking down this false shepherd and scattering the sheep underneath him. This is God allowing the striking of the Messiah to wash away sin and impurity and moreover we can definitely say there has

been a removal of prophets since then, as this Zechariah passage seems to indicate. Give me the name of one person considered a prophet since the coming of Jesus. Have there been spiritual revelations? No doubt. Have there been premonitions from God? Sure, why not? Have there been brilliant men and women who have been called by God to take the Gospel around the globe and even witness miracles? Absolutely. Have I personally heard of a single prophet who literally speaks the words from God's mouth in the last 2000 years? No, not even one. This sounds to me like further evidence that Jesus is the Messiah and that this "Shepherd" referred to is none other than the same suffering Savior of the world.

As a side note to this, I find Mr. Besherse is inconsistent in what he believes regarding New Testament. He seems to quote it at convenience and when inconvenient, he simply dismisses it as falsehood and pagan/political concoction from the pagan Constantine government. This is just Mr. Besherse taking what he thinks is convenient for his point so he can say Jesus actually admitted to being a false prophet when that is not the case. Why would the power-hungry NT authors write that Jesus called Himself a false prophet? I see a very biased selection of verses being chosen.

Can you say “communion”?

It seems to me that Bernie is missing the point when it comes to Exodus 12:46 and Numbers 9:12. He is completely right in saying this is not prophecy, but the point he is missing is the reason Jesus’s bones were not broken. What John is saying in chapter 19 is that due to the nature of the sacrifice of Jesus, He is taking the place of the Passover lamb (remember that we just went over parallels in Scripture). The Passover sacrifice’s bones were not to be broken and, therefore, Jesus’s bones were not broken either.

What else was done to the Passover lamb? Its meat is eaten! Are we to eat the meat of Jesus every year? By no means! It just so happens that Jesus gave instructions for this in Luke 22:14-20 when the first communion is described. Believers in Christ are also instructed to keep the practice alive in remembrance of Jesus and His sacrifice. This essentially does away with the Passover sacrifice because Jesus is that sacrifice now.

This is all information I’m sure Mr. Beshorse is completely aware of, but would dismiss it as an excuse when in reality, everything connects and it is he who is rejecting the Messiah he claims to be waiting for along with most every other Jew.

Let me draw your attention to Hosea 6:

1 Come, **let us return to the Lord. For He has torn us, and He will heal us; He has wounded us, and He will bind up our wounds.**

2 **He will revive us after two days, and on the third day He will raise us up** so we can live in His presence.

3 **Let us strive to know the Lord.** His appearance is as sure as the dawn. He will come to us like the rain, like the spring showers that water the land.

The Lord’s First Lament

4 What am I going to do with you, Ephraim? What am I going to do with you, Judah? **Your loyalty is like the morning mist and like the early dew that vanishes.**

5 This is why I have used the prophets to cut them down; I have killed them with the words of My mouth. My judgment strikes like lightning.

6 For I desire loyalty and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings.

7 But they, like Adam, have violated the covenant;
there they have betrayed Me.

What is this then? Yahweh, God, our Heavenly Father, who communicated basically the entire Jewish culture directly to Moses, with feasts and rituals and sacrifices included, all of a sudden desires loyalty and not sacrifice? For us to know Him instead of give burnt offerings? There's a novelty! Maybe it does make sense for Jesus to take the place of these sacrifices after all, if God is ultimately not interested in those things as much as a relationship with us. Psalm 51:16 says God does not want a sacrifice, that He is not pleased with a burnt offering but rather with a broken spirit and a humbled heart. Furthermore, Hosea 6:6 tells us that God desires loyalty and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings. Micah 6:8 tells us that God requires only that we act justly, love faithfulness and walk humbly with Him.

We are dealing with a deeply personal God who desires a faithful relationship with us. We are not talking about some far off feudal sky-overlord who collects taxes from His people and walks away. This is our Creator and Father, who created us free of sin, free of sacrifices, but with the option to choose to follow Him or follow our own hearts. We chose the latter, and from the OT we see that sin has trickled down to you and me today. If you stick to nothing but the OT, what is next? God stopped inspiring Holy Scripture almost 2500 years ago and your messiah still hasn't shown up. Your nation has forgotten its God and your people are scattered around the whole planet. What if I told you that Messiah really came already and desires for you to see that. He wants it so bad that He paid the price of your sin and asks only that you acknowledge it. He's placed people in your life, maybe including me, to tell you this so that you can know what He did for you and you can love Him as well.

If God is a just God, which we know He is, then He must punish wrongdoing. His nature demands it, His goodness sanctions it and our sin warrants it. Of course He won't accept sin sacrifices before Jesus, because if He did, He wouldn't get the chance to pay for our sins Himself. And in His omniscience, we know that's been the plan since Genesis 1:1 when He commanded light to come forth and shine upon our void Universe. Find me another god who has done the same and I will be truly shocked.

I've already mentioned briefly that the Ezekiel vision of the Temple and the tables for the offerings cannot definitively be categorized as Messianic; that is an assumption. As far as this Mithraic influence on Paul's explanation of Jesus's salvation, I'd like to see the real sources for that information, because it is false that Mithraism and Zoroastrianism proposed the same dying "Savior" type deity. In any case, by the time Paul was around writing epistles right and left, Christianity was already spread throughout the region. Peter was already traveling and sharing the Gospel. And besides, Mr. Besharse, wasn't the New Testament put together at the Council of Nicea? Which is it? Did Paul write blasphemy to fool the ignorant or did the pagans in Nicea invent Paul and everyone else in the NT to control the masses?

To finish with this topic, Galatians 3 has a great explanation for the law:

Galatians 3 says this:

19 Why then was the law given? It was added because
of transgressions until the Seed to whom the promise

was made would come. The law was put into effect through angels by means of a mediator. 20 Now a mediator is not for just one person, but God is one. 21 Is the law therefore contrary to God's promises? Absolutely not! For if a law had been given that was able to give life, then righteousness would certainly be by the law. 22 But the Scripture has imprisoned everything under sin's power, so that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe. 23 Before this faith came, we were confined under the law, imprisoned until the coming faith was revealed. 24 The law, then, was our guardian until Christ, so that we could be justified by faith. 25 But since that faith has come, we are no longer under a guardian, 26 for you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.

No further comment on this for the moment.

“They” thrust “Him” Through

The next assault on the Messiah comes from Zechariah 12, which is ironically, like some of the other verses Mr. Besherse brings up to try and disprove Jesus, another Messianic prophecy that supports His claim.

10 “Then I will pour out a spirit of grace and prayer on the house of David and the residents of Jerusalem, **and they will look at Me whom they pierced.** They will mourn for Him as one mourns for an only child and weep for Him as one weeps for a firstborn.

Let’s ignore the glaring Trinitarian argument that could come up from reading this verse because that’s not what we’re debating here... Actually, let me just paste Mr. Besherse’s preferred unnamed version of this verse and use that instead:

10 And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication; and **they shall look unto Me because [according to my copy of the Masoretic text, this “because” is not there, just saying] they have thrust him through;** and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born. (Unknown)

I will now ask the same questions asked by Mr. Besherse, with his answer to the *left* and mine to the *right*:

Who is doing the piercing?	
<p>In Zechariah, probably Israel, or at least an Israeli.</p> <p>In John 19:36, who was it that is said to have pierced Jesus’s side? A Roman!!! Even if this were prophecy about the death of a messiah (which it certainly does not appear to be), then this essential detail would rule out applying this to Jesus (if Jesus were a messiah). Also, the nation of Israel did not mourn when Jesus died.</p>	<p>Zechariah seems to indicate that it was Israel who thrust through this person. Bernie claims this definitely shows this is not a prophecy of Jesus because it was a Roman who pierced the side of Jesus. But tell me something. If a person is being wrongly put to death because you falsely and purposefully accused him/her, should the person hold you accountable for that, or the judge who is only carrying out the death sentence based on what you say?</p> <p>I believe it’s perfectly fine to hold the Jews accountable for “thrusting through” Him, whether it was the spear or the nails that pinned Him to the cross. As a matter of fact, we non-Jews who believe include ourselves among those who</p>

	<p>thrust through Jesus and killed Him. Our sinful nature sent Him to the cross after all.</p>
--	--

Who is doing the “looking on”?

<p>In Zechariah, probably Israel. In John 19:36, the Romans were looking on. This would not fulfill anything, even if this were a messianic prophesy.</p>	<p>Actually John doesn't really specify who was looking on in 19:37. This parallel was only mentioned in passing while the central fulfillment in verse 36 is the Passover bones not being broken. Looks like Bernie took it a little out of context to try and give a certain point more strength than it actually has.</p>
---	--

Who are they looking at or unto?

<p>In Zechariah, the Almighty ONE. In John 19:36, they are looking at Jesus, a self-described false prophet.</p>	<p>Now this would really have to depend on the version you used, wouldn't it? Obviously I'm not reading every single version, but I haven't found a version that words it the way Bernie's quote does. They all seem to indicate that God was pierced and looked upon. The Trinitarian Christian has no problem explaining that one, but I'd love to hear Bernie's excuse for it. Also, we've already established that Jesus wasn't calling Himself a false prophet; that's a gross stretch of the scripture to prove something that isn't said at all.</p>
--	---

Why are they looking at this one?

<p>In Zechariah, because they need the grace and supplication provided by the Almighty ONE because they have pierced, either figuratively or literally, some man.</p> <p>In John 19:36, the Romans are looking upon Jesus, with contempt, not supplication.</p>	<p>Personally, I don't think this prophecy has been fulfilled yet. Bernie is allowed his personal interpretation of scripture, so I will share mine.</p> <p>In context, it's referring to Israel being opposed by every nation of the Earth (v. 2, 3) and then God basically demolishing everyone who rises against it (v. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9). Then in v. 10, the house of David will receive a spirit of grace poured upon it because they will turn unto God and mourn over the Messiah, whose death is directly laid on their hands and they now realize what they've done.</p> <p>I draw this conclusion because of prophecy books I've read by people like Timothy McHyde and from the fact that none of what is described here happened in the days of Jesus. Regardless, John 19 doesn't quite say who's looking on.</p>
<p>Who was pierced?</p>	
<p>This might possibly refer to the false prophet in Zechariah 13, but you will have to decide this for yourself. As for me, I am simply reserving judgment until there is sufficient evidence to make up my mind who was pierced.</p>	<p>Depending on the version of the Bible you read, God Himself was pierced. But at the very least, the reader can decide if what I'm saying makes more sense in context than what Mr. Besherse is saying. His interpretation is even left with a gaping hole because he can't say who this person is.</p>
<p>Why was he pierced?</p>	
<p>I would have to again reserve judgment, as above. I'm not going to make up a story to make these passages fit a pre-conceived belief that Jesus was or wasn't the messiah. It isn't intellectually honest.</p>	<p>Christ was tortured in a great many number of ways, one of which was to be pierced by nails, pinned to the cross on which he died for the sins of the world, as described by the Old Testament prophets we've covered previously.</p>

Three days and three nights, indeed...

The last accusation brought up by Mr. Besherse in this writing has to do with Matthew 12:39-40 (HCSB).

39 But He answered them, “An evil and adulterous generation demands a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. 40 For as Jonah was in the belly of the huge fish three days and three nights, so the Son of Man will be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights.

If you're a Christian, chances are you've heard this passage before. After casting out a demon, Jesus is accused of using satanic power to accomplish it. He rebukes those around Him and is asked for another sign (by His reaction, it's probably safe to say it was requested with clear sarcasm). His next answer is the foretelling of His death and resurrection as the greatest sign that will be given. We've already seen this alluded to in Hosea 6:2. Any one of us would say it's important for Him to get it right.

Jesus is foretelling His death and resurrection after three days. You might think back to that one week a year when we celebrate things like Palm Sunday, Good Friday, and Easter Sunday... You think back to Jesus being crucified on Friday, and count Saturday the second day, and Sunday the third day, and there you have it. Three days and Jesus's prophesy came true. But where did you put the third night? The Jew stops there and says, “Behold, your ‘messiah’ speaks lies.” The honest Christian digs a little bit deeper. Bear with me because this isn't your typical Sunday School Easter story.

Turn with me to Leviticus 23:5-8

5 The Passover of the Lord comes in the first month, at twilight on the fourteenth day of the month. 6 The Festival of Unleavened Bread to the Lord is on the fifteenth day of the same month. For seven days you must eat unleavened bread. 7 On the first day you are to hold a sacred assembly; you are not to do any daily work. 8 You are to present a fire offering to the Lord for seven days. On the seventh day there will be a sacred assembly; you must not do any daily work.

This is crucial and here's why. Nowhere in the Bible does it say that Jesus was crucified on Friday. Here's what we know: We know that the day after the crucifixion was a Jewish Shabbat, day of rest, on which no work could be done (which is why it's assumed that He was crucified on Friday, but even the New Testament suggests otherwise). We know that the Jewish tradition initiates days at sunset the day before. We also know that Jesus was taken in by the Jews who wanted to crucify Him on Passover. Now let us begin piecing the evidence together.

Matthew 26:5, Mark 14:2, and Luke 22:2 all speak of a clear knowledge that the day after Passover is the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which means there were two “extra” *Shabbats* that week and the next. For this reason, when verses like Luke 23:56 and John 19:42 refer to preparation, we can know it refers to preparation for the first day of the Feast, which is a technical Sabbath.

Furthermore, it is strongly believed that Jesus was born in the year 4 A.D., based on the descriptions of the political sphere and the Herod’s census timing, etc. And we know He was killed at about the age of 33 (it doesn’t ever say He was exactly 33 either, but that’s inferred), so we can know His death likely occurred in 37 A.D. Of course, it may not be the most accurate of measurements, but if you look at online Jewish date converters, the 14th of Nisan (the first month as described in Leviticus 23) of the year 37 A.D. fell on a Wednesday.

So using that, we can reasonably conclude that at sun down on Tuesday, which was already Wednesday according to Jewish tradition, Jesus and His disciples celebrated Passover in the famous scene of the Last Supper. On Wednesday, which was still Passover and preparation day for the Feast of Unleavened Bread, He was crucified. Thursday was the first day of the feast and a technical *Shabbat*. Friday went by, likely filled with much mourning over the death of Jesus. The actual weekly Sabbath came and left, and then on Sunday, the first day of the week, we’re told in Matthew 28:1, Mark 16:2, Luke 24:1, and John 20:1 that the two Mary’s went to the tomb and found it empty.

One last time, let’s check and make sure we haven’t lost any days or nights...

Wednesday sundown to Thursday sundown = 1 day + 1 night
Thursday sundown to Friday sundown = 1 day + 1 night
Friday sundown to Saturday sundown = 1 day + 1 night
= 3 days + 3 nights ...and then He was raised. Three days and three nights later, indeed.

Were they all false prophets?

As Bernie recalls, Deuteronomy actually gives us instructions for determining if someone is a false prophet or if someone is truly speaking in the name of Yahweh.

Deuteronomy 18:20-22

20 But the prophet who dares to speak a message in My name that I have not commanded him to speak, or who speaks in the name of other gods – that prophet must die.’ 21 You may say to yourself, ‘How can we recognize a message the Lord has not spoken?’ 22 When a prophet speaks in the Lord’s name, and the message does not come true or is not fulfilled, that is a message the Lord has not spoken. The prophet has spoken it presumptuously. Do not be afraid of him.

We've already looked at what Zechariah has to say about the Messiah, based on the same verses Mr. Besherse tries to use against Jesus, but was Isaiah lying in chapter 42?

24 Who gave Jacob to the robber, and Israel to the plunderers?

Was it not the lord?

Have we not sinned against Him?

They were not willing to walk in His ways, and they would not listen to His instruction.

25 So He poured out on Jacob His furious anger and the power of war.

It surrounded him with fire, but he did not know it; it burned him, but he paid no attention.

We could go in order, and just point things out left and right.

Isaiah 43:22

22 "But Jacob, you have not called on Me, because, **Israel, you have become weary of Me.**

23 You have not brought Me your sheep for burnt offerings

or honored Me with your sacrifices.

I have not burdened you with offerings or wearied you with incense.

24 You have not bought Me aromatic cane with silver, or satisfied Me with the fat of your sacrifices.

But you have burdened Me with your sins; you have wearied Me with your iniquities.

25 **"It is I who sweep away your transgressions for My own sake**

and remember your sins no more.

26 Take Me to court; let us argue our case together.

State your case, so that you may be vindicated.

I don't know about Karaite Jews, but the Orthodox Jews claim the servant in Isaiah 53 (which I've already referred to earlier in this paper) is Israel the nation, who is to be beaten and disfigured beyond human form for the sins of many. What about Isaiah 49?

5 And now, says the Lord, **who formed me from the womb to be His Servant, to bring Jacob back to Him**

so **that Israel might be gathered to Him**; for I am honored in the sight of the Lord, and my God is my strength –

6 He says,
“It is not enough for you to be My Servant raising up
the tribes of Jacob
and restoring the protected ones of Israel. **I will also
make you a light for the nations,
to be My salvation to the ends of the earth.**”

7 This is what the Lord,
the Redeemer of Israel, his Holy One, says
to **one who is despised,**
to **one abhorred by people,**
to **a servant of rulers:**
“Kings will see and stand up,
and princes will bow down,
because of the Lord, who is faithful,
the Holy One of Israel – and He has chosen you.”

Israel will not be the one saving itself. God will. God *has!* In the midst of a sinful and dispersed Israel, Yahweh is saying HE will be the one sweeping away the sin. HE will be the one bringing rebellious Jacob back to Himself. And not only that, but it will be His Servant, the one despised, abhorred by people, a servant of rulers, who will bring the salvation of God to the ends of the earth, Jews and gentiles alike!

The knife-bearing hand of Abraham was coming down upon his son Isaac, and Yahweh said, **“STOP!! Do not lay a hand on the boy. I will provide!!”** 2000 years ago, He did just that, and just as he foretold in Isaiah, his Servant was despised to the point of being killed by the hands of the lost souls He came to save. Were all the sacrifices in the laws of Moses intended for unintentional sin? This was an unintentional sacrifice that washed away the rebellious, intentional sins of the world. The salvation promised to Israel and beyond. Jews and Christians both await the victorious Messiah who will shatter the chains of this world and release the prisoners. The difference is we accepted Him 2000 years ago, while IT IS WRITTEN, as Mr. Besherse graciously pointed out in Zechariah 12, that the Jews will realize what they’ve done when it’s late (not too late, but late). They will look upon God with bitterness like for a dead firstborn son, and say, “Oops, we’re sorry.”

In a moment of divine foresight, the psalmist wrote these words in the 118th psalm:

21 I will give thanks to You
because You have answered me
and **have become my salvation.**

22 **The stone that the builders rejected
has become the cornerstone.**

23 This came from the Lord;
it is wonderful in our eyes.

And all this not to mention Isaiah 53 yet again! I ask you now, were these all false prophets and prophecies? This is the rejection of the Messiah that we are told about.

And there can be no confusion as to who this is referring to. This is clearly talking about the Messiah, the Servant, the Salvation, the Rejected Cornerstone, the Abhorred, the Despised.

Were all of these people false prophets with hidden pagan agendas, all of them deserving of death? Are you waiting for the “real Messiah” so that you can reject him instead? Or do you think yourself too righteous and close to God that SURELY you are not among those who rejected the Messiah? Here’s a news flash you may have heard before: We ALL have rejected Him. The difference is that the Christian acknowledges it and accepts the forgiveness in the sacrifice. Let it not be said that our repentance brought our salvation, but that the great I Am desired for us to know Him rather than sacrifice to Him; that He stepped down and bore the sin we couldn’t take and the punishment we couldn’t withstand, so that Sin and Death would no longer be the divide between the created and the Creator.

Praise be to Yahweh, who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son so that whosoever should believe in Him would not perish, but have everlasting life.

Conclusion

If you agree with Bernie Besherse, then I have just laid out an array of excuses. Page 5 of Mr. Besherse’s paper has a space to put tally marks for each excuse the reader has to make for the New Testament contradictions and you’re probably sure that page 5 of my copy of *“For it is Written...” – or is it?* must be filled with tally marks. It’s not.

I haven’t been presented sufficient evidence to conclude the New Testament is false, and therefore have no reason to think the events in the New Testament didn’t happen. If they DID happen, then I think it’s safe to say Jesus is the Messiah.

1 Corinthians 15:17

And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is worthless; you are still in your sins.

You not believing Jesus is the Messiah based on your own interpretation of Old Testament is irrelevant. Everything hangs on whether or not Jesus was raised. If He was, then he successfully accomplished Isaiah 53 down to the last syllable. Your Old Testament interpretation hole is a lot bigger and a lot deeper if you don’t have Jesus to fill it.

Also, it strikes me as a lack of humility on the part of Judaism followers in general to see this and still say, “No, it HAS to be the way Jews interpreted prophecy for centuries!” Tell me this: Did God include a footnote for each prophecy where it interpreted the whole thing for us?

Nope.

All we can do is read, look to what we have around us and see if it fits, even if it may not have been the way we expect it. In all honesty, God doesn't always speak clearly in His word, including but not limited to prophecy. Why is it we have so many debates regarding whether or not homosexuality is OK, or smoking marijuana is OK, or drinking is OK? Because you can make sound arguments based on scripture for both! (Note: I am not condoning any of the above examples.)

My point is this: At the end of the day, all Mr. Besherse can offer is his interpretation of the Old Testament. I've presented the reasons why I disagree with his interpretations and stick to my own. I see a man who fulfilled the prophecies and then some; I see a God who made it so that at the name of Jesus every knee would bow and every tongue confess that He is Lord.

Let's hypothetically say Jesus wasn't the Messiah. We would still be waiting for him to come from the seed of David (good luck trying to find that out). He would have to come and establish perfect peace in the world and we would then have the entire world go to Hell and the Jews rubbing it in all our faces. We would not have a viable solution for sin because it would be too late for that, and all of these Messianic scriptures would not be fulfilled, but the Jews would be happy.

Instead, we have God Himself providing His own son, who fulfills scripture, does away with the problem of past, present, and future sin, suffers and is rejected for our sake so that no man, not even the heroes of the Old Testament, can say they aren't underneath that salvation.

Interpret as you please. At the end of the day, if Jesus was truly risen from the grave, any opposition is void.

Please send any comments about this article to:

BeytDinHillel@GMail.com

Similar articles and papers that were written, formatted, or edited by Bernie Besherse:

1	How many in YahHead.pdf	24	Counting of the Omer.xlsx Spreadsheet)
2	Has THE Messiah Come.pdf	25	Counting of the Omer - scripture cites.pdf
3	Problems with the NT.pdf	26	Message to Friends about Omer.pdf
4	The Jesus Forgery.pdf	27	False Prophet Test.pdf
5	NT Disagrees With Itself.pdf	28	Who are the Rabbis?
6	Mithra: The Pagan Christ.pdf	29	Roman Tribute Coin
7	383 false Messianic Prophecies.pdf	30	Romans 13 & 1 Peter 2:13-14
8	Gentiles take hold of a Jewish Cloak	31	The accuracy of our written Torah.pdf
9	72 Jerusalem Jews translate Torah.pdf	32	Origins of the Jesus Mythos
10	Can Jesus be a ransom for our souls.pdf	33	Why I Gave Up Jesus
11	For it is Written, - or IS it?.pdf	34	Forgiveness of sin in the Tanakh
12	Yes, it IS written (Re-Direct).pdf	35	Does Christianity have Hebrew Roots?
13	Forgiveness of Sin without blood.pdf	36	No Not One
14	Ten Commandments & Los Lunas Stone.pdf	37	The Roman Road
15	Jesus, the Perfect Passover Lamb?	38	Examination of Two House Doctrine
16	Why Jesus Didn't Qualify as the Messiah.pdf	39	Karaite Believe
17	Why Jews Don't Believe in Jesus.pdf	40	Rise Of The Karaite Sect-Cahn 1937
18	Torah is Forever.pdf		
19	Virgin Birth IS possible.pdf		
20	Karaite discussion of Sukkoth in exile.pdf		
21	How do we celebrate Sukkoth		
22	Talmudic Logic – (a story, probably fiction)		
23	NT Contradictions.pdf		List Of Articles On Religious Topics

יהוה

The name of our Creator is made up of four, Hebrew **VOWELS**, Y H W H יהוה (source: Flavius Josephus - *Antiquities of the Jews*)

The letter ה (h) when used as a vowel, usually has the "ah," "ha," or the "huh" sound. The ה is the *definite* article, or **THE, SPECIFIC, to the EXCLUSION of ALL others.**

This is exemplified in showing the difference between the word "eretz," meaning land, and the words "ha Eretz," meaning **THE Land of Israel, to the exclusion of all others.**

In Hebrew, the letters י (y) and ו (v)(w) are used interchangeably, and when located in the first, second, or third position in a word, indicate the tense of the word, either past, future, or continuing. Being placed in the first and third positions, the י and ו indicate that the name is **both past and future**, or, - *Eternal*.

The ה preceding both the י and the ו means that the name is specifically, to the exclusion of all others, both *past* and *future*, or **THE Eternal**.

Furthermore, being *singular*, and *being found twice*, the ה would also allow the addition of the word, **ONE**, as a descriptor.

The Name, **YHWH**, could then be logically rendered as **The Eternal ONE**, because **He** has eternal existence, **to the exclusion of all others.**

It is pronounced in one, long breath, like the wind, with the accent on the middle syllable. .

eeeeeeaaaaa UUUUUU' waaaah