

Stolen Identity By Ryan McGinnis

To fully grasp this topic, we must go back to the era of Yahushua, and the disciples. In Acts 11:26, is the first time the word 'Christian' appears in the English texts. Because of this 'illusion,' many believe that the 'Christian religion' is the 'true religion.' However, the word 'christian (Χριστιανοί)' did not appear in any Greek texts until 200ad. This word (Χριστιανοί) was first used to describe the 'Gentiles,' not the Hebrew Disciples. If we look back to 470bc, we find the word 'Chrestus/Christos' used throughout Paganism. The Greek word Χριστιανοί literally means a follower of the 'Chrestus/Christos,' which was a word used for the 'pagan priests.' In fact, the Vatican itself even today still uses the 'Pagan practices, and definitions' that date back to 470bc. This is where EVERY 'professed christian' needs to do their own research, instead of hanging on to 'their pastors word from behind the pulpit.' The Christos-Pagan religion believed that 'God had a wife (Semiramis),' and that when the Jews came along, they 'dropped the female counterpart of Elohim.' This is Anti-Semitism at its greatest strength. From this 'theory,' comes 'Christianity.' What is called 'Protestantism' today, is nowhere close to the Bible from the days of Yahushua and the apostles. Catholicism (Latin – Universal) was so far removed from Yahushua's teachings, that when Martin Luther wrote his Thesis, making a 'separation from Catholicism,' NOTHING changed in his doctrine, except they dropped the 'female god (Mary-Semiramis).' Luther's proposal was not to 'separate religions,' but to give the Catholic followers 'The Bible to read for themselves.' This was the ONLY reason that these were called 'Protestants,' because they 'protested the Vaticans sole authority to have the scriptures.' (See <http://www.mountainman.com.au/essenes/chrestos%20christos.htm>)

The Delusion

In the earliest recorded texts of the Bible (Biblios/scrolls), we find a sect of disciples that were 'separate' from the Israelites (See Numbers 6 & Isaiah 8:16). These men were called 'Nazarites.' In Acts 21, James the brother of Yahshua instructs Paul to 'keep his vows as a Nazarite,' to show the Jews that had spoken evil of him, that he did not preach against the law. Now, if in Acts 11, the Gentile disciples are called 'Christians,' yet Paul is a 'Nazarite' in chapter 21, there lies a discrepancy within the text. If Paul is a 'christian,' why would he be performing the 'vow of a Nazarite?' This would NOT make him a 'Christian,' but a 'Nazarite.' Nazarites 'were separate from Israelites & Jews,' they did not follow the same principles. Numbers 6 outlines the 'Law of a Nazarite,' which isnt under the same set of laws as the Israelites themselves. Nazarites fell under Melek Tsedeq Law, where Israelites fell under Levitical. Nazarites performed specific rituals, rights, and walked a certain way, unlike the other Israelites which sat in the congregation, and heard the message, then returned to their normal lifestyle. But, this brings us to a very peculiar debate. Are the 'Christians' the Nazarite disciples as Paul was? No. The word 'christian' used in Acts 11, was a 'condemnation' against the Nazarites which Peter speaks of in 1Pe 4:16. When you understand the context of Peters use of the word, it changes the meaning entirely.

“Yet if any man suffer as a pagan, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify Elohim on this behalf.”

When you understand the context of Peters speech, he is not using the word 'christian' as a 'good thing,' but as a 'bad thing.' Jews in the days of the Nazarites were persecuting the

Disciples, as they did the Pagans. Peter's usage here, shows the 'suffering, that we as disciples should be enduring, if we are following the Messiah.' Being considered 'outcasts, separated from the rest of the Israelites' because we follow the Melek Tsedeq Law, and are not 'under the Levitical law (a Hebrew Idiom meaning we are ignorant of the law).' Today's 'Christo-Pagans' Separate Paul's letters from the rest of scriptures, holding to Paul's words over the rest of scriptures.' Peter again states that 'they that do such things are unlearned, and are perverse (see 2Pe 3:15-17).' Paul even prophesied this in his own letters (see 2Th 2:11), which was a quote from the book of Psalms (see Psalm 2:4). This sect that was prophesied about, are the 'professed Christians today.' In fact, when we look in the book of John, John (Yochanon) testifies to this.

“He first find his own brother Simon, and said unto him, We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ.”

The word 'interpret' in the Greek is 'methermeneuo' and means 'translated.' So when this document was translated to Greek, they 'adopted' the word 'Christos,' which was a Greek pagan usage of the word 'Messiah (Mashiyach)' which meant 'high priest.' So the Greek word 'Christos' meant a 'high priest' in the pagan religions. If you are unaware of the 'Hebrew usage' in the NT, you would be 'deluded' into buying the lie that Messiah actually meant 'Christos,' which it does not. And this is a very simple, and easy to understand lesson, if you heed it. In the same verse (see above), the Greek uses the word 'Messias (Μεσσίας)' then 'interprets (changes) the word to Christos.' The actual Greek word Messias (Μεσσίας) is 'translated from Hebrew (משיח) then to English as 'Mashiyach (Messiah/Messias).' There would have been NO NEED to change this to 'Christos' unless the 'translators' were trying to lead a person into a 'delusion' that we should say 'Christos' INSTEAD OF Messiah/Mashiyach. This leads us into another error. Many theologians (Professors of Theology - religious beliefs and “theory” when systematically developed) claim that 'Jesus' comes from the Hebrew word Y'shua (Yahushua) which means 'Jehovah (Yehovah) saves,' EXCEPT, no such name exists in the Hebrew. יהוה translates to English as 'Yahweh (Yah-Way),' rendering the name 'Jesus' as 'useless.' When we search the 'origin' of the name 'Jesus' it comes from Latin origin, meaning this name holds no merit in the Hebrew/English tongue. And to prove this, all we have to do is look to a few English translations that have 'corrected it.'

Heb 4:8 For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. {Jesus: that is, Joshua } KJV

Heb 4:8 For if Joshua had given them rest, he would not have spoken afterward of another day.
(ASV)

Notice that the translators of the ASV, RECOGNIZED that Yahushua is properly translated to English as 'Joshua,' and NOT as 'Jesus.' This brings us again, to another proof, that both 'Joshua & Jesus' are incorrect. The letter 'J' did not exist in the English language until 1700ad. In the first KJV (1611), Joshua is called 'Ioshua,' the 'I' carrying the 'Y' pronunciation. Just because a language 'adopts' an alphabetical letter, it doesn't change the 'pronunciation of a Name/word.' If you haven't figured out yet, that Yahweh is laughing His butt off in the heavens at your 'delusions,' you would be sorely mistaken.

The Result

Now that we have shown you the 'delusion,' we will show you the 'end result' of this delusion. Because of this simple 'confusion (Babel) of the English perversions,' MANY MILLIONS OF DOCTRINES have been bred. Many 'schisms' have occurred in the Body of Messiah over a simple 'delusion.' We have been accused of 'starting cults/occult's' by many christian sects, all because we have decided to 'return to Yahweh, and study His Word as it was originally written.' All the while, not realizing that they themselves are the 'victims' of an occult that started in 470bc, called Christo-Pagans. Rome merely 'adopted' Christo-Paganism, and stole the Hebrew scriptures to claim it as 'their own.' Paul in Romans 3, shows us that Elohim did not give Rome (The Vatican/Catholicism) His scriptures, but gave it to Israel to 'distribute throughout the world.'

“What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision?

Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed (entrusted) the oracles (scriptures) of Elohim.”

Yahuwah DID NOT ENTRUST His scriptures to Rome (The Vatican, Catholicism) but to Israel. Why? Because Yahuwah KNEW that Rome would corrupt His scriptures. If you believe that Yahuwah's Word is 'inerrant,' then YOU MUST UNDERSTAND that He already prophesied that Rome would corrupt it, because He did not entrust His scriptures to Rome, but to Israel. All of the apostles prophesied that after their 'departure' the wolves would enter (they knew Rome was the wolf) and pervert their texts.

“Ac 20:29-31 For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.”

Paul cried over this issue, that Rome would enter 'not sparing you!' Even if you look at the early church fathers (Origen, Ignatius, Polycarp, etc.) they all lead you to worship/serve the Vatican/Roman church. These men WERE NOT followers of the Messiah, nor of the Nazarites. They spoke VERY 'perverse things,' even tolerating/condoning 'sin in the church.' They ALL advocated the 'Nicene Creed,' which was a Catholic doctrine of belief.

The Stolen Identity

If any of you, doubt what I have shown you thus far, all you have to do is ask your minister (IF he will give you an answer – MOST wont) how the Gentiles received the inheritance, and they will 'misquote' Romans 11 (out of pure delusion) making the claim that 'god cut off the Jews for their lack of faith, and gave it to us instead.' This is called 'Replacement Theology (a theory of replacement),' and is 100% a lie. Romans 11, Paul explains it clearly, that only SOME of the Israelites were 'pruned' to make room for the Gentiles 'that believed' to be adopted into Israel's Covenant with Yahweh (as found at Sinai – The Doctrine of Torah/Law), and those that WERE pruned, if they shall turn to the Melek Tsedeq, shall be grafted in again (they don't get grafted into another belief, law, etc. but the same law/belief/etc.).

“For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of

them be, but life from the dead? For if the first fruit (Israel) be Separate, the lump is also Separate: and if the root be Separate, so are the branches. And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partaker of the root and fatness of the olive tree; Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bear not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou stand by faith. Be not prideful, but fear: For if Elohim spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of Elohim: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for Elohim is able to graft them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted against nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree? For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own delusion; that blindness "in part" is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins."

Nowhere within this chapter does Paul state "god gave you a separate religion/belief/law than He gave to Israel." On the Contrary, Yahuwah adopted you into the Same Law/Belief/Doctrine as He gave to Israel. ONLY Israel of the flesh HAS NOT entered into that Covenant yet, neither have the Gentiles. As it is written, "Many are called, but only few have been chosen." The main 'ignorance' enters, when a Gentile believes 'they are the Elect.' If you look up every scripture pertaining to the 'Elect,' they are 'Israelites.' They are NOT Gentiles. The 'Elect' are the 'Twelve Tribes of Israel.' They are NOT 'Gentiles.' It is these 'twelve tribes' that have obeyed, followed, and held true to Yahuwah since Yahuwah 'Elected them.'

The Adoption

I know many of you are 'ignorant, or unlearned' as to what 'The adoption' is, or means, so I will show you. When a 'child' is adopted, it is because the 'parent' has handpicked that child, because of their 'morality, characteristics, and desire of learning (I am not speaking of the American Legal Adoption System, but the Biblical).' Yahushua shows us this, when He says;

"Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted (reversed, turned back to), and become as children (paidion), ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

While many Gentiles have a 'distorted idea' of what this word 'child' means, they are not even close. Their definition of the word is a 'nepios,' or in English 'an imbecile, infant, a non-speaking person, unlearned.' The word 'Paidion' means 'a toddler, well behaved, moral, a half grown person.' Paul uses this word in Hebrews to describe Moses as a 'proper Paidion,' meaning he was well-behaved, moral, and had his conscience trained. Let me show you Isaiah's description of Yahushua Messiah;

"Therefore Yahuwah himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a maiden shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings."

If none of you understand, the 'butter and honey' is a Hebrew Idiom. Meaning that Yahushua from His infancy would understand right and wrong, He would have 'good discernment,' and be 'well behaved.' Yahuwah (or any parent) does not adopt a child that is evil, immoral, sinful, etc. No parent adopts a child that is 'a heathen, misbehaved, and is always into trouble.' And while you might be thinking, "But God loves the sinner, but hates the sin." No, Gandhi taught that, that is not found ANYWHERE in scripture. Yahuwah destroyed Sodom, Gomorrah, and almost destroyed Nineveh because of the 'sinners.' Sin would not be 'in the world,' if it wasn't for the 'sinners.' Sins do not commit themselves. And because of Yahushua's sacrifice, you should have understood His walk, His experience, been pricked at the heart to 'behave, be moral, and train your conscience,' so He CAN adopt you. This is what Romans 6 is all about. It is NOT a 'get out of punishment card (see Hasbro's Monopoly).' It is NOT a 'chance card.' It is an explanation for you to 'STOP SINNING,' and walking 'well-behaved' so Yahuwah can accept you, and 'choose you to adopt as His very own child.'

"But when the fullness of the time was come, Elohim sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law (ignorant of the law), that we MIGHT receive the adoption of sons." Ga 4:4-5

So you see, when you 'change your behavior,' you come into the House of Israel to 'learn Yahuwah's Law (The Torah from Sinai),' that Yahuwah might 'redeem you,' so you 'MIGHT be received and adopted as a huio (fully mature, well behaved, moral, upright, perfect, mature) son.

Shalom.