

NEW TEACHING

The Unjust Hacking of Hebrews Part 3

Last In A 3 Part Series

 The image "file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/Rabbi%20Moshe/Desktop/New-Hall-4.jpg" cannot be displayed, because it conta

By Nazarene Yisraelite Rabbi/Brother Moshe Yoseph Koniuchowsky

Delivered Live at B'nai Yahshua Synagogue North Miami Beach Florida. For the real McCohen, Join the growing family of Video and/or Audio Club members! For the full message to share with family and friends around the globe go to: <https://yati.hosting-advantage.com/AUDIOVIDEOCLUB.htm>

Sermon Date 12-11-05

A well-known Hebrews hacker claims this:

Now even the first covenant had regulations of divine worship and the earthly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle prepared, the outer one, in which were the lampstand and the table and the sacred bread; this is called the holy place. And behind the second veil, there was a tabernacle which is called the Holy of Holies, having a golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant covered on all sides with gold, in which was a golden jar holding the manna, and Aaron's rod which budded, and the tables of the covenant. And above it were the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy seat; but of these things we cannot now speak in detail. HEBREWS 9:1-5

There is a problem with this passage. Some say it is a translation problem.

And behind the second veil, there was a tabernacle, which is called the Holy of Holies, having a golden altar of incense...

This part is not correct as written. The altar of incense is in the first sanctuary with the lampstand and table, not in the Holy of Holies with the Ark of the Covenant. Some commentators on Hebrews argue that the Greek word for "altar" here should be translated as "censor." They say that the writer was really referring to the High Priest's censor (a device carried by the priest with coals and incense) that was carried into the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement. To their

support, the writer of Hebrews does reference later, several times, the elements of the Day of Atonement. However, if he was really referring to the censor then he made another equally grave mistake. He forgot to describe the altar of incense in the holy place. In either case, his explanation of the *earthly sanctuary* is not correct.

Lets look at the Aramaic as looking at the Greek is a waste of time as the Brit Chadasha was written in Aramaic a sister language to Hebrews. From Aramaic scholar and friend Andrew Gabriel Roth-

Hebrews 9:4 What's the Aramaic word there? Pryma or Mebekha? It is BESMA in Heb 9:4, specifically "golden censor". Altar does not appear in that passage. That is part of the phrase Lamsa properly calls GOLDEN CENSER. That word never means "altar". One cannot insert Hebraic Greek thoughts in a Semitic document.

I believe the Peshitta IS CORRECT AS WRITTEN, and I will tell you why. It is true that A CENSER is exactly where you say it is, in the outer area, away from the ark and the holy of holies. However, there was MORE THAN ONE CENSER, AND THERE IS ANOTHER CENSER IN THE HOLY OF HOLIES THAT THE PRIEST USED ON YOM-KIPPUR. THAT IS WHAT PAUL IS TALKING ABOUT:

Wayiqra/Lev. 16:11-19 "When Aaron presents the bull for his sin offering and makes atonement for himself and his household, he will slaughter the bull for his sin offering.

12 Then he must take a FIREPAN/CENSER (Heb. MACHTAH, Aramaic PYRMA/BESMA in Peshitta-Tanakh) full of fiery coals from the altar before YHWH and two handfuls of finely ground fragrant incense, and bring [them] inside the veil.

13 He is to put the incense on the fire before YHWH, so that the cloud of incense covers the mercy seat that is over the testimony, or else he will die.

14 He is to take some of the bull's blood and sprinkle [it] with his finger against the east side of the mercy seat; then he will sprinkle some of the blood with his finger before the mercy seat seven times.

15 "When he slaughters the male goat for the people's sin offering and brings its blood inside the veil, he must do the same with its blood as he did with the bull's blood: he is to sprinkle it against the mercy seat and in front of it.

16 He will purify the [most] holy place in this way for all their sins because of the Israelites' impurities and rebellious acts. He will do the same for the tent of meeting that remains among them, because it is surrounded by their impurities.

17 No one may be in the tent of meeting from the time he enters to make atonement in the [most] holy place until he leaves after he has made atonement for himself, his household, and the whole assembly of Israel.

18 Then he will go out to the altar that is before YHWH and make atonement for it. He is to take some of the bull's blood and some of the goat's blood and put [it] on the horns on all sides of the altar.

19 He is to sprinkle some of the blood on it with his finger seven times to cleanse and set it apart from the Israelites' impurities.

Machtah TWOT - 777a Hebrew

Phonetic Spelling Parts of Speech

makh-taw' Noun Feminine

Definition fire-holder, censer, firepan, snuff dish, tray snuff-dish fire-pans censer. Now, in Hebrew and Aramaic, the word that is translated as CENSER is also called INCENSE because it holds the incense. Not all INCENSE is the CENSER, but all CENSERS can also be called INCENSE. This the Aramaic word specifically does in Hebrews 9:4, BESMA, which has the majority meaning of "incense" and can never be referring to the altar.

In the Peshitta Tanach, the censer by itself can be called PYRMA, but when it gets the incense in it, BESMA, especially when the kohen is carrying the "incense" around, then it must be "censer".

Numbers 17:11 (Jewish) /16:46 (Christian) actually contains both words but one is understood to also include the other. The Greek is pretty good with this too, as LIBANATOS refers to the censer, but it is derived from the same word as FRANKINCENSE, a key part of the INCENSE recipe! Furthermore, Hebrews tends to favor BESMA, whereas Revelation 8 favors PYRMA, but they BOTH are referring to the exact same thing. So, I can see why anyone might think this is wrong, but it really is not, if we do extra effort and see that what was rendered "incense" is actually another censer IN THE HOLY OF HOLIES.

Some have objected however that Moshe does not call that censer "golden", however to answer that I have some very reliable ancient Jewish testimony that I feel is accurate and does not conflict with the written Torah. Lets look at Josephus-recorded in Antiquities. I. 3. c. 8. Sect. 3.3.

"Moses now purified the tabernacle and the priests; which purification was performed after the following manner: - He commanded them to take five hundred shekels of choice myrrh, an equal quantity of cassia, and half the foregoing weight of cinnamon and calamus (this last is a sort of sweet spice); to beat them small, and wet them with an hin of oil of olives (an hin is our own country measure, and contains two Athenian choas, or congiuses); then mix them together, and boil them, and prepare them after the art of the apothecary, and make them into a very sweet ointment; and afterward to take it to anoint and to purify the priests themselves, and all the tabernacle, as also the sacrifices. There were also many,

and those of various kinds, of sweet spices, that belonged to the Tabernacle, and such as were of very great price, and were brought to the golden altar of incense; the nature of which I do not now describe, lest it should be troublesome to my readers; but incense (19) was to be offered twice a-day, both before sun-rising and at sun-setting. They were also to keep oil already purified for the lamps; three of which were to give light all day long, (20) upon the sacred candlestick, before God, and the rest were to be lighted at the evening."

As you know, Josephus was a contemporary of the apostle Paul. He would have been in his late 20s when Paul was killed. And both men were eyewitnesses to the Temple itself. Josephus would have, as he himself says several times, written originally in Aramaic. BESMA is the ONLY word that means both "incense" and "censer" (lit. carrier of incense) so I have very high certainty that he, like Paul, is using this word in his writings. ALSO PLEASE NOTE THAT "GOLDEN" NEED NOT REFER TO THE METAL, BUT THE FACT THAT THE TORAH SAYS BURNING COALS AND INCENSE ARE IN THE "FIREPAN", MAKING IT GLOW THE COLOR GOLD THROUGH THE HOLES.

It only takes ONE WORD not having its depth of meaning shown and the whole truth flies out the window. Because I'll tell you, even most Hebrew translations make that "incense". In this case, I know for a fact that myself, Paul Younan and Lamsa even got this one nailed. BESMA is "censer" in Hebrews 9:4 and it is reflecting ancient traditions that do not overturn the pashat/literal application of scripture.

As for the assertion that He forgot to describe the altar of incense in the holy place.

“In either case, his explanation of the earthly sanctuary is not correct.”

Paul states that he was not being detailed specific as seen in Hebrews 9 verse 5. He had certain points to make and made them!

=====

The Hebrew Hacker states:

In Hebrews 7:28 the writer insisted that this oath (*The Lord has sworn*) was proclaiming that the Messiah was a priest in the order of Melchizedek. Agreed. But then he stated this oath *came after the Law*. He has already argued that a change of priesthood requires a change of Law – *of necessity there takes place a change in the law also* (Heb 7:12). I agree that Psalm 110 was written after the Law, but I disagree that the oath came *after* the Law. The entire plan for the Messiah to come as our Redemption, to be our High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, and to sit at the right hand of the Almighty was established *before* the foundations of the world.

The fulfillment or the entry of Moshiach into the office of Melech-Tzadik did chronologically follow Torah. The plan was eternal, but He could not enter into it as a human, until He was born as a human, which was clearly 2,000 years after Torah was given, at which time He took the oath on earth AFTER following a life of obedience. How could he be a kohen before he was born and how could he be sworn into office before his arrival on earth? What president is sworn into office before they become president? Oy Vey!

The Hebrews Hacker goes on to claim that Hebrews 9:23 is a blasphemous statement, as heaven does not need to be cleansed by Yahshua's blood as it is the pure holy heavenly abode of YHWH Himself. This statement is further proof of the blasphemy and errors contained in the book of Hebrews.

Answer-In the Aramaic the word for sacrifice is singular, or plural, depending on the context and obviously here the DEBKHA OR SINGLE sacrifice of Yahshua is singular. Moreover, the blasphemous error in the Greek and subsequently ALL English translations derived from the Greek reads that Yahshua PURIFIED THE HEAVENLY TEMPLE by His blood, as if YHWH'S heavenly abode is impure and needed His Son to come clean up, is not in the Aramaic at all. BUT the 3rd edition of the RSTNE reads:

Hebrews 9: 23 It was therefore necessary that the images of the heavenly things should be purified with these; although the heavenly objects are from a better sacrifice than these.

This is word for word from the Aramaic!!!

Meaning, that the heavenly Tabernacle BECAUSE IT WAS ALREADY PERFECT needed an UNDEFINED PERFECT SACRIFICE to be present and presented on its altar to accompany all other perfect vessels already in the heavenly tabernacle!!! Any bull or goat would be defiled itself as a result of the fall and all of creation being subject to the penalty of that fall! What a difference! **NO OTHER BIBLE TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH IS WILLING TO TAKE THE BOLD STEPS NEEDED TO RESTORE SANITY AND REMOVE BLASPHEMY** from the painted Greco-Roman mistranslations.

As we see **Hebrews 9:19** there are more errors. The first being that in the **Exodus 24** account there are no goats that were slain with the blood sprinkled on the people.

Every English translation based solely on the Greek adds the word goats in the verse below, yet it is obvious from Exodus 24 that bulls, not goats, were sacrificed to sprinkle the people in this account. Based on the Aramaic original we have removed this clear historical error and the verse properly reads:

Hebrews 9: 19-For when Moshe had spoken every precept to all the people

according to the Torah, he took the dahm of calves, with mayim, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the scroll, and all the people..... There is NO MENTION OF ANY OF GOATS IN THE ARAMAIC WHICH LINES UP WITH TORAH.

Another error made by the writer of the Book of Hebrews is that Hebrews 9:19 speaks of water, scarlet wool, and hyssop all being used to sprinkle the people and the scroll. The problem is that nowhere in Exodus 24 are these elements of sprinkling mentioned and sprinkling was done with the finger on the altar by the priests and not by Moses upon the people. These elements that are mentioned here in Hebrews are not in Exodus 24. Furthermore, where does the blood get sprinkled on the book, or Torah? This is completely made up by the writer of Hebrews and is found nowhere in Torah.

From Aramaic scholar and friend Andrew Gabriel Roth-

I would argue they [sprinkling procedures] don't have to be mentioned in Exodus 24 if they were well known procedures at the time. Just because the details come in what is from our view a later book, does not mean those procedures did not exist before UNLESS the text specifically says otherwise. These are not just five books, but five books of MOSHE, and as such are contemporaneous with his life.

Now, if there was an instruction tied to a specific event that happened LATER than an event mentioned in a passage of scripture, that I could see as problematic. For example, slaughtering the Paschal lamb is tied to the time of the Exodus, but if someone said Abraham put the blood of the lamb on his doorpost based on an obscure reading of whatever, that reading is in error, as the text says this just happened with the Exodus.

This is not the case however here. By Exodus 24 we know that Moshe is receiving instructions from YHWH that get written down later, or gives discourses to the people that are summarized briefly at the time and the details [like sprinkling procedures] come later. This is not linear storytelling as we are used to it in the modern sense. It is CYLCICAL instead. All the time we Semites repeat ourselves, say and come back to a point later, say the same thing over and over, see even I'm doing it. There are so many examples of this kind of summary-detail-summary form in the Torah that it is not even worth arguing over.

Aaron is irrelevant here because this is not the red heifer sacrifice at all. It's has nothing to do with that, but how the blood is mixed to purify the people. The verse mentions SPRINKLING, which by definition is a mixture of blood and water and hyssop to purify things, like in Leviticus 14. The procedure can be found spelled out in Leviticus. 14 later, but was used by Moshe earlier, as it was an already established procedure in Yisrael.

The Torah is not modern western literature. You have to fight a bit to get the

details together. They won't all be in the same convenient place. Leviticus 14:6 mentions SCARLET YARN, and actually is just references the color, not the material. Most experts assume that "thread" is implied (Genesis 38: 28), just like the Hebrew does not say "hand" directly when Benjamin is interpreted literally as "son of my right" but everyone agrees it is "right hand". Wool is of course WHITE in its natural state, but the Torah commands it being dyed scarlet, which is why Isaiah uses the metaphor in the first place.

More specifically, where did Rav Shaul get the idea the scarlet material was wool? Probably from places like Exodus 26:31, 36 that read that the tent way is made of "scarlet (insert material here) AND fine twisted linen". In other words, the linen is NOT dyed and material A is clearly shown to NOT be linen. Well, what's left if not wool? Scarlet goat hair? Kind of doubt it. The fact is that specific material is NOT mentioned in Torah unless it has to be, like Leviticus 13:47-48 and Deuteronomy 22:11.

The procedure used by Moshe when he came down from the mount in Exodus 24 is layed out in Leviticus 14: 5

14:5 Then the priest will order that one of the birds be slaughtered over fresh water in a clay pot.

14:6 He is to take the live bird together with the cedar wood, scarlet yarn [wool], and hyssop, and dip them all into the blood of the bird that was slaughtered over the fresh water.

These verses mention the MIXING OF BLOOD AND WATER. Every time that is mentioned it is NOT necessary to repeat the entire process. Fact is, having Lev. 14:6 say that the blood of the bird was slaughtered over fresh water is about as clear as the Torah gets. It has yarn (wool), hyssop, blood and water. What more do you need? If you see the ingredients here and combine them with the sprinkling procedure, the full picture emerges rather easily.

Remember that Paul the author of Hebrews was trained by Gamaliel, the greatest rabbi of the age, the grandson of Hillel who literally wrote the rulebook on this stuff. If ANYONE is going to know how to combine details from fifty different verses to weave a common picture, it is a student of Gamaliel.

The different events described in Hebrews 9:19-21 are all mixed together by the writer and great confusion is caused. The altar, tent of meeting and all the vessels of ministry were purified with blood at a different time the first day of the first month about 9 months after Moses came down and allegedly sprinkled the people with water, scarlet wool and hyssop that supposedly took place in Exodus 24. The writer of Hebrews not only adds things not found in Torah, but ties separate events together that did not take place together. And of course the cleansing of the Tabernacle was by the drops of blood

dipped by the finger of the priest, not by scarlet wool, water, and hyssop.

Andrew Gabriel Roth--That's a true point, if Hebrews read like a modern letter or book. Yes it SEEMS that way, but the fact is "telescoping" is another common Semitic storytelling technique. Matthew does this, for example. Read his account of the calling of and sending out of the apostles. Sounds like it happened all at once. Read Mark and Luke--they are actually two separate occasions. If Matthew could tell a story like this, and he was the most Jewish styled writer of the evangelists, then why would not Paul do the same thing?

Another explanation is that it is a Midrash, or a weaving of two separate scripture themes into one story to deliver a moral lesson. Again Hillel did this, who passed it on to Gamaliel, who passed it on to Paul. Great sages do this all the time, putting together verses of Scripture written many centuries after an event. The story of Joseph is amplified by using a Psalm, for example. Other times Rabbis look at Ezekiel's amplifying on the reason Sodom was destroyed in Genesis. I just finished reading an excellent book on Midrash called "In Potiphar's House" that really drives this home effectively.

Finally, Paul would know his audience could make these fine distinctions and would be familiar with these techniques. They are HEBREWS after all, and did not need to be spoon-feed the exact chronology. Whether folks in our own time meet that level of understanding is another matter. It is also worth noting that the procedure in Hebrews is described AFTER Moses explained ALL the precepts of the Torah to the people. That could take a while, yes? Not necessarily happening at once. To say otherwise is to ASSUME what is not there, without trying to put oneself back into the original cultural realities.

Moshe did not anoint the tabernacle with blood, as it was Aaron who anointed it with oil not blood later on in Exodus 40.

You have event 1 in Hebrews 9:19-20, the speech that the blood is for atonement. Then LATER you have event 2 with the blood being sprinkled on the Tabernacle later.

Now I know it seems to suggest that the blood from that day lasted 8-9 months and then was sprinkled on the Tabernacle, but again this is how events get combined to make a spiritual point. That's what a Midrash is all about. Clearly Paul knew, as did his audience, that additional blood was used in Exodus 40 that was prepared in the same manner. I know again it looks like it says "this same blood" but I would argue the meaning is "blood derived from this same manner". This becomes clear I think also when we see that Exodus 24:5 talks about burnt offerings and sacrificed bulls and Exodus 40:29 refers to burnt offerings and meal offerings.

Hebrews 9:19 speaks of Moses putting the blood on the book, or scroll. Not only is that not found in Exodus 24 when Moses comes down from the mount, but it's not found anywhere else in Torah for that matter. What book was sprinkled? More error from this writer.

This is an answer as plain as day! In the days of Moses, there was no wooden altar, platform, or bema from which to address the people and where a heavy scroll could be laid. Now Exodus 24 does in fact clearly speak of the Torah being read and sprinkled with blood.

6 And Moshe took half of the dahm, and put it in basins; and half of the dahm he sprinkled on the altar.

7 And he took the scroll of the brit, and read it in the audience of the people: and they said, All that YHWH has said will we do, and be obedient.

8 And Moshe took the dahm, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, See the dahm of the brit, that YHWH has made with you concerning all these words.

So we can clearly see that Moses sprinkled the people and the altar, and as such blood was on the altar. Now when Moses read the book to the people as seen in verse 7, he LAID IT DOWN ON THE ALTAR WHERE HALF THE BLOOD WAS. As such, it can be said that the scroll/book itself was also sprinkled with blood, as the blood from the altar saw to that. Moreover when sprinkling the people with a plant-hyssop (as seen in verse 8) while the book rested on the altar, obviously it got sprinkled as well. There remains no such thing as a 'neat sprinkling!' Everything gets sprinkled! There's no way Moses could sprinkle the people and still keep the book dry, while it was laying on the altar from where he read it to the nation.