

MESSIANIC ISRAELITE

Online Witnessing

(lastmodified=28/01/15)
(lastmodified=13/07/16)



About this form:

This form includes example posts of witnessing to various people, both Jews and Christians.

Post one

On this first post, the editor is in response to a Jew. The Jew is trying to explain that we don't know how long the Sabbath is for. He is trying to get out of keeping the Sabbath.

Message 32, in reply to **message 29**.

Posted by **The Covenant (U8843775)** ** on Tuesday, 26th February 2008

And any Jewish child over the age of 9 can tell you that the Hebrew word for "day" merely refers to a period of time that includes an alternation of darkness and light.

Apikoros. And if a nine year old asked you the question: "Do you cut the Sabbath short during a eclipse", your answer should be plainly, no. Your trying to get around a plain doctrine.

The word day in the Hebrew is "yom" and means "a 24 hour period of time" to which we refer as a literal day. When speaking prophetically the Hebrew word has been used abstractly [viz. The day of Yahweh, Zec 14:1]. However, when the term is used in it's mundane sense as in Genesis, there is no question that it means anything less than 24-hour period of time.

so it is unlikely (as well as illogical and utterly pointless) for God to be operating on a 24-hour Earth day while creating...stars, ...galaxies, countless planets, dark matter, and the rings of Satum.

MS

HE S

You recognise that the creation was no miniscule job. To at least identify this, you are only a step a way of recognising the power of Yahweh. As it is written:
"For he spoke, and it was done;
He commanded and it stood fast"

Why is it hard to believe that the Creator and Sustainer of this Universe, did not work within the confines of a 24 hour day? To deal with your question: Yahweh knows how long it takes for the earth to spin on it's axis in one rotary motion, which is equal to one day. No sun was needed to calculate the day, therefore the excuse that the sun wasn't created until the fourth day is not a viable one. Yahweh did plan creation, He knew how long a day would last.

Post two

On this second and third post the editor is talking to an individual who doesn't believe in creation as the Bible states, most probably an atheist or a Chr-stian who rejects the creation story. The editor presents evidence to show how the creation story may be true from scientific evidence. **However**, it is advisable to try not to get too heavily involved in such discussions because they **never end** and further, the concentration should be on the importance of keeping the Biblical Law. Inevitably, you will run in to people who will ask for evidence to prove the Bible is true. You will have to do your own research.

AL

AL

AL

Message 101, in reply to [message 99](#).

Posted by [The Covenant \(U8843775\)](#) on Tuesday, 29th June 2010

Message 99. Richard Forrest (U9894298)

The extent to which earth underwent freezing is debatable. In Genesis 1:2 we have several elements which you coincidentally call "common elements" before Creation, which begins in [Genesis 1:3]. We have water, we have darkness, waste and what may be lack of activity, motionless . Combine this with no light and what you have are the requirements for cold conditions. In [Genesis 1:6] Yahweh creates a (suitable) atmosphere but in Genesis 1:9, the waters were flooding the land, hence the instruction to have all the water "gathered to one place".

It is possible for water to exist under ice under the correct conditions. That was demonstrated in a study on one of Jupiters moons: www.nature.com/news/...

One of Jupiter's largest moons, Callisto, may hold watery secrets beneath its surface, suggests a new analysis. The satellite's icy crust may be the planetary equivalent of a blanket, insulating an underground ocean

[Published online 26 July 2001 | Nature | doi:10.1038/news010726-12 | Callisto's watery secret]

You say "We have life both before and after the "Snowball Earth" event", but on the source I showed you, it plainly says:

Yet, if this was the case [these cold conditions], how could life have survived at all?

[Published online 25 May 2000 | Nature | doi:10.1038/news000525-10 | Escaping the big freeze]

It's illogical. We should re-examine our dating methods as they are inaccurate for dating. That's a different debate to be had. But for more contradictions of your view, please see the below:

www.nature.com/news/...

But it was unclear what could have tipped the world into that [snowball earth] state in the first place.

There was indeed a proliferation of such life in the late Proterozoic, though no one can yet prove why.

The assumptions are not being logically thought out because the dating methods are wrong. I know you will not agree, but all these unanswered questions are pointing towards a fundamental error in scientific judgment,.

The Covenant.

Post three

Same as above post.

Message 120, in reply to **message 112**.

Posted by **The Covenant (U8843775)** on Thursday, 1st July 2010

Message 112. Good afternoon Richard Forrest (U9894298)

? Bearing in mind that there is not so much as a smidgeon of evidence to support this assertion, how do you propose to test it using the tools of science

I think Pluto would be a good example to use. Pluto's has the most eccentric and inclined of all the planets and it has puzzled scientists

[www.nature.com/natur...]

A suggestion⁴ that the orbit may have evolved purely by chaotic dynamics appears unlikely in light of recent orbital stability studies⁶

[Levison, H. F. & Duncan, M. J. *Astrophys. J.* 406, L35−L38 (1993).] .

And the evidence on which you base this speculation is [for stray planets]

[R. Forrest]

What about Cha 110913-773444?

Although it is currently unconfirmed as a Rogue Planet, it may be:

en.wikipedia.org/wik... Remember, Yahweh used stars in the universe as anchors to stop everything flying everywhere. This is why impact events should mostly be seen as characteristics of the universe before life was created on earth. Further, the Moon may have taken the collisions between the asteroid, comet, or meteorites bound for earth, when the strong pull of gravity was suddenly established by the creation of the Sun.

Therefore, the Moon may have acted as a buffer, to assist in removing all the debris that existed between Earth and the Moon. It would be great if seismology made some advances and would date the majority of those craters on the Moon - if accurate, I would say they should prove to be a few thousand years old.

The Covenant.

Post four

On this fourth post it is important to highlight an important aspect of

these discussions. You are to remain respectful even when others jibe at you. 'Thank you for your opinion' is a great statement to use when people claim that the Bible is untrue for some reason. Remind them that it's their **opinion**.

Message 124, in reply to **message 102**.

Posted by **The Covenant (U8843775)** on Thursday, 1st July 2010

Message 102 . Good afternoon Rabbac (U5273099) ,

If the dating methods are wrong how come its only YEC's that think so?

Everyone else in the real scientific community (and the community at large) don't think they are wrong but then they dont have a hidden agenda to go on only facts!

Thank you for your opinion.

Actually, you'll find that scientists have been known to question radiometric dating whenever it doesn't fit in to their own preconceived ideas. As shown below, and I also might add, many times in the past two years, dating have had to be pushed forward or backwards for events and "evolution" due to controversial finds.

[news.nationalgeograp...](#)

[news.nationalgeograp...](#)

[news.nationalgeograp...](#)

Although other bone tools of about the same age have been discovered at other sites in Africa, the findings have been single tools or the context has been disputed.

The fossils, dubbed Omo I and Omo II, were dated at the time as being about 130,000 years old. But even then the researchers themselves questioned the accuracy of the dating technique.

Your statement: "They are only wrong because they dont go with your doctrine's version of the world", comes to mind very readily.

The Covenant.

Post five

On this fifth post is a typical example of someone not believing the AOY because in their opinion, it's not as old as other religions. In hindsight, the poster here should have explained that the AOY is the reconstituted Apostolic Assembly.

Message 5, in reply to **message 4**.

Posted by **The Covenant (U8843775)** ** on Tuesday, 5th October 2010

Message 2 - Ad Orientem (U1646376)

*The heresy of the Judaisers lives on, I see.
So, there was no true faith before the 1960's?*

It seems one does find out how anti-semitic people are when you start keeping the commandments of Yahweh. Yahshua was a Jew. He was Jew who died trying and successfully upholding the commandments of Yahweh. He was perfect in law keeping. Should I recall Matthew 5:17 - Yahshua came to *do* the Law, not to abolish it. To show how it should be done. www.biblegateway.com...

Was Yahshua a Judaiser because he kept the Biblical Law and taught his disciples to? Then follow his example: 1 Corinthians 11:1.

So, there was no true faith before the 1960's?

The prophesy in Malachi 4 says that Yahweh would send Elijah before the end time judgment religiousviews.webno... Before the 1960's there have been various groups who have tried to live in complete harmony with the scriptures, but sadly have failed in various doctrinal points. The Assemblies of Yahweh is the complete truth. It has been founded on complete doctrinal truth.

Message 3 - DCI Burnside (U1878668)

that's what they all say, your odd beliefs are no different

You should be careful. If you call our beliefs odd, you call Yahshua odd - but fear, Revelation 14:7. We are not part of mainstream religion.

The Covenant.

Post sixth

On this post the editor has had to include the original post to which The Covenant is responding to. This individual has the usual excuses for not keeping the Law. You'll notice, they rarely ever post in context and this poster (Ad Orientem) didn't even include citations"

Message 10, in reply to **message 9**.

Posted by **Ad Orientem (U1646376)** on Tuesday, 5th October 2010

You're already contradicting yourself then. Tut tut! No circumcision. Yet you impose the laws regarding meats, for instance, despite the teaching of the aspostles at the council of Jersusalem.

The law came to an end.

"In like manner the chalice also, after he had supped, saying: This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you."

"And behold the veil of the temple was rent in two from the top even to the bottom"

"For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of partition, the enmities in his flesh: Making void the law of commandments contained in decrees"

"And you, when you were dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh; he hath quickened together with him, forgiving you all offences: Blotting out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, which was contrary to us. And he hath taken the same out of the way, fastening it to the cross"

[Link to this](#)

 [Report message](#)

The Covenant's reply:

Message 11, in reply to **message 10**.

Posted by **The Covenant (U8843775)** ** on Tuesday, 5th October 2010

Message 10 -Ad Orientem (U1646376)

You're already contradicting yourself then.

No. That's not true.
You should speak truth.

"In like manner the chalice also, after he had supped, saying: This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you."

[Luke 22:20]

How you have come to the conclusion that this has anything to do with the abolishing of the Biblical Law is beyond me. The blood of Yahshua covers sin so we have a chance of making it to the Kingdom through the keeping of the Biblical Law. See Hebrews 10:19.

"And behold the veil of the temple was rent in two from the top even to the bottom"

[Matthew 27:51]

When Yahshua died the veil of the temple was rent in two. Again, there is a reason for this which in no way corresponds to any wishful thinking that this showed that the Law had been done away with. But I don't go in to the significance of these things because it is not necessary for you to understand them.

"For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of partition, the enmities in his flesh: Making void the law of commandments contained in decrees"

[Ephesians 2:14]

Your focus is on the middle wall of partition and your misconception is that it represents the Law of Yahweh - the commandments. A third time, this is your misconception. The quote does *not* suggest this wall is the Law of Yahweh at all. The middle wall is the enmity between gentile and Jew. All people can be saved.

Did you forget to read verse 18 - 19:

In conclusion, you are no longer foreigners and aliens, but fellow citizens with Yahweh's people [Jews] and members of Yahweh's household

Your last quote is from Colossians 2:

"And you, when you were dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh; he hath quickened together with him, forgiving you all offences: Blotting out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, which was contrary to us. And he hath taken the same out of the way, fastening it to the cross"

This is stating - if you are confused on what it says here - that through Yahshua our sins can be nailed away. The punishment, which is written in various places in the Bible, is that the sinner will die. This can be therefore blotted out through Yahshua. You have a chance through Yahshua to eternal life by the blotting out of your old sins.

Or should we exclude Romans 6:15-16:

*15What then? Shall we sin because we are not under law but under grace? By *no* means! 16Don't you know that when you offer yourselves to someone to obey him as slaves, you are slaves to the one whom you obey—whether you are slaves to sin, which leads to death, or to obedience, which leads to righteousness?*

Read the above again with 1 John 3:4.

Paul is asking, Shall we break Yahweh's Law after accepting Yahshua? He says, No way! We serve Yahweh now in obedience to eternal life.

www.biblegateway.com...

Please include the quote passages next time.
It shows insincerity on your part.
The Covenant.

[Link to this](#)

 [Report message](#)

Post seven

This is a continuation of the discussion The Covenant is having in the above post. You'll see very quickly that Christians don't have the answers, but many choose not to accept the truth anyway.

Message 12, in reply to [message 11](#).

Posted by [Ad Orientem \(U1646376\)](#) on Tuesday, 5th October 2010

They're all scriptural evidence that the law of Moses was abolished. Christ made a new covenant, thus making the old void. Those who follow the old law, whether they be Jew or Gentile, reject Christ and therefore salvation.

[Link to this](#)

 [Report message](#)

The Covenant's reply:

Message 14, in reply to **message 12**.

Posted by **The Covenant (U8843775)** ** on Tuesday, 5th October 2010

Message 12 - posted by Ad Orientem (U1646376)

They're all scriptural evidence

What scriptural evidence? You have taken these quotes out of context. Even Satan can take quotes out of context to get you to break Yahweh's Law as Matthew 4:6 demonstrates. You claim that the Law has been abolished. You're going to have to give account of this foolishness that you're teaching. I'm not going to stand for this.

Haven't I just showed the truth?

I'm not hiding behind any hidden meanings and rending of veils of Temples and middle wall of partitions.

Let's look at some straightforward passages:

17It is easier for heaven and earth to disappear than for the least stroke of a pen to drop out of the Law.

Please understand. It is easier for this earth to be destroyed, to disappear just like that, than for any aspect of the Law to pass away, says Yahshua the Messiah. How about Romans 7:12

12So then, the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, righteous and good.

[www.biblegateway.com...]

You're not speaking truth.
The Covenant.

Post eight

A brief message about the Trinity.

Message 10, in reply to **message 1**.

Posted by **The Covenant (U8843775)** ** on Tuesday, 13th July 2010

I would like to place on record that every christian is a Trinitarian. That has been the case since Jesus Himself walked the earth.

Message 1. Good afternoon Preacher (U2899850)

No.

That is your opinion.
It is an erroneous opinion.

If one must be a Trinitarian to be a Chr-stian, every Chr-stian is in false doctrine. Trinitarianism, as T8-eh-T8 (U1732911) and others have pointed out, is not Biblical. Wikipedia says: "Trinitarianism, belief in the Trinity, is a *mark* of Roman Catholicism" It may give the impression of being Biblical, but it isn't.

"non-Trinitarians are a tiny, misguided group with false doctrines"

That's a lie.
Sad case.
The Covenant.

[Link to this](#)

 [Report message](#)

Post nine

Discussion on whether we as Yahshua's disciples should keep the Sabbath.

Message 17, in reply to **message 16**.

Posted by **The Covenant (U8843775)** ** on Thursday, 8th July 2010

Message 16. Colin (U5770274)

Yes, of course I've read Matthew 24:20, where Jesus tells the Jews to pray that they won't have to flee on a sabbath. Naturally the Jews would be observing the Sabbath.

No.

That is not true Colin. Yahshua wasn't just specifying his instructions to the Jews, but His disciples. That's an outrageous lie. It seems you're going in circles with this argument. You claim you have read Matthew 24:20, so I assume you read the chapter. In it is says:

*(3) As Yahshua was sitting on the Mount of Olives, *the disciples* came to him privately. "Tell us," they said, "when will this happen, and what will be the sign of your coming and of the end of the age?"*

He was talking to his disciples. That includes us. Yahshua knew His words were being recorded for us in our time. Hence: [14] "And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and then the end will come." also verse 15, 24, 29 etc. The entire chapter was not directed simply towards the Jews, but towards those who believe in Yahshua and this includes us, in the Last Days.

www.biblegateway.com...

Why are you trying to depreciate Yahshua's instructions? It does not work. It is hypocritical. Yahshua's words are not simply for the Jews. How comical. I really shouldn't have to state the obvious but it seems in many cases, people try so hard to avoid keeping Yahweh's Laws.

The Covenant.

Post ten

Discussion on whether we need to keep the Sabbath.

Message 7, in reply to **message 1**.

Posted by **The Covenant (U8843775)** ** on Friday, 25th June 2010

Message 1. Good afternoon notfreepresbyterian (U8656587)

I work as a trader, and my week starts on Wednesday through to Sunday, Off am Monday and Tuesday.

There have been many instances in my faith, where the members of our faith have turned down jobs, or had to put their foot down when it came to the Sabbath day. This may sound incredibly rude, but, it doesn't matter about what you want, it matters about what Yahweh Has instructed.

The seventh day Sabbath is the Saturday.

If you are in doubt, ask a Jew, ask a Rabbi.

Shabbat; Ashkenazi pronunciation: Shabbos, Yiddish: Shabbes, "rest" or "cessation") is the seventh day of the Jewish week and a day of rest in Judaism. Shabbat is observed from sundown Friday until ... Saturday night.

[en.wikipedia.org/wik...]

The Jews have been faithful in keeping the Sabbath day on the correct day, praise Yahweh. You cannot change the day of rest to any day you wish, just as you cannot change the Law. Yahweh commands in Exodus 20:8-11 and is the fourth of the Ten Commandments. In my faith, as well as practicing Jews, we rest when Yahweh tells us to and move when He tells us to also.

The Covenant.

[Link to this](#)

 [Report message](#)

Post ten

Discussion on why there is suffering in the world. Many atheists use this as an excuse to not believe.

Message 11, in reply to **message 6**.

Posted by **The Covenant (U8843775)** ** on Thursday, 3rd June 2010

Message 6 Good morning Sir Bernard Quatermass (U1732830).

The Covenant. If suffering is down to sin, perhaps you might like to explain how the 30,000 babies and young children who will suffer and die are sinful?

I said *most* suffering is a result of sin.

You use this statistic

"30,000 babies and young children who will suffer and die"

[Msg 6]. I assume it your statistic is from that report published in 2006 by the food and agriculture organization of the United Nations (FAO) that claimed that nearly 11 million children die before reaching the age of five each year, which roughly works out at 30,000 a day [www.opednews.com/art... Opednews].

I don't know how accurate that report was, but for the sake of simplicity, let us assume it is. Now, the report states that "more than half of these child deaths are [from] hunger and malnutrition." I don't think we can blame these deaths on Yahweh. Surely, one should think before they have a child and review if they have enough food to see the child through.

28"Suppose one of you wants to build a tower. Will he not first sit down and estimate the cost to see if he has enough money to complete it?"

[Luke 14:27-29]

Then you might argue that changes in circumstances could result in the loss of a child also. We cannot however access this information so how could we reach a conclusion that Yahweh has done us wrong? It's illogical.

The Covenant.

[Link to this](#)

 [Report message](#)

"...I showed that the 144,000, each one of them individually, can serve as a witness"

Yahweh and His Witnesses

Elder Jacob O. Meyer

www.messianicisraelite.com

"Open the door"