

The "Fossilized" Reformation

My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth. (1 Jn. 3:18)

The Concordant Literal Version renders this important scripture of the Apostle John in the following manner: "we should not be loving in word, neither in tongue, but in act and truth." With this as our keynote and spring board, we will show examples in the scripture that sanctification through language was not a fundamental concern of YHWH's prophets.

Some years back, C. J. Koester of S. Africa, a physician by training, wrote a book called *The Final Reformation*, in which he claimed to be able to trace the origin of a number of terms used in the King James Bible—holy, sacred, lord, God, Christ—back to pagan culture many hundreds of years ago. Nobody called the man to task for his dubious efforts, the fruits of such doctrine, or the self-righteousness in thinking a mere human could ascribe to himself the work of final reformation. Acts 3:18 and our own intuition tells us that full unity and restoration of doctrine awaits the return of our Lord and Savior, Yahshua of Nazareth.

Compare the spirit and flavor of Koester's thesis with the teaching of another reformer of the first century—John the Baptist. Yahshua said of John that he was Elijah, and came restoring all things (Matt. 17:11). Yet John said nothing about terminology, not even to soldiers and publicans who spoke Latin and Greek. His answer to the crowds who asked him what they should be doing was to share food and clothing with the poor. To the tax-collectors he said to impose no more than was prescribed to them. To soldiers he said, "Intimidate no one, neither be blackmailing, and be content with your wages and rations."

Those who make a fair show with the tongue are a diversion from the kind of practical righteousness that John and Christ taught. The apostle Paul re-emphasized practical righteousness, saying that nothing but envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings and the like came from "strifes over words" (I Tim. 6:4-5). The same thought is repeated stronger in II Tim. 2:14:

Remind them of these things, solemnly testifying before Yahweh not to dispute about words *for nothing useful, to the throwing down of those hearing.*

How many divisions contrary to the doctrine of Christ, how many broken relationships and marriages must occur before we realize that terminology-based righteousness tears down those listening to such tripe? My wife and I met a couple recently whose marriage was in jeopardy, thanks to Lew White's book Fossilized Customs. This so-called study in etymological origins of scriptural words, led to inability of the couple to praise and worship freely together because of undue concern over terminology used in praise music that had hitherto been a rich blessing to them. When we showed them that Yahweh Himself used 'questionable' terminology to refer to his role as Husband, they quickly realized it could not possibly be wrong to call him 'Lord.' Jer. 3:14 says: "Return unto Me, O apostate sons, says Yahweh, for I am lord (ytleb) over you." The Hebrew characters are the verb form of ba'al, and translated 'married' by the KJV. Similarly, Isa. 54:5 says "For your husband (ytleb) is your Maker, YHWH is His name." The parenthetical Hebrew characters mean "your ba'al," but are best translated "your husband." To this day in

Israel, where modern Hebrew is used, the ba'al of any household is the husband. When we see how Yahweh desired to remove the *names* of Baalim out of Israel's mouth (Hosea 2:17), it is apparent that Yahweh's concern all along was against calling upon the name of Ba'al, as though Ba'al were a real entity, not against using ba'al as a common noun meaning husband, owner, lord. The verb and noun form of ba'al is used in many places, hence any other understanding would invalidate the scriptures using this noun. It is apparent to those having the Spirit of YHWH, that Jeremiah and Isaiah did not share the scruples of so many in the Sacred Name movement, which falsely censors its adherents from using common terminologies such as Lord, God. We hasten to confirm the truth that no man has the authority to substitute Lord or God in the place of Yahweh's revealed name, which occurs some 6,958 times in the OT, and was likely in the original MSS of the NT. In this the translators are in grievous violation of the 3rd commandment, which prohibits taking away or bringing to desolation the name of Yahweh.

Ezra and Nehemiah coming out of captivity, adopted the Babylonian terminology for referring to the months of the lunar calendar (see Neh. 2:1, 6:15, Ezra 3:7, Esther 8:9). Their lack of scruples in this indicates that *what* a word refers to is more important than the word itself.

Word Origination vs. Word Pathways: A Study in Deception

There is an important lesson to be learned when we return to the example of the word ba'al. It is apparent to the thinking person that Ba'al did not originate with the Canaanites or Assyrians. They simply must have taken the already existing common semitic noun and turned it into a proper name for their deity. In other words, they turned a common noun into a proper noun. Likewise, the Ammonites probably took the common noun for king—melech—and appropriated it for the name of their god Molech. Common sense does not jump to the conclusion that the Ammonites originated the term molech. All human language had its origins in Babel in Gen. 10, thus making Yahweh the ultimate author of language.

The same principle applies to old English and terms such as sacred, god, lord, holy. Lew White claims that these terms were used by pagans in the Middle Ages. But this does not mean that they originated the terms. The lingo came thru pagans, but did not originate with them. Lord is a legitimate and useful poetic equivalent of the Hebrew word *adonai* and the Greek *kuriov*.

Cristov—A study in Butchered Etymology

The Greek Cristov, translated Christ in our English versions, goes back to classical Greek times as far back as Homer. It meant *to pour oil upon, anoint*. The Hebrew word messiah (hysm) means essentially the same thing, and was used when a prophet, such as Samuel, poured oil on the head of the next king, David. To explain this equivalency in terms, John the apostle included interpretative explanations for Hebrew terminology in his Gospel. Notice John 1:41:

Andrew, finding his own brother Simon, says to him, "We have found the Messiah!" (which is being interpreted, 'Christ').

To the pure all things are pure, but to the defiled and unbelieving, is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled (Titus 1:15).

Lew White understands the simple meaning of christos, that of anointing with oil, yet relies on one old French dictionary to cast aspersions upon the term Christian. This dictionary, without explanation, gives *cretan* as the meaning of Christian. Contradicting this, many sacred name adherents struggle in their attempts to link 'Christian' with Krishna, the Indian god. But this violates the laws of etymology. *Cristov* was in use in Greece long before Alexander the Great had any contact with east India. The -ian ending (such as on Christian) was very commonly added in Latin to Greek names to indicate the followers of any particular person. There are scholarly articles on this that make infinitely more sense than Lew White or C.J. Koester's etymological nonsense.

Was Christian a Pejorative Term?

The term Christian occurs three times in the New Testament. Its first use is in Acts. 11:26. When one asks the question of why Luke, the greatest historian of all time, ancient or modern, would mention the fact of where the disciples were first called 'Christians,' it is plain that he is trying to inform the prominent Roman convert to the faith, Theophilus (Luke 1:3), of the source of the label which early on became widespread for the followers of The Christ. It is irrelevant who coined the term, for the literary use by Luke and Peter, as we shall see, is simply not pejorative. In Acts 26:28, Herod Agrippa II, king of Judea, asks the question whether Paul has almost persuaded him to become a Christian. Paul's response in vs. 30 contains no negatives, but rather an affirmation that Paul wishes all present, including the Roman governor Festus, would become as Paul himself. ***There is not the least hint in this narrative that Paul finds the term offensive, or that it misrepresents what he is.*** It is evident that King Agrippa believes Paul to be a Christian, and Paul does not deny it. We have almost no evidence in the New Testament for how Sunday worship came about, but the New Testament leaves no doubt that the term Christian became the most popular way of referring to the new sect.

I Peter Shows that 'Christian' means a follower of Christ

In I Peter 4:14, Peter says "If you be reproached for the name of 'Christ.' Now we know the name of Christ was 'Yahshua,' or 'Yehoshua' but it is more likely that Peter means the title 'Cristov.' He says that when the Christians were being reproached for the name of Cristov, they were happy, because the very same spirit of glory and power that Yahweh had anointed Yahshua with, had come to rest upon the Christians. Two verses later Peter says ***they should not be ashamed if they suffer as a Christian***, but should be glorifying Elohim *in this name*, seeing it is now the appointed time for judgment to begin from the house of God.

The Sacred Name movement has provided no excuse for rejecting the sense and the truthfulness of these verses penned by Peter and John Mark. The Greek New Testament is, after all, the most well-attested and highly scrutinized piece of literature in the ancient world. The variant readings seldom make much, if any doctrinal difference, and when they do they make for very

challenging investigation as to why and how they came about. Variant readings should be no more offensive to the true believer than the fact that Elohim suffered His Son, the Word of God, to be pummeled beyond recognition and hung on a tree.

Attacks on the terms Christ and Christian are vain attempts at creating a parallel religious culture seeking to create separation and differences for the mere sake of differentiation, not holiness or righteousness. This kind of differentiation is pseudo-intellectual sophistry with cultish tendencies. Lew White, C.J. Koester, and many others fostering exclusivism via the Names *have cast unnecessary aspersions on the integrity of the New Testament Greek texts containing the names Christ and Christian*. Yet the author of Fossilized Customs — Lew White—earns the largest portion of his income as owner of the largest head shop in Louisville, KY. My heroes are the various authors of the New Testament —Mark, Luke, John, Peter, Paul and their amenuenses Barnabas, Mark, Luke, etc. Marvin Cox sins greatly against the Word of God by repeatedly pointing people to Lew White, in lieu of the authors of the New Testament, who do not share his scruples.

Lew White Owns/Operates *Electric Lady Land* 7 Days a Week!"

How ironic that a major sacred name publication such as YEA newsletter would lean on Fossilized Customs to come up with enough evidence to debunk the Lunar Sabbath, which is a counter-cultural religion just like Lew White's headshop—*Electric Lady Land*. There, in mid-town Louisville, KY you will find thousands upon thousands of hard rock and acid rock albums promoting the most heinous sex crimes and immorality, even violence against women and constituted authority. Large posters of vile rock stars are displayed prominently in idolatrous fashion. Lew White's religious books are displayed prominently right next to cases with 300-400 dollar dope-smoking pipes and paraphernalia. Sacred Namers who continue to buy and distribute his books are partakers of his iniquity. Such are false apostles who have spoken, but YHWH has not sent. It is shameful that you have settled for a bowl of pottage instead of the inspired Greek New Testament.

A Word on the Peshitta

The Aramaic New Testament, the Peshitta, is a translation from a Greek original! That is the opinion of the vast majority of scholars who have compared the two. It is in Aramaic because the Churches it served—in Babylonia, Antioch, Damascus, Syria, Mesopotamia, eastern Asia Minor—spoke Aramaic, and thus had the need for an Aramaic record of the deeds and words of our Lord and His Apostles. Of course, there is not one Sacred Name adherent who has investigated the Greek origin of the Peshitta. They have yet to explain how the Peshitta would use the Greek word *pentecostos* in Acts 2:1; 20:16, and I Cor. 16:8 to refer to the Feast of Weeks, and why the Peshitta seems dependent on the Greek text in Acts 17:22. There the Greek word--desidaimonesterouv--actually means "fearful of gods." The word was taken to mean "*worship-pers of demons*" by whoever translated from the Greek to Aramaic. Countless other examples could be adduced to demonstrate the Greek origin of the Peshitta.

Since Gentile believers in Yahshua greatly outnumbered Jewish believers in Asia Minor, Antioch, Macedonia, Achaia, Ephesus, and Galatia, and since the Jewish believers in these areas

were very much like Philo and only understood Greek, there is no question that every apostle who had anything to do with writing the New Testament saw the tremendous need for a faithful and reliable Greek transcript of whatever had been placed in the Canon under their authority. The marginalization of the Greek New Testament is therefore an attack on the New Testament itself, and in turn *casts aspersions on Yahweh's willingness and ability to preserve the New Testament as originally penned*. And if Yahweh's truths and concepts cannot be conveyed adequately via the Greek language, through which the vast majority of Church members were converted in the first Century, then we are led to believe that our own ability to grasp the Bible is hindered somehow by English. Some Messianics believe that the vibrations of the Hebrew language convey healing and spiritual connectivity. None of this is healthy to the Body of Messiah.

Christ Himself foretold that the Kingdom of Heaven would be taken from the Jews, those speaking Hebrew, and given to a nation (the Church) speaking a different language that would bring forth the fruits thereof (Matt. 21:43). There is always value in studying the scriptures in Hebrew and Greek, as I myself am able to do, but the Sacred Name and Messianic movement has gone way too far in lowering the status of the Greek New Testament in the eyes of its followers. A New Covenant with the Gentiles required a new language for its adherents. Sabbatizo--the keeping of Sabbaths (Heb. 4:9, and used long before in the LXX)—is a good example of the sufficiency of the Greek language to convey Hebrew concepts to its hearers.

www.convince-the-gainsayer.com