

# Why the Word Had To Become Flesh

## (Affirming Mashiach Is Elohim and Incorporating the New Covenant)

### Introduction

*And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many and because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. (Matt.24:11-12)*

Sad as these words are, it is always exciting to see the fulfilment of prophesy even when it is negative prophesy because such fulfilment gives credence to Scripture. Today I have personal experience of the falling away Mashiach prophesied. One person I knew who, living in Israel, used to head a charity supporting Messianic Jews who, because of their belief in Yahusha Mashiach, were persecuted by Orthodox Jews. Today this chap has done a complete U-turn, even publishing a book claiming Yahusha was the product of a normal birth by a normal woman and no different to anyone else. I know of others who having previously had a steadfast belief in Yahusha Mashiach: all He said and did, and now vehemently denying His deity and siding with Orthodox Judaism. What does Scripture have to say about such people?

*And every spirit that does not confess that Yahusha Messiah has come in the flesh is not of Elohim. And this is the spirit of the anti-messiah which you heard is coming, and now is already in the world. (1John 4:3).*

What an exclamation. It begs the question of those who turn away from Mashiach whether they ever had YHWH's Ruach HaKodesh (Holy Spirit) in the first place.

Hopefully, this article will *inter alia* convincingly prove claims against Yahusha Mashiach's deity to be as false as the claimants themselves but to do this we have to consider Scripture from a Hebraic perspective. The original Hebrew language of the Scriptures has its own unique construction, where words hide information which does not yield itself to translation.

### The Relevance of the Aleph Tav (אָ) In the Hebrew Scriptures

*Aleph* (א) is the first letter of the Hebrew *alephbet* (alphabet), and the *tav* (ת) is the last letter of the *alephbet*. The expression *aleph-tav* (אָ) is strategically located within many verses throughout the Hebrew Scriptures and serves a grammatical purpose in that it points to the direct object of the sentence in which it occurs. However, this expression does not form an actual word, rather, it implies a particular understanding.

The *aleph-tav* (אָ) character is only present in original Paleo-Hebrew scrolls written by the hand of Moshe and the Prophets. It was copied by the scribes for thousands of years and included in modern Hebrew manuscripts. It was never translated in the Greek Septuagint, the Latin Vulgate, the King James, or subsequent English bible translations because it was not considered a word. Yet this expression appears 7000 times in the Hebrew Tanakh (Old Testament), this frequency alone is sufficient to tell everyone it is not meant to be ignored. Whilst its relevance is a mystery, it is thought its purpose is to draw attention to a deeper meaning within the text. Some believe, and I agree, it is meant to give a messianic relevance to the text which would find support in Rev.1:8, 1:11, 21:6 and 22:13. In these verses Mashiach claims He is the *aleph tav* (אָ). This being the case the placement of these two Hebrew letters throughout the Hebrew Scriptures has far reaching implications starting with the Abrahamic covenant.

### The Abrahamic Covenant

First a word about covenants. Most would consider covenants as boring legal instruments meant only for the eyes of lawyers. Whilst this may be true in the social world, we cannot be so flippant where Scriptural

covenants are concerned because YHWH knows only one type, one level of relationship – a covenant relationship. Thus, if we want a relationship with YHWH, we have no choice but to enter into a covenant with Him. It is therefore important for us to understand the nature of what we are entering into. It is also relevant for us to understand how the ancients enacted covenants particularly a ‘blood cut’ covenant.

Where the subject matter was of some gravity the covenant was usually sealed or ‘cut’ in blood. For this, one or more animals would be killed and cut in half, the head would be placed opposite from the hind quarters and the parties to the covenant would walk between the two halves and make a vow of the nature, “If I break this covenant may I be like these animals.” In other words, the penalty for breaking a covenant ‘cut’ in this way was the death of the guilty party. Thus, covenants sealed in blood had to be conditional covenants – you cannot break a covenant if there are no conditions attached to it.

Let us consider what is recorded in Gen.15,

*I. The Promise*

*And he brought him outside, and said, look now toward heaven, and see the stars, if you be able to number them: and he said to him, So shall be your seed. (Gen.15:5)*

*And he said to him, I am YHWH who brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give you this land to inherit it. (Gen.15:7)*

*II. Abram’s Doubt*

*And he said, YHWH Elohim, how shall I know that I shall inherit it? (Gen.15:8).*

When Abram requested confirmation of what YHWH had promised him, YHWH, followed the ancient custom and sealed the promise with a blood cut covenant, knowing Abram would fully understand this procedure,

*And He said to him, “Bring Me a three-year-old heifer, and a three-year-old female goat, and a three-year-old ram, and a turtledove, and a young pigeon.” And he took all these to Him and cut them in the middle, and placed each half opposite the other, but he did not cut the birds. (Gen.15:9-10).*

*And it came to be, when the sun went down and it was dark, and see, **a smoking furnace and a burning torch passing between those pieces. On the same day YHWH made a covenant with Abram, saying, “I have given this land to your seed, from the river of Mitsrayim (Egypt) to the great river, the River Euphrates. On the same day YHWH made a covenant with Abram, saying, “I have given this land to your seed, from the river of Mitsrayim to the great river, the river Euphrates.”** (Gen.15:17-18).*

A further point we need to understand about covenants is that two parties are always involved, you do not covenant with yourself. Furthermore, covenants will generally place responsibilities on both parties.

However, the above verses present us with an anomaly, we are told that YHWH made this covenant not only with Abram, but with his seed also. However, Abram was ‘asleep’ and did not ‘cut’ the covenant, a furnace and a torch ‘cut’ the covenant. This raises some questions, firstly, who did the furnace and torch represent, exactly who made this covenant? Secondly, how could Abram be a party to the covenant if he did not play an active part in its enactment? Let us first deal with the question of identity: what or who cut this covenant?

### **The Identity of the Smoking Furnace and Lighted Torch**

We said above that covenants require two parties, this explains why it was necessary for two objects to pass between the animal pieces: the smoking furnace and burning torch had to represent the parties making this covenant. There is no argument that YHWH was party to this covenant therefore, one of the objects had to be

a representation of Him. Note it says a smoking furnace and not just a furnace. How often is YHWH's appearance accompanied by smoke and/or fire; the destruction of Sodom, the burning bush, Mount Sinai, the two columns that led Israel through the wilderness etc. etc. thus the smoking furnace had to represent YHWH. But it is the second object; the lighted torch that is most amazing, because it is this object that shows the awesome wonder YHWH is. This covenant was made with Abram hence the lighted torch was somehow a representation of Abram and his descendants. The lighted torch is proof of YHWH's unmeasurable omniscience.

There is a misconception that this covenant was an unconditional covenant. But as stated above, covenants 'cut' in blood carried the death penalty for breach and it is not possible to breach an agreement if it has no conditions attached to it. It is the presence of a death penalty that is the main difference between this covenant and the oath of Gen.12 which did not require any penalty for breach. The Abramic Covenant did indeed have conditions, **but YHWH did not explain them until He met with Israel much later at Mount Sinai.** The covenant conditions YHWH imposed upon Israel are detailed in Exodus chapters 19 through 23. Sinai confirms two facts: 1) that YHWH always considered Israel (Abram's descendants) party to the covenant and 2) the acquiescence of Abram's descendant's to being a covenant party. Unfortunately, no sooner had Israel, as a nation, accepted its covenant position they broke the covenant via the golden calf incident – a transgression that required the death of the whole nation, which obviously would annul the covenant. Under normal circumstances this breach would have put YHWH in a most difficult if not impossible situation, because He could not honour His unconditional oath to Abram (Gen.12) without Abram's descendants?

The fact that Abram's descendants were to be party to the covenant precluded YHWH from making His covenant with the person Abram for several reasons; firstly, it is not possible for one person to swear obligations on the part of another, thus Abram could not covenant for his descendants. Secondly, the death of a party to an agreement automatically annuls the agreement thus Abram's death would have brought the covenant to a premature end. Possibly the greatest complication for YHWH was foreknowing that Abram's descendants would eventually break the covenant and thereby bring His promise to an end. But being Elohim He must fulfil what He has promised. His dilemma is how to fulfil His original promise (Gen.12) and at the same time **comply with the provisions of the covenant (Gen.17) which, due to its breach, required the death of the benefactors of that promise.** YHWH overcame all these issues via the lighted torch. It was the lighted torch that represented the second party to the covenant: Abram and his descendants - but how?

When we study the covenant record in the Hebrew Scriptures we find an *aleph-tav* (אָ) situated between covenant and Abram,

*In the same day YHWH made a covenant with (אָ) Abram...(Gen.15:18).*

The presence of the (אָ) tells us that Mashiach played a fundamental part in the enactment of this covenant and the words of the apostle remove all doubt,

*But this I say, that the covenant from the first was confirmed by Elohim in Mashiach and the written law that came 430 years later, cannot cast away the promise. (Gal.3:17).<sup>1</sup>*

Here the apostle is telling us that it was the Father and the Son who cut the covenant, confirming the promise. Thus, the lighted torch had to be a representation of Yahusha Mashiach. Remember He claimed He was the light of the world (John 9:5, 12:46) so such a representation makes sense. The apostle Paul was well versed in the Scriptures, he would have understood the relevance of the (אָ) in Gen.15:8 and in his epistle to the Galatians he is revealing information hidden within the Hebrew Scriptures. The previous verse also provides confirmation of Mashiach's direct involvement,

---

<sup>1</sup> It was 430 years from the Gen.12 promise to Israel's exodus to Sinai. This period is explained in the separate article 'The Period the Israelites Were in Mitsrayim (Egypt).' on the website: [www.undertorah.com](http://www.undertorah.com) in Miscellaneous Articles.

*But the promises were spoken to Abraham, and to his Seed. He does not say, "And to seeds," as of many, but as of one, "And to your Seed," who is Messiah. (Gal.3:16).*

The placement of the *aleph tav* throughout the Hebrew Scriptures is deliberate, even its positioning within a sentence is intentional it is not haphazard. In Gen.15:8 the *aleph tav* is adjacent to Abram indicating that there will be a direct relationship between Mashiach and Abram.

*In the same day YHWH made a covenant with (אבֶרָם) Abram...*

For further confirmation that Mashiach is the lighted torch, we have Isaiah describing Mashiach as a torch,

*For Zion's sake I am not silent, and for Jerusalem's sake I do not rest, until her righteousness goes forth as brightness, and her salvation (Yahusha)\* like a blazing torch (lappîyd). (Isa.62:1).*

\*The Hebrew name Yahusha/Yeshua means salvation

The Hebrew *lappîyd* is the same word used in Gen.15:17 to describe the torch passing between the animal pieces. It is plain from Scripture that both the Father and the Son made the covenant. To fulfil His covenant role, Mashiach had to singularly represent the whole of Abram's descendants, thus He had to have a connection to physical Israel and for this He needed to become human, as the gospel records,

*And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.... (John 1:14)*

A reading of the following verses in John leaves no doubt that the apostle is describing Yahusha Mashiach. Furthermore, Rev.19:13 describing Mashiach's return on a white horse says, 'His name was called the Word of Elohim.'

### **Why Mashiach Had to Come in the Flesh**

It was explained above that the covenant was conditional but the conditions were only revealed to Israel much later at Mt. Sinai. The nation of Israel accepted the covenant conditions and their acceptance was sealed in blood (Exod.24:7-8). Hence Israel's affirmation for the covenant to be a 'blood cut,' conditional covenant.

To summarize:

- The covenant was enacted by a smoking furnace (YHWH) and a lighted torch (Mashiach),
- The covenant was between YHWH, Abram, and Abram's descendants.
- Therefore, the lighted torch had to represent Abram and his descendants.
- It was a conditional 'blood cut' covenant.
- Breach of 'blood cut' covenant conditions required the death of the guilty party.

Unfortunately, immediately after confirming their participation in the covenant the nation of Israel broke the covenant via the golden calf incident. The creation of the golden calf at Mt. Sinai was a transgression of the second commandment, (the Ten Commandments were included in the covenant conditions). This transgression required the death of the guilty party - Abram's descendants, Israel. But as explained earlier YHWH could not kill the nation Israel because of His unconditional oath to Abram (Gen.15). It was to overcome this dilemma that YHWH substituted Mashiach for Abram when making the covenant. We must remember YHWH's omniscience; He foreknew Israel would break the covenant and prepared the solution at the very start, when making the covenant.

Mashiach came in the flesh to fulfil His destiny as the lighted Torch and pay the penalty for the golden calf transgression. But for this He had to be a descendant of Abraham. It is to prove His connection to Israel that

His lineage is given in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.<sup>2</sup> This connection was paramount for the final conclusive act of the covenant. Hence Yahusha's dying words, "It is finished." Yahusha's death brought closure to the old covenant and paved the way for the new covenant.

### Is It a New or Renewed Covenant?

Yahusha knew that He came to die and He fully realized His sacrifice was essential if the new covenant described in Jeremiah was to be realized,

*"See, the days are coming," declares YHWH, "when I shall make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Yehudah, not like the covenant I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Mitsrayim, My covenant which they broke, though I was a husband to them," declares YHWH. For this is the covenant I shall make with the house of Israel after those days, declares YHWH: I shall put My Torah in their inward parts, and write it on their hearts. And I shall be their Elohim, and they shall be My people. (Jer.32:31-34).*

Some argue that it is a renewed not new covenant but as said earlier the breach of a blood sealed covenant required the death of the guilty party which effectively annulled the covenant. Annulment means termination, invalidation, end of. With the death of one of the parties the covenant no longer exists. What is more the new covenant is far more reaching than the old covenant with greater implication. The apostle describes it as a better covenant,

*But now He has obtained a more excellent service, inasmuch as He is also Mediator of a better covenant, which was constituted on better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then no place would have been sought for a second. For finding fault with them, He says, "See, the days are coming," says YHWH, "when I shall conclude with the house of Israel and with the house of Yehudah a new (**Kainos**) covenant, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Mitsrayim, because they did not continue in My covenant, and I disregarded them," says YHWH. (Heb.8:6-9).*

Not according to the old covenant!!! The new covenant is different from the old covenant. The apostle also claims the old covenant was faulty, why would YHWH renew a faulty covenant? He did not, He replaced it,

*By saying, 'new,' He has made the first old. Now what becomes old and growing aged is near disappearing. (Heb.8:13).*

It cannot be disappearing if it is renewed; the apostle affirms this premise a little later in the same epistle,

*For the Torah has in it a shadow of the good things to come, but not the actual manifestation of the originals. Therefore, it can never, by means of the same sacrifices repeated endlessly year after year, bring to the goal those who approach the Holy Place to offer them. Otherwise, wouldn't the offering of those sacrifices have ceased? For if the people performing the service had been*

---

<sup>2</sup> Why was Yahusha's lineage given twice, first through the line of Mary's husband Joseph in Matthew and subsequently through the line of Mary herself in Luke? Was it to counter the argument that if Yahusha was born of Joseph then He could not be the promised Mashiach who was to be born of a virgin: the product of divine conception? Yahusha's lineage through His mother Mary leaves no room for such an argument. Although in Luke, Mary's husband, Joseph is named as the son of Heli (Jacob) it was Mary who was the daughter of Heli but Luke, as with Matthew, follows the Hebraic tradition of listing only the male names, consequently Mary is designated by her husband's name. Most translations attempt to clarify this issue by adding an additional phrase, usually in parenthesis, in verse 23: And Yahusha Himself began, He was about thirty years of age being (*as reckoned by the law*) the son of Joseph of Heli. Furthermore, Hebrew uses the word son in the context of 'son-in-law' (1Sam.24:16, 26:17) and this is Joseph's relationship to Heli.

*cleansed once and for all, they would no longer have sins on their conscience. No, it is quite the contrary – in these sacrifices is a reminder of sins, year after year. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins. This is why, on coming into the world, He says, it has not been your will to have an animal sacrifice and a meal offering; rather, you have prepared for me a body. No, you have not been pleased with burnt offerings and sin offerings. Then I said, look! In the scroll of the book, it is written about Me. I have come to do your will. In saying first, you neither willed nor were pleased with animal sacrifices, meal offerings, burnt offerings and sin offerings, things which are offered in accordance with the Torah; and then, look, I have come to do your will; He takes away the first system in order to set up the second. It is in connection with this will that we have been separated for Elohim and made holy, once and for all through the offering of Mashiach's body. (Heb.10:1-10).*

The apostle says Mashiach is the mediator of a better covenant so it cannot be a renewal of the old covenant, what is more we are told you cannot amend a covenant once it is enacted,

*Brothers, as a man I say it: a covenant, even though it is mans, yet if it is confirmed, no one sets it aside, or adds to it. (Gal.3:15).*

The apostle is saying once a covenant is validated it is beyond change, hence Mashiach was the instigator of a new and better covenant. Primarily there are two salient changes from the old covenant,

1. A change in the law concerning the priesthood,

*Truly, then, if perfection were through the Levitical priesthood – for under it the people were given the Torah – why was there still need for another priest to arise according to the order of Malkizedek and not be called according to the order of Aharon? For the priesthood being changed, of necessity there takes place a change of law also. For He of whom this is said belongs to another tribe, from which no one had attended at the altar. For it is perfectly clear that our Master arose from Yehudah, a tribe about which Moshe never spoke of concerning priesthood. (Heb.7:11-14).*

2. The annulment of the sacrificial system,

The new covenant has no place for animal sacrifice. Mashiach offered Himself once and for all,

*But Mashiach, having become a High Priest of the coming good matters, through the greater and more perfect Tent not made with hands, that is, not of this creation, entered into the Most Set-apart Place **once for all**, not with the blood of goats and calves, but with His own blood, **having obtained everlasting redemption.** (Heb.19:11-12).*

*For Mashiach has not entered into a Set-apart Place made by hand – figures of the true – but into the heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of Elohim on our behalf, **not that He should offer Himself often**, as the high priest enters into the Set-apart Place year by year with blood not of his own. **For if so, He would have had to suffer often**, since the foundation of the world. **But now He has appeared once for all at the end of the ages to put away sin by the offering of Himself.** (Heb.9:24-26)*

The prophet Daniel also confirms that Mashiach put an end to temple sacrifices and meal offerings,

*And after the sixty-two weeks Mashiach shall be cut off and have naught. And the people of a coming prince shall destroy the city and the set-apart place. And the end of it is with a flood. And wastes are decreed and fighting until the end. And he (**Mashiach**) shall confirm a covenant with many for one week. And in the middle of the week he (**Mashiach**) shall put an end to slaughtering and oblation\*. And on the wing of abominations, he shall lay waste, even*

until the complete end and that which is decreed is poured out on the one who lays waste. (Dan.9:26-27).

\*The word in Hebrew is *minchâh* which may mean meat or a bloodless offering. The Septuagint has 'drink offering'. However, in the context of 'slaughtering' I believe meat is most appropriate.

Daniel says an end to slaughtering without classification, therefore Daniel must mean all slaughtering. A pertinent point of note is that Judaism refers to the principle of animal sacrifice as a *qorbân* (H7133) which has the root *qârab* (H7126) which means something that draws close or draws near to. In other words, the *qorbân* enabled the transgressor to return to or draw near to Elohim, after becoming distant due to his transgression. However, Mashiach categorically states nobody comes near to the Father except through him (John 14:6). In other words, in the eyes of YHWH, Mashiach is now and henceforth the only acceptable *qorbân*: **the only acceptable offering**, thereby abolishing the system of animal sacrifice and this means **all animal sacrifice**.

The following tabulations show how both the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts support the term new not renewed. In the Hebrew where, *châdash* appears it is always with respect to new. Renew is either *châdash* or *châlah*. Although *châdash* and *châdash* are similar these Hebrew words are different with different pronunciations.

#### Tanakh (Old Testament)

Strong's	Hebrew	Pronunciation	Totals	New	Renew	Comment
H2319	châdash	khaw-dawsh'	53	53	0	Used in Jer.31:33
H2961	târîy	taw-ree'	2	1	1	New is a weak translation
H2323	châdâth	khad-ath'	1	1	0	
H2498	châlah	khaw-laf'	28	0	2	Generally means changed (26)
H2318	châdash	khaw-dash'	10	0	10	Also means repair

#### Brit Hadashah (New Testament)

Strong's	Greek	Pronunciation	Totals	New	Renew	Comment
G2537	kainos	kahee-nos'	44	44	0	12 Instances means young/er
G46	agnaphos	ag'-naf-os	2	2	0	
G4372	prospatos	pros'-fat-os	1	1	0	
G3501	neōteros	neh-o'-ter-os	24	12	0	
G340	anakainizō	an-ak-ahee-nid'-zo	1	0	1	
G341	anakainōō	an-ak-ahee-no'-o	2	0	2	
G365	ananēōō	an-an-neh-o'-o	1	0	1	

The Hebrew word *châdash* is clearly dominant when new is to be described. Whilst there are several Greek words used to convey new, *Kainos* is the most common and is used to describe the covenant Mashiach is discussing with His disciples in Matt.26:28, Mark.14:24 and Luke.22:20. *Kainos* is never used in the Scriptures to portray renew or renewed. There is no confusion between the usage of new and renewed in either the Hebrew or Greek manuscripts both talk of new covenant.

#### Is Mashiach Elohim?

This question challenges Mashiach's deity. Was he wholly man and no different to YHWH's prophets, or was/is He Elohim? Well, we are told He is our atonement and YHWH says no man can atone for another,

*A brother does not redeem anyone at all, Neither give to Elohim a ransom for him; (Ps.49:7)*



Torah does provide for a rich man redeeming his brother from debt, or from prison into which he is cast because of the debt, by paying the debt for him. This is the Torah law known as kinsman redeemer. This redemption is possible with respect to man, **but not with respect to YHWH. No human being can free another from the bondage of sin.** This is what the Psalmist is referring to.

There are several Scriptures affirming Mashiach's deity, the first being a verse from Isaiah,

*I am YHWH, that is My Name, and My esteem I do not give to another, nor My praise to idols.*  
(Isa.42:8)

Here YHWH says He does not share His glory with another, yet Mashiach claims the same glory,

*I glorified you on earth by finishing the work you gave me to do. Now, Father, glorify me alongside yourself. Give me the same glory I had with you before the world existed.* (John.17:4-5)

**Glorify me alongside yourself.** In other words, glorify me together with you. **With the same glory I had with you before the world existed.** Mashiach had a primary request that the Father return Him back to the glory He had renounced coming to earth as a human to fulfil His task. This request to return to His original glory unequivocally implies His pre-existence. As confirmed by John 17:24.

Mashiach was aware of His pre-existence He knew there was a time in the eternal past when both Father and Son shared glory. Mashiach could never pray the way He did if He was not YHWH Himself.

**With the same glory I had with you before the world existed.** If the Father and the Son shared their glory and YHWH does not share His glory with anyone, they must both be the same entity as confirmed by Mashiach statement "I and My Father are one." (John.10:30).

## Conclusion

In chapter 3 of his epistle to the Corinthian congregation, the apostle highlights a fundamental difference in the tenet of the old covenant and that of the new covenant,

*But if the administering of death in letters, engraved on stones, was esteemed, so that the children of Israel were unable to look steadily at the face of Moshe because of the esteem of his face, which was passing away, how much more esteemed shall the administering of the Spirit not be? For if the administering of condemnation had esteem, the administering of righteousness exceeds much more in esteem.* (2Cor.3:7-9).

**The old covenant was founded on condemnation whereas the new covenant is birthed in spiritual righteousness born of a new heart – a heart of flesh which is only obtainable through Yahusha Mashiach.** The apostle continues,

*... and not like Moshe, who put a veil over his face so that the children of Israel should not look steadily at the end of what was passing away. But their minds were hardened, for to this day, when the old covenant is being read, that same veil remains, not lifted, because in Messiah it is taken away.* (2Cor.3:13-14)

When we collect all that the apostle has said I believe what we have through Yahusha Mashiach is a new covenant.

Mashiach Yahusha's death, resurrection and ascension offered a new opportunity for everyone, whatever their race or colour, (not just Abraham's direct descendants as with the old covenant) who seek separation from a falling humanity. With His death He paid the penalty for Israel's breach of the Abramic covenant and paved the way for a new and better covenant.



We said earlier that the new covenant is different from the old covenant a point confirmed by the writer of Hebrews,

*For the priesthood being changed, of necessity there takes place a change of Torah. (Heb.7:12).*

If it is changed it cannot be the same. But as is detailed below the changes introduced by the new covenant go far beyond the Torah rules for the priesthood. So how are we to reconcile the apostle's statement in terms of Deut.4:2 not to add or subtract from the Torah and Mashiach's comment that not one jot or tittle shall pass from the Torah (Matt.5:18)? Well, change does not necessarily mean addition or subtraction; it can be a change in how we obey Torah commands, that is, a change in the 'mechanics of obedience.' It can also be a change to the principles embodied within a Torah command and its objective. For example,

- Mashiach took Pesach from Egypt into covenant: from the salvation of the first born into salvation for all believers. But we still observe Pesach, we just do so differently.<sup>3</sup>
- Mashiach removed the repetitive bloodletting from worship, offering His blood once and for all time. (Dan.9:27,<sup>4</sup> Heb.9:12, 10:1-4, 10:18). Sacrifice is still required but it is a living sacrifice of service/worship (Rom.12:1) and prayer (Heb.13:15).
- Mashiach removed the prohibition against entering the holy sanctuary (Num.16:40, 18:7). Post Mashiach we can personally go before the throne,

*Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need (Heb.10:19-20).*

We being able to enter the holiest place is something additional thus it must be a new covenant,

Let us again repeat the words of the apostle, *"Brothers, as a man I say it: a covenant, even though it is mans, yet if it is confirmed, no one sets it aside, or adds to it". (Gal.3:15).*

- Post Mashiach the rules of priesthood changed from the order of Aharon to the order of Malkizedek, but a priesthood remains.
- Under the Torah sins were forgiven but not forgotten but under the new covenant sin is forgotten (Jer.31:33-34).
- Torah has no provision for deliberate sin but under the new covenant all sin is forgotten. (Tit.2:13-14).

There are other changes introduced with the new covenant such as the annulment of the requirement for wearing tzitzit (tassels). That this requirement immediately follows an act of transgression of Torah law implies that tzitzit are for a visual reminder of Torah observance. But those under the new covenant no longer need this form of visual reminder because YHWH has given a different form of reminder – a heart of flesh: our new heart is the reminder. Believers have Torah written on their hearts, thus the principle behind tzitzit: the constant awareness of YHWH's Torah, is observed internally not externally.

Whilst the covenant introduced by Yahusha Mashiach changed the goals and means of observance of Torah rules, the most prominent change of all is in the latitude attached to the new covenant compared with that of the old covenant.

Unlike the old covenant which was exclusive to a particular race the new covenant is available to all, hence the apostle describing it as a better covenant (Heb.8:6). But if the new covenant is available for all then why is

---

<sup>3</sup> Refer to the separate article 'The Changing Face of Pesach' at [www.undertorah.com](http://www.undertorah.com) in Miscellaneous Articles.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to the separate article 'Daniels Seventy Weeks' at [www.undertorah.com](http://www.undertorah.com) in End Time Articles.

it necessary for believers to be grafted into Israel as decreed by the apostle in his epistle to the Roman congregation? The apostle himself provides the answer,

*And if you are of Messiah, then you are seed of Abraham and heirs according to promise.*  
(Gal.3:29).

The apostle is here referring to YHWH's oath given to Abram in Genesis 12,

*And YHWH appeared to Abram and said, "To your seed I give this land." And he built there an altar to YHWH, who had appeared to him. (Gen.12:7).*

Note the apostle says heirs to the promise not the covenant because the Abramic covenant is dead. Our destiny is to live with Mashiach in the Land throughout the millennium,<sup>5</sup> hence the phrase 'heirs according to the promise' but YHWH promised the Land to Abram's descendants alone and not to anyone else. Thus, it is necessary for all believers to be grafted into Abram's family (Rom.11:11-24). Only the new (better) covenant facilitates the extension of this promise beyond Abram's direct descendants.

The lighted torch a.k.a. Mashiach, paid the price for the golden calf transgression thereby ending the old covenant and the resurrected Son: the new high priest, enacted the new covenant promised in Jer.31:31-34.

Clifford Fearnley 2019 (Revised 2024)

---

<sup>5</sup> Refer to the separate article 'A Rapture To or Not To Be Part 2' at [www.undertorah.com](http://www.undertorah.com) in End Time articles.