

# Hebrew Roots Heresy (Part 1)

## The Perversion of 'Repentance'

By Tim Warner © www.4windsfellowships.net

---

It is remarkable that one of the most serious errors that infected early Christianity, that was officially renounced by the Jerusalem council,<sup>1</sup> and was so soundly refuted by the Apostle Paul in Galatians, could make the kind of come-back that we see today. Yet it spreads like cancer among God's people.

Paul's leaving Timothy behind at Ephesus was to counter the 'Hebrew Roots' heresy that was continually undermining his efforts to spread the Gospel among the nations.

*1 Timothy 1:1-11*

*1 Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the commandment of God our Savior and the Lord Jesus Christ, our hope,*

*2 To Timothy, a true son in the faith: Grace, mercy, and peace from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord.*

*3 As I urged you when I went into Macedonia – **remain in Ephesus that you may charge some that they teach no other doctrine,** 4 nor give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which cause disputes rather than godly edification which is in faith.*

*5 Now the purpose of the commandment is love from a pure heart, from a good conscience, and from sincere faith, 6 **from which some, having strayed, have turned aside to idle talk,** 7 **desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say nor the things which they affirm.***

*8 But we know that **the law is good if one uses it lawfully,** 9 knowing this: that the law is not made for a righteous person, but for the lawless and insubordinate, for the ungodly and for sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, 10 for fornicators, for sodomites, for kidnappers, for liars, for perjurers, and if there is any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine, 11 according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God which was committed to my trust.*

Hebrew Roots teachers appeal to the fact that the teaching of Christ and the Apostles stems from a Hebrew 'root' (not a Gentile 'root'). That is, it deals with the fulfillment of promises made to Abraham and the nation of Israel. These teachers claim that Christianity, which follows the New Covenant to the exclusion of the Old Covenant, is a perversion of the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles. While it is true that there are

---

<sup>1</sup> Acts 15

many perversions of doctrine in various Christian denominations, the modern Hebrew Roots movement is itself a perversion. It does not represent the pristine teachings of Jesus and the Apostles. And it twists the New Testament Scriptures in order to support its deadly error. There are many in this movement who, *“desiring to be teachers of the Law, neither understand what they say nor the things which they affirm.”*

Hebrew Roots theology sets out to show that Jesus simply reaffirmed the original meaning and intent of the Law of Moses against the corruption of the Pharisees and Sadducees, rather than establishing a new Law. In other words, Jesus was Moses’ revival preacher, clarifying what the Law of Moses said and reaffirming its jurisdiction not only over Israel, but over all humanity. While it is true that Jesus often pointed out the hypocrisy of Israel’s leadership and their perversion of the Law of Moses publically, at the same time He was privately establishing a New Law,<sup>2</sup> a New Covenant<sup>3</sup> that is *“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 Egypt.”*<sup>4</sup> The New Covenant is *“a better covenant, which was established on better promises.”*<sup>5</sup> Throughout His preaching and teaching ministry, Jesus was privately gathering together His own “household” that was distinct from the “household” of Moses.<sup>6</sup> Jesus was greater than Moses,<sup>7</sup> greater than Abraham,<sup>8</sup> greater than Jacob (Israel),<sup>9</sup> greater than Solomon,<sup>10</sup> and greater than the Temple itself!<sup>11</sup> The Law of Christ, the New Covenant, does not require a physical Tabernacle or an intermediary Levitical priesthood in order to worship God as did the Law of Moses. Instead, under the New Covenant, God’s presence on earth dwells in the local assembly, and we now have access to God through our High Priest *“according to the order of Melchizedek.”*<sup>12</sup> These things are contrary to the Law of Moses, and require a New Law<sup>13</sup> to supersede the Law of Moses.

### **Hebrew Roots Deception, Step 1: The Perversion of Repentance**

In his website article series on “repentance,” Hebrew Roots teacher Brad Scott of **Wild Branch Ministry** made clear one of the real objectives of the Hebrew Roots ministries.

---

<sup>2</sup> Gal. 6:2; James 1:25; James 2:12

<sup>3</sup> Hebrews 8:7-13

<sup>4</sup> Hebrews 8:9 quoting Jer. 31:31-34

<sup>5</sup> Hebrews 8:6

<sup>6</sup> Hebrews 3:1-6

<sup>7</sup> Hebrews 3:3

<sup>8</sup> John 8:53-59

<sup>9</sup> John 4:12-14

<sup>10</sup> Matt. 12:42

<sup>11</sup> Matthew 12:6

<sup>12</sup> Psalm 110:4; Heb. 5:9-10; Heb. 7:11-22

<sup>13</sup> Hebrews 7:12

*“The foundation of repentance is the return to where you came from. The root of repentance is to go back to something. Adam came from the dust, and that is where he will teshuvah, or return to. The root of repentance is to go back to something. It is what we are to go back to, that is critical.”*<sup>14</sup> [Bold mine]

Scott attempts to impose upon the words “repent/repentance” in the New Testament the idea of **returning back to a former condition, state, or thing from which one has deviated**. As he stated in the above quote, the thing to which one is to “return” is the **critical factor**. In Scott’s Hebrew Roots theology, this is a return to God’s Law (Torah) revealed through Moses. This is the ultimate destination for followers of the Hebrew Roots ministries. He made this point crystal clear.

*“The very first words that we hear from Yochanan the immerser (John the Baptizer) is REPENT! Who was he speaking these words to? the Nations? Of course not. The nations would not have a clue as to what to go back to! He speaks this word to the local Jewish leadership. Yochanan is pleading in behalf of Yahshua for YHVH’s covenant people **to go back to the covenant**. Yahshua’s first words to the Jewish leaders is to REPENT! (Mattityahu 4:17). The two main religious systems in Judaism, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, had strayed away from the Word of YHVH. He certainly knew this in advance. Go Back! YHVH says. The common myth that Judaism was a law-keeping religion that YHVH came to denounce and change is a lie. Most of the Jewish leaders of that time were big time law breakers.”*<sup>15</sup>

### **The Meaning of Repentance in the New Testament**

The Greek word translated “repent” is μετανοεω (metanoew – me-ta-nah-eh-O, Strong’s #3340). As with many Greek verbs, it consists of a verb prefixed with a preposition. The preposition “meta” means “after,” and “noiew” means “think,” “consider,” or “comprehend.” Hence, the basic sense of μετανοεω is “after-thought.” In modern English idiom we would say, “after second thought.” **It indicates a change of mind after further contemplation.** All Greek lexicons define this word as change of mind or to reconsider. None suggest, as does Scott, that this change of mind is a return to a former place, condition, state, or way of thinking. In fact, it is usually a turning AWAY from a former way of thinking that is being stressed. Here are a few examples of lexical definitions.

---

<sup>14</sup> Scott, Brad; Repentance, Wild Branch Ministries, Part I; <http://www.wildbranch.org/Archive/lesson16.html>

<sup>15</sup> Scott, Brad; Repentance Part II; <http://www.wildbranch.org/Archive/lesson17.html>

## Easton's Bible Dictionary

*"REPENTANCE, There are three Greek words used in the New Testament to denote repentance.*

- (1.) The verb metamelomai is used of a change of mind, such as to produce regret or even remorse on account of sin, but not necessarily a change of heart. This word is used with reference to the repentance of Judas (Matt. 27:3).*
- (2.) Metanoeo [metanoew], meaning to change one's mind and purpose, as the result of after knowledge.*
- (3.) This verb [metanoew], with the cognate noun metanoia, is used of true repentance, a change of mind and purpose and life, to which remission of sin is promised."<sup>16</sup>*

## Unger's Bible Dictionary

*"REPENTANCE, a 'change' of mind. In the theological and ethical sense a fundamental and thorough change in the hearts of men from sin and toward God."<sup>17</sup>*

## Kittle's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament

While most Greek lexicons trace Greek word usage in the NT and the LXX, Kittle's ten-volume Theological Dictionary of the New Testament adds massive evidence from thousands of secular Greek manuscripts written in both classical and koine Greek, showing the usage of biblical Greek words in every-day speech. According to Kittle's TDNT, "metanoew" (repent) was used in secular Greek literature of the period to mean, "change one's mind," "adopt another view," or "change one's feelings." He gives many examples of these in Greek literature. Kittle then adds, "...if the change of mind derives from recognition that the earlier view was foolish, improper or evil, there arises the sense 'to regret,' 'to feel remorse'." He cites many examples of this as well.<sup>18</sup> In no case does the word "metanoew" (repent) suggest the idea of returning to a former place, state, or condition as something implied by the word itself in common Greek usage.

In the face of massive contrary linguistic evidence, Scott alleges that Christianity has redefined "repentance" to suite its own ends. Yet, as we shall see, it is Scott and other Hebrew Roots advocates who have done precisely what is alleged of Gentile Christians – twist the meaning to suite one's own purposes.

---

<sup>16</sup> Easton's Bible Dictionary, article on "Repentance" (electronic version)

<sup>17</sup> Unger's Bible Dictionary, article on "Repentance" (electronic version)

<sup>18</sup> Kittle; TDNT, Vol. IV, pp. 976-977

Scott completely ignores the etymology of “metanoew” and all the lexical evidence, all the while pretending to offer a more nuanced definition **which he claims is derived from the Hebrew equivalent**. He claims that Jesus, John, and their hearers would have held his view of “repentance” because of their Hebrew background and knowledge of the alleged equivalent Hebrew term. Scott writes:

*“When Yahshua and Yochanan (John the baptizer) said to the P’rushim (Pharisees), ‘repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand’ what did they mean by repent? Do you really believe the meaning of repent in the English or the Greek is what they meant? Do you believe that 23,214 verses of teaching in the Tenach (Old Testament) about this word is irrelevant?”<sup>19</sup>*

Scott gives the impression, in the above quote, that there are over twenty-three thousand verses in the Old Testament that contain teaching on the word “repent,” and that all modern lexicons ignore this “teaching.” The fact is, there is only a handful of Old Testament verses that use the verb “repent” or its noun form “repentance,” and not one of them supports Scott’s definition. Brad Scott plays a shell-game with the Hebrew words. First, he declares by fiat that the Hebrew equivalent of the New Testament Greek word “metanoew” (repent) is the Hebrew word, “shoov” (Strong’s #7725). He offers not one shred of linguistic or historical evidence in support of this claim, which is THE fundamental premise of his entire series of articles on repentance. He then incorrectly defines this Hebrew word. The Hebrew word “shoov” (or “shoob”) clearly does NOT mean “return” (as Scott claims) in many cases. Strong’s Hebrew lexicon states this very clearly.

*“#7725 שׁוּב shub shoob A primitive root; to turn back (hence, away) transitively or intransitively, literally or figuratively (**not necessarily with the idea of return to the starting point**); generally **to retreat**; often adverbially again.”<sup>20</sup> [emphasis mine]*

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia adds that “shoov” can either mean “return” or “turn away,” the latter having nothing to do with returning to a former place or state.<sup>21</sup> Numerous examples of this meaning can be produced.<sup>22</sup>

Even if “shoov” (shoob) was the Hebrew equivalent for the Greek “metanoew” (repent), which it is not, it would not support Scott’s point. The Hebrew word “shoov” is used in

---

<sup>19</sup> Scott, Brad; Repentance Part I; <http://www.wildbranch.org/Archive/lesson16.html>

<sup>20</sup> Strong, Hebrew Lexicon of Old Testament Words, #7725 (electronic version)

<sup>21</sup> International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, article on “Repentance” (electronic version)

<sup>22</sup> Example: Gen. 27:44-45

Old Testament contexts where the idea of returning back to a former state, place, or condition was clearly not intended. Consequently, the meaning Scott seeks to squeeze out of this Hebrew word is NOT essential to its basic meaning, and therefore not necessarily the sense even if it was the exact equivalent for the Greek word for “repent” in the New Testament. Had Scott been successful in establishing equivalence between the Hebrew “shoov” and the Greek “metanoew,” the most he would have accomplished would be to establish a possibility, but not a necessity. In other words, had Jesus and John the Baptist used the Hebrew word “shoov” instead of the Greek “metanoew” they might have meant “turn away” (from their present course) rather than “turn back” (to Moses) as Scott incorrectly insists, since the Hebrew word is broad enough for either meaning.

The proper way to determine equivalence between Hebrew and Greek biblical words is to examine the Septuagint usage, the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek by Jewish scribes 250 years before Christ. It is a simple thing to search the Septuagint (LXX) to verify the closest Hebrew equivalents for Greek terms found in the New Testament.

One cannot accuse the LXX translators of “Gentile thinking” or any bias against Judaism or the Law of Moses, since they were themselves Jewish scholars living shortly before the appearance of Jesus Christ. They were far more fluent in the Hebrew of the Torah and ancient Greek than any modern scholar, never mind self-appointed Hebrew Roots teachers. When translating the Hebrew Bible into Greek, they chose the best Greek equivalents for the Hebrew words of the Old Testament. If Scott were correct in his claim that John and Jesus had the Jewish idea of “return” allegedly contained in the word “shoov” when they spoke of “repentance” in the Gospels, we would expect the LXX translators to render the Hebrew word “shoov” as “metanoew” (repent) in their Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament. However, **not once did those seventy Jewish scholars translate “shoov” as “metanoew” in their Greek translation.** So, not only does Scott’s view flow counter to all modern linguistic scholars, but also the Jewish scholars who translated the Old Testament from Hebrew to Greek!

The Jewish translators of the Septuagint used the Greek word “metanoew” (repent) in their Greek translation, not to translate the Hebrew word “shoov,” but rather the word “nacham” (Strong’s #5162). They used “metanoew” (repent) sixteen times in their Greek translation in the following verses: 1 Sam. 15:29, Prov. 20:25, Prov. 24:32, Jer. 4:28, Jer. 8:6, Jer. 18:8,10, Jer. 31:19 (38:19 in LXX), Joel 2:13,14, Am. 7:3,6, Jon. 3:9,10, Jon. 4:2, Zech. 8:14. In each of these verses, “metanoew” translates the Hebrew word “nacham” (#5162), except in Prov. 20:25 & Prov. 24:32. And in neither of these exceptions do we find the Hebrew word “shoov.” In the former it translates a Hebrew term that means to

“inquire,” and in the latter it translates two Hebrew words meaning to “make to understand,” both having to do with reconsidering something.

So, what is the meaning of the Hebrew word “nacham” which the LXX translators rendered as “metanoew” (repent)? The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia says that nacham “*implies difficulty in breathing, hence, ‘to pant,’ ‘to sigh,’ ‘to groan’ ... Naturally it came to signify ‘to lament’ or ‘to grieve,’ and when the emotion was produced by the desire of good for others, it merged into compassion and sympathy, and when incited by a consideration of one’s own character and deeds it means ‘to rue,’ ‘to repent’.*”<sup>23</sup> In no case does “nacham” mean to return to a previous place, state, or condition.

Furthermore, there are a few verses in the Hebrew Bible where both Hebrew words “shoov” and “nacham” appear together in the same sentence, but are mutually exclusive! In other words, the context clearly shows that they are NOT the same thing, but were being contrasted with each other, or their diverse meanings were used to compliment each other. For example, Jer. 31:19 says this: “*Surely after that I was turned (shoov) I repented (nacham).*” That these two words are contrasted in this way proves their meanings are not the same. If “shoov” means “repent,” as Scott claims, then Jeremiah quoted Ephraim (Israel) as saying, “*After I repented I repented,*” a rather nonsensical statement! The meaning is precisely as the NKJV renders it, “*Surely after that I was turned (shoob – turned aside), I repented (nacham – regretted turning asside).*”

In Jer. 4:28, the Lord made a similar contrasting statement using both terms. “*I have purposed it, and will not repent (nacham – regret), neither will I turn back (shoov – turn asside) from it.*” The word “neither” in the above sentence indicates contrasting ideas, NOT a restatement of the same idea. Consequently, the Hebrew terms “shoov” and “nacham” do NOT have the same meaning. “Shoob” means to “retreat,” “return,” or “turn aside,” but “nacham” means “to change the mind” or “regret.”

Joel 2:14 also uses both terms in the same sentence. “*Who knoweth if He will return (shoov) and repent (nacham) and leave a blessing behind Him.*” Here the two terms have a cumulative effect, hoping that God will do two distinct things: return to His favor for Israel and also change His mind (or regret) regarding His intent to judge Israel.

The LXX translators frequently rendered the Hebrew term “nacham” as “metanoew” in Greek, but never rendered the Hebrew term “shoov” as “metanoew.” They did not view “shoov” and “metanoew” as equivalent in meaning. If the LXX translators, who knew both Hebrew and Greek, did not see the Hebrew words “shoov” and “nacham”

---

<sup>23</sup> International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, article on “Repentance” (electronic version)

as equivalent, or more importantly, did not see the Hebrew word “shoov” and the Greek word “metanoew” as equivalent, why would we suppose that John the Baptist, Jesus, and their hearers did, as Scott insists? More importantly, why should we suppose that Hebrew Roots teachers know more about ancient Hebrew and Greek linguistics than the Jewish translators of the LXX and authors of all Greek lexicons?

### **Should Gentile Pagans “Return” to Where They Came From?**

God sent the Hebrew prophet Jonah to preach to the Ninevites, the capitol of the Assyrian empire.<sup>24</sup> In referencing this event, Jesus said the following: *“The men of Nineveh will rise up in the judgment with this generation and condemn it, because **they repented** at the preaching of Jonah; and indeed a greater than Jonah is here.”*<sup>25</sup> The same Greek word, “metanoew,” is used here. Now if Scott is correct, then the Ninevites must have returned to a former condition. What condition was that? They were never Jews, nor was the Law of Moses ever given to them. They were pagans.

If “repent” (metanoew) in the Gospels means *“to return to where you came from,”* then the use of the same word in evangelizing Gentiles would mean they should return to their pagan roots. Scott did not seem to notice this glaring problem. While arguing that “repent” in the Gospels requires his definition, he wrote the following;

*“The very first words that we hear from Yochanan the immerser (John the Baptizer) is REPENT! Who was he speaking these words to? the Nations? Of course not. The nations would not have a clue as to what to go back to!”*<sup>26</sup>

Yet, Paul encouraged the Gentiles to “repent” (metanoew) as part of his evangelism. In his speech at Athens, he said:

*Acts 17:26-27,30-31*

*26 “And He has made from one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and has determined their preappointed times and the boundaries of their dwellings, 27 “so that they should seek the Lord, in the hope that they might grope for Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us; ... 30 “Truly, these times of ignorance God overlooked, but now **commands all men everywhere to repent**, 31 because He has appointed a day on which He will judge the world in righteousness by the Man whom He has ordained. He has given assurance of this to all by raising Him from the dead.*

---

<sup>24</sup> Jonah 3:1-10

<sup>25</sup> Matt. 12:41

<sup>26</sup> Scott, Brad; Repentance Part II; <http://www.wildbranch.org/Archive/lesson17.html>

The “repentance” was not turning back to the Law, or to anything they were involved with in the past. Rather, it was turning away from their pagan idols to Jesus Christ.

Again, Paul testified before Agrippa as follows:

*Acts 26:19-20*

*21 “Therefore, King Agrippa, I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision,  
20 but declared first to those in Damascus and in Jerusalem, and throughout all the region of Judea, and **then to the Gentiles, that they should repent**, turn to God, and do works befitting **repentance**.*

When Simon the sorcerer asked to purchase the apostolic gift, Peter told him to “repent of your wickedness.” Since the object of the preposition is “your wickedness,” does this mean that Simon should return back to his wickedness, instead of away from it?

Scott’s definition of “return to where you came from” becomes absurd in all these contexts. The same problems appear in all passages that speak of Gentile “repentance,”<sup>27</sup> none of which suggest “return to where you came from.” The same is true with the noun form – “repentance.”<sup>28</sup> Jesus told the disciples, when sending them out to the Gentiles with the Great Commission, “that **repentance** and remission of sins should be preached in His name **to all nations**.”<sup>29</sup> How does Brad Scott suppose these Gentiles would “have a clue as to what to go back to?”

### **Other Greek Words Mean “Return” or “Turn Back”**

1. ὑποστρέφω (upostrephw – hupo-streph-O, Strong’s #5290), means to “turn back,” a compound of the preposition “hupo” (under or back) and “strepho” (to turn). Examples can be found in Luke 1:56, Luke 2:20,43,45, Luke 4:1,14).
2. ἀνακάμπτω (anakamptw – ana-kamp-tO, Strong’s #344), means to “turn back,” a compound of the preposition “ana” (again) and “kampto” (to bend).
3. ἀναστρέφω (anastrephw – ana-stre-phO, Strong’s #390) means “return again,” from the preposition “ana” (again) and “strepho” (to turn, reverse course).

The last term is probably the closest to the meaning that Scott tried to impose on μετανοεω (repent). Yet, it is nowhere used in the New Testament in the sense Scott promotes, a turning back to the Law of Moses. In fact, it is never used in an evangelistic

---

<sup>27</sup> Acts 17:30, Acts 26:20

<sup>28</sup> Luke 24:47, Acts 11:18, 2 Cor. 7:10, 2 Pet. 3:9

<sup>29</sup> Luke 24:47

sense in the New Testament. What is painfully obvious from Scott's treatment of "repentance" is that he is manipulating the evidence to suite his purposes.

Not all who are part of the Hebrew Roots movement are as bold as Scott when it comes to Torah-keeping as a means of salvation. In fact, most such groups disguise their true goals and intentions. However, some like Brad Scott openly proclaim the very heresy Paul called a different gospel and a perverted gospel. *"I marvel that you are turning away so soon from Him who called you in the grace of Christ, to a different gospel, which is not another; but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so now I say again, if anyone preaches any other gospel to you than what you have received, let him be accursed."*<sup>30</sup>

Here it is in Brad Scott's own words, his "different Gospel."

*"I am going to, very bluntly, tell you that without a scriptural understanding of repentance, you are NOT redeemed or reconciled back to YHVH. To put it more perfectly, as Sha'ul would say, you are not saved."*<sup>31</sup>

By making his definition of "repentance" synonymous with a "return" to keeping the Law of Moses, Scott is claiming that **observance of the Law of Moses is necessary to salvation**.

Furthermore, Scott places all Christians who are not "Torah observant" (by his definition) within the category of the "workers of iniquity" to whom Jesus promised to answer, "depart from Me, I never knew you." He equates this with the "mystery of iniquity" which gives birth to the Antichrist. Here are Scott's own words.

*"If you are curious to know who the workers of iniquity are in Mattityahu 7:23, you can find them here. They are those who are TORAHLESS, lawless ones. This is the translation of the King James English, "workers of iniquity". It is also a description of their leader, whether they know it or not, in 2 Thessalonians 2:7-8. He is the mystery of iniquity that already works and is called the wicked one or the lawless one."*<sup>32</sup>

Scott's claim that his perverted "repentance" (return to the Law of Moses) is essential to salvation puts him and his movement in the same camp as the ancient Judaizers who

---

<sup>30</sup> Gal. 1:6-9

<sup>31</sup> Scott, Brad; Repentance Part I; <http://www.wildbranch.org/Archive/lesson16.html>

<sup>32</sup> Scott, Brad; Repentance Part III; <http://www.wildbranch.org/Archive/lesson18.html>

“troubled” and “unsettled” the Gentile believers. Paul taught that those who embraced this perverted gospel become “estranged from Christ” and have “fallen from grace.”<sup>33</sup> Just as with the term “repentance,” Scott misrepresents the term ἀνομία (translated “lawlessness” in the NKJV and “iniquity” in the KJV). This is the word νόμος (law or command) with the negative particle ἀ prefixed. It literally means “lawless.” However, Hebrew Roots proponents use a similar word game which conflates the term νόμος with the Law of Moses. The term itself is non-specific and can refer to any human or divine law or command. The New Testament teaches that the Law of Christ supersedes the Law of Moses. Yes, both were given by God. But they were given to different entities under different circumstances, for different purposes. Matthew 5-7 is the Sermon on the Mount, which is the Law of Christ<sup>34</sup> in contrast to the Law of Moses. Jesus’ statement, “*Depart from Me you who practice lawlessness,*” was made in the context of Jesus having just given His own New Covenant commandments, some of which are contrary to the Law of Moses.<sup>35</sup> The statement concerning those who practice “lawlessness” has nothing to do with failing to eat kosher, but with failing to heed the Law of Christ.

Redefining critical terminology to make the text say what it does not say is the mark of those who pervert the Scriptures. “Repent” and “repentance” in the Bible mean to have a change of mind, and consequently to experience remorse, and to turn away from the previous course. These terms say nothing about turning back to a former state or condition, never mind the Law of Moses.

---

<sup>33</sup> Gal. 5:4

<sup>34</sup> Gal. 6:2

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Exod. 21:23-25 & Matt. 5:38-39