# The Word Pierced Striped and Bruised an OBRY Projekt presentation by: Jonathan Machtemes

The following presentation was written for an audience who may have no concept of the distinction of OBRY from Hebrew. Those who are more familiar will find some of it repetitious, but repetition is often one of the best tools of learning.

This presentation, at this point, has gone through many drafts. The chief reason for this are the complexities of the situation and materials, and how to adequately relay the problem. This is especially compounded when one such as myself has come to understand the language called Hebrew in such a radically different way. Yahweh has become YEUE, Yeshua/Jesus has become YEUShO, Elohim - ALEYM, and so forth, so please bear with me as I do my best to present an English audience concepts concerning Masoretic Hebrew from an OBRY understanding... if that makes sense. If not, let me explain further...

OBRY is the title I've given to a language without all of the Jewish influence that Hebrew has. OBRY is a word consisting of four successive glyphs combined meaning "of OBR" (or, in Masoretic... Eber, the father of Pelag and the patriarch most likely at Babel in Gen 11). They are, in fact, the very glyphs the old non Israelite scribes and Masoretes used, and distorted via their vowel points and altered script face to arrive at the word "Hebrew". Many of the terms have been altered as well, so attempting to illustrate the problems with Masoretic Hebrew or just Hebrew (which I've come to call "Jewbrew") while using their terms, on their playing field, is a bit moot. I will however, do my best to illustrate some of the problems that I hope best illustrate the current state of the text without too many foreign terms to an English audience. I'll also not be spending any time on other texts, such as the Septuagint, Samaritan Pentateuch, or Vulgate, as these texts tend to agree with only some parts of various Hebrew manuscripts and do not always agree with one another. My aim is to stay just with the so called "Hebrew" text.

Let it be known that I do not, now or ever, claim to be an "expert" in linguistics or grammars. I do not claim to be an expert in anything. What I am is a German/Celt with a rough past, who has had grace given to me. This grace has caused me to treasure the scriptures above all manner of works possessed by a creature such as man. I am enthralled by the scriptures, and because of this I have a great desperation to know their author, and exactly what He was communicating, that I may hope to walk with Him as best as I'm able. It wasn't until this deep journey into the Word that I began realizing what and who I was, who we are, and what and who the Jew is today. At a point, one is forced to ask fundamental questions regarding the nature and identity of the Jew and the Western European in light of Biblical truths and present realities.

The details of some of these inquiries are difficult to determine, as our enemies have been controlling a great deal of information for quite a long time, but one fact that is not all that difficult to arrive at is that the Jew is the enemy of all that is good, natural, "Godly", orderly, enlightening, and productive. Would anyone disagree? Moreover, the Jew bears no Biblical-Prophetic marks that the House of Israel and Judah would bear. Does anyone disagree? That being said, how many here trust what the Jews have to say about the scriptures? How many hearing this would trust that any change a Jew would effect on the scriptures would be a good change; a benevolent change; a trustworthy change? The reason for pointing these things out is because the Hebrew scriptures, as we know them, are brought to us by Jews, and Hebrew as we know it is a linguistic expression built from countless

Jewish devices. My task today is to relate to you the mechanisms and devices employed by the Jews to alter our understanding of the scriptures.

The Masoretic Hebrew (or "Jewish") Bible is an organism held together by a great number of claims and techniques. Among these are:

The Letter

The Underlying Assumptions

The Vowel Points

The Scribal Traditions

The Orientation

The Notes

The Pericopes

The Verses

The Abreviations

The Recensions

The Undocumented Claims

The Random Anomalies

The Fairy Tales

and The Lies

That doesn't cover it all I'm afraid, and unfortunately time will not allow me to dive very deeply into these concepts that weave their way throughout scripture driven by centuries of animosity, so I will instead talk about a few of them and hopefully dispel some of the nonsense we've all been made to accept, typically through our once trusted authorities.

#### The Glyph

Lets begin with the letter itself, or as I call it (and I believe more precisely) the glyph. Mar Ukba, a celebrated chief judge of the Jews in the 3rd Century AD, said "At first the Thora was given to Israel in Hebrew characters and in the sacred language, but in the time of Ezra they obtained it in the Assyrian [= square] characters' and in the Aramaic language. At last the sages chose the Assyrian [= square] characters and the sacred language for the Israelites and left the Hebrew characters and the Aramaic language for the idiots." Even though there is no proof whatsoever that Ezra had anything to do with changing the glyph itself, Ukba reveals a very important detail. The "letters" as they call them, or the Hebrew character as we know it today, is MAShUR-Assyrian. Would this line up with any Biblical information? It does with 2 Ki 17:24-33 (from the KJV, adjusted and expanded as needed):

2Ki 17:24 And the king of AShUR-Assyria brought men from BBL-Babylon, and from the area of CUT, and from OUA, and from HMT, and from SPRUYM, and placed them in the cities of ShMRUN-Samaria instead of the children of Israel: and they possessed ShMRUN, and dwelt in the cities thereof. 2Ki 17:25 And so it was at the beginning of their dwelling there, that they feared not YEUE: therefore YEUE sent lions among them, which slew some of them.

2Ki 17:26 Wherefore they spake to the king of AShUR, saying, The nations which thou hast removed, and placed in the cities of ShMRUN, know not the manner of the God of the land: therefore he hath sent lions among them, and, behold, they slay them, because they know not the manner of the ALEYM-God of the land.

2Ki 17:27 Then the king of AShUR commanded, saying, Carry thither one of the priests whom ye brought from thence; and let them go and dwell there, and let him teach them the manner of the God of the land.

2Ki 17:28 Then one of the priests whom they had carried away from ShMRUN came and dwelt in Bethel, and taught them how they should fear YEUE.

2Ki 17:29 Howbeit every nation made gods of their own, and put them in the houses of the high places which the SHMRNYM-Samaritans had made, every nation in their cities wherein they dwelt.

2Ki 17:30 And the men of BBL made Succothbenoth (brothels), and the men of CUT made Nergal (pigrimage), and the men of HMT made Ashima (fiery cauldrons),

2Ki 17:31 And the OUYM made Nibhaz (vision quest) and Tartak (mutilations), and the SPRUYM burnt their children in fire to Adrammelech (king of procreation/spring) and Anammelech (king of humiliation), the gods of SPRYM.

2Ki 17:32 So they feared YEUE, and made unto themselves of the most undesirable priests of the high places, which sacrificed for them in the houses of the high places.

2Ki 17:33 They feared YEUE, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations whom they carried away from thence.

Unfortunately there isn't time to unpack and expound upon all the obvious translator-generated confusion intentionally inserted into that passage, but relating to that quote from Ukba, there is an interesting aspect to the Jewish word Masorah/Masorete, and that is their arbitrary alterations of the phonetics of the W, the 21st glyph in the OBRY alphabet (or glyph set), thus easily deriving "asorah" from 汝以行中 (Assyrian like). Adding the prefixed 세, making a concept an instance of a noun, we arrive at 세汝以行中 or Masorah. Thus the title of "The Masoretic text". Now, even though we have no scriptural evidence of Ezra, or any Israelite, altering the text in any way, we know these peoples brought from Assyria/AShURE, before Ezra's time, had mixed with and formed alliances with our ancient neighbor-adversaries, and had diluted themselves to the point of believing YEUE was indeed their God. From Ezra 4:1-4:

Ezr 4:1 Now when the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded the temple unto YEUE God of Israel;

Ezr 4:2 Then they came to Zerubbabel, and to the chief of the fathers, and said unto them, Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esarhaddon king of Assur, which brought us up hither.

Ezr 4:3 But Zerubbabel, and Jeshua, and the rest of the chief of the fathers of Israel, said unto them, Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto YEUE God of Israel, as king KRUSh-Cyrus the king of PRS-Persia hath commanded us.

Ezr 4:4 Then the people of the land weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building

In addition, there are the words of Asaph the seer and psalmist who wrote in Psa 83:3-8:

Psa 83:3 They have taken crafty counsel against thy people, and consulted against thy hidden ones. Psa 83:4 They have said, Come, and let us cut them off from being a nation; that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance.

Psa 83:5 For they have consulted together with one consent: they are confederate against thee: Psa 83:6 The tabernacles of Edom, and the Ishmaelites; of Moab, and the Hagarenes;

Psa 83:7 Gebal, and Ammon, and Amalek; the Philistines with the inhabitants of Tyre; Psa 83:8 Assur also is joined with them: they have helped the children of Lot.

Concerning that last line, we know from Nehemiah that the people brought by Assyria were allied with Ammen, the children of Lot.

We also know, from scripture, that no change in the form of the text, nor any of the 66,000 variations existed even in YEUShO/Jesus' day, as in both his time, and that of the Apostles, not one of them had to refer to which text they are citing: beit with a different character, a variation in form, or a different language. Even found in the documents called "The Writings of Flavius Josephus" is the admittance that there was still a perfect text in existence in the House of YEUE in the land of Judah in the first century AD. The change of the meaningful glyph to the empty letter came after this time, and there still exists many older forms of the OBRY gliph that the Jew must recognize and spin, of course, in their own publications as far too many examples exist to be destroyed or controlled.

The simple fact is, before our text was changed, at some point, it bore far more of a resemblance to our Western European forms, and that's in letters (Glyphs), words, and grammar. With the presence of these older examples of the Glyph form, and no indication within ALL of scripture of any sort of change, and with what I've just cited from within and without scripture, if we accept this later Jewish form, in the glyphs themselves, we do it purely on faith... that is faith in the claims of the Jews.

## The Underlying Assumptions

This is perhaps more a broad category than singular point, because these assumptions, or claims, work together and saturate everything we know about Hebrew so called. This section and presentation will not begin to cover the far reaching implications of these assumptions, but instead will attempt to illustrate the real problems within them. These are technically known as Matres Lectiones (Mother of Language) and the concepts of Plene vs Defective Spelling and Kere and Kethib which accompany the first concept. These are all ubiquitous devices within the text, so I will try to simply point out the problematic nature of them.

Matres Lectiones (or sometimes Mater Lection) is the idea and baseless claim that OBRY/Hebrew has not, nor ever has had any vowels. This claim is baseless because there is absolutely no proof of it's veracity and furthermore there are clues that alert us to the same. The first large, glaring clue is just how remarkably similar to our western alphabet the OBRY alphabet is (so, the Hebrew alphabet before the OBRY glyph was altered to the square MAShURE (from Assyria... Masoretic) letter. We have around 20-28 characters in our Western European alphabet as compared to the 22 in OBRY; however, some are diaphonic or redundant, such as C-K-S, I-Y-E, and U-W. Some are late comers and obvious phonetic variations, such as J, F and V. Even with these slight variations, we share 19 direct phonetic matches, mostly in the same or approximately the same position in the alphabet with Hebrew/OBRY.



The next clue is the fact that what they call "weak" or "quiescent" consonants are the equivalent of our vowels: the so called "aleph, he, yod, ayin, waw" are simply A E I O U ( 文 中 2 O f) in OBRY. All of these Paleo Hebrew, OBRY, glyphs even look like our modern Western characters. All of the names

the Jews have applied to the OBRY glyph set are easily dropped for the "Germanic" way of pronouncing the alpha bet, therefore:

Alef-Ah, Beyt-Beh, Gimel-Geh, Dalet- Deh, and so forth.

With this in mind, what the Jew does is claims none of the "weak" consonants, or our vowels, were even present in the earliest form of Hebrew. They claim vocalizations were mostly performed via tradition, and that various scribes added many of these letters into the text to, in their words, "aid in pronunciation" or "distinguish between homonyms". Of course, as with all the other Jewish claims on the text, there is no constancy in this assumed technique, nor, as I've demonstrated, Biblical evidence of any such thing ever taking place. But, if we believe them, that the obvious vowels are just weak consonants to aid pronunciation or to avoid homonym confusion, they now have a great deal of control over what the text may or may not say.

They have applied terms to aid in their claims via Masoretic notes. Those terms, as stated, are "Plene vs Defective" spelling and "Kere and Kethib" readings. Christian D Ginsberg, a Converso Jew, published a very lengthy four volume set called the Massorah, in which these variations are documented. If a Masorete claimed a word was "Plene" (meaning "full"), they were claiming it was penned with the Matres Lectiones' "weak consonant" added, and if they claimed it was Defective, then the Jewish copyist penned it without the weak consonant (or in reality, the vowel), and perhaps, according to the particular Masorete, should have added it. If they applied a mark and a qof (the Jewish Q) and kaf (the Jewish K), this would mean that though a word were written in a certain way, it should be pronounced as a different word, which they would often write in the margin.

As I realize I'm now at the precipice of a great chasm of foreign terminology and confusion for my audience, I'll real it back in and state this issue in the simplest of ways... This means they can and have changed words, word meanings, and potentially the understanding of entire concepts with these devices.

With the presence or absence of ≯ (Jewish alef) they could change MLK- "king" or "pagan god" to MLAK "messenge/laborer" or "angel" (as we understand), and vice versa. They could change BAR-"well; spring; pit" to BR- "son/heir", "pure; clean", "field", "grain", or "potash" and vice versa. They could claim either of those were BRA- "to create", and so on. With a variation of ♀ (Jewish he) they could make something feminine masculine and vice versa. They could change the location of a thing from precise to general, and vise versa, and the Tiberian school were known to do just this rather routinely, in fact. They could change the aspect of a verb by adding or subtracting the Y (Jewish yod), and on and on it goes. And remember, the Devil IS in the details.

So, could we just work the rest of our already troublesome lives at amassing as many Jewish texts as they've allowed to be published, along with as many Koine Greek, Latin, and otherwise we could get our hands on, compare all the instances of certain words, in certain locations, then refer again back to their sources for lexicography and come to some conclusions that way? We could, and we have, and unfortunately, we are not all that much further down the road than we once were centuries ago. Could we trust that our God divinely inspired a certain specific English manuscript even in the face of massive textual and conceptual problems? We certainly could, and have, and that too has led us to chasing our own tails and forming all manner of sometimes benign sometimes highly bizarre beliefs and practices.

augmentative, primal, male effect: thus why ASP means "gather/bind" where SP simply means "container"; where BO is "something full of" BA is to "enter in"; TsU is "a command" but TsA is "a going forth". We could further note that 中E has a broadening, softening effect at the end of a word, an enlarging and absolute effect at the beginning of a word, and a widening effect within a word' therefore why YEUE changed ABRM-"Abrem's" name to ABREM-"Abraham" (thus broadening his production with the E inserted in the RM syllable) and WRY'-"Sarai" name to WRE-"Sarah" (thus softening the name of a woman hardened by her years of barenness). We may see that 2-Y is masculine force or will: it changes a thing to an action AMR "word", YAMR "he spake". It possesses: thus OBRY is "of OBR". Or it can vary an action from passive MUSh "be removed" to active MYSh "departed".

But if we believe the Jewish narrative, we have no way, other than their grammatical rules and demands, of knowing what the author did indeed mean, and in what sense a thing was being described in. If we believe the Jewish tale, we have a language far from our own and just as empty. A language dependent on the one writing the lexicons and dictionaries. If we trust the Jew, we must accept that the language changed over time, and that what we know of as vowels, which all have their own character and effect on a word and the text, are just scribal peculiarities, with a lifetime of unsure arguments behind them, one way or another.

With Matres Lectiones, Plene vs Defective, and Kere vs Kethib, we again see interdependent and inconsistent Jewish concepts that rely on the belief of the hearer as to their veracity. We have to believe the ALEYM-"God" who determined to have His mind and relationship to man, and our fathers in particular, allowed it all to be recorded in a language subject to whims, speculation, and opinion. Because if you believe the Jewish model all you have is opinions and their hegemony over the text and how we understand it. These particular devices sew the seeds of endless confusion, and as far as the Jew is concerned, whether they ever really understand all these things or not may not really be the point so much as whether we understand them or not. And even that alone, in my mind, is enough reason to reject these concepts.

## The Vowel Points

The vowel points, accent marks, and additional textual signs (minus something called Punctis Extraordinare, which is it's own peculiar oddity) are entirely mounted on the shoulders of the Masoretes, and the Masoretes are phantoms. There is no solid proof these individuals did actually exist at the time and place it is claimed they existed, and among the most well known of the Masoretes of the "Tiberian School" (the emergent Masoretic text type) are characters such as Moses Ben Naphtali and Aaron Ben Asher, (Moses and Aaron being the well known Levite brothers and Naphtali and Asher are both the names of the second sons of Rachel and Lea's handmaids, Bilhah and Zilpah respectively). Out of these two assumed families, the emergent one was Ben Asher, both father and son... again Moses and Aaron Ben Asher.

The vowel points and accent marks do far more to the text than the Jewish claims of "standardizing" proper pronunciation or directing cantillation (an intoned liturgical recitation, as opposed to cantellation, a geometric reduction, which may not be far off either). The vowel points direct the classification of words. This is why ODR H5737 may be categorized as "lacked" or "failed" or "dig" or "keep", while ODR H5739 is categorized as "flock" or "drove" or "herds". Now, we can't blame all the English variants on the Masoretes, but we can blame the sharp separation of one word into multiple homonyms on them. We can blame all the word parsing on them. We can blame Hebrew grammar rules, as we know them, on them, because of their word parsings, or deeming when a word

is different in word type than it's other occurrences, (i.e. noun, verb, adjective, adverb, determiner, substantive, and so on). These things, the Masoretes, the phantom spooks of language, should bear.

These occultists took the word, which was, by all reason and internal evidence, a compilation of many inspired books of many black and white concepts and faded much of it into gray. Gray is the color the Jews work in. Gray is uncertainty, confusion, and controversy. As long as the Goyim know only gray, and their adepts know the black and the white, they have power. But, just in case anyone out there is not convinced of how mangled the text is, due to Masoretic vowel pointing, allow me to illustrate. The following are taken from the book "Accidence of Hebrew Grammar" by Henry Coffee. This title is again a farce as accidence a-c-c-i-d-e-n-c-e (as any apt reader could readily admit) could, or maybe should, just as well be accidents a-c-c-i-d-e-n-t-s. I assure the listener the grammatical rules and concepts to be found within this work are generally identical in any other work on the subject, but I certainly invite all to check.

From the preface, "The chief difficulties that face one entering on the study of Hebrew arise from the number and <u>instability</u> of the <u>Masoretic points</u> and the <u>changes incident</u> to the weak, quiescent and guttural letters. The aim to lessen these difficulties will explain <u>most</u> of the departures in the following pages from what might <u>otherwise</u> seem a <u>more logical method</u> of treatment." and again, "As long as Hebrew was a spoken language there was <u>no regular method</u> of representing the vowels. The pronunciation of a given word had to be known from the context or from <u>tradition</u>. Thus DBR could stand for dabar, dober, dibber, etc." Those words at the end of the quote are all the same word, spelled the same, with naught but a Masorete standing between us and understanding the true meaning of that one word via the parsed occurrences' similar characteristics.

Rules of grammar are like any other rules. They are either consistent and make sense or they are inconsistent and do not. Any former English student, or even a child learning via wrote and phonics, knows what a bastard language English is. We know this because the rules are not consistent. When we trace English back, we see that the English we know and use today was generated from about 30% German with a whole lot of bits and pieces of other languages forced into it. This is a big reason why English grammar rules aren't consistent. Would one expect the language the Almighty chose to record His will and character, not to mention vital prophecy within to be so inconsistent? All His natural rules are consistent, His creation follows consistent order, the sun, moon, and stars move in order, consistently, the seasons, the hydrologic cycle, the tides follow an orderly consistency. He Himself doesn't change... He is consistent. There's even consistency of His voice throughout His word, which is one way we know it's His word... consistency of voice. Would He then, do you suppose, choose to hand down all His word to us that He saw fit for us to retain in a language form as radically inconsistent as Masoretic Hebrew?

I can't even begin to relay to you the sheer amount of incidents of rule breaking, adjusting, ignoring, bending, and contriving one will find in just this little 132 page tome, but here are just a few examples within the first ten pages:

- page 4: (concerning full or "Plene" and "Defective" writing) The consonant so remaining <u>is said to</u> quiesce in its cognate vowel (n. 2). When a long vowel is thus indicated by a quiescent consonant and a vowel point, it <u>is said to</u> be written fully; when indicated by a point only, it <u>is said to</u> be written defectively.
- page 5: Compound shewa is made up of one of the short vowels and a simple shewa; it is used mostly in connection with the gutturals a, e, h, and o.
- page 6: <u>Most</u> words are accented on the last syllable. <u>Some</u>, like mlk and certain parts of the verb, are accented on the penult.
- page 7: An unaccented open syllable <u>usually</u> has a long vowel.

Metheg therefore <u>usually</u> shows that the vowel is long and that the following shewa is vocal. <u>At times</u> the diacritical point of shin coincides with holem (because they are the same mark) a. shin is "o-sh" when the preceding letter has no other vowel.

sin is "so" when it begins a syllable and has no other vowel.

sin-shin is "sho" when it begins a syllable and has no other vowel; It is "o-s" when it is in the middle of a word and is followed by a vowel; it is "os" at the end of a word or syllable.

- b. waw w/ holem is "wo" when a vowel precedes. It is "o-w" when a vowel follows.
- c. shurek (waw with dot at middle-left) with a vowel preceding and following is waw with dagesh forte, <u>otherwise</u> it is shurek.
- An accented syllable whether open or closed <u>may have</u> a long or short vowel.
- page 10: The construct infinitive is usually the base of the imperative and imperfect.

How would you like the people making our laws to be that inconsistent? Oh wait... they are. Who do you suppose is making our laws? Again, I must stress, that was the first ten pages, where there are a lot of blank gaps therein and before things begin to get really complicated. Is this the language form you're ready to put your faith in? Because, again, faith is what's required here and plenty of it... blind faith, in fact. To further inform you on just how radically inconsistent Masoretic Hebrew, and it's rules are, I compiled a list of variant type words used in just the first 50 pages consisting of: in case, should be, loses, deprived, added, inserted, liable, some, sometimes, certain, often, ordinarily, irregular, change, replace, whenever, omission, transfer, dropped, so far as, instead, rearrangement, compensate, and many ifs and buts.

This is the Masoretic style. These are the Masoretic rules. These are what we are basing much of our understanding of the Bible off of: confusion, insecurity, debateability, abstractions, indeterminations, lack of qualification, and downright arbitrary classification. And if your still unsure of whether or not to trust Masoretic Hebrew as a viable grammatical foundation, have I mentioned the Masoretes... phantoms or not, and all the masses of commentaries and Biblical literature surrounding, defending, and developing their system... are indeed and unmistakably JEWS?

## In Summation

As you can see, just covering the broad stroke points of three out of the many issues with the Jewish textual tradition has taken up a good deal of time. Any one of the points mentioned earlier could be expanded on into a presentation far longer than this. Therefore, I will unfortunately not be able to discuss The Scribal Traditions, The Orientation, The Notes, The Pericopes, The Verses, The Abreviations, The Recensions, The Undocumented Claims, The Random Anomalies, The Fairy Tales, and The Lies, but I would like to conclude this with my thoughts on Hebrew (Jewbrew), those who control and perpetuate it, and our responsibilities.

There are a lot of different opinions on who exactly the Jews are. Some believe they are apostate Israelites who "God" has rejected. Others believe they were once Israelite/Judahites who mixed ad nausium with other races until they were unrecognizable to their long distant kin... us. Still others believe them to be more direct descendants of Esau/Edom, bearing the negative connotations and prophecies Esau's children bear from scripture. I, however, don't entirely subscribe to any of these beliefs, though I do believe the blood of Esau flows in their veins. I believe the blood of Cain, Ham, Japheth, Canaan, Ishmael, Esau, Amalek, Moab, Amman, along with Asher/Assyria, Elam, the Chaldeans, and other peoples who surrounded us and were ever at odds with us, flows in their veins. There is, for whatever reason we shall one day fully understand, a murderous animosity extant from the Jew towards us. This, by their actions and writings, is undeniable.

There is also a very clear disrespect from this people toward all of the creation and creatures in it, not to mention an arrogance towards the Creator Himself and His order. There is a preternatural instinct within these people to distort, pervert, and destroy. They have shown this natural tendency in every discipline they are allowed to participate in. They will and have taken every single pure concept and derided it, debased it, defaced it, and remade it according to their own twisted desire: Tikun Olam... "to heal the world". But that so called "healing" only comes after they've destroyed.

They are a blight on our institutions, but not for nothing. It's no accident that they are where they are and causing the mischief and grief they appear to have been created to bring about. Every wrong perpetrated is an opportunity to right it. Every appearance of degeneracy and depravity in our highest institutions is a sign of our failure, and they will be used to refine us, make no mistake about it. And here we are now. We find ourselves in a world of gray: gray science, gray law, gray politics, gray religion, gray history, gray morals, and gray scriptures. And yes, they're gray... they are very gray. If not, we'd not have thousands of denominations, hundreds of translations, dozens and dozens of worldviews under just the umbrella of Christianity. The scriptures are gray, but that doesn't mean they have to stay that way. The Spirit of HY ALEYM "the living God" resides in His people. His Spirit knows His word.

He can do anything He chooses at any time. He has chosen a people to put His name upon. He has chosen a people to bless and try and test: one that would be a blessing to His creation. Is that the Jew? Does the Jew bless anything? Most hearing this know the answer to that. Most who will hear this know who bear the marks of Israel. Israel was tasked with keeping, guarding, preserving, and perpetuating YEUE' Laws, His Character, His institutions, His prophecies, and His Will. But, in order to act, we must identify the problem, I hope I've demonstrated enough of it to at least direct the mind of the listener in the appropriate direction.

What work I've done to rediscover the language given our fathers and kept in tact all those long centuries by YEUE, our Creator and Covenantor, the language I call OBRY, represents my best efforts at understanding the truth of the scriptures once handed down to my fathers. I offer all I have and understand about it, as I go, freely, and if anyone find a better means of expression of the pure language form, I am a ready and apt recipient. I don't want to start a new religion. I don't want honor and adoration. I want us, the children of Jacob/Israel, to once again discover the history of our people with our ALEYM YEUE. I want us, as a people, as His people, to take up our rightful place in His creation: the called and chosen bearers of truth, compassion, and love modeled after YEUShO/Jesus.

I offer all I have, and all I can, for the consideration, criticism, and hopefully edification and advancement of not our cause, but our duty, our destiny, and our birthright. We must all rise to our calling, stand firm, and obey the Word, and to do so to the best of our abilities we must know and understand the Word, which demands that we understand what's been done to the word, so that it may be repaired and once again stand as the clear, uncontroversial covenants, instructions, history, and prophecies of our people, and the light of restitution, a renewed creation, and the authentic healing of the world.

for the OBRY Projekt, I'm Jon Machtemes Thank you