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Summary

This is the fourth paper in a series, written by different authors (D, AF, AH), dealing with the anti-Paul arguments. The previous papers, plus this one, have shown that the majority of the planks in these arguments fail completely when merely checking what is written in the Hebrew/Greek text of the referenced English version verses. The remaining planks fail mainly by simply checking the context of the verses. These papers contain sufficient evidence, each in its own right, to put an end to such uninformed criticism of a person appointed with Paul’s authority. The four papers combine to comprehensively and permanently resolve the matter, from an Israelite perspective.

This paper has addressed all 119 questions raised to castigate Paul and to denigrate his work. The questions themselves derive from a collection of material that relies on its volume to create its air of “authority”. From a Biblical perspective, that collection of material has been poorly researched. However, without having acquired the necessary language, Scripture and analytical skills, the average seeker of truth is ill-equipped to critically examine such material.

The answers provided to the 119 questions in this document are generally long and detailed, but as each answer is independent of the others, they can be read one answer at a time. Table 1 lists the questions, grouped into sets, and shows the approach used to answer the questions. The summary of the approaches shows that the ultimate authors behind the questions, who clearly consider themselves to be Biblical teachers, have erred through inadequate knowledge/understanding of the Scriptures.

Table 1 – Summary of the mechanisms required to answer the questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions:</th>
<th>Answered by reference to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 119, 54, 55</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to the trivial questions: 4, 5, 6, 98</td>
<td>Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 15</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 9, 16</td>
<td>Logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7 revisited</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 11, 23, 24, 63, 64, 99, 100, 101, 105, 106</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 12, 13, 14, 22, 85, 114</td>
<td>Hebrew text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to question: 17</td>
<td>Logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 18, 19, 20, 21</td>
<td>Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 25, 26, 27, 87, 88</td>
<td>Greek text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33</td>
<td>Hebrew and Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48</td>
<td>History (non-Scriptural questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 49, 50, 51, 52, 53</td>
<td>Greek text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 56, 57, 58</td>
<td>Logic (non-Scriptural questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 59, 60, 61, 62</td>
<td>Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 65, 66, 67, 68, 97</td>
<td>Logic (non-scriptural questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84</td>
<td>Logic (religious questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 89, 90, 91, 92, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 118</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to question: 86</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 93, 94, 95, 96</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to questions: 102, 103, 104</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to question: 115</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to question: 116</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to question: 117</td>
<td>Greek text and Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer to question: 1</td>
<td>Logic – based on all the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Paul of Religion or the Paul of the Bible?

(This is the sixth letter in the “Mr Jones” series (A, B, C, D, E).)

Dear “Mr Jones”,

Thank you for your two lists totalling 119 questions concerning the validity of Paul’s writing in Scripture. They have been collected together and listed, including all the duplicates, in Appendix A, with a short summary of each answer. They will all be addressed in detail in the remainder of this document.

You will understand our surprise on discovering for ourselves that the bulk of the questions appear to be based on, derived from, or in other ways connected to the work of others such as Shriner (www.justgivemethetruth.com) and Del Tondo (www.jesuswordsonly.com). In fact some of your questions are extracted verbatim, or nearly so, from those sources.

The arguments put forward by proponents of these types of hypotheses have a number of characteristics in common:

1. The content is presented with no apparent understanding of the Bible in its entirety, which means the analysis is generally “one dimensional”, dealing with the superficial and seemingly obvious at the expense of the interconnections that exist throughout the Bible.

2. There is virtually no consideration of the text beyond the English translation(s) and what little consideration is given, also tends to be superficial.

3. There are virtually no ground rules – all things can be questioned, challenged, freely re-interpreted and the arguments and proofs can be extended as far as necessary with complete disregard to anything else that is overturned, contradicted or ignored in the process.

4. The apparent intent of the presentation, conscious or otherwise, is to turn “believers” away from belief in one or more aspects/topics/foundations of the Bible.

For people who are just beginning to become aware that there are gaps and limitations in what is presented by Christianity in general and/or their own religion in particular, anti-Bible hypotheses with these characteristics are difficult to evaluate. The difficulty is due to such emerging seekers of truth not knowing where to start to assess the correctness of what is presented to them. For this reason, at a Bible Meeting in Tasmania in 2008, we reviewed a proposed Bible Sanity-check Model. The detail of the model is presented elsewhere, but a summary diagram is presented in Appendix B. Using that model, we see that the anti-Paul and similar hypotheses fall into the Selective Exceptions category. In other words, this type of hypothesis is presented on the basis that the Bible is basically quite acceptable – except for all the bits the particular hypothesis decides to exclude.

Having determined where in the spectrum of Biblical views any particular hypothesis stands, the next logical step is to try to determine the boundaries of the individual hypothesis. In the case of the anti-Paul hypothesis, your first question in Appendix A sets the bounds: are Paul’s writings Scripture? Consequently, the Paul Sanity-check Table (Appendix C) presents the Scripture references to the validity of Paul and hence also his writings – all of which this anti-Paul hypothesis flatly rejects. We will discuss them in various places in this document.

As stated above, the proponents of these anti-Bible hypotheses have no ground rules, so they readily extend their opposing view to include any and every Bible book or individual that needs to be removed, by one means or another, to make their point. So it was no surprise to subsequently find that Shriner and Del Tondo present arguments to carefully excise:
• Luke – because he is supposed to be an ardent fan of Paul
• Ananias – because he is supposed to be one of the high priests of the Sanhedrin and was thus helping Paul build his Christian persona in order to derail Christianity
• 2 Peter – because it is supposed to be a well known fake that should never have been included in the Canon (one proponent categorises both of Peter’s epistles as forgeries)
• Barnabas – who is supposed to be the author of Hebrews, and another fan of Paul
• Plus one or two others from the Bible record.

Widening the scope in this manner merely creates a never ending spiral that ignores an ever increasing volume of Scripture in order to prop up the original thesis. The logical end point is that the whole Bible is deemed unreliable, except of course, for the bits that the particular anti-Bible proponents have sanctioned. This takes us back to the need for the Bible Sanity-check Model.

To readers for whom the witness of Luke, Ananias and Peter, as presented in Appendix B is sufficient, the rest of these notes may provide some incidental information of interest for future reference. To those for whom these three are not acceptable, the rest of these notes present various counter-points to a collection of common anti-Paul statements that are freely bandied about.

But it is most important to bear in mind that there is no absolute proof for any of the tenets of the Bible – which is why Jesus praised those “who believe but have not seen”. As this document shows, there is a considerable collection of nonsense spread abroad under the heading of Religion and there is a considerable amount of mis-information available under the heading of the Bible. At some point we all have to decide whether we believe what “religion”, in any or all of its various forms, has to say, or what the Bible has to say. This document provides some insights as to how to go about making that a well reasoned decision.

The material that lies behind these 119 questions has been labelled an anti-Paul hypothesis, because an hypothesis is a supposition: a proposition assumed for the sake of argument; a theory to be proved or disproved by reference to facts; a provisional explanation of anything. (Chambers Dictionary.) A groundless or insufficiently grounded supposition; a mere assumption or guess. (The Compact Oxford English Dictionary, Second Edition, 1992.)

---

1 To make it even easier, the text of the main references under discussion have been inserted in the footnotes. References that are not inserted are supportive of, but not central to, the point being made. KJV stands for the King James Version, RSVi stands for the interlinear text of the RSV – this is used in preference to the interlinear of the Textus Receptus, because as will be explained later, this manuscript includes the bulk of the changes made by the Seven Critical Editors of the Textus Receptus. The RSVi has been presented basically “as is”, to highlight the differences from the KJV. Generally speaking, all references have been annotated as required to emphasise certain points. For example, the Definite Article is presented as The where it is present in the Greek text and ignored if it is not in the Greek text. Once the text for a referenced verse has been inserted, it is generally not inserted again at subsequent references.
1.1. Religion versus the Bible

The title of this paper draws a distinction between the religious critics’ view of Paul and the Bible’s view of Paul. The paper itself will also draw distinctions between religions (and Christianity, in particular) and the Bible. When referring to Biblical references, this paper will also draw a distinction between the words in common English translations of the Bible and the words in the underlying Hebrew and Greek texts which should have been used when those translations were made. Therefore, to make sure everyone understands the basis of these distinctions, this subsection provides a necessarily very high level view of the origins of religion and Bible translations, such as the Church of England’s Authorised Version (AV).

1.1.1. The origin of religion

We know from a number of places in the Bible itself that religions are man-made interpretations, usually based on inappropriate translations, of what God has caused to be written in the Hebrew and Greek. For example, Daniel prophesied that four monotheistic religions would rise out of the sea – a common Biblical symbol for the descendants of Noah, other than the children of Israel. The common view is that the four beasts are another aspect of the empires presented in the gold, silver, bronze and iron image of a man presented in Daniel’s first vision. However, a grammatical examination of the Hebrew reveals these to be feminine beasts in contrast to the masculine beasts (he–goat and ram) that are clearly identified as empires in one of Daniel’s subsequent visions. In order of appearance, the religions are Judaism, Christianity, Islam and Roman Catholicism.

The Scribes and Pharisees were teaching the Traditions of the Elders which are the basis of what we call Judaism. The Traditions of The Elders were (and still are) a collection of human interpretations of Scripture (and of the Law in particular), that started amongst the people taken into captivity in Babylon. They came into full blossom under the Greek appointed Edomite Chief Priests in Jerusalem while it was under the Greek Empire. Jesus vigorously attacked these corrupted teachings because they deceived the people and imposed burdens on the people in the form of “laws” that were never part of the Mosaic Law or the added Law of the Levites.

Compare the efforts of Judaism with the Compact Oxford Dictionary’s definition of religion: action or conduct indicating a belief in, reverence for, and desire to please, a divine ruling power; the exercise or practice of rites or observances implying this. What this definition lacks is any indication of the source of the information that drives religion.

Roman Catholicism, as it came to be called, had a similarly corrupted beginning. Its first steps were the combination of the Roman Emperor’s title and role as Pontifus Maximus and the Vestal Virgins with the basic concepts of Christianity, plus some of the pagan practices of Rome. The title of Pope emerged approximately 350 years after Paul and Peter had been in Rome. (The title was in use long before formal emergence of the religion in its own right with temporal power in 800 AD.) Yet the modern institutionalised version of the religion claims that Peter was the first Pope by citing Mat 16:18 And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Hence Roman Catholicism is built on Christianity and Protestantism grew out of, or broke away from, Roman Catholicism.
1.1.2. The source of the Textus Receptus manuscript

Over the years there have been many manuscripts (or texts) come to light that have contributed to the translations of our modern Bibles. Until recent times there has been considerable debate over the validity and accuracy of these manuscripts and much effort has gone into trying to produce an accurate text. One manuscript in particular deserves specific mention – the Textus Receptus.

For its first 1000 years, the geographic base and centre of Christianity was Byzantium (Constantinople). Following the rise of Islam in 600 AD and its expansion as the basis of the Mohammedan Empire, the centre of Christianity slowly withered. The scholars and intelligentsia of Christendom moved west along the Mediterranean and into Europe. The Byzantium-based Greek texts that had been in the hands of the Christian Church showed a high degree of stability because they had been cared for by the priests of that religion – and they acquired a number of textual notes and amendments that had gradually crept into subsequent editions of the texts over the years.

After the Greek manuscripts arrived in Europe, the first Greek New Testament manuscript to be printed was produced by a Dutch Catholic scholar and humanist, Desiderius Erasmus. This manuscript was generally based on the Byzantine text. The name Textus Receptus came to be attached to several manuscripts, with the most widely known being the 1565 Stephanus or Stephen’s text. The Stephen’s text was heavily influenced by the Erasmus text and it became the real basis of Elzevir's text, published in 1624. Elzevir’s text contains the words Textum … ab omnibus receptum in its preface and hence it was actually the first text to be called the Received Text or Textus Receptus. The Elzevir text is the most commonly printed text in Europe. In the main it is identical to the Stephanus text and hence they are both referred to as the Textus Receptus. However, it was the Stephanus text that was used as the basis of many post-reformation Bibles, including the Church of England’s Authorised Version.

1.1.3. The origins of the English Translations

Our common English Bibles are generally the result of translations made by people with vested religious interests. In most cases, the major translations were funded by the churches or the Bishops, as the case may be, and hence had to conform with the teachings of the associated religion. The King James Version (KJV), also known as the Authorised Version (AV), went considerably further. Apart from a set of 15 translation rules laid down by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Bancroft) and the king, the translators had a firm policy of using as many synonyms as possible in their translation. The policy was aimed at ensuring the translation was not seen to disadvantage any section or group of people by omission of words or collections of words that were more or less in common use. In addition to this generous use of language, there was also use of transliterated Greek and Latin words plus introduction of Latin theological/religious terms. In all cases, these translations give a different view of the detail provided by the underlying Hebrew or Greek texts.

Subsequently, a number of interlinear Bibles have been produced for mainstream use. The interlinear texts use a specific Hebrew or Greek manuscript and provide an almost word-for-word translation of every Hebrew or Greek word. Over the years, since the Textus Receptus was produced, there have been a number of renowned Editors of the available texts who have produced updated texts in one form or another. One of the Interlinear Bibles uses the Stephen’s text as its base text and shows every variation of that text made by six of the most prominent Editors, giving a total of seven views of the text.

Each time a source manuscript is edited to correct deficiencies or errors, it creates or produces a new version or text. In modern times, through application of linguistics etc, and the availability of more and more papyri, it has been possible to construct/produce texts that have a very high degree of certainty of being accurate – that is, closer to what the original must have been. These new texts are dealing with fewer and fewer words that are in dispute. In general terms, there has only been debate over 10% or less (usually considerably less) of the words in any given source text. A common source text has been one of the several texts labelled Textus Receptus.
text in the one book. This work is commonly referred to as the version of the Seven Critical Editors. Another more modern manuscript (Nestle, 1952) forms the basis of the Revised Standard Version Interlinear (RSVi).

1.1.4. The resultant impact of religion and the translations

The nett effect of religion and the religious-based translations is that for the last few hundred years, as far as Western Civilisation is concerned, we have Roman Catholicism on the one hand and Protestantism on the other (and it consists of over 300 different sects). Quite clearly, even if there are only two or three such groups in the world, all claiming to have the correct interpretation of “the truth” then none of them “know the truth”. These 300-plus organisations, including the four entities prophesied by Daniel, are what we call religions. Each one has risen because a number of people have grouped themselves together on the basis of an agreed interpretation of selected Bible references.

The best way to demonstrate these different interpretations is to compare how the Church of England’s Authorised Version’s translation of Mat 11:28 is used by religion and what a corrected translation of the Greek text has to say. Verse 28 reads:

Come unto me all that travail and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

A typical interpretation of this verse given to the Christian “man in the street” (or the ploughman) is that if we take our problems and difficulties to Jesus, He will answer our prayers. If you enter “Matt 11:28” prayer into Google, you will see many such statements, including a United Methodist Church site. And Rev. John Edmondstone, OAM, a Baptist Minister, said exactly the same thing in his daily mini-sermon just before the news on Radio 2CH in Sydney (0759, Monday, 6th October 2008) – he said this verse shows that Jesus is concerned with the very detail of our lives; with our burdens and toils and if we turn to him, He will give us rest. “What a wonderful thing that is,” he says.

However, if we check the AV a little more closely, two things should be reasonably obvious – that verse 28 should be read together with verses 29 and 30, and that there appears to be comparison involved in the way the verses are worded. Namely, My yoke and My burden should be compared with the yoke and burden the people are already under:

28. Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.
29. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls.
30. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.

So, at this level, by mere close examination of even the AV text alone, we can see a disconnection associated with a verse happily and frequently quoted by religions/religious people. This is a good example of a common religious interpretation or belief. However, some of the more knowledgeable religious authorities have a slightly better insight. One of the Seven Critical Editors, Bishop Alford (AD) states:

The main invitation however is to those burdened with the yoke of sin and of the law, which was added because of sin. All who feel that burden are invited.

---

3 The Seven Editors of the Stephen’s text (1546-9) and the dates over which they produced their manuscripts are: Elzevar, 1624; Griesbach, 1774-5; Lachmann, 1831-50; Tischendorf, 1841-72; Tregelles, 1856-71; Alford, 1862-71 and Wordsworth, 1870. It is available under at least two titles; the one used in this document is by Berry (AM).
The only problem with that statement is that it implies that the God-given added law had significant negative impact, but Jesus was now offering an “improved” option. This is not an appropriate implication because it would mean that God had placed all previous generations at a disadvantage in comparison with the generations of Jesus’ day and beyond.

Another respected Bible Commentator, Bishop C.J. Ellicott D.D.\(^{(2)}\) states:

... the Son of Man turns with infinite compassion to those whose weakness and weariness He has shared and offers them the rest which none other can give them ...

The words are wide enough to cover every form of human sin and sorrow, but the thought that was most prominent in them at the time was that of the burdens grievous to be borne, the yoke of traditions and ordinances which the Pharisees and Scribes imposed on the conscience of men. ...

As the teaching of the Pharisees was a yoke too grievous to be borne, so the yoke of Christ is His teaching; His rule of life, and so is explained by the “learn from Me” that follows.

(Notice the slight, but subtle, inference that this statement applied only to Jesus’ day: but the thought that was most prominent in them at the time. This is a typical religious tactic; it says we are much more sophisticated these days, so we can see and understand the simple lessons that were presented to the simple folk way back then, so just you listen to us and we will make it all perfectly clear.)

Ellicott’s view is more attuned to the source of the problem as being the Pharisees and Scribes – two religious sects – but he does not follow the thought to its logical conclusion: when, where and why did the Scribes and Pharisees impose these teachings on “men”?

Despite being quite familiar with the Greek language, both commentators have missed a significant component of what Jesus has said, so it is safe to conclude that as both commentators are Anglican Bishops, they are presenting an institutional “Christian religion” interpretation of the three verses. It is fundamentally a correct view, but they do not appear to understand its significance. But more importantly, because they have completely overlooked one aspect of these verses, it is not a complete view. Nevertheless, that incomplete view is part of the basis of the common Christian teaching that the Old Testament is no longer applicable. That makes it a religious view of what the Bible says. So let us follow this point to its proper conclusion.

The Revised Standard Version (RSV) Interlinear Greek text, with some minor modifications, reads:

28. Come unto me all The (ones) labouring [Present tense, Active voice] and have been burdened [Perfect tense, Passive voice] and I will rest you (in appropriate work).
29. Take The yoke (of work) belonging to Me on you and learn (through instruction) (by thought accompanied by endeavour) from Me, because meek I am and lowl y The heart (belonging to Me) and ye will find rest (in work) in The souls of you
30. for The yoke belonging to Me is easy and the burden belonging to Me is easy to bear.

The following brief notes, based on Vine’s Expository Dictionary\(^{(AG)}\), are pertinent to understanding the translation:

• The word translated labouring has the meaning of laborious toil – working hard, striving, struggling.
• The word translated have been burdened has the metaphorical meaning of requiring burdensome legal observances, caused to do many hard things.
• The word translated yoke refers to coupling two things together and hence can be used of submission to authority (as in this verse) or to the bondage of the added law (Acts 15:10).
• The word translated learn is mathesteuo, to be taught, which is derived from manthano, to learn, indicating thought accompanied by endeavour.

• The word translated rest is anapauo and it is intimately associated with the Sabbath day \(^{(AK)}\). It has the primary meaning of up-ceasing (which is the opposite of katapauo: to cause to cease, restrain). Vine states:

  \(\text{anapauo}\) is not a “rest” from work, but a rest in work; not the rest of inactivity but of the harmonious working of all the faculties and affections of will, heart, imagination and conscience – because each has found in God the ideal sphere for its satisfaction and development.

Leaving aside the emotional aspect of those comments, the expression rest-in-work refers to the invigoration we experience as our indwelling spirit reveals the Father to us and we learn to work in harmony with God. In the context of verse 27 it means instead of trying to discern and reach the necessary standard by labouring under the imposed burdens of the Scribes and Pharisees, Jesus will instruct us in a much easier approach. That approach is to follow what God taught us in the first place, which is what Jesus upheld in every regard.

• The words translated in The soul honours the grammar of the underlying Greek text (which is in the Dative case) to show us where the rest-in-work is located – which in this context, refers to the conscious and subconscious components of our mind.

• The word translated easy means easy, able to be used, in contrast to what is hard, harsh, sharp and bitter.

When we look at the corrected translation, the point that stands out is that Jesus is not offering put-your-feet-up rest. Far from it, He is promising the rest-in-work that comes from working with the right tools and the correct instructions to get rid of the burden imposed upon us by religions that have us toiling endlessly for no tangible gain in knowledge or understanding on any appropriate level. For example, the “Every Day with Jesus” or Scripture Union daily readings and notes – for some people it is their life long chore to read and act in accordance with those Bible guides. But apart from the basic message that Jesus is the Son of God and that He can “forgive” our sins (which is the fundamental belief requirement), what does it have to offer? For example, the Scripture Union approach includes:

... These questions may help you:

• How does this passage help us to understand and relate to God?
• How does this passage help us to understand ourselves, our situation, our relationships?
• Is there some promise or warning or example we need to notice?

You may find it helpful to turn these questions into prayers. Here are some suggestions:

• Lord, show me yourself in your Word; help me to discover you in new ways.
• Lord, your Word is like a mirror in which we see ourselves. Show me myself in your Word today.
• Lord, help me to live by the truth you show me - to praise you, or trust you, to say sorry to you, to let you change me

This is indeed the kindergarten of Bible study and for many people, this will be, to the best of their abilities, as much as they can achieve, so it certainly has its place. But what would these same people achieve if they were taught what the Bible actually says? What does the Scripture Union or “Every Day with Jesus” offer those who start to question the Scripture Union/Every Day interpretation of Scripture?
Jesus offers us the chance to learn by His instruction and to gain knowledge of the Father and hence to learn how to live in accordance with the Will of the Father – as set forth throughout the Bible, not just in the Gospels. That sentence is almost the same as the claim of every religion – and therein lies the difference between the teaching of religion and the teaching of Jesus. As we learn to differentiate the between the two we find Jesus’ yoke is indeed easy.

1.1.5. Ramifications of religion and religious views versus the Bible

So what are the immediate, practical applications of what we have just discovered with respect to this document and the subject before us?

Referring back to the teachings of Judaism (a religion) and the Mosaic law of the Old Covenant (“testament”, in religious terms) – the message of the Mosaic Law is to believe God. Deu 30:19 *I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.* This is what Jesus taught.

There is no inconsistency between the Old Covenant teaching and the teachings of Jesus. The only change was the abolition of the added ceremonial law of the Levites, because the arrival of Jesus fulfilled all their symbolism with respect to personal salvation and hence changed the manner of worship. But everyone from Jesus’ day down to ours has had to do the necessary work, to the best of their individual abilities, (which may consist of at least listening to and carefully considering what we are told by others), to fully convince ourselves on that point.

Jesus’ reference to His yoke being easy and His burden being easy to bear, should cause us to ask precisely what is His yoke and His burden? In a word, it is belief and all that stems from it – which is what Paul elaborates in great detail. Again, everyone from Paul’s day down to our own has had to do the necessary work, to the best of their individual abilities, to understand what Paul was saying. Unfortunately, when it comes to Paul’s writings, we find a lot of religious talk and very little practical research – which is why the “christian” religions have never progressed beyond the kindergarten level – which, at least, can be readily understood by the ploughman.

This paper follows the same processes demonstrated above. It looks at the anti-Paul statements made by the religious critics, supposedly supported by their quotations from today’s Bibles, and compares them with what is stated in the Hebrew/Greek texts. The end result of this investigation is to ask the question one last time: what can we trust – a religious view of the Bible or what the Bible actually says?
Answer to questions: 119, 54, 55

• 119. Just a few thoughts and questions perhaps enough for you to take further? (Much confusion for such as me. Yet, even I, am reasonably content and can understand most of the Old Testament (OT), Gospels, the so-called "Jewish Epistles" and indeed much of Revelation too. There is much more and certainly masses have been written concerning Paul.)

• 54. Why don’t they proclaim the Gospels and the OT?

• 55. Perhaps because Paul himself didn’t do so?

The source of much of the error in what the anti-Paul hypothesis is attempting to present, is that it bases its comments almost entirely on the English text of the AV (which we know from your previous correspondence is also restricting your knowledge, “Mr Jones”) and/or American Standard Version (ASV). Therefore it is no surprise to find that in Question 119 you state There is much confusion for such as me and yet, even I, am reasonably content and can understand most of the OT, Gospels, the so-called "Jewish Epistles" and indeed much of Revelation too. There is much more and certainly masses have been written concerning Paul. This perception of one’s own knowledge is quite understandable when the only thing it can be compared with is what Christianity itself is teaching. In fact, such claims have much in common with many Biblical commentators. Unfortunately, the English text alone will never lead to anything more than a relatively simple understanding of the Bible. Let us consider one example, taken from Philippians, one of the seven Pauline epistles that Shriner considers to be “acceptable”.

Paul uses an expression in Philippians 1:1 that is translated, probably universally, as Christ Jesus. Hence the English AV text states to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi. From the English language and Christian point of view, we read it as addressing all the Christians in Philippi. However, if we use the Greek text to correct the translation, it says:

To all The separated ones in an anointed (people) belonging to Jesus, The ones being in Philippi …

The corrected translation conveys a completely different tone and message from the traditional version. That translation is from the Greek of the Textus Receptus (which we know from your previous correspondence that although you have not studied this text as such, you believe it to be the inerrant Word of God). It has been translated according to the rules of grammar and the well recognised and understood meaning of the words – for example, in Vine’s Theological Dictionary of New Testament Words (AG). (Incidentally, the anti-Paul hypothesis favours the ASV and the UBS GNT (with its Westcott and Hort based text) over the AV and the Textus Receptus, so why you accede to this hypothesis, is a contradiction in itself.)

You asked in Questions 54 and 55 does Christianity not proclaim the Gospels and the OT – because Paul did not do so? Let us consider some of the questions that we need to ask ourselves now we have the corrected translation of this portion of Paul’s text, and look at where we can find the answers:

a. Which people are “anointed”? That is answered in the OT.

b. When were they anointed? That is answered in the OT.

c. At what point do they “belong to Jesus”? That is answered in the Gospels.

d. What does “separated” mean in this context? That is answered in the Gospels.

e. When did they become “separated”? That is answered in the OT and the Gospels.

f. Where are the other separated ones – the ones that are not in Philippi? That is answered in the Gospels.

4 You have stated in correspondence that you detest Westcott and Hort and supported that attitude using the proven out-of-context citations from a book by the co-incidentally named Floyd Jones that claimed the Textus Receptus is the inerrant Word of God handed down through the centuries and hence all other manuscripts are at best, unreliable.
So perhaps the more appropriate question is: Is Paul referring to the Gospel and the OT in these few words, or is he merely giving a summary of the status of these people based on what was taught in the OT days and by Jesus? In terms of your question, perhaps the reason Christianity does not proclaim the Gospels and the OT is because it is ignorant on these points, as are the authors of the various anti-Paul hypotheses. Or perhaps it is because Christianity and Paul’s critics do not approve of what the Gospels and OT actually say.

So, in this example of just six Greek words, we can see a Christian religion (AV) view of Paul and the Biblical view of Paul. Which one should we trust?

Consider one more example from the AV text of Ephesians 3:15, which is one of the Epistles that Shriner rejects:

... of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.

This is what the Greek says:

... out of whom every family in a heavens and upon an earth is given a name.

Here again we find a very different tone and message in the latter versus the former. Again, it is taken from the Textus Receptus and again it has been translated according to the rules of grammar and the well recognised and understood meaning of the words – for example, in Vine’s Theological Dictionary of New Testament Words. So, as above, let us consider some of the questions that we need to ask ourselves now we have the corrected translation of this portion of the text, and look at where we might find the answers:

a. Which family or families can be described as “out of (the Father)” – as stated in the preceding verse? That is answered in the OT.

b. Why does it say “a heavens and an earth” instead of “the heavens and the earth”? That answer is given in the OT.

c. What does “a heavens and an earth” mean? That answer is given in the OT.

d. Which families does this statement refer to? That answer is in the OT and in the Gospels.

e. What is the name that is given to these families? That answer is in the OT and in the Gospels.

So, again, perhaps the more appropriate question is: Is Paul referring to the Gospel and the OT in these few words, or is he merely giving a summary of the status of these people based on what was taught in the OT days and by Jesus? Hence we repeat our statements: in terms of your question, perhaps the reason Christianity does not proclaim the Gospels and the OT is because it is ignorant about these points, as are Paul’s detractors. Or perhaps it is because Christianity and Paul’s critics do not approve of what the Gospels and OT actually say.

Here we have another ten Greek words and we can see again that there is a big gap between the Christian religion’s (AV) view of Paul and the Biblical view of Paul. Which one should we trust?

And for those who think the number of pages or other measure of volume is a consideration in an argument, here we have looked briefly at only 16 words out of some 1500 verses in Paul’s epistles (excluding Hebrews, which is rejected by Shriner and Del Tondo).

The important point is that there is a way out of the apparent confusion that you refer to which arises from reading Paul’s writings in the English versions, and it has been well known for some time. J.O. Adams, for example, has said/written on more than one occasion, the only way to understand Paul’s
writings is to at least read Paul’s writing using an Interlinear text. Why? Because it lets the reader see what practically every English translation has otherwise hidden from the reader – which English words have been used to translate the underlying Greek words. This is especially useful when **different** English words are used to translate the **same** Greek word. For example, in Galatians chapter 3 alone, the Greek word *ethnos* is given three different translations in the AV: *heathen* and *nations* in verse 8, and *Gentiles* in verse 14 (see a corrected translation of the whole chapter elsewhere in this document).

As mentioned earlier, the need to refer to the Greek to untangle the English is due entirely to the Authorised Version’s stated dedication of using as many English synonyms as possible (see its Introduction (AL)). If it were not for such an irresponsible approach to the translation, at least half the confusion in reading Paul’s words would probably disappear.

It is also not unusual for avid AV supporters, and especially the ones who rarely, if ever, consult the Greek text, to consider the Textus Receptus as the only reliable source of the Word of God to come down through history. Not surprisingly, these same people generally consider the AV (also known as the King James Version, KJV) as the only reliable translation of God’s Word. If such people are prepared to seek a little further, their concerns about which text can be addressed by using Berry’s *Interlinear Greek-English New Testament* (AM) that was described earlier. However, be aware that none of the interlinear texts successfully address the basic translation issues of the kind illustrated above, but at least you will have made a start by cross-checking the AV with the Greek text.

A major difficulty with this list of questions, is determining how much detail to provide in the answers. As we have seen, the questions are asked against the background of the work of Shriner and Del Tondo, (which cover more than 750 pages). Fortunately the answers to your questions do not require another 750 pages. As your questions are based on the AV text alone, the answers in this document will generally go down to the level at which the AV has obvious difficulties or contradictions. This will serve to emphasise the gap between the AV/religious view of Paul and the Bible’s view of Paul and it will provide a road map for you to follow those questions through to their logical conclusions.

**Answer to the trivial questions: 4, 5, 6, 98**

- 4. When Peter stood up with the “eleven”, how many Apostles were therefore present?
- 5. After the “first” Pentecost, how many times are the 12 Apostles mentioned individually by name?
- 6. Was Matthias the only Apostle not mentioned by name in the New Testament after this time?
- 98. Who said that Paul was the Apostle to the “Gentiles”?

These questions are classed as trivial because it takes only a few minutes for anyone to look up the answers.

There are no lists of Apostles given outside the Gospels. There were only 11 “Apostles” who had been appointed by Jesus from the time of Jesus’ crucifixion until the Lord personally called Saul (Acts 9:15). Jesus said in Acts 9:15 ⁵ Paul was to bear His name before **nations** (not **gentiles**, and there is no Definite Article), kings and sons of Israel. Paul confirmed that role in Rom 11:13, Gal 2:8, 1Ti 2:7 and 2Ti 1:11 (but read **nations**, not **gentiles** in each case).

The importance of the lack of reference to Mathias in Scripture after his “election” is too easily overlooked. Consider the topics listed in the last two columns of the table in Appendix C. It is doubtful there is a skerrick of reliable literature anywhere in the world that attributes the proclamations in the table to any of the eleven “Apostles”. So, who else could have made them? The

---

⁵ KJV Acts 9:15: But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel:
next possible source appears to be Mathias. But Mathias’ contribution to Scripture is outstanding by its absence, so he is not the source of these statements. On the other hand, the person that the Bible tells us was appointed by Jesus Himself is universally recognised as the source of these statements. Without that information there would be major holes in the complete story of the history and future of Israel.

So in the simple comparison of who was the replacement 12th “Apostle”, as judged by their fruits, Mathias versus Paul, the answer should be obvious. Man’s elected 12th “Apostle” drops into obscurity, but Jesus’ personally appointed 12th “Apostle” has clearly been in the forefront of many a Biblical discussion since the day he was appointed.

Answer to questions: 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 15

- 2. The 13th?
- 3. Are there 12, 13 or indeed 14 Apostles appointed by GOD?
- 7. Was James, Jesus Christ’s brother, one of the 12 Apostles?
- 8. Or is James just referred to as an Apostle, as are others, like Barnabas and indeed Paul?
- 10. Was Paul the 13th Apostle?
- 15. How many Apostles were there then and how many will there be later, as per Rev. 21:14?

You added the comment to Question 15: I’m certain that only 12 will be involved in the Kingdom and the City will have 12 foundations and in them the NAMES of the 12 Apostles.

The key phrase in Question 3 is appointed by God. Because the AV has merely transliterated the underlying Greek word, apostolos, into English, it has buried the meaning of the word. Consequently it has also buried the reason why the method of appointment is so important. Without understanding the meaning of the Greek word, much of the discussion concerning “apostles” is somewhat meaningless and, at times, confusing.

The definition is given in the Greek text of John 13:16 and John 17:18 and that explains why Jesus Himself is referred to as an “Apostle” in the English text of Heb 3:1,2. And these references, together with Acts 1:8 and Acts 9:15, show the authority possessed by those in the role. Therefore, those who belittle and deny people who have been given such authority, had better be very sure of their ground, because they are refuting God Himself. (For those who believe there is a resurrection, it is worth considering that at sometime or other, after the resurrection of the dead, we will all come face to face with the Biblical characters who have been so soundly maligned.)

The correct meaning and usage of apostolos establishes that there were 13 “Apostles” appointed by Jesus, but there were only 12 in office at any one time and Revelation confirms there will only be 12 honoured in the foundations of the New Jerusalem. Given the statement in Mark 14:21, it is not hard to determine which 12 will finally be honoured.

All other people labelled as “apostles” in the AV, such as Mathias, Silvanus and Timothy, were appointed by men as their “apostles”. The idea that an “apostle” of Jesus had to have been with Him from the beginning is a man-made idea, that arises from the comments of the 11 (the number of Man’s short-sightedness / foolishness) when they decided they should elect a replacement for Judas.

---

6 RSVi John 13:16 Truly, truly, I tell you, is not a slave not greater [than] The Lord of him, nor is a sent one (Greek: apostoloS) greater [than] The (one) sending (Greek: pempo) him.
7 RSVi John 17:18 As me thou didst send (Greek: apostelO) into The order (Greek: kosmos: order, system) I also sent (Greek: apostelO) them into The order (Greek: kosmos: order, system).
8 KJV Hebrews 3:1 Wherefore, holy brethren (Greek: separated kinsmen of the same womb), partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle (Greek: sent one) and High Priest of our profession, Christ (Greek: christos: an anointed) Jesus; 2. Who was faithful to him that appointed (Greek: poieO) him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house.
9 KJV Acts 1:8 8 But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost (Greek: The separated spirit) is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.
10 KJV Mark 14:21 The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born.
It is tempting to say that Barnabas was also appointed by God as an “Apostle”, because of the wording of Acts 13:2,4 11, where The Spirit The Separated (one) – that is, God Himself – directs Barnabas and Saul to be separated into The work which I myself called them, which is emphasised again in verse 4: So, therefore, being sent forth under (authority) of The separated spirit ... . However, there are several points of difference between the appointment of Saul and this appointment of Barnabas which show that Barnabas was not an “Apostle” of Jesus, including:

- Barnabas is not called twice – see Appendix D for additional information. The original twelve were selected face to face, whereas all those named twice in Appendix D were addressed by voice alone, with no human manifestation of God present. In other words, Paul was treated in the same manner as all the others who have been “called” by voice. Paul was called twice by his name, meaning the mechanism was the same in all cases. We shall return to this point again in due course.

- The words of verse 2 were addressed to the group, not to Barnabas personally, which is not the case for people named in Appendix D, or in the personal face to face manner of Jesus and the original 12.

- There is no explicit record of Barnabas seeing the resurrected Jesus, which is the first point the final 12 have in common.

- There is no record of Barnabas receiving any personal instruction from Jesus, which is the second point the final 12 have in common.

- There is no record of Barnabas being given a specific mission by Jesus, after His resurrection, which is the third point the final 12 have in common.

- Given the statement in Rev 21:14 12, we know Saul replaced Judas Iscariot, but who would Barnabas have been replacing? Not Thomas (who was not present when Jesus breathed on the other ten “Apostles” in John 20:22 13, but he was present at the Pentecost event) and not James, son of Zebedee, who was killed by Herod (Acts 12:1,2). This would have established the precedent for all the other “Apostles” also being replaced following their deaths.

Even with a correct understanding of the word apostolos, it is not possible to unravel the conundrum of Gal 1:19 14 by reading only the English text. As is so often the case, the AV translation has glossed over the proper meaning and use of the underlying words and/or the grammar, so the full extent of the meaning is lost. Consequently, the AV’s translation has led countless numbers of people astray, including your favourite litmus paper, the ploughman. When the verse is correctly translated, it means something completely different, and yet, as is so often the case, that meaning is also very apparent in the AV’s translation (which is the first indicator of whether or not a new translation is correct). The correct translation is: different from (other than) The “apostles” I saw not (anyone) except James The brother of The Lord.

As we shall see, the corrected translation cuts a swathe through many of the principle assertions of Paul’s opponents.

---

11 KJV Acts 13:2-4  2 As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost (Greek: The Spirit The Separated (one)) said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.  3 And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.  4 So they, being sent forth by (Greek: upo – under the influence of) the Holy Ghost (Greek: The Spirit The Separated (one)), departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus.

12 KJV Revelation 21:14  14 And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.

13 KJV John 20:22  22 And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost (Greek: receive ye separated spirit – no Definite Article!):

14 KJV Galatians 1:19 But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.
Answer to questions: 9, 16

- 9. Did GOD, or anyone else, tell the 12 Apostles of the new addition to their ranks?
- 16. Did any witness tell the 12 Apostles that Paul had been appointed as an Apostle also?

Consider the matter logically: the favoured son of the Pharisees had a well-known charge that he rigorously pursued to persecute “Christians”. Then all went quiet until he reappeared three years later, renouncing that charge and proclaiming the very “Christianity” he formerly persecuted. That news was going to spread as fast as the bush telegraph of the day could spread it.

The Lord told Ananias and subsequently, Ananias and/or others, such as those in the assembly at Damascus, certainly told Luke and anyone else who would listen, of the events that unfolded. So the chances are, the 11 “Apostles” all heard about the event in a very short space of time and if not in such a short space of time, then certainly in the years between Paul’s return to Damascus from Arabia, and his first visit to Jerusalem which culminated in the words of Gal 1:19. So the 11 “Apostles” in Jerusalem certainly heard about Paul’s appointment, long before he ever met them face to face.

There is no requirement in the process of appointing an apostolos to notify anyone of the appointment in that sense. The “apostle” does that himself when he first addresses his designated audience in the process generally referred to as “presenting his credentials”.

Question 7 revisited

- 7. Was James, Jesus Christ’s brother, one of the 12 Apostles?

Apart from the error ensuing from using the AV’s translation of Gal 1:19, discussed above, the anti-Paul hypothesis has failed to consider all the information that is provided in the Bible under the heading of James.

Young’s Concordance (AI) states there are five people named James in the NT:

a. James, a son of Zebedee and brother of John the apostle.
b. James, a son of Alpheus.
c. James, the brother of the Lord Jesus.
d. James, the son of Mary – also called the Little.
e. James, the brother of the apostle Jude.

James (a) and (b) are listed among the twelve apostles of Jesus in Mat 10:2,3 and Mark 3:17,18. And there is no obvious reference connecting James (c), (d) or (e) to the possibility that they were counted among the apostles appointed by Jesus. James (c) was certainly not one of the people the 11 Apostles put forward as a replacement for Judas.

Interestingly, the Christian commentators introduce considerable debate as to whether Jesus HAD any siblings – on the basis that the word translated brother is claimed to have a wide latitude in meaning. As “proof”, they ask why would Jesus, as He died, commit the care of His mother to other than His assumed siblings, who surely must have been responsible if His mother was their mother also?
This explanation fails on the grounds of not understanding the Bible in its entirety – if Paul’s critics had taken into account Jesus’ statement in Mat 8:22 and Luke 9:60, *let the dead bury the dead*, coupled with John 7:2-10, they would see why Jesus committed Mary to John’s care. And the fact that He did so is absolute testimony to the unsuitability of any suggestion that His brothers had any roles in the called-out assemblies of Israel in Judea.

Consider another false explanation. Ellicott *(Z)* lists 7 people with the label of James – the six mentioned above, (James the Less is a separate instance of a named person) and the seventh is the person who is considered to be the first Bishop of Jerusalem. Ellicott goes into a long explanation to establish that Jesus had no brothers and therefore, of all the people named James, there were actually only two physical people, both of whom were “Apostles” – James the son of Zebedee, who was killed in ~44 AD, and James the son of Alphaeus. The latter is considered to be a cousin of Jesus, and hence his “brother”.

This explanation also fails because of John 7:2-10 – if the anti-Paul hypothesis wants to adopt the view that “brother” has a wide meaning, then John’s comment embraces all and sundry. But what change has to be made to “brother” to suit Mat 12:48-50? If the answer is “different contexts”, then maybe the hypothesis needs to take that point back to the drawing board and the whole subject re-examined.

Another common mis-explanation is that James was indeed the brother of Jesus, but he was an elder brother from a former marriage of Joseph. That explanation fails on the grounds of not understanding the Bible in its entirety – if Jesus had elder half-brothers that would mean the regal possession of the crown would have passed to that half-brother, and not to Jesus. That would mean Jesus does not have the appropriate authority to become the king of Israel and therefore He cannot lay claim to the throne of David.

The anti-Paul hypothesis whilst clearly claiming to have a good understanding of the Gospels, appears to fail to realise that the lists of the Apostles included James the son of Zebedee and his brother John, and James the son of Alphaeus, and the brother of Judas (who was not Judas Iscariot). Given that James, the son of Zebedee was killed in ~44 AD, then the James with the elders in Jerusalem, and the author of the Epistle of James were one and the same person, James the son of Alphaeus. Furthermore, the Epistle of Jude was written by the surviving James’ brother, as stated in its opening, using the name Jude instead of Judas. (Ellicott considers Jude to be the brother of the James who was Jesus’ brother, which stems from Gal 1:19 – which as we have noted, is not translated correctly in the AV.)

So much religious confusion – all stemming from the AV English text of Gal 1:19, but as we have seen, not from the Greek text of Gal 1:19. So, what should we trust – religion’s view of Paul or the Biblical view of Paul?

---

15 KJV John 7:2-10  2 Now the Jews’ feast of tabernacles was at hand. 3 His brethren therefore said unto him, Depart hence, and go into Judaea, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. 4 For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world. 5 For neither did his brethren believe in him. 6 Then Jesus said unto them, My time is not yet come: but your time is alway ready. 7 The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil. 8 Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come. 9 When he had said these words unto them, he abode still in Galilee. 10 But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.

16 KJV Matthew 12:48-50  48 But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? 49 And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! 50 For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.
Answer to questions: 11, 23, 24, 63, 64, 99, 100, 101, 105, 106

- 11. How many times is Paul referred to as an Apostle?
- 23. Did Paul ever consider the words of John 5:31?
- 24. Did Peter or any Apostle, ever endorse Paul?
- 63. Who called himself an Apostle? ("I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them to be liars ")
- 64. Who "say" that they are "apostles"? Shall we see? Why not check out who actually says that Paul is an Apostle?
- 99. Who refers to Paul as an Apostle?
- 100. Do any of the other 12 Apostles, ever refer to Paul as an Apostle?
- 105. Did Paul at any time repent concerning his previous actions?
- 106. Did Paul ever repent of his "former work" of persecuting "Christians"?

First and foremost, as we saw earlier, Paul was commissioned by Jesus Himself in the words recorded in Acts 9:15. Altogether, in one form or another, there are approximately 22 references to Paul as an “apostle” – the actual number depends on knowing the proper meaning of the word apostolos.

There are nine references where Paul is commonly stated to be calling himself an “Apostle” in the AV, namely, in the introduction to nine of his epistles, where the AV says called Apostle. A moment’s check of the Greek text shows that the correct translation is a called Apostle. The difference is significant because it shows that Paul did not make a claim on his own behalf, but is stating his authority, as is the right and proper thing to do when presenting one’s credentials. The title, a called apostle encapsulates the following facts:

- Paul was called to his role by the disembodied voice of Jesus, not addressed in the physical face to face manner as had been the case of the original 12, as shown in the Gospels. This method of his selection, by calling, sets Paul apart from the other 11, and by using the descriptive title of himself, there is no confusion about who is whom.
- Paul’s calling was in exactly the same manner as was the calling of others in Israel who have been appointed by God, as shown in the OT and itemised in Appendix D. And these callings are all consistent with the meaning of the word apostolos and most, if not all, such people could rightfully use that title.
- Paul’s calling was in exactly the same manner because God does not change His ways when doing the same things, irrespective of which Covenant is in place, as can be seen in Old and New Covenants (or “testaments” in religious terms).

By the way, the fact that Jesus used the name Saul, whereas Paul uses the name Paul is of no consequence, because Paul is merely the Greek and Roman equivalent of Saul.

Before we proceed, you mention in Question 90 that the only Scripture applicable in Paul’s day was the Old Testament. So, if John’s gospel was not readily available in Paul’s day, why do you refer to it here? However, we show elsewhere that all the Words of God are Scripture, so we have no problem in addressing this reference, irrespective of whether Paul had seen John’s gospel.

The assertion that Paul is acting as a witness for himself overlooks the simple fact that the Lord Himself is a witness to his appointment: Acts 9:15. As was Ananias. And the fact that the anti-Paul hypothesis cites John 5:31, while ignoring verse 32 17, which spoils its argument, is a classic example of the one-dimensional nature of the analysis mentioned at the beginning of this document. Paul had the same additional witness that Jesus cites. Why is that acceptable for Jesus but not for Paul?

---

17 KJV John 5:31-32   31 If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.  32 There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true.
In 1Co 15:9, Paul states that he should not have been an “apostle” because of his earlier persecution of the called out assembly of the God. This is one example of Paul expressing regret of his past life. You ask did Paul at any time repent concerning his previous actions? It is surprising this question should even arise, because every Christian knows that repentance is about adopting a completely new life that is the antithesis of the life style that preceded the repentance. The whole collection of Paul’s writings, and his acceptance by the 11 “Apostles” and the others at Antioch, is the proof of his repentance. (And yes, we did see what Shriner and Del Tondo had to say about Manean etc, etc. As we said earlier, anyone and any book that gets in their way is denigrated for the sake of their hypothesis. We will deal with their proposal that Paul was a cousin of Herod in due course.)

As mentioned earlier, those who do not want to accept the evidence of Luke, Ananias, and Peter, will not accept that these three are independent witnesses. And we can add a fourth witness – Barnabas who testified on Paul’s behalf in Acts 9:27 – that is, in Luke’s writings, not Paul’s writings. On the other hand, we see Paul’s critics are prepared to declare 60% of the New Covenant as fraudulent in order to prove their point. (We wonder where that leaves the Textus Receptus – how does one hold the view it is the inerrant word of God and still entertain this line of reasoning against Paul?)

There are several people other than Paul who make reference to themselves as “Apostles” in one form or another:

- Peter in referring to himself and the rest of the 11 in Acts 1:25.
- All “apostles” in Jerusalem identified themselves as “apostles” in their letter to Antioch, Acts 15:23 – reported in Luke’s writings, not in Paul’s writings.
- Peter identifies himself as an “Apostle”, in the opening of his two epistles – presenting his credentials.
- For completeness, God calls Jesus The “Apostle” in Heb 3:1 – that is, the Father calling the Son an “Apostle” – for Trinity believers, this is a type of “self” reference. (Here is another example of the one dimensional analysis of the anti-Paul hypothesis. Given there are 19 epistles written according to the well known, standard format of epistles, why is Hebrews not recognised as an epistle written by God to His people? It is for the same reason that 1 John is not recognised as Jesus’ own epistle to His people.)

Now consider these points:

- In the light of all this discussion about “Apostles”, the word *apostolos* appears in the English version only 83 times. It is used only once each by Matthew and Mark, six times in Luke but it is not used even once in the AV text of John. Luke uses it 31 times in Acts.

Why does John use the word *disciples* and never a mention of “Apostle”? 

---

18 KJV 1 Corinthians 15:9 For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God.
19 KJV Acts 9:27 But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared (Greek: proclaimed) unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.
20 KJV Acts 1:25 That he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place.
21 KJV Acts 15:23 And they wrote letters by them after this manner; The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles (Greek: The nations (of dispersed Israel)) in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia:
The answer lies in the facts that:

1. The “Apostles” were not given their commissions until after Jesus’ Resurrection – Mat 28:16-20, Acts 1:8 (the English text to a large extent, and Greek, quite clearly, shows that Jesus did not give the “Apostles” their commissions in Mat 10:5-42).

2. John presents Jesus as God in his Gospel.

As Jesus had not given any of the “Apostles” their commissions during His physical presence on the Earth, He certainly did not call any of them by that title, individually or collectively. The term is used only by the Gospel writers and Luke in Acts when writing after the events took place. This is precisely the same as Moses using names of the manifestations of God at various points in the Pentateuch despite the fact that the people associated with those events did not know those names. But those very same names have great significance in providing a clear understanding of those events to all who have followed since. So the term “Apostle” was only officially applicable after Jesus had physically left the planet, which makes perfect sense, given the fundamental meaning of the word, and it was only applicable to 12 people to whom Jesus personally assigned commissions. Hence, as John’s account concluded prior to the presentation of the commissions to the “Apostles”, he does not use the word “Apostle” in his Gospel in reference to any of the disciples.

As shown above, those who were entitled to use the term did so, in the manner that was commensurate with the meaning of the word. Which also explains why Luke and none of the “Apostles” ever directly refer to or address Paul as an “Apostle” (only Americans use such titles in such an inappropriate manner). However, as we shall see, all eleven Apostles directly and explicitly endorsed Paul and his teaching.

And by the way, even the English clearly shows that Matthias was not present when the 11 did receive their commissions. Jesus was quite capable of including Matthias, at that time – if it had been His intention to make him an “Apostle”.

Answer to questions: 12, 13, 14, 22, 85, 114

- 12. Did Jesus Christ, in the Book of Revelation, confirm Paul as an Apostle?
- 13. Did Jesus Christ confirm Pauline “doctrine” in the Book of Revelation?
- 14. Did Jesus Christ, in the Book of Revelation, stand against Pauline “doctrine”?
- 22. Are there any similarities between the story of Balaam and Saul’s (Damascus road) conversion?
- 85. Why does Jesus Christ mention Balaam in Revelation 2:14?
- 114. What was the problem over eating certain meats?

The links between these questions come straight out of the anti-Paul hypothesis. The outright claim is that Balaam and Paul taught Israel to eat meats sacrificed to idols and that Paul, contrary to the law, permitted fornication among Israelites. The basis of the discussion is Rev 2:14 and the essence of the anti-Paul hypothesis is as follows:

1. Balaam was a soothsayer who was converted to be a prophet of God while on the road to meet with Balak, by the appearance of an angel (which the hypothesis insists was Jesus). The Logic is that Balaam subsequently went bad because he told Balak how to corrupt the people – enticing them to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication (as stated in Rev 2:14).
2. In the account of what happened to Balaam when Jesus is said to have appeared, the words spoken by the donkey to Balaam are claimed to be the equivalent of, *why are you persecuting me*. The actions of the donkey are claimed to be the equivalent of demonstrating “it is hard for the donkey to keep kicking against the goads of God’s angel”. Hence the account of Balaam’s conversion and subsequent behaviour is claimed to be the exact parallel of Paul’s conversion and subsequent behaviour.

3. Balaam was “indwelt by the Holy Spirit” (Num 24:2 23).

4. The discussion concerning fornication and the eating of meats is based on “Paul’s doctrine of Grace” – that the law no longer applied, and hence various behaviours that were previously illegal, are now permitted, such as fornication and the eating of meats sacrificed to idols.

5. Much of the anti-Paul argument is based on 1Co 7:15 24, and in particular that there was no divorce certificate issued (it seems that because Paul did not mention a divorce certificate, then clearly one was not issued) and that this contradicts Mat 5:32 25, (which is put forward as more evidence of Paul contradicting Jesus).

So the only similarities between what Balaam encountered on the road and what Paul encountered on the road, are forced ones. God had no interest whatsoever in Balaam’s motivations for going to Balak; His concern was only with what words Balaam would use. Paul’s critics miss the specific reason why the angel was required (which was in response to Balaam’s response to the condition in Num 22:20 26). Furthermore, as these critics know nothing about the names of God and the manifestations of God, they make the absurd claim that it was Jesus who stood before Balaam. Hence the anti-Paul hypothesis completely misses the point that Balaam was indeed just an Israelite soothsayer, not a prophet, who had the living daylights scared out of him to ensure that he would say precisely what he was told to say. There was no “conversion” of the kind the anti-Paul hypothesis likes to presume. Balaam was basically undesirable when he began his journey and remained undesirable at the end of it. He subsequently paid the price for his unauthorised advice to Balak.

Similarly, the anti-Paul hypothesis misses the fact that the AV’s translation of the Hebrew text has dealt incorrectly with four different names of God in its translation of Balaam’s final speech. Hence the hypothesis has no idea as to precisely what spirit did come over Balaam or why. (In fact, reading Balaam’s final speech from the Hebrew text, with the three names of the manifestations of God in place, plus the correct meaning of the fourth “name” in place, provides a significant insight to the scope of work of each of the manifestations of God in Genesis.) These points are sufficient in themselves to establish there are absolutely no connections between Balaam and Paul, on any level whatsoever.

The basis of the discussion concerning fornication in Rev 2:14 is summarised by the excerpts and comments in Table 2, and the discussion following the table.

---

23 KJV Numbers 24:2 And Balaam lifted up his eyes, and he saw Israel abiding in his tents according to their tribes; and the spirit of God came upon him.
24 KJV 1 Corinthians 7:15 But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace.
25 KJV Matthew 5:32 But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.
26 KJV Numbers 22:20 And God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him, If the men come to call thee, rise up, and go with them; but yet the word which I shall say unto thee, that shalt thou do.
Table 2 – Fornication: anti-Paul Hypothesis versus with Bible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-Paul Hypothesis statement (Del Tondo)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the Hebrew Scripture, the word <em>fornication</em> meant primarily adultery. In English, it has evolved into almost exclusively the meaning of unwed sexual intercourse. The reason for this change in meaning is because Paul used the synonym for this word in 1 Corinthians 7:2 apparently to mean unwed sexual intercourse. However, in the Hebrew, <em>fornication</em>’s meaning differs from our own usage.</td>
<td>1. In the first sentence, using the word <em>primarily</em> is misleading – see extracts from lexicons following this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. In the second sentence, the words <em>almost exclusively</em> are equally misleading:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>fornication</em> noun voluntary sexual intercourse between unmarried people, sometimes extended to cases where only one of the pair concerned is unmarried (legal); adultery (Bible); idolatry (figurative).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Third sentence: there is no synonym in the text – the word is <em>porneia</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown-Driver-Brigg’s Hebrew Dictionary defines the contexts for <em>fornication</em> (Hebrew <em>zanah</em>) as:</td>
<td>The Hebrew Dictionary is a freeware program for pocket PCs. See extracts from the lexicons, including Brown Driver and Briggs, following this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a1) to be a harlot, act as a harlot.</td>
<td>1. The sentence starting <em>there is no concept within zanah</em> is not true. See extracts from the lexicons following this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a2) to commit <em>adultery</em></td>
<td>2. The reference to Mat 5:32 is mystifying – the Greek uses two different words, <em>porneia</em> (typically translated <em>fornication</em>) and the verb <em>moicheuo</em>, which is in the Passive voice, meaning the man <em>causes her to commit adultery</em>. The anti-Paul hypothesis ignores the second word entirely and hence interprets what it thinks Jesus intended to say in order to suit its own explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a3) to be a cult prostitute</td>
<td>3. The anti-Paul hypothesis also conveniently overlooks the fact that there is a Hebrew word <em>naaph</em> that is commonly translated <em>adultery</em> and that Hos 4:13, for example, uses <em>zanah</em> and <em>naaph</em> in the same verse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a4) to be unfaithful (to God)</td>
<td>1. The first sentence completely disregards even the English of the verse, discussed above, let alone the Greek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thus, fornication in Hebrew is synonymous with adultery. (Out of this arises metaphorical meanings such as 1a1, 1a3 and 1a4 above.) In turn, adultery was sex with another man’s wife. (Lev. 20:10.) There is no concept within <em>zanah</em> ‘to have sex among unwed partners.’ One can also see in context of Matthew 5:32 that the Greek word for <em>fornication</em>, as Jesus intended it, had to have the underlying Hebrew meaning of only <em>adultery</em>.</td>
<td>2. The really odd-ball comment is the assertion that Jesus was speaking in Hebrew, which is used to justify the hypothesis and subsequently citing a Hebrew version of Matthew’s gospel to “prove” its point – because the Greek text is asserted to be corrupt. (Interestingly, the Seven Critical Editors do not support that claim.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus says you can only put your wife away if she committed <em>zanah</em>, translated in Greek as <em>fornication</em> but which must mean she committed adultery. Thus, because the word <em>fornication</em> in Hebrew here did not mean sexual relations among unwed people which meaning mismatches the context, we know Jesus’ original spoken language only meant <em>adultery</em>. This then was innocently translated as <em>fornication</em> but is too broad in meaning.</td>
<td>3. The whole paragraph is a good example of the contrivances and twisted logic that is common in the anti-Paul hypothesis. The hardest part of dealing with this type of nonsense is not the verification of what is said, rather, it is in working out what it is actually trying to say.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following excerpts from the lexicons on the meaning of the Hebrew word *zanah* highlight yet again the one dimensional analysis of these kinds of anti-Bible hypotheses:

Brown Driver and Briggs (G) state:

1. Commit fornication, be a harlot.

2. Figure of improper intercourse with foreign nations, with Accusative of persons

3. Of intercourse with other deities, considered as harlotry, sometimes involving actual prostitution.

4. Of moral defection.

With respect to item 3, above, the anti-Paul hypothesis conveniently ignores the other common meaning of the English word *intercourse* – to have discussion or communication.

Fuerst (H) states that *zanah* does include intercourse between unmarried people (for the sake of brevity, only the references addressing *unmarried* relationships have been included, as this flatly contradicts the fundamental point of the anti-Paul hypothesis):

Properly, to shake out seed, *semen emittere*, therefore, to beget, to cohabit. In Hebrew only:

1. to play the whore, to commit fornication, of men with the Accusative, of the female; usually of a woman, whether married, that is to commit adultery or unmarried, Gen 38:24, Hos 4:13, Eze 16:17, Eze 16:26 and Eze 16:28, or of the paramour, Eze 16:34, with slight modifications to the idea; of the man Judges 19:2, to play the whore upon (the man), that is, against or besides him. …

2. Figuratively (a) to apostatise, from God, to commit idolatry (Israel being thought of as the spouse of Jehovah, God being the husband, and idols the adulterers) (b) to run after whorishly; to whore after, that is to imitate (c) to have intercourse externally or with strangers ….

Gesenius (I) states:

1. To commit fornication. Attributed properly and chiefly to a woman; whether married (when it may be rendered, to commit adultery) or unmarried, Gen 38:24, Lev 19:29, Hos 3:3 and Eze 16:17, Eze 16:26 and Eze 16:28, Eze 16:34, Lev 17:7, Lev 20:5,6, Deu 31:16. …

2. It is very often used figuratively – (a) of idolatry …

There are several other comments that need to be made concerning the handling of this topic in the anti-Paul hypothesis:

1. A dictionary is not a lexicon (and neither is a concordance a lexicon). Some people consider research based on lexicons, instead of dictionaries and concordances, as “academics” or “Uni types” searching around “until evidence is found that suits a personal view”. Perhaps the example above puts the need for such research into its proper perspective.

2. If the uses of the words translated *fornication* and *adultery* in Hebrew and Greek are researched thoroughly, it will also become obvious that:
1. These terms are used in national and individual contexts. Hence although the meanings of the words do not change between these contexts, the meaning of the message conveyed by the verses is dramatically different.

2. There is a particular, deliberate and specific use of gender in the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible that provides another layer of abstraction such that:
   1. Various things (topics, figures of speech, visions, prophecies) that are associated with feminine nouns relate to the Sanctuary and the spirit/mental plane
   2. Various things that are associated with masculine nouns relate to the Dominion and the physical/carnal plane.

So applying these principles to our answers to the questions for this section, the most important point in connection with the fornication topic is to understand whether it is in the national or personal context. Rev 2:14 is clearly national because even the English states it involves the Children of Israel. It requires individuals to participate in the associated activities, but the context is about seducing Israel to adopt the worship of foreign gods. The same context applies to Rev 2:20.

Closely coupled to this topic is the anti-Paul hypothesis view on the subject of Paul’s “doctrine of Grace” – that “the law” no longer applies. Typical of the references presented and discussed in this regard is Eph 2:15. The logic behind the hypothesis discussion of this verse is as tortuous as that applied to Mat 5:32, above. For example, in the words of the hypothesis, Eph 2:15 is presented “in its wider context” – verses 14 to 16 – and it states that “most reputable commentators agree that Paul says here that Jesus abrogated the entire Law of Moses” and then they move on to its next “handy one line proof” – its words, not ours. An authoritative pronouncement based on having no idea of what the middle wall of partition refers to, let alone the law of commandments in ordinances!

All that was required was to read Eph 2:11-22 because then it becomes apparent that it is actually discussing the status of the two divisions of Israel in that day – the Dispersion and the Judeans. The reference to the law concerns the abolition of the Ordinances of the law (otherwise known as the law that was added, Gal 3:19). It refers to the ritual law of worship, which no longer applied after Jesus’ death and resurrection – because the change in the priesthood following His resurrection automatically triggered a change in the style of worship. (That is why the curtain in the temple was rent in twain.) With the Ordinances gone, these verses are telling us that both divisions of Israel are now on the same footing with respect to the manner in which the Israelites can approach God.

A point to bear in mind about Mat 5:32 versus 1Co 7:15, on which so much of the anti-Paul hypothesis rests, is that the point of the discussion is different in the two verses. In Matthew, Jesus is

---

27 KJV Revelation 2:20 Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols.

28 KJV Ephesians 2:11-22 11 Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles (Greek: The nations) in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; 12 That at that time ye were without (Greek: Xoris Adverb: outside) Christ (Greek: an anointed (people)), being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: 13 But now in Christ (Greek: christos: an anointed) Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ (Greek: christos: an anointed (one)). 14 For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us: 15 Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace: 16 And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; 17 And came and preached (Greek: proclaimed) peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. 18 For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. 19 Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints (Greek: The separated (ones)), and of the household of God (Greek: of a household belonging to The God); 20 And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ (Greek: an anointed Jesus) himself being the chief corner stone; 21 In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: 22 In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit (Greek: RSVi: in whom also ye are being built together into a dwelling place belong to The God in spirit).
raising the personal standard for adherence to the Law. Turn the other cheek, go the extra mile and not to even lust in the mind after a woman. These are all exhortations to lift our personal standard higher than mere compliance with the Law. Why? Because if we are prepared to go the extra mile, turn the other cheek and can discipline our minds sufficiently, our own lives and the life of society overall will be so much the better. The grief and aggravation of going to court, for example, will be avoided; the one who benefits from the extra mile, if nothing else, learns by the example to do likewise; a person with a disciplined mind, if nothing else, can keep the peace under all circumstances and provocations.

On the other hand, the explicit focus of 1Co 7:15 concerns the extreme case of an unbeliever who departs from the believing spouse. It comes at the end of 14 verses that have discussed a number of other combinations. Yet the anti-Paul hypothesis focuses only on this one verse, and then makes a song and dance about the lack of reference to a bill of divorce, with nary an intelligent word about the fact that unbelief is the topic under discussion. Well, consider this: as shown above, fornication and adultery, in the personal context, usually refers to the behaviour of the individual, but when it is used at the national level, it refers of the nation fornicating with another god. Bear in mind that the behaviour of the nation, in such a context, is the sum of the behaviour of all the individuals within it. Therefore, according to context, fornication and adultery can apply to an individual Israelite who adopts, for example, a religious versus a Biblical view of the Bible. (Never lose sight of the fact that Mat 5:32 and 1Co 7:15 are both in the context of Israel only.)

Now re-consider the whole context of Paul’s words. Like Jesus, Paul is also advocating a higher level of compliance with the spirit of the law. It is certainly possible not to believe God, but it is not possible to have belief in nothing at all – everybody believes in something and believes something. At the worst case, the unbeliever is actually a believer in the “no-God” god. But the more common case is to find someone who believes in the god of one religion married to someone who believes in the god of a different religion. However Paul is addressing the case of an Israelite who believes The God of The Bible but is married to an Israelite who does not believe The God of The Bible. That unbeliever, on the higher plane that is consistent with the rest of Paul’s comments in chapter 7, is indeed fornicating with another god.

But even leaving that reality aside, there is a marked difference between the unbeliever of Paul’s earlier verses and the unbeliever of verse 15. The unbeliever of the earlier verses, who chooses to reside with the believer, is in fact manifesting the basic requirements of the Law. (This is the whole basis of Rom 2:14.) However, on this same higher plane, the unbeliever who chooses to leave the believing spouse is not manifesting even the basic requirements of the Law.

Now consider this: the law forbids lending money on usury, but money can be lent on usury to the foreigner – and there are a number of laws in this category. Why the difference? Because the foreigner was never given the law and has no desire or intention to live by the law, and so will never gain the benefits of the law. Paul, as the lawyer that he was, is simply encapsulating all that thinking by saying, in long hand:

If the one who chooses to fornicate with other gods (an unbeliever), chooses to depart from a believer, that unbeliever is choosing to live as a foreigner. That is, as one who cares nothing for the law or the physical benefits that it brings etc, so that unbeliever should be treated as a foreigner. Therefore, if an unbeliever actively chooses, as demonstrated by this behaviour, to live outside the law, then the believer has no obligation under the law with respect to that unbeliever – because the unbeliever no longer wants to be a party to the same law. (But that unbelieving Israelite will nevertheless be judged in accordance with the law they have rejected.)

29 Romans 2:14 14 For when the Gentiles (Greek: The nations), which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves:
This is practical, common sense advice that is being provided to people living in communities where such “mixed belief” marriages were the norm at the time of the spreading of the good news of the Kingdom of God. The advice is aimed at those who have believed Jesus and changed their lives but have been confronted with a break-up of their marriage over that belief. This is the difference between merely knowing the law and understanding the law.

On the level of Paul’s discussion, the question of a bill of divorce is not relevant, because that belongs on the lower level of the mechanics of dissolving a marriage in accordance with the law of God. Paul’s discussion is on the higher plane of the relationship between an Israelite and compliance with the point and purpose of the law of God, which is consistent with the level of his discussion in the previous 14 verses.

So in order to understand when Paul is speaking about individuals and their relationships versus the national entity and its relationships, and the nature of those relationships, it is a matter of first accurately identifying the context of the verses in question and paying attention to any references to the law within each context. This is a task Paul’s critics failed to do, but you, Mr Jones, can commence rectifying it yourself.

The questions associated with the expression eating meats sacrificed to idols are straightforward. Exo 34:15 refers to Israel tearing down the altars to the foreign gods (verse 13) so that the people do not make covenants with the inhabitants of the land and go whoring (zanah) after the gods of the people of the land, doing sacrifice to them and subsequently intermarrying with the people (verse 16). The particular clause of interest in the AV text is: and one call to thee and thou eat of his sacrifice.

The Hebrew reads and it (the covenant) calls out to you (that is, you are called, literally or metaphorically, depending on the covenant, to assembly) and you eat of its sacrifice. The expression eat of <its> sacrifice is a Hebraism that is derived from the Levitical sacrifices where, according to the type of sacrifice, the priest(s) and/or the people involved, ate of the sacrifice as an act of acknowledgement and commitment of Jehovah, unto whom the sacrifice was made. Hence for anyone to eat of a sacrifice, in the context of a religious ceremony, is to make a commitment to the person or entity to whom/which the sacrifice was offered.

Hence we find there are two types of “meat”, which basically means food, under discussion in the New Covenant:

1. That which applies at the level of whole communities or called-out assemblies, that is associated with people attending ceremonies and committing to the idols for which the ceremonies were held. This is the most common context.

2. That which applies at the personal level and specifically to meat (food) that is left over from the sacrifice to gods in the temples that is subsequently sold in the shambles (open market), to raise money for the temples. The discussion of the latter has absolutely nothing in common with the former, other than the fact that the food had at some previous time been offered in a sacrifice.

By the way, for those of us who have eaten in Thai and/or Chinese restaurants, we have all eaten food that falls into this second category. If you look around these restaurants, you usually see a statue of the national god somewhere in the restaurant, and it will have some fruit and sometimes burning candles in front of it. That fruit is symbolic of the offering of all the food that is served in the restaurant. Paul’s discussion on this subject simply says that if, on some occasion, someone who believes The God of The Bible, were to point this fact out to you, (implying it is a wrong thing to do), then for the sake of the strength of the belief of that person, (not your own belief), do not eat of that food, on that occasion 30.

30 While we are on the subject, there are another couple of aspects with regards to the foreigners we should also consider. The complete alien (Hebrew: zewr) has no legal standing within Israel, meaning no rights of any kind. But these days not only do we...
So here again, Paul’s critics, whilst claiming to be teachers of the Word of God, have failed in the simple task of identifying the context and applying the correct meaning according to the corresponding scope of the discussion. This is something else you can begin to rectify for yourself, Mr Jones.

Finally, under the heading of these questions, the claim that Paul’s “doctrine of Grace” refers to the abolition of the law, shows a complete lack of understanding of the meaning of Grace in Scripture. The detail of that reply is beyond the scope of this document, but the manifestation of the Grace of God commenced with provision in the law of the kinsman-redeemer and it extends to God’s acceptance of those Israelites who have not believed Him but at least treated their fellow Israelites as they would themselves. Paul’s “doctrine” included, supported and explained various aspects of that Grace and what it means in everyday life. However, because the anti-Paul hypothesis has not discerned the vast difference between the national scope of Revelation and the scope of Paul’s writings, it looks for a connection between Revelation and Paul that has no logical reason to exist (except, of course, for Paul’s reference to the Third Heaven, which is a major part of Revelation).

Answer to question: 17

17. Should we apply The Bible’s test for true Prophet to Paul?

The logical response to this question is “who said Paul was a prophet?” This is a red herring that is noised abroad by the anti-Paul hypothesis based on 1Jo 2:19. The basic problem with this approach is that Paul did not start in the company of the Judean disciples and “Apostles”. He started his work in Antioch and he returned to Antioch. Therefore he was not “sent out” by the Judeans – otherwise he would have been their “apostle”, not the “Apostle” of Jesus – so he could not have “departed” from them. The question of what happened at the meeting in Jerusalem is addressed by the corrected translation of Gal 2:1-10 in Appendix E.

It is also surprising that you would even consider the “test” put forward in the anti-Paul hypothesis, because it is based on OT references and you have been disparaging of such references in the past – such as the similarity between the calling of Paul and the calling of those in the OT. Therefore, why not apply the NT test, set down personally by Jesus Himself, for the acceptability of someone coming in the name of Jesus? That test is spelt out in detail in 1Jo 4:1-3. Paul passes that test.
Answer to questions: 18, 19, 20, 21

- 19. Who were the witnesses?
- 20. Who are the witnesses as to what occurred on the road to Damascus?
- 21. Are there real and important differences, in the three reports of Saul’s “conversion”?

Bearing in mind the statements concerning Luke (and the other apostles) in the table in Appendix C, there is no question as to the validity of Luke’s record. But apart from that, the inconsistency in the logic of the anti-Paul hypothesis is on display again. For example:

- Who were the witnesses to Jesus’ temptation in the wilderness?
- Who were the witnesses to the events in Gethsemane?
- Who were the witnesses to Jonah’s three days in the whale, which Jesus cited?
- Who were the witnesses to John’s Revelation?
- Who were the living witnesses to the events that Moses recorded in Genesis?

Applying the flawed logic of the hypothesis to these other recorded events would require removal of these events from the Biblical record, due to the same absence of physical witnesses.

Interestingly, the anti-Paul hypothesis is very happy to state: Furthermore, in the book of Acts, we also find a vivid reminder that conversion is recognition of Jesus as Messhiach in the prophetic sense. (Acts 8:31-34.) There we read of an Ethiopian eunuch who asks Philip to explain to him a Messianic passage from Isaiah. Philip does so. The Eunuch realizes Jesus is Messhiach in the prophetic sense. The Eunuch is converted and baptized. Which raises at least several obvious questions which again go directly to the consistency of the logic of the hypothesis:

- Is Luke acceptable or is he not?
- Who witnessed this event with the eunuch?
- Who heard the spirit speaking to Philip?
- Who saw Philip caught away by the spirit?
- How are the circumstances of this account different from the circumstances of Paul’s experience?

Ananias received his information concerning Paul direct from the Lord, and neither Luke nor Paul were witnesses to that event. So how did the conversations between the Lord and Ananias get into Luke’s record? As Paul’s critics state that Luke’s record is actually a conspiracy between Paul, Luke and Ananias, it is puzzling that you can support that view and still support the view that the Textus Receptus is the only reliable source of God’s Word.

However, leaving even all those points aside, consider the following significant inconsistency presented in the anti-Paul hypothesis: who were the witnesses to Balaam’s encounter with the angel? As we saw above, the hypothesis “carefully” compares Balaam’s and Paul’s “conversions” to prove that both were “prophets” that went bad. Which is it to be? Either Balaam’s encounter and Paul’s encounter are both invalid due to lack of witnesses, or they are both genuine. It would appear that Paul’s antagonists want to have it both ways. Especially as they attach considerable significance to the witness of the ass!
The anti-Paul hypothesis argues that the three accounts of the events on the road to Damascus are not factual because Acts 26 records Paul saying more than has been reported in the two earlier accounts, and that Paul seeks to legitimise his accounts by ascribing those words to Jesus. However, the hypothesis cites Jesus’ remarks in Rev 2:14 as proof that Balaam went bad – but that information was not recorded when the account of Balaam’s encounter was written some thousand years earlier. So by the same rules that are used to reject Paul’s words, why are Jesus’ words not also rejected?

However, you can correct this problem in the hypothesis yourself, Mr Jones, by comparing the scope of what is said in the three accounts, together with what Ananias was told and what he said to Saul, to confirm that the accounts are indeed consistent with each other.

**Answer to questions: 25, 26, 27, 87, 88**

- 25. Which of the 12 Apostles or any followers of Jesus Christ remained in touch with Paul?
- 26. Did even Timothy leave Paul?
- 27. Why did they all “turn away” from Paul?
- 87. Why was it that “all they which are in Asia be turned away from me” (2 Timothy 1:15)?
- 88. So was this “turning away”, not only in Ephesus?

The link behind these questions is the anti-Paul hypothesis’ view that because Paul taught things that were contrary to Jesus and because Paul rejected the authority of the “12” in Jerusalem, “they rejected him”/“left him”.

Luke was one of the followers of Jesus who was with Paul until the end of Paul’s work. Given that most of the Apostles are not mentioned from Acts onwards, we have no idea which Apostles remained in touch with Paul.

In trying to support the general argument that everyone turned away from Paul, the hypothesis cites 2Ti 1:15 to claim that all the people Paul had visited on his travels turned away from him. The first point to note here is that the Asia of the AV is not referring to the whole subcontinent that we call Asia Minor today. The Asia of the Bible was a Roman province, located in the western part of Asia Minor. It did not encompass the entire subcontinent – barely even a major portion of it. It was one of Rome’s richest provinces. Some of its most important cities were Pergamum, Sardis, Smyrna and Ephesus.

This same province is where the seven assemblies of Revelation were located.

This district is interesting for one particular reason – Paul was forbidden to go there on two occasions (Acts 16:6-7) and permitted to go there on at least two other occasions (2Co 1:8, Acts 20:16-21).

---

33 KJV 2 Timothy 1:15 This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me; of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.
34 KJV Acts 16:6 Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia, 7 After they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not.
35 KJV 2 Corinthians 1:8 For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life:
36 KJV Acts 20:16 For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia: for he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost. 17 And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church. 18 And when they were come to him, he said unto them, Ye know, from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons, 19 Serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears, and temptations, which befell me by the lying in wait of the Jews: 20 And how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, 21 Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.
(In fact, the whole of 2 Timothy concerns individuals who were either for or against Paul, one way or another.) As to the accuracy of the verse as presented in the AV, the detail is outside the scope of these notes, but it is important to note that 2Ti 1:15 and 2Ti 4:3,4 are intimately connected and have a key word in common – *apostrepho*. It means to turn a people away from their allegiance to their sovereign; pervert; incite to riot (which is exactly what happened when Paul was in Ephesus). When we correct the parsing of the AV translation of 2Ti 1:15, the verse reads:

*Thou knowest that* The entire (population/people) in Asia, of whom Phygelius and Hermogenes (are leaders) **have been turned** away from me.

Note that the verb is Passive – they did not actively turn away of their own volition. Literally, the expression reads *had their ears turned away from (by someone or something)*. Hence the correct parsing and corrected translation of that one word in 2Ti 1:15 – and it is only a parsing problem, not a meaning problem – destroys the anti-Paul hypothesis on this point. This is just one more example of why it is necessary to double check the AV translation against an interlinear, because although that won’t solve the parsing problem, it would at least bring the common word in these verses to the fore.

How can someone **cause** others to turn away? By peer pressure, weight of the opposing numbers and constant harping and complaining. Is this not precisely the same behaviour that culminated in all but two Israelites over the age of 20 being condemned by God for their disbelief in the Sinai Wilderness? The reference to the two names, Hymanaeus and Alexander, identifies two ring leaders (1Ti 1:20) and 2Ti 4:16 shows that Paul is speaking about the Israelite component of the population.

Interestingly, the anti-Paul hypothesis manages to avoid mentioning the fact that Constantinople, Nicea and the old Roman province of Asia, became the seat of the Christian religion – the second beast of Daniel’s vision – for nearly 1000 years. The Christian religion grew out of the people of this very region – those who resisted Paul from the beginning and those who had their understanding turned away. That same Christian religion is the one that today advocates the appointment of homosexual bishops, female bishops and barely tolerates the idea that Jesus was in fact the Son of God. The fact that the manuscripts most closely ascribed to the origin of the Textus Receptus also came from this same region should be sufficient to explain a great deal about the apparent **consistency** of that manuscript (S). It certainly explains the large number of religiously-biased insertions that are in it.

The hypothesis has failed to discern that the messages of Jesus, Paul and the other “Apostles” are **not** the messages of Christianity. Rather, they are the messages of the Bible, and as such, they were never going to take the world by storm, because then Israel’s identity would no longer be hidden. The fact that Christianity and the other monotheistic religions (as foretold by Daniel) have taken the world by storm is proof enough of how effective they have been in collectively turning away the understanding of Israel. So on that score alone, we clearly have to reject all “Apostles” because their work failed to prevent the spread of Judaism and the rise of Christianity, Islam and Roman Catholicism.

If we consider Paul’s comments in conjunction with the letters to the Seven Assemblies, what we see in Asia is a cosmopolitan mix that has been Israel’s lot since the Exodus and more so since its Dispersion began. The difficulties arising from the cosmopolitan mix are recorded throughout the Bible because they have been present in every Israelite society since the Exodus. For example, consider the admixture of Edomites and Judeans in Palestine and all the problems that that caused Jesus, and subsequently Paul. So it is no surprise to read of the hardening of the hearts of sufficient numbers in Ephesus for Paul to leave the area after a three month visit. It is also safe to say that had it not been for the presence of the Roman Empire, the believing components of dispersed Israel of

---

37 KJV 2 Timothy 4:3 For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; 4 And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.

38 KJV 1 Timothy 1:20 Of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme.

39 KJV 2 Timothy 4:16 At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge.
Paul’s day would generally not have moved off to the North and West – they would have tried to return to Palestine to take the land again by force. But the presence of Rome and the rise of Christianity was enough to get them moving, and the rest, as they say, is history.

Answer to questions: 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33

- 28. Some say that the Apostles were of the tribe of Benjamin. Paul certainly made a point of agreeing with this view. Yet, “Benjamin shall ravin as a wolf”. Or is that out of context?
- 29. Who is the Benjamite wolf in prophecy?
- 30. Was Saul a member of the tribe of Benjamin?
- 31. If so, where is the evidence?
- 32. Was Saul an Edomite and a Pharisee?
- 33. If so, where is the evidence?

This is one of those classic guilt-by-association arguments, of which this is one of the two major examples in the anti-Paul hypothesis. Typically, the arguments are further confused by labelling Paul as a Jew who converted to Christianity and proclaiming that Paul was not of Israelite descent. The statements also demonstrate another aspect of the problem – the supporters of the hypothesis do not understand the scope of some of the key terms they are using.

At least the hypothesis does not appear to perpetuate the common religious misconception that Jacob was “blessing” his 12 sons at the time of his death. Jacob delivered a set of prophecies of what would befall the descendants of his 12 sons over the next 1000 years. On the other hand, when Moses blessed the tribes just before he died – he told them of all the good things that would come their way, hence the tone is somewhat different from what Jacob had to say. For example, Jacob is scathing in the prophecies for Simeon and Levi whereas Moses did not even mention Simeon 40.

The uninformed argument on this topic starts by citing Jacob’s prophecy for Judah, but only from half way through. So let us at least read the whole prophecy:

Gen 49:8-12: Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee.  9. Judah is a lion's whelp: from the prey, my son, thou art gone up: he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up? 10. The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. 11. Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes: 12. His eyes shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk.

The anti-Paul hypothesis starts its citation at verse 10 in order to attach a disproportionate significance to the underlined text, but pointing out, correctly, that this clearly foreshadows the birth of the Messiah. However, it pays no attention to the first half of the prophecy and therefore happily turns its attention to Benjamin’s prophecy and claims it too, is a statement about a future individual:

Gen 49:27: Benjamin shall ravin as a wolf: in the morning he shall devour the prey, and at night he shall divide the spoil.

---

40 The composition of various lists of the Tribes of Israel throughout the Bible is a study on its own. You will never find more than 12 tribes in a list, and the list of tribes are usually different and easy to understand, but you will often find more than 12 names in various lists of names associated with the tribes.
This, the hypothesis claims, is clearly foretelling the coming of Paul – because Jacob prefixed the prophecy with the expression *latter days*. It states the clause *in the morning he shall devour the prey* is the direct reference to Saul killing the Christians and the phrase, *at night he should divide the spoil*, is the direct reference to the converted Saul subsequently claiming the mission to the Gentiles for himself.

As we shall see, these claims are yet another example of the one dimensional analyses presented in the anti-Paul hypothesis overall. But first we need to review what the Bible tells us about the population of the Southern Kingdom.

The first and most important point is that once the captivities occurred, from the Bible’s perspective, the distinction between the tribes ceased to exist (which is why the names Ephraim and Manasseh are the only legal names that are applied to the collection of the former tribes of Israel in the latter days).

When the Kingdom was divided, the Southern Kingdom consisted primarily of Judah and Benjamin – the latter being *a lamp* for David (1Ki 11:13,31,32,36; 1Ki 12:23, 2Ki 8:19). There was also a “remnant of the people”, which refers to a goody portion of Levi plus others who left the Northern Kingdom and came to live in the south so they could worship at the Temple and not be associated with the calf worship of the Northern Kingdom (2Ch 11:13,14). Hence, at the time of the captivity of the Southern Kingdom, it consisted of Judah, Benjamin, a portion of Levi plus a smattering of others from assorted Northern Kingdom tribes.

It is clear from the lists given in Ezra and Nehemiah that the returning Israelites were of Judah, Benjamin and a small number of Levi (Ezr 1:5; Ezr 2:36,40; Ezr 4:1, Ezr 10:9 etc). This implies that the collection of people from the Northern Tribes who moved to the south soon intermarried with the Benjaminites and Judahites during the captivities, such that their own lineage effectively became Judahite and Benjamine (and such mixture became the norm for all of Israel from the captivities onwards).

Allen (J) states that the Galileans were Benjaminites. The name *Galilee* is a transliteration from the Hebrew and means *district*. In Isa 9:1, it is identified as “galilee” of The nations. This name appears to derive from the fact that before the captivities, this area was the land of Naphtali, Zebulun and Issachar – and instead of driving out the Amorites and Hivites they defeated, they let them settle in the district. Needless to say, this was a troublesome area with rebellions occurring from time to time. Interestingly, 20 cities of Galilee were given to Hiram of Phoenicia in exchange for materials to build the Temple. (Given Solomon’s wisdom, and noting that this all took place before his adoption of idolatry, the 20 cities were probably the Amorite and Hivite dominated cities.) Also not surprisingly, Galilee was one of the early casualties at the commencement of the captivities.

Bernard Comparet (K) states that when the returnees from Babylon arrived in Judea, the Judahites settled what little land was left around Jerusalem and Benjaminites had to go north to Galilee which was largely uninhabited.

Of the “Apostles”, Judas Iscariot was from the southern end of Judea, from a town called Kérioth-Hezron – *Iscariot* is a corruption of *Ish Kérioth*: man of Kérioth. The other 11 were Benjaminites, because apart from anything else, their accent marked them as Galilean (Mark 14:70 41, Luke 22:59 42 – and conclusively, Acts 1:11 43 and Acts 2:7 44).

---

41 KJV Mark 14:70 And he denied it again. And a little after, they that stood by said again to Peter, Surely thou art one of them: for thou art a Galilaean, and thy speech agreeth thereto.
42 KJV Luke 22:59 And about the space of one hour after another confidently affirmed, saying, Of a truth this fellow also was with him: for he is a Galilaean.
43 KJV Acts 1:11 Which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.
Now we can return to the passages cited, above, by the anti-Paul hypothesis.

The expression the last days in Gen 49:1 is a religious contrivance. Brown Driver and Briggs state the Hebrew word translated last when used of time, refers to the latter part, or actual close (future) according to context; of the end or ultimate issue of a course of action. Specifically:

In end of the days – a prophetic phrase denoting the final period of the history as far as the speaker’s perspective reaches; the sense thus varies according to context; but it often means the ideal or Messianic future; Gen 49:1 (of the period of Israel’s possession of Canaan) … .

Gesenius translates the phrase as: in future days – which ignores the presence of the Definite Article – to which he adds the comment: properly, the end of the days, or later days. And Fuerst translates the phrase as in the future.

With respect to Jacob’s prophecies for his sons and their descendants, Jacob was well aware of the prophecy given to Abraham concerning the future of his descendants. Jacob also understood the meaning of the events associated with the animals Abraham laid out before God, and in particular, he certainly understood the relevance of the age of the animals and symbolism associated with the 400 shekels Abraham subsequently paid for the tomb for Sarah. Therefore, as Jacob and his sons could all count, they knew the time for the return to the Promised Land was not far away. Therefore it follows that Jacob’s prophecies were providing insight into that period following their prophesied return to the Promised Land. That is, the final period of time given in the prophecy to Abraham. As Brown, Driver and Briggs indicate, anything more distant in time would be well beyond the perspective of any vision Abraham, Isaac or Jacob had seen or been told in any conversation with God that is recorded in the Bible.

But that is not quite all that is relevant here.

The more literal translation of the phrase is: in following The days. For those who know the rules of grammar concerning the use of the Definite Article, the next question is: which “The days” is in view? A few minutes checking shows that in Gen 47:9, Jacob used the word for day 4 times – three without the Definite Article and once with the Definite Article (the latter was referring specifically to the days of the pilgrimage of his ancestors). The same check should also reveal that the word for day is used only 6 times between that verse and Gen 49:1 and that the use of the Definite Article in some of those verses is specific to the context of those verses only. Hence the expression the days in Gen 49:1 is referring back to the days of Jacob’s life. Therefore, the corrected translation of Gen 49:1, based on Green’s Interlinear is Gather yourselves and I will tell you what will happen to you in (a time/period) following The days (of my pilgrimage).

In the absence of that somewhat elementary information associated with the Hebrew of the verse, the anti-Paul Hypothesis claims the AV’s word last (ASV’s latter) is used to mean a period that runs up to, but no later than, 135 AD (the final destruction of the Jerusalem of the Judean era), because individual tribes of Israel cannot be identified after that date. Even though that claim is wrong, it sounds plausible. But even this claim is not supported by Scripture, for the following reasons:

---

44 KJV Acts 2:7 And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans?
45 KJV Genesis 49:1 And Jacob called unto his sons, and said, Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days.
46 KJV Genesis 47:9 And Jacob said unto Pharaoh, The days of the years of my pilgrimage are an hundred and thirty years: few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage.
1. When the 12 tribes went into their respective captivities, they ceased to exist, in Biblical terms, as the twelve Tribes of their original names. They are not mentioned by those names until they become *My people* again. Therefore, Jacob’s prophecies could refer only to the next 1000 years, at the most.

2. The single most notable incident that affected the tribe of Benjamin is that in just one day they were reduced from 26,700 fighting men to only 600 men capable of bearing swords (Judges 19 – 21 – see also Ellicott’s notes about the tally of the numbers in Judges 20:46.)

We know from this account of the war with Benjamin that the Benjaminites were very capable fighters:

Judges 20:16: *Among all this people there were seven hundred chosen men left-handed; every one could sling stones at an hair breadth, and not miss.*

1Ch 8:40: *And the sons of Ulam were mighty men of valour, archers, and had many sons, and sons' sons, an hundred and fifty. All these are of the sons of Benjamin.*

During the first two days of the battle, the 400,000 strong Israel army lost 40,000 soldiers to only ~1000 Benjaminites lost. However, on the third day, we are told that God smote Benjamin and so 25,100 died on that day. The 600 Benjaminites that survived did so only because they fled the field of battle.

The incident with the concubine that led to this battle and the Benjaminite decimation showed that these very capable warriors were getting out of control and becoming a law unto themselves. They were going down the same path as the Sodomites. If they had been allowed to continue, they would have corrupted all of Israel.

On the other hand, by re-populating the tribe from the 600 men who had fled the battle field with a large proportion of women from the other tribes, the overall fierceness of their character was taken out of the tribe. If that sounds far-fetched, consider Jacob’s prophecy of Simeon and Levi. Simeon declined in numbers over the years in the wilderness (as shown by the numberings in Numbers) and received only 15 cities scattered around the territory of Judah. In Levi’s case, the tribe was scattered across every city of every tribe, without land inheritance, so they never had cause to assemble together again as a whole tribe. By this means the cruelty in the nature of these two tribes was bred out or weeded out of Israel.

As we can see in 2Sa 2:25 47, the Benjaminites were collectively no longer the fighters they used to be, even though they could still produce a few outstanding warriors (1Ch 12:2 48). In 1Ch 12:16-18 49 we see the final alignment of Benjamin with David – notice that when Amasai speaks, it is under God’s influence (but it was not *The spirit* that came over him) and he declared *peace, peace* (that is, twice) by which David knew this declaration was of God and hence reliable – there would be no more disruptions of any kind from Benjamin.

The need to rebuild the tribe meant that for a long time they would be the smallest tribe (1Sa 9:21 50) – for example, compare their number to those of the other tribes in 1Ch 12:23-37.

---

47 KJV 2 Samuel 2:25 And the children of Benjamin gathered themselves together after Abner, and became one troop, and stood on the top of an hill.

48 KJV 1 Chronicles 12:2 They were armed with bows, and could use both the right hand and the left in hurling stones and shooting arrows out of a bow, even of Saul's brethren of Benjamin.

49 KJV 1 Chronicles 12:16 And there came of the children of Benjamin and Judah to the hold unto David. 17 And David went out to meet them, and answered and said unto them, If ye be come peaceably unto me to help me, mine heart shall be knit unto you: but if ye be come to betray me to mine enemies, seeing there is no wrong in mine hands, the God of our fathers look thereon, and rebuke it. 18 Then the spirit came upon Amasa, who was chief of the captains, and he said. Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse: peace, peace be unto thee, and peace be to thine helpers; for thy God helpeth thee. Then David received them, and made them captains of the band.

50 KJV 1 Samuel 9:21 And Saul answered and said, Am not I a Benjamine, of the smallest of the tribes of Israel? and my family the least of all the families of the tribe of Benjamin? wherefore then speakest thou so to me?
(Note that that is not actually a numbering, but it illustrates the point. Don’t be fooled by Judah’s or Naphtali’s numbers, but notice the continued relative decline of Simeon in the same list, relative to lists in Numbers.)

3. Of Jacob’s prophecies concerning the 12 tribes, we see only the prophecy of Judah has two parts – the first half pertains to the whole tribe whereas the second half makes clear and unambiguous reference to one individual – an individual who was to be a descendant of the line of law-givers that would arise in Judah and persist as a distinct line over a 1500 year period. None of the next ten tribes have any suggestion of a two-part prophecy or of the prophecy applying to an individual. Therefore, it is inconsistent that the twelfth prophecy would apply to a single person at the expense of covering the whole tribe.

By way of comparison, the blessings of Moses are consistent with the prophecy of Jacob, except in the matter of Benjamin. The meaning of Benjamin’s blessing is not obvious at first, but it refers to Jerusalem (Beloved of Jehovah), as being the place where God would dwell, which was located in the land of Benjamin. And if that does not sound like a blessing, consider what happened to the Philistines in 1Sa 6 versus the blessing of Obededom in 2Sa 6:10-12 when the Ark of the Covenant was in these respective places. So the tribe in whose territory the Ark of the Covenant, the King, the Temple and God all resided was hardly going to be suffering! And an indication of the benefits of that can be seen in the huge relative increase in Benjamin’s number in 2Ch 14:8.

4. When David ordered the numbering of Israel at the end of his reign, which was within, at most, 2 generations of Benjamin’s decimation, the number counted, excluding Levi and Benjamin was 800,000 – of which Judah was 500,000 fighting men. We also know that Asa mustered an army of over 500,000 men made up of 300,000 from Judah and 200,000 from Benjamin (but this does not tell us how many men were actually available from these two tribes). We can safely infer from these numbers that we can double the number of men to allow for wives and we can double it again to allow for those under 20 years of age and those over 60 years of age. Which means a population of at least 2 million people, split mainly between Judah and Benjamin, plus the Levites who were with them.

The most important point to note is that out of all these people, only some 42,00 of all three tribes returned to build Jerusalem – these are nowhere near being “the tribes” of Judah, Benjamin and Levi in their entirety.

5. With two such large tribes of people going into one region of captivity, keeping track of one’s lineage within those two tribes would not be a problem over the next two or three generations. Similarly, keeping track of one’s lineage as a member of the tribe of Levi would not be overly difficult because the function of the Levites had been so different from the other tribes. Some of those Levitical functions, such as the priests, teachers, lawyers and doctors, would have persisted well into the period of the Babylonian captivity.

Jacob’s prophecy states Benjamin will be a wolf that tears (ravens). This refers to Benjamin’s unruly people becoming a law unto themselves and turning away from God and the Law in every way possible. The behaviour of the men at the door of the house where the Levite and his concubine were staying was precisely the same as the men in Sodom at the door of Lot’s house Gen 19:4-10. The

51 2 Chronicles 14:8 8 And Asa had an army of men that bare targets and spears, out of Judah three hundred thousand; and out of Benjamin, that bare shields and drew bows, two hundred and fourscore thousand: all these were mighty men of valour.

52 KJV Genesis 19:4 But before they lay down, the men of the city, even the men of Sodom, compassed the house round, both old and young; all the people from every quarter: 5 And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, Where are the men which came in to thee this night? bring them out unto us, that we may know them. 6 And Lot went out at the door unto them, and shut the door after him. 7 And said, I pray you, brethren, do not so wickedly. 8 Behold now, I have two daughters which have not known man; let me, I pray you, bring them out unto you, and do ye to them as is good in your eyes: only unto these men do nothing; for therefore came they under the shadow of my roof. 9 And they said, Stand back. And they said again, This one fellow came in to sojourn, and he will continued overleaf ...
Benjaminites took the concubine and left her for dead. The Levite traveller dismembered the body and sent the pieces to all the tribes of Israel. When the Benjaminites were confronted with the matter, they refused to hand over the culprits for judgement and that precipitated their decimation.

That sequence of events, starting with the increasing lawlessness of the Benjaminites, (which took place over the 50 years following their settlement in the Promised Land), is a fitting description of as a wolf that tears. The devouring of prey in the morning and dividing the spoils at night is a metaphorical description of both their prowess as fighters (when battles were fought during the day and spoils divided at night) and of the lawlessness (when plans are made during the day and executed at night). This makes far better sense than to say Jacob’s prophecy applies to one man, who is not identified in any way similar to the second half of Judah’s prophecy and whose role was not comparable to the one identified in Judah’s prophecy.

So, the answers to some of the original questions on this topic are that the prophecy speaks of Benjamin as a wolf that tears – not that there was a single wolf. Therefore you are quite correct in your question – to try to tie this prophecy to Paul is taking it totally out of context. The prophecy was that the whole tribe of Benjamin will behave in the stated manner, and as we have seen, that came to fruition in no uncertain terms. Benjamin’s prophecy did not apply to any individual, at any time in the history of Israel. It is only in the anti-Paul hypothesis that a prophecy that is applied to a whole tribe has been subverted into applying to one man. And it is only in the anti-Paul hypothesis that such a disconnected guilt-by-association case has been made and presented as serious argument.

Given that you subscribed to the view that Jacob’s prophecy referred specifically to Saul, one wonders why you would then ask whether Saul was an Edomite. This shows a fundamental failure to discern between the descendants of Jacob and the descendants of Esau. However, as established above, Jacob was not referring to Saul (or any other individual), so your remaining questions about Paul’s descent can be taken at face value.

The logic behind the questions of Paul’s descent arise partly from a deliberate mis-application of the scope of the Greek word suggenes (pronounced: sun-genes). But before considering that aspect, the straightforward statements that need to be addressed are:

Rom 11:1 I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin.

Phi 3:5 Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee;

The anti-Paul hypothesis also claims that King Saul was another type that prefigured Paul. Saul, a Benjaminite, was a king appointed by God who also went bad: Acts 13:21 And afterward they desired a king: and God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, ... .

It should be an elementary observation that if Saul was a Benjaminite, then he could not have been an Edomite – they are two different races. But we will humour the antagonists for a moment and assume Paul was lying. The verses above also show that Saul was indeed a Pharisee. The Pharisees were not a racial group – it was a religious sect, noted as being the most extreme or self-conceited, holding to the “traditions”, fasting often, paying surplus tithes etc.

The argument presented in the anti-Paul hypothesis is another case of guilt by association. The hypothesis claims Paul was not a “true Jew”, but a “Herodian Jew”. Apart from not understanding the scope of the terminology it uses, the hypothesis cites the work of Robert Eisenman of the Institute for
Jewish-Christian Origins, California State University. Eisenman defines a “Herodian Jew” as referring to “a religio-political orientation not inimical to the aims of the Herodian family, not only in Palestine, but also in Asia Minor and even Rome and possibly implying a genealogical connection as well”. Eisenman then presents several pages in which he, not surprisingly, presents all Paul’s actions in terms of his “pro-Roman and by extension pro-Herodian political philosophy”. He also presents a collection of such speculative and highly tenuous assertions about Paul’s genealogical ties, that he concludes by saying that “none of this is precise enough or secure enough to draw any clear-cut or final conclusions” and that “we have proved nothing”.

In the light of that conclusion, only those who have swallowed the logic of an anti-Paul hypothesis, without any assessment on their own behalf, could dream of asking “Where is the evidence?”

And then the hypothesis seizes on the word *suggenes* in Rom 16:11 53, where Paul writes *salute Herodian my kinsman*. The logic presented in the hypothesis is very simple: Herodian is obviously a descendant of Herod who was an Idumean, Paul called Herodian his blood relative, therefore Paul was Edomite. Hung, drawn and quartered by his own words. Hoisted on his own petard.

*Suggenes* appears 11 times in the NT and in every case it refers to one’s blood relatives. The Bible uses two words to refer to one’s relatives – *adelphoi* and *suggenes*. As indicated by Vine, the former means *kinsman of the same womb* and refers to those who are descendants of the same parents – but which parents are in view is determined by the context. The latter term, which is the combination of *sun*, meaning *with* and *genos* meaning *a race, descendant or family* (in the racial sense), can refer to family relationships, (that is, kith and kin), or to tribal or racial kinship. Hence, all Israelites are *kinsman of the same womb* with respect to each other, but not all Israelites are one’s *suggenes* – blood relatives in the family sense). *Suggenes* occurs four times in Romans – twice in Chapter 16 – but the other two occurrences are not mentioned by Paul’s critics because there are no “sensational” names involved.

Rom 1:7 54 is addressed to *separated ones* and *beloved of God*. As this group includes Herodian, he cannot be anyone of Esau’s descent, because God declared He hated Esau from before he was even born Rom 9:13. Therefore Herodian is indeed Paul’s blood relative, not an Edomite.

These questions show a failure to understand the distinction between the Israelites of Judea and the Israelites of the Dispersion and a failure to understand the distinction between the descendants of Esau and the descendants of Jacob. So at the end of the day, who do we believe? Do we believe a religious view of Paul that is based entirely on a paper in which its author says “we have proved nothing”? Or do we believe a witness appointed by the One who by law can redeem only His own kinsmen of the same womb — the Paul of the Bible?

---

53 KJV Romans 6:11 Salute Herodion my kinsman. Greet them that be of the household of Narcissus, which are in the Lord.
54 KJV Romans 1:7 To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. (The translation of this verse will be discussed shortly.)
Answer to questions: 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48

- 34. From where did all this "churchianity" come? I've never been "happy" with Paul - along with other matters such as the trinity, sunday, lent, holy communion, christenings, christmas, easter etc. Namely, all the "churchy" stuff.
- 35. Rome?
- 36. Who started matters in Rome?
- 37. Who spent time in Rome?
- 38. Who was born in Tarsus - a very "Roman" city?
- 39. Do we actually know the name that Saul/Paul was given, at birth, in Tarsus?
- 40. What do we know of Tarsus?
- 41. Which religion prospered in Tarsus?
- 42. Who was a Roman citizen?
- 43. How did "Saul" become a Roman citizen?
- 44. When did this occur?
- 45. Who was "guarded" (protected) in Rome?
- 46. Who could be called the Latin Man?
- 47. Who founded the "church" in Rome? (There is no proof of Peter ever visiting Rome.)
- 48. Who still is guarded in Rome today?

Where, indeed. Before addressing these questions it is worth reviewing the basis of the anti-Paul hypothesis on these topics in general. The two authorities Shriner uses for opening statements on her chapter titled Paul and the Origins of Christianity are HG Wells and George Bernard Shaw:

...it is...a fact of history that St. Paul and his successors added to,..., or imposed upon, or substituted another doctrine for...the plain...teachings of Jesus...H.G. Wells (1866-1946)

The conversion of Paul was no conversion at all: it was Paul who converted the religion that has raised one man above sin and death into a religion that delivered millions of men so completely into their dominion that their own common nature became a horror to them, and the religious life became a denial of life. George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950)

Shriner’s view of the Bible authorities is that Luke is an unreliable author and is not the author of Acts and that I and II Peter are forgeries. She also states James’ epistle is authentic, but not written by James. Table 3 lists her categorisations of Paul’s epistles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 – Shriner’s view of Authorship of Pauline Epistles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authentic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I and II Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philemon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shriner states that James, the brother of Jesus, is the most important post-crucifixion person, primarily because he was a devout Jew, and that the congregation in Jerusalem were all devout Jews who remained faithful to the Torah. She then goes on to say:

*We have seen that the Jerusalem Church, consisting as it was of Jesus' relatives and his apostles, was the legitimate heir to the mission and message of Jesus. Yet the Jewish War of 70 CE resulted in the scattering of the remnants away from Jerusalem and other parts of Judea and Galilee. In order to identify the probable theological descendants of this church, it is important to note, from what we have discovered so far, the five main differentiating characteristics of the Jerusalem Church:*
• They were all, without exception, devout and practicing Jews and demanded at least some adherence to the Mosaic law by Gentile converts.

• James held the prominent position in the church. He remained unchallenged as the leader for three decades until his death in 62.

• They were opposed to Paul and his law-free mission.

• The Jewish war had a devastating effect on the Jewish Christians but some of them survived by escaping to the Transjordan.

• They were never called Christians. They were called Nazarenes, Ebionites and followers of The Way.

And this is the basis of the rest of her presentation:

The period flanked by the two Jewish Revolutionary Wars, 70-135 CE, was an extremely murky period in the history of the evolution of Christianity. We do not have a Josephus, like we did for the years preceding the first Jewish War, to record events during that period in detail. However there are some documents dated to this period that give us an idea of the development of Jewish and Gentile Christianities. The epistle of James, a pseudonymous epistle written circa 85 CE, seems to have originated from a Jewish Christian community that kept the Mosaic laws, exalted James, the brother of Jesus, and denigrated Paul. On the other side of the fence we find in the epistles of the Gentile Christian bishop, Ignatius of Antioch. Written around 110 CE, his epistles show us that Pauline Christianity was hitting back, calling Jewish Christianity a thing of the past.

Later documents - the polemics of the church fathers, some scattered references in the liturgies and writings of the emerging Rabbinic Judaism and a fourth century "romance" called the Pseudo-Clementines - allow us to at least get a glimpse as to what the situation was like from the early second century and thereafter.

From these sources, we know that from the early second century onwards, the region of the Transjordan was populated by Jewish Christians. They were called Nazarenes and Ebionites. They were described as Jewish Christians because they continued to adhere to an (albeit modified) form of Judaism, while at the same time preaching Jesus as the messiah. Unlike the Gentile Church that was quickly gaining strength elsewhere, they revered James. In their writings they considered Peter subordinate to James. While the Pauline corpus (the collection of his epistles) was quickly gaining canonical status in the Gentile church, the Jewish Christians continued to oppose the influence of the self-proclaimed "Apostle to the Gentiles".

When we compare these to the developing Gentile proto-orthodox church we find something different. We know that the Gentile Church did not require circumcision or any strict adherence to the Mosaic laws; they held Peter and Paul in high esteem rather than James; Paul was, to them, the Apostle to the Gentile par excellence; they were spread out geographically and of course, they were called Christians. We can safely conclude that the Gentile churches that developed outside the Jewish Christian one did not have the characteristics of the original congregation in Jerusalem founded by the brothers and apostles of Jesus.

It is obvious from our comparison of the two developing churches and the original church in Jerusalem, that the Jewish Christians had the distinguishing features of the original Jerusalem church. In other words they were the true theological descendants of Jesus. The gentile church was not only different, they advocated positions (such as the importance of Pauline theology) that were actively repudiated by the original apostles of Jesus. It is easy to see, in retrospect, who the heretics really were.
And the conclusion of the chapter states:

What are our conclusions here? That:

- Jesus did not talk about the atonement and that this innovation came from Paul of Tarsus. It is to Paul that Christianity should trace its roots. The origins of Christianity as we know it came, not from Jesus, but from Paul.

- The leadership and importance of James, brother of Jesus, was suppressed by the developing Gentile Church but it is through James that we would most likely be able to trace the original teachings of the earthly Jesus.

- The original followers, the successor to James and the apostles of Jesus (whether they number twelve or not), were the Jewish Christians (called Nazarenes and Ebionites), who never preached of a heavenly divine Jesus. They fought Pauline Christianity to the end of their days.

That is the background to the questions in this section.

This is the biggest of the guilt-by-association sections in the anti-Paul Hypothesis. The basis of the logic is: Paul was a Roman citizen, Paul said different things from Jesus, the Pope is a Roman Catholic, therefore, Paul was effectively the first Pope. The whole case is built on statements such as:

For the ones not following Paul, Paul says, "And I exhort you, brothers, to watch those making divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them." Rom 16:17. We see here that Paul tells his followers to avoid those who would disagree with his gospel of instructions. This is how religious cults operate. The religious leader lays down his decrees that his flock can never question.

Typical of her work in this whole chapter, Shriner concludes it quite acceptable to quote Jesus, saying: And Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us (Mark 9:40, Luke 9:50), yet rejects the authenticity of Paul having made the same statement.

And Del Tondo is no better; he states:

In Romans 13:1, Paul says “Everyone must submit himself to the governing authorities ...” Paul explains why. The Roman rulers are “the minister of God for your own good.” (Rom. 13:4, repeated twice.)

Let us begin by examining this statement. There are one or two things wrong with it:

1. There is no reference to Roman rulers in Chapter 13. Del Tondo’s inference that it is the Roman rulers who are in view is because the epistle is addressed to “Romans”, based on AV text of Rom 1:7: To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Having made the assertion that Paul is referring to Roman leaders, he then castigates Paul for what is written.

It should come as no surprise to find that the Greek text of Rom 1:7 is basically the same as we saw earlier for Phi 1:1:

To all The (ones) being in Rome, beloved (Greek: Adjective!) (ones) belonging to God, called (Greek: adjective!) (ones), separated (Greek: Adjective!) (ones) ...
That text accurately identifies that Paul is not writing to all and sundry in Rome, or even all those who profess mere belief in God – but to Israelites, because they are the only ones the Bible states are called AND separated AND beloved AND belong to God. So then it is a matter of determining precisely who Paul is referring to as the AV’s higher powers.

2. The Greek text shows that the AV translation is in error in the tense of the verb in Rom 13:1. It should read every soul is subject to “higher powers” – it is Imperative mood, Present tense, Passive voice – meaning every soul lives their life under somebody’s authority; authority is imposed on every soul. There is no choice involved. The “higher powers” refers to, literally, upholding authorities, that is, those with the power or authority, to uphold or impose rules, law etc. As such, there is nothing sinister in the statement; rather it is a statement of common sense and a statement of fact. For example, even in heaven, there is a hierarchy of leaders now, and there will be in the Kingdom age (AN). In a relatively pure Israelite society, such as in David’s day, there were hierarchies of leaders. Even Moses appointed 70 elders to form a hierarchy under himself.

Furthermore, in this verse, there are no grounds to imply it is talking about civil authorities to the exclusion of all others. In fact, as per the gender theme of the Bible, mentioned earlier, it is pertinent to note that the word for soul and the word for powers/authorities are both feminine, which shows us that in the context where they occur together, the discussion is about mental attitudes whether in the Dominion (on the physical plane) or the Sanctuary (the spirit plane). It is not until verse 3 that the focus moves to civil rulers – of any kind, not just Roman.

3. Del Tondo treats Paul’s statement about the source of the authority of the rulers as some kind of assertion by Paul, having no basis in Scripture. This shows a lack of understanding of the Bible or of history or of both.

For example, as to the Roman rulers, Jowett (Q) cites Julius Caesar’s Book IV of his four volume Commentaries of Julius Caesar (M) in reference to his admiration for the people of the British Isles. He described their culture, their sterling character, ingenuity in commerce and craftsmanship. He refers in amazement to the number of populous cities, the architecture, universities of learning, the numerical population of England, and particularly to their “religion”, with its belief in the immortality of the soul. Subsequent history shows that within a generation, the upper classes of both countries were attending each other’s universities and intermarrying (which is another interesting side story). All of which explains why Caractacus was the first defeated enemy king not to be denigrated, humiliated and barbarously executed when brought to Rome; why he was the first enemy king allowed to address the Roman senate – and he did so in Latin – and why he was the first enemy king to be granted his freedom and the right to live in Rome, and in a stately manner. The Palace Britannicum was the centre of not only the British people in Rome, but also, obviously, of the Israelites in Rome. History shows that the “Roman” rulers, across the hierarchy of civil rulers, were not all Neros and Caligulas. Interestingly, for example, the Scottish Black Watch Regiment includes amongst its honours the title Pontius Pilot’s Bodyguard – because the Romans considered the Scots to be such superior fighters, they deployed them in various places across the empire. Such regiments are just one example of the rulers in the hierarchy of the Roman Empire.
We have further proof of this point in the Gospels themselves. In Mat 8:5-13 we read the account of the Centurion who asked Jesus to heal his servant by simply saying the word, rather than coming personally to his house. Jesus’ stated He had not found such belief in all (official) Israel. By the definition of John 3:3, that Centurion was an Israelite. How did he come by his Roman citizenship?

And what about the Centurion of Mark 15:39? It appears that Paul’s critics did not understand the context of the Centurion’s statement—like the churches in general, they also probably describe it as merely a highly significant religious moment in the life of a heathen soldier. The reality is that Paul’s critics do not understand the significance of Jesus’ statement in verse 34, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani. The Scribes and the Pharisees recognised it immediately as an indication of them, and that is all they could see, which is why they hastily left the scene. On the other hand, the Centurion also recognised it, but by the timing of his statement, not as quickly as the Scribes and Pharisees—but he clearly understood it from the opposite perspective from the Scribes and Pharisees, namely, that it absolutely identified this man as the Son of God. That is why his statement is recorded. So again, by the definition of John 3:3, that Centurion was an Israelite. How did he come by his Roman citizenship?

And in case anyone considers that a Roman Centurion could not possibly have recognised that Hebrew verse from the Psalms and understood what the whole Psalm meant, consider the circumstances of Cornelius. Acts 10:1-8 tells us that Cornelius was a Centurion, who believed God and he had a soldier and servants who also believed God. Now consider the questions that arise from this one little passage of Scripture:

i. Where did Cornelius get his knowledge of Scripture in order to hold such belief? From the same place as the Scribes and the Pharisees—either the Hebrew Scriptures and/or the LXX (the latter being the more readily available of the two).

ii. Why is this particular account considered to be acceptable when there were no witnesses?

iii. Given that Luke is reporting this event in the third person, as he reported Paul’s event, why is Cornelius not accused of making up his vision?

iv. Why is Cornelius not accused of being a party to the Luke-Paul-Barnabas conspiracy to defraud Christianity?

v. Why isn’t Peter accused of being a part of a Luke-Peter conspiracy?

vi. Etc, etc.

55 KJV Mat 8:5-13 The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed. For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith (Greek: belief), no, not in Israel.

56 KJV John 3:3 Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. This woeful translation is a foundation stone for all Protestant religions. It should read unless anyone is begotten from above, he is not able to perceive (with the mind's eye) the Kingdom of God.

57 KJV Mark 15:39 And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God.

58 KJV Acts 10:1 There was a certain man in Caesarea called Cornelius, a centurion of the band called the Italian band, 2 A devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway. 3 He saw in a vision evidently about the ninth hour of the day an angel of God coming in to him, and saying unto him, Cornelius. 4 And when he looked on him, he was afraid, and said, What is it, Lord? And he said unto him, Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God. 5 And now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter: 6 He lodgeth with one Simon a tanner, whose house is by the sea side: he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do. 7 And when the angel which spake unto Cornelius was departed, he called two of his household servants, and a devout soldier of them that waited on him continually; 8 And when he had declared all these things unto them, he sent them to Joppa.
So here we have at least three examples of Roman Centurions, who are clearly Israelites by Jesus’ own definition, who are all Roman citizens.

It also pays to read Isa 45:1 and Isa 44:28 and consider by whose authority Cyrus came to rule over Babylon. (It is equally pertinent to follow the leads for these verses to examine the history of the rise of the “Persian” power in relation to who was really whom etc.) Is it any wonder, when Cyrus was shown that before he was even born, God had named him and prophesied his entry into Babylon, that he then made the proclamation concerning Jerusalem? By whose authority did Cyrus come to rule?

Now consider the account of Jonah. Jonah did not want to go to Ninevah because he knew God intended to let the Assyrians capture the Northern Kingdom. He reasoned that if he did not go to Ninevah, the Assyrians would not change their ways and so God would destroy them. As we know, he ended up going there, but more importantly, he arrived by being vomited out of the belly of a whale – to the Assyrians, he was a manifestation of someone from their fish god, Dagon. The Assyrians did not repent and believe God – they repented their barbaric ways in fearful obedience to the message delivered from their fish god. Once they had become more civilised, God permitted them to capture the Northern Kingdom. So, by whose authority did the Assyrians come to have power over Israel?

And if that is not sufficient, consider the words of John 19:11, where Jesus himself stated that Pilate only had authority over Jesus because it was given to him by God.

So, we repeat our question: which authorities did Paul have in view? Was he referring to the “Roman authorities” of his day or the civil authorities in any location who hold power over Israel at any time in history, from Paul’s day down to our own? As we will see, Paul was actually saying the same thing that Jesus had already stated in the Gospels.

**4. Why has this anti-Paul hypothesis not picked on Jesus’ words Render unto Caesar The things belonging to Caesar?** The things include his taxes together with civil obedience, loyalty etc. 1Pe 2:13 repeats the same requirement spoken by Jesus, but there is no criticism of Peter. Yet once again, Paul says the same thing Jesus has said (another example of him doing so), and he is castigated for it.

**5. And while we are on the subject, notice that Jesus told the multitude in Mat 23:1-3 that because the Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses seat, we are to do what they tell us to observe (attend to carefully), but not to do as they do, because they said one thing and did another. Jesus gave this warning because the Scribes and the Pharisees knew the Law in excruciating detail, so they were well equipped to teach it – they just did not follow it themselves.**

And before Paul’s antagonists jump up and down and say this is a condemnation of Paul, before Paul came on the scene, they need to consider:

---

59 KJV Isaiah 45:1 Thus saith the LORD to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut;

60 KJV Isaiah 44:28 That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid.

61 KJV John 19:11 Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin.

62 KJV 1 Peter 2:13 Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme;

63 KJV Matthew 23:1 Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, 2 Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: 3 All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not.
• The corrected translation and ramifications of John 1:10-12.  

• Whether or not Nicodemus, a Pharisee, believed Jesus and what it means if he did believe.  

• As this paper is showing that Paul believed Jesus and that Jesus did indeed personally call Paul, what does that mean with respect to Jesus’ comments to the Scribes and the Pharisees as two classes of people versus every individual in those classes?

There is neither reasonable time nor sensible space to go any further in attempting to deal with the biased logic that the anti-Paul hypothesis has presented in the background to this group of questions. Furthermore, none of the questions in this group, with possibly one exception, has a Biblical basis, so they can be addressed at face value, to show something of the lack of research or understanding behind them.

Who started matters in Rome? The simple answer is the Apostles at Pentecost in Jerusalem. Acts 2:10 states there were strangers of Rome present and when they returned to Rome with a remarkable report of what had happened, that would have been the physical or actual “start of matters in Rome”.

Who spent time in Rome? With reputedly seven million Judeans spread over the Roman Empire at that time, some of whom would have travelled extensively through the cities of the Empire as a result of their business/commercial acumen (including Jerusalem for worship and business), it is a pointless question. Even the heretic, Marcion, established a sect in Rome (AD 144). Given the known history of Rome and Britain, the presence of the Palace Britannicum in Rome etc, of course Paul, and at least Peter, would spend time in Rome. The fact that Paul was also a prisoner there gave him no choice during that particular period.

Who was born in Tarsus? As Paul stated in Acts 22:3, he was begotten in Tarsus, but notice that he also stated he was a “Jew”. The discussion is confused by the religious imposition of the words Jew (and in other places, such as Gal 2:15, the imposition of Gentile), neither of which have any place in an English translation of the Greek text. Such terminology considerations are another area of ignorance shown by Paul’s critics. Paul states he is “Judean”, not “a Jew”, and the importance of this statement is seen in Gal 2:14,15. The lack of understanding concerning these verses is compounded because of the Greek word being translated merely as nature in verse 15 of the AV.

In verse 14, the AV records Paul saying to Peter if thou being a Jew, but the Greek says, if thou, always being a Judean – which refers to the fact that Peter was born and bred a Judean. In verse 15 in the AV Paul states: we are “Jews” by nature because it translates the Greek word phusis merely as nature, but phusis has a wider meaning. It occurs 11 times in the New Testament, 9 of them in the epistles of Paul and one each in James and 2 Peter. Vine shows it refers primarily to the natural powers or constitution of a person or thing, but it also refers to origin or birth and to the regular law or

---

64 KJV John 1:10 10 He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. 11 He came unto his own, and his own received him not. 12 But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:   These verses should read: 10 In The Order He was and The Order, through Him, comes into being and yet The Order does not recognise Him. 11 He comes unto His own (possessions) but The people (ruling over His possessions) refuse to accept Him (as the rightful owner). 12 But to those who welcome Him, to The ones believing in His name, to them He gives authority to (make themselves) become (because of their belief) children of God (again).  

65 KJV Acts 2:10 Phrygia, and Pamphilia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews (should be: Judeans) and proselytes.  

66 KJV Acts 22:3 I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day.  

67 KJV Galatians 2:14 But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? 15 We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,
order of nature. In the context of verse 15, it is comparing the dispersed Israelites with the Israelites of Judea, and thereby is referring to the ancestry of origin or birth of the two groups. Paul says, in the Greek text, we who are born Judeans – which is consistent with the reference to Peter’s origins presented in the previous verse (and with the metaphor of Rom 11:24 to show that the olive tree and the wild olive are of the same botanical family). So even though Tarsus was not part of Judea, because his parents and/or his grandparents were Judean, Paul could claim to be a Judean because he was born into a Judean family – which refers to the geographical origin of his ancestry. Hence Paul’s reference to his Benjaminitc descent refers to his genealogical ancestry. None of these expressions refer to his religious persuasion.

Further proof of Paul being of direct Israelite descent by birth is given in Acts 16:1-3, which again shows the lack of research that is characteristic of the whole anti-Paul hypothesis. Timothy was the son of a man of the Israelite Dispersion and a woman of Judea. Paul’s role in circumcising Timothy (of which more later) would NOT have been accepted by any of the Judeans present when Paul performed the ceremony if Paul was anything other than a Judean and an Israelite. And nor would those present have accepted Timothy’s circumcision if Timothy was then going to go, in the company of a non-Israelite, to talk to whomever about the things of Israel’s Scripture and Israel’s God.

These two points are also born out in Acts 21:39 where Paul says, in the Greek text: I am a man, indeed a Judean, (of) Tarsus, The (one) belonging to Cilicia … . Do you see how much is achieved by simply using the correct terminology and paying some attention to the underlying Greek, as presented in an interlinear text? (And the Textus Receptus will be suitable for this purpose, most of the time.)

By the way, even though Paul was born in Tarsus, he did not say he was born in Tarsus, he said having been begotten which is a reference to his lineage versus the location of this birth – because he said, in order, he was a Judean, begotten in Tarsus (that is, of Judean parents, who were living in Tarsus), because begetting always concerns lineage, not birth. (Failure to understand that distinction was why Nicodemus did not understand what Jesus was saying, and it is why the religions consistently get it wrong when they refer to John 3:16.)

When Paul was born in Tarsus it was already one of the ancient cities of the Hellenistic world. The Catholic Encyclopaedia states it was of Semitic origin and already Greek when governed by the Persian Monarch in 400 B.C., becoming increasingly so before Alexander captured it in 333 B.C. The famous University of Tarsus was known all over the civilised world (third to Athens and Alexander – all Greek speaking cities). Asia was then the great centre of Hellenism. In 171 B.C. Pompey subjected it to Rome but the Romans were the first “Phil-Hellens” – and the city became a “Free City” under Augustus. It was self-governing with its own courts, magistrates, taxes and apparently no Roman interference. It was especially favoured by at least two Emperors and is reported to have influenced Roman thinking. It was a very rich and prosperous port city, an important centre on the caravan trade routes from Asia to the West. Thus it was a very ‘Greek’ city. Eerdman states that

---

68 KJV Romans 11:24 For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?
69 KJV Acts 16:1 Then came he to Derbe and Lystra: and, behold, a certain disciple was there, named Timotheus, the son of a certain woman, which was a Jewess, and believed; but his father was a Greek: 2 Which was well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium. 3 Him would Paul have to go forth with him; and took and circumcised him because of the Jews which were in those quarters: for they knew all that his father was a Greek.
70 KJV Acts 21:39 But Paul said, I am a man which am a Jew of Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city: and, I beseech thee, suffer me to speak unto the people.
71 KJV John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. (This is another woeful mis-translation that is a foundation stone for all Protestant religions. It should read: For The God so loves The order (system – of Israel) that He gives The Son, The one alone begotten of Himself, in order that The whole (of) The (order, system – of Israel) believing in respect to Him should not perish, but possess eternal life. Note: because Jesus is the Kinsman-Redeemer, then by Law, The order can only be the order of Israel, because the kinsman-redeemer can redeem only his blood relatives – that is, kinsmen of the same womb.)
in 170 BC, a community of Jews (Judeans! “Jew” is a religious term and it tells us nothing about where they came from, but Judean gives us the correct geographic identification) were encouraged by the Seleucids to live in Tarsus to stimulate economic growth. They were granted rights equal to those of the Greek inhabitants of the city.

Who was a Roman citizen? At the time of Paul, one could obtain Roman citizenship by birth or it could be granted because of loyalty, position, money etc (Acts 22:28). The Herodean Kings were granted Roman citizenship in return for their loyalty. Most men of rank within the empire were eager to become Roman citizens since it granted important networks, contacts and opportunities for economic, social and political advancement. Individually, it facilitated travel and gave one preference in a variety of ways throughout the empire. Gibbon states:

The right of Latium, as it was called, conferred on the cities to which it had been granted a more partial favour. The magistrates only, at the expiration of their office, assumed the quality of Roman citizens; but as those offices were annual, in a few years they circulated round the principal families. Those of the provincials who were permitted to bear arms in the legions; those who exercised any civil employment; all, in a word, who performed any public service or displayed any personal talents, were rewarded with a present, whose value was continually diminished by the increasing liberality of the emperors. Yet even in the age of the Antonines, when the freedom of the city had been bestowed on the greater number of their subjects, it was still accompanied with very solid advantages. The bulk of the people acquired, with that title, the benefit of the Roman laws, particularly in the interesting articles of marriage, testaments, and inheritances; and the road of fortune was open to those whose pretensions were seconded by favour of merit. The grandsons of the Gauls who had besieged Julius Caesar in Alesia commanded legions, governed provinces, and were admitted into the senate of Rome.

Which goes to show, that then, as now, citizenship is readily granted to those who have real potential to add value to a society. We know, for example, that Joseph of Arimathea, was the uncle of Jesus, one of the wealthiest men in the civilised world, a member of the Sanhedrin and a member of the local Roman Senate – which means he was also a Roman citizen. That explains why he was able to so easily gain an audience with Pilate to claim Jesus’ body – no ordinary citizen would be able to go direct to Pilate with such a request.

How did Paul become a Roman citizen and when? Paul was born a free Roman citizen (Acts 22:28) because of the family business. Paul’s family was from Judea but for whatever reason, moved to Tarsus, where due to their industriousness and/or their wealth, they became Roman citizens. There is no reason to consider Saul’s name at birth was anything other than Saul – except of course for the alleged Edomite connection that has been addressed above – because Paul is merely the Roman (Latin: Paulus)/Greek (Paulos) equivalent of his Israelite name.

Clearly his was an influential family, because not only was Paul well educated, but he was educated by the best minds of his day. When Paul appealed to Rome against his accusers in Jerusalem, he would have needed considerable financial resources to undertake such an expensive legal process – much like that required in the past by one appealing to the Privy Council in England against Australian legal decisions. He kept himself in a hired house for two years awaiting his appeal coming to court – which requires more than a simple labourer’s income. And remember how careful Paul was to lay no burden on the church for his own expenses. Acts 24:26 says He (Felix) hoped also that money should have been given him of Paul, that he might loose him: wherefore he sent for him the oftener, and communed with him. 27. But after two years …. So Felix sought a bribe from Paul. Now when do the worldly wise seek bribes from an apparent tent maker’s labourer? Overall, under these circumstances, it would have been a bigger surprise if Paul was not a Roman citizen.

72 KJV Acts 22:28 And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born.
Who was guarded in Rome? Caesar, Army leaders, High officials, Patricians, wealthy individuals, prisoners, gladiators, temples and their priesthoods, Governing institutions, various buildings, the city walls and gates etc. And Paul, because he was a prisoner on remand.

Which religion prospered in Tarsus? Many religions prospered, as is the case today. Greek and Roman religions certainly and possibly some Asiatic ones. And no doubt, Judaism, Christianity and Islam in due course. But none of these are of direct relevance with respect to the Bible itself because the Bible is not a book of religion.

Who can be called the Latin Man? Various Caesars, Priests of the Pontifex Maximus, later subsumed by the so called popes, etc. As to who founded the church in Rome, the source and evolution of the Roman Catholic Church is very plain to see by simply studying the history of the Pontifex Maximus and the Vestal Virgins together with the impact on Rome of making Christianity the official religion. All this has basically nothing to do with the events and purpose of what is in the Bible.

It is known that Paul ordained Linus, Caractacus’ son, as the first “bishop” (a religious term injected into the historical record) of the called-out assembly resident in Rome, at the Palace Britannicum. That does not establish when the assembly was founded. The assertion that there is no proof that Peter ever visited Rome is contrary to The Apostolic Constitutions which records that Peter ordained Clemens as the second “bishop” of the Palace Britannicum called-out assembly, which could only be achieved by Peter’s personal presence in Rome.

Who is still guarded in Rome today? The Pope by his Swiss Guards. Also the various leaders and legal officials fighting the Mafia, to mention a few. What has “who is guarded by whom today” got to do with Paul? More guilt by association. Let us hope Shriner and Del Tondo are not magistrates.

Answer to questions: 49, 50, 51, 52, 53

- 49. Did Jesus Christ form a new “religion”?
- 50. On what was the “church” founded?
- 51. Did Paul form the “christianity” as we know it today?
- 52. Was it Peter’s statement to Jesus Christ in Matthew 16:15-18, or Paul’s “teachings”?
- 53. Why does modern “Christianity” ignore Peter, James and John and all the Apostles? (Mind you in Paul’s eyes Peter, James and John only “seemed to be pillars”.)

The questions for this section all focus on religion, church and Christianity, which are three topics that have nothing to do with the Bible. The reason modern Christianity ignores Peter, James and John and all the Apostles (your words, but our emphasis) is because the Bible is not a book of religion and Jesus did not found any church. Therefore, none of what the “Apostles” have to say directly supports any religion or church. Religion is a man-made concept that uses churches and the religions to twist the Bible to suit their particular points of view. The religions focus on what Paul had to say because they think the English translation is correct and they think they understand it. None of them address Paul’s comments in terms of the underlying Greek, so their Christian religion perspective is their problem – the Bible has nothing to do with it.

As we have seen already, the anti-Paul hypothesis does not understand the terms it bandies about, so it is no surprise that it does not understand the difference between a church and the meaning of the word ekklesia, which is used in the Greek text. The latter was founded much earlier than Pentecost, no matter what most of Christendom teaches and despite the AV’s erroneous use of “church” in its translation of Acts 7:38. The ekklesia existed in the wilderness in approximately 1500 BC, which was a long time before any of the “Apostles” came on the scene and long before any churches were established.

73 KJV Acts 7:38 This is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us:
Jesus said He would build His *ekklesia* on Peter’s proclamation, *Thou art The anointed (one), The Son belonging to The God, The living (one)*, but in order to understand what that means, it requires finding the answers to the following questions:

1. What does *ekklesia* mean?
2. How was it originally formed?
3. To whom did it apply?
4. What is the difference between the Hebrew words, *edah* and the *qahal*, and what is their connection with the Greek, *ekklesia*?

There is no verse where Paul contradicts Peter’s proclamation and his message is always consistent with the role and function of the called-out assembly. However, the Greek text of the Bible is highly inconsistent with religious views/interpretations of the common English versions of the Bible and the teachings of every religion – which includes British Israel, as it has stood for the last 50 years.

Your statement that *Peter, James and John only “seemed to be pillars”*, refers to Gal 2:9. Notice how you have subtly distorted even the AV text by introducing a derogatory “only” into your statement. It is this kind of thinking and deliberate denigration that lies at the base of this whole misbegotten collection of questions. As we have seen, this verse is part of a discussion that begins at verse 1. Even the AV shows that the contentious word, *seemed*, is used in two other verses in this discussion. But none of them are translated correctly according to their parsing. So nothing sensible can be gained from Gal 2:9 (or indeed, verses 6-10), without paying some attention to the Greek, because it introduces a significantly different point of view on this verse, which once again, destroys the logic of Paul’s critics. The correct translation is given below and an extract of the supporting translation notes *(R)* is presented in Appendix E. The translation uses indents to offset the parenthetical statements and digressions which are discussed in the supporting notes. The “straight line” version of what Paul wrote is seen by reading only the lines that start at the left side of the page.
1. After that, through to 14 years (after my appointment) I go up to Jerusalem, with Barnabas, also taking Titus with me.

2. (Note that I go up (because of) a down-to-me revelation.) And so I myself set forth to them (people in Jerusalem) The good news that I am proclaiming among The nations (of Dispersed Israel) but down through private (meeting) to The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea) so that in no way I may be running into an empty (purpose) [that is, I may not be supporting a lost cause on this present occasion] or (that in no way) I run (into an empty (purpose)], [or, I support an empty/lost cause at any time].

3. BUT not even Titus, the (man) with me, being Greek, is compelled to be circumcised.

4. On the other hand, (Titus is compelled to be circumcised) because of The surreptitiously introduced false kinsmen of the same womb who slip in to spy on The freedom (from the added Law) belonging to us, which we have via an anointed Jesus, in order to make us subservient (to the added Law).

5. To whom we yield not even towards an hour to The submission (required of us) in order that The truth may continue (unchanged/undeflected) towards you.

6. But (something) from The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea) being something (important) ... (words)(that) were in time past of whatever value, it (the collection of words offered) is carrying nothing through to me ((as) The God is NOT merely accepting a face belonging to a man (neither am I)) ... for The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea) themselves add nothing to me.

7. BUT on the other side, (The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea)) perceiving (in the mind’s eye) I was committed to The good news belonging to The uncircumcision, just as Peter (was committed to The good news) belonging to The circumcision ...

8. (For The (one) working (in) with Peter (entering) into an “apostleship” belonging to The circumcision, works also within me among The nations (of dispersed Israel)).

9. … Then, knowing (absolutely) The grace (which is) The given (grace) to me, James and Cephas (Peter) and John, (The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called out assembly of Israel) are) being pillars (of the called out assembly of Israel) give right (hands) belonging to a partnership to me and to Barnabas, that we (are) among The nations (of dispersed Israel) but they (are) among The circumcision.

10. (They asked) only that we should be remembering The poor (ones (belonging to the called-out assemblies of Judea)) which I make haste to accomplish this same (thing).

Did Paul form the “christianity” as we know it today? No. His gospel was exclusively Israelite and made to the descendants of “the Fathers”. The Christianity of today is a universal religion based on a mixture of Judaism, Paganism and the politics/philosophies of men. There is no common ground between the religious presentation of Paul and the Bible’s presentation of Paul.
Answer to questions: 56, 57, 58

- 56. Looking at our churches today and indeed BI churches, we have been deceived! By whom?
- 57. Not by a "serpent" nor by an evil looking guy with horns
- 58. Rather, perhaps by Pauline doctrine? (Ah yes - but which Bible, from which texts and with which translation. "Instruction manual"? Yes of course, but we all, shall I say "amend" this work - do we not? Are we to think that the devil hasn't also done so in the past?)

There has been enough presented to this point in this document to show that the English text of the AV is inadequate for dealing with the substance of the Bible. That inadequacy stems directly from the policy set down in the Introduction to the AV, namely, that as many words as possible from the English language would be used in the translation to show there was no bias in the minds of the translators to preclude any person, group of persons, directly or indirectly, by limiting the choice of words. So the simple answer to the questions in this section is: the deceivers are the translators of the AV text. The fact that these were largely men of the orthodox religions, answers the questions completely.

As to which translation, the reference to the interlinear of the Seven Critical Editors is perfectly adequate, because it will show you where a change is made relative to the Textus Receptus, and who made it. That is sufficient to determine which change fits the context of the verse and chapter, and which one does not. The context and the grammar always rule.

As to “amending this work”, that shows a lack of understanding of the difference between what is written in the Greek versus the AV translation and the need to correct the latter. Putting bible-time into studying of even the Textus Receptus, in preference to assimilating the views of religious men and women who do not comprehend the fundamentals of the Bible (as distinct from their religion), will build a proper foundation for comprehending these subjects.

Answer to questions: 59, 60, 61, 62

- 59. What about Paul’s view of circumcision?
- 60. I assume that Timothy (as well as me) was confused?
- 61. What happened with Timothy over “circumcision”?
- 62. In Paul’s disagreement [Gal 2] with Peter, who was correct?

These questions arise from the ignorance of Paul’s critics regarding the difference between the law of Moses and the ceremonial law and the differences between the Judeans and the Dispersion. The late Professor C.A. Totten said (10): I cannot state too strongly that the man who has not yet seen that the Israel of Scripture is totally distinct from the Jewish People is yet in the very infancy, the mere alphabet of biblical study, and that to this day the meaning of seven-eighths of the Bible is shut to his understanding. To this we can add the necessity of understanding the difference between Judeans born of the Houses of Israel, Judeans born of the House of Edom, and the difference between the Mosaic Law and the Levitical Law versus the “law” of Judaism.

Time and space does not permit presenting a detailed response, so a brief summary follows, which will make it easier to dig out the rest of the information.

The ingrained attitude of the Judeans in general towards the Dispersion, promoted and fostered by the ardent followers of Judaism (especially the Pharisees and Sadducees), was that not even social intercourse was allowed with members of the Dispersion because the Dispersion were the sinners, the unclean, the cast off etc. Hence, when Peter went to see Cornelius, despite the vision of the animals in the sheet and learning the lesson that he was to call no man unclean, he stood aloof from Cornelius and his family and was reluctant to be open, expansive and embracing of them. Consequently, he

---

74 To be fair, it was not so much the translators themselves but the ones who paid for the work to be done and hence approved the final version. The translators basically followed the laid down rules – which included the extensive use of synonyms.
received a first class kick in the pants, as did all those who came with Peter: And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles (Greek: The nations) also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost (Greek: The separated spirit) (Acts 10:45).

You would think this would have been sufficient for Peter to have learnt once and for all. Hence, when Peter was in the company of people of the Dispersion, on his own, he was indeed open, expansive and embracing towards them. But when others (not “Apostles”) from Jerusalem arrived, he reverted to the Judean norm and stood aloof again – perhaps because of the contention he had had with them in Acts 11:2 75. The only person present who could take Peter to task over such behaviour was Paul (and note that only another “Apostle” would dare, or even have the right, to admonish an “Apostle”) and he did so for one reason and one reason only. How were the people of Judea ever going to change their attitudes if those who came from Jerusalem saw Peter acting in the old and inappropriate manner? Which by the way, was always inappropriate behaviour – it had grown out of Judaism, the Jewish religion that had itself prospered under the Greek-appointed Edomite high priests.

So Paul was totally correct in giving Peter a verbal flea in his ear for his lack of understanding of the ramifications of his behaviour. And Paul no doubt pointed to Barnabas as a first class example of someone who was adversely affected by Peter’s behaviour. So Paul was only doing what he already knew Jesus had done with regards to Cornelius in trying to get Peter to change his behaviour.

The high priests of Judaism based by far and away the largest part of their discrimination against the Dispersion on the matter of circumcision. Hence when Paul started his journeys he was going to places that included ardent followers of the Jewish religion and in order to gain their initial attention, Paul took a pragmatic approach (1Co 9:19-23 76). The incident with Timothy took place at the beginning of his journeys. Timothy’s parentage was an impediment to Israelites who held strongly to the Jewish religion because they all knew circumcision was the token of the covenant made with Abraham. But to Israelites who had understood what Jesus had to say, circumcision was no longer a barrier – as we see in the attitudes of the Judean leaders towards Titus (Appendix E).

In those early days, if Paul had arrived in the company of an uncircumcised person, irrespective of him being of Israelite descent, those people simply would not have accepted him in their presence and similarly would not accept Paul. This is why Paul makes the point Gal 2:3 that those in Jerusalem had indeed understood the point that circumcision was not the be all and end all of what they were all commanded to do, because they did not require Titus to be circumcised (Appendix E).

Paul’s position on the Mosaic Law versus the Levitical Law is based on the simple fact that the former stood forever, but the latter was over, because with Jesus’ resurrection there is a new priestly order with a new High Priest. Therefore the laws of worship had changed accordingly (because the nature of the worship always changes when there is a change in the priestly order). There is no requirement in the Law of Moses to be circumcised. On the other hand, there are several references to circumcision being required as part of the ceremonial law: Gen 17:10-14, Gen 21:4, Exo 12:48 and Lev 12:3. However, the ceremonial application of circumcision has nothing directly to do with its role as a token of the covenant made with Abraham. Voluntarily continuing the practice of circumcision is a sign of our understanding and knowledge and respect for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Remember that Abraham’s act of belief took place and was counted to him for righteousness before he was circumcised.

---

75 KJV Acts 11:2 And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, 76 KJV 1 Corinthians 9:19 For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. 20 And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; 21 To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law. 22 To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. 23 And this I do for the gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you.
Therefore, as the ceremonial use of circumcision applied under a system of worship that was no longer applicable, then of itself, it no longer had any direct relevance to the new system of worship. Therefore it could not be a fundamental requirement for being acceptable to God under that new system of worship. But for those who, after hearing about the new system of worship, wanted to continue to apply circumcision in accordance with the old ceremonial law, Paul was saying they were setting aside the evidence of the change in the priesthood, and therefore, they would have to take on the whole of the old ceremonial worship, not just pick and choose. In other words, they had to return to the bondage of the whole of the ceremonial law.

Paul’s words in Gal 5:11 are intended to deal with this contradiction once and for all. Ellicott says (accepting the religious wording for what it is):

... The Galatians might say that he preached circumcision himself. [This is a reference to his first visit to Galatia when he brought Timothy with him.] His answer is, that if he really preached circumcision he would not be so persecuted by the Judaising party [the religious Jews]. And he has also a further answer, which is conveyed in ironical form: “If I do preach circumcision, and if I have ceased to lay stress on the one great-stumbling block, the cross of Christ, I may assume that there are no more hindrances in the way of my teaching.” Circumcision is taken in the way of the Judaising system, the same place that the cross of Christ occupied in that of St. Paul. The two things are alternative. If one is taught there is no need for the other.

This pragmatic aspect of Paul’s approach will be seen again in answering the next set of questions.

**Answer to questions: 65, 66, 67, 68, 97**

- 65. Who wrote 13 Epistles?
- 66. Who quotes the Greek philosophers as well as paraphrases their sayings?
- 67. Why?
- 68. Why not use the Words of Jesus Christ alone?
- 97. Why did Saul change his name to Paul, as told by Luke, Acts 13 verse 9 (1+3+9 = 13)?

If we were to answer these questions using the words of Jesus only, we would not refer to the AV or to the Textus Receptus. However, we refer to them for the same reason Paul made a passing reference to the Greek philosophers. Because these are the only things the respective audiences knew anything about, pending hearing and perhaps learning something different. The favourite reference of the anti-Paul hypothesis appears to be the American Standard Version; your favourite reference is the AV. Therefore, we have to use the AV words and tell you the Greek words of Jesus where appropriate. The question is whether you will take the time to check the accuracy of the words we have given you.

Paul’s critics take a very selective view of what constitutes “Jesus’ words”. Now given that Floyd Jones did not include one word of criticism for the inclusion of Luke, 2 Peter, Hebrews, Revelation or any of the epistles of Paul in the Textus Receptus, it is time for you to make a choice. Either God has successfully deluded countless generations of Israelites by including a collection of forgeries in the Textus Receptus (the anti-Paul hypothesis view), or the books of Luke, 2 Peter, Hebrews, Revelation and all the epistles of Paul are what they profess to be, albeit generally poorly translated. In the latter case, God has not deceived His people, because His Word has always been there in sufficient detail for even the ploughman to understand and thereby believe that Jesus is The Son of The God, The living one, and that He can “forgive” the ploughman’s wrong doing. Even the churches tend to teach that “truth”, and they do it using all the books of the New Testament to a greater or

---

77 KJV Galatians 5:11 And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased.
lesser extent. Rom 6:23 \(^78\), for example, is one of the first verses that most of us learned when we were in the churches, or our church schools or our church youth camps or from our Scripture Union books – because these are the kindergarten lessons that the churches/religions teach (and it is all they can handle). This typifies what Paul identified as “the milk”, which is the Bible’s view, not the view of a religion \(^79\).

A fact of life is that the Textus Receptus is the explicit product of the development of Christianity in Asia Minor over the bulk of its first 1000 years. Floyd Jones made this very point without appreciating what he was writing – that the manuscript had been tightly controlled within the church. Its uniformity and its reputed stability are the result of it being managed by the priests of the Christian religion, for the Christian religion. Even so, it is largely a correct text. The number of differences found over the years are relatively few in number, but where they do occur, they are significant for understanding what Jesus’ words, as written in the Greek, are intended to convey.

The question of who wrote 13 epistles and the assertion that adding together the chapter and verse numbers to produce 13, with the implication it is significant, reveals a disappointing misunderstanding of symbolism and use of numbers in Scripture. It is commonly held that 13 is the number associated with rebellion, but that is not supportable in Scripture. Thirteen is the number of division, as in dividing something into two or more parts. Yes, Paul is the 13th person who was appointed as an “Apostle” and he is the named author of 13 epistles and look at what a superb example of division he has been. He divided between the Edomites of the Judean Kingdom and the Israelites by his great pronouncement of Acts 28:28 \(^80\), which in turn was the fulfilment of Jesus’ words in Mat 21:43 \(^81\). Paul and even more so, every one of his epistles, have divided between the Dispersed Israelites and the peoples of the nations in which they were living – Acts 17:23 is the ultimate example: For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. It was not that the Athenians had erected an altar on the assumption they might have missed a god along the way, rather, they knew that God existed, but they knew nothing about him. Which is what Paul proceeded to declare – starting with some of the words of the Greek philosophers, because that was the basis of their knowledge. And the same can be said of Christianity today – they worship in ignorance because they do not know the first principles of the Bible itself. For example, their doctrines of “forgiveness” of sin, the Trinity and universalism have no support in the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible. Paul’s comments show that the men in Athens were in the same predicament.

And Paul’s epistles successfully divide between the teachings of the Bible and the teachings of religion, because, as this paper shows, when we examine what Paul wrote in the Greek text, we find the anti-Paul hypothesis is not based on anywhere near an adequate amount of research.

---

\(^78\) KJV Romans 6:23 For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

\(^79\) But even at this basic level, the religions still do not know what the Bible actually says. There is no concept of “forgiveness” in Scripture; only the actual setting aside of wrong doing. The price of that wrong doing, which is rebellion against God, is eternal death and that price still has to be paid. But the religions have no idea of what that involves. However, the concept of “forgiveness” is probably the only concept that those on milk can digest. The problem is that their adult mind gets the wrong idea by persisting with the use of this child’s term.

\(^80\) KJV Acts 28:28 Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles (Greek: The nations), and that they will hear it.

\(^81\) KJV Matthew 21:43 Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.
Answer to questions: 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84

- 69. Perhaps Paul didn’t know many of the Words of Jesus Christ?
- 70. After all, Paul wasn’t present listening was he? (Or if he was, these Words had no effect on a Pharisee! Paul was not one of the disciples that listened and followed Jesus Christ.)
- 71. From whom did he learn about Jesus Christ and His teachings?
- 72. We know when Jesus Christ taught the disciples and Apostles – what about Paul? (Also, Paul didn’t need instruction from the Apostles who had received their instructions directly from Jesus Christ.)
- 74. Why did Paul go into Arabia for three years?
- 75. What happened to him there?
- 76. Did Paul seek advice concerning “doctrine” from any of the Apostles?
- 77. What did Paul say about these Apostles in this context?
- 78. Did Paul think that James, Peter and John were “pillars” of “Christianity”?
- 79. How often, in an historical context, does Paul refer to Jesus Christ?
- 81. Did Jesus Christ not also warn about the Pharisees?
- 82. Of course, he couldn’t possibly be aware of Paul?
- 83. How does the wolf enter the fold?
- 84. Did Jesus Christ warn of false prophets who would deny the Law?

This collection of questions is driven primarily by a religious perspective of the Bible. For example, associating James, Peter and John with the word, “Christianity”, is a distortion of even the AV text. As mentioned above, this kind of casual approach to the Biblical text – whether using the AV or the Textus Receptus – is the very means by which subtle religious interpretations are started and slipped into the minds of the people of Israel without the majority of them even noticing it.

The obvious counter questions are:

- What “words of Jesus” are in view?
- Peter, John and James all knew “the words of Jesus”, but how many of them did they use?
- Why did Peter in the square at Pentecost not “use the words of Jesus”?
- If Peter had listened to and understood the “words of Jesus”, why did he need the vision of the animals in the sheet before he visited Cornelius and why did Paul have to tick him off about still not behaving in accordance with that vision?


---

82 KJV Acts 20:21 Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.
83 KJV Acts 26:20 But shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judaea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance.
84 KJV 2 Corinthians 12:21 And lest, when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they have committed.
85 KJV 2 Timothy 2:25 In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth;
86 KJV Acts 14:9 The same heard Paul speak: who stedfastly beholding him, and perceiving that he had faith to be healed, 10 Said with a loud voice, Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped and walked.
87 KJV Acts 20:9 And there sat in a window a certain young man named Eutychus, being fallen into a deep sleep: and as Paul was long preaching, he sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead.
88 KJV Acts 28:8 And it came to pass, that the father of Publius lay sick of a fever and of a bloody flux: to whom Paul entered in, and prayed, and laid his hands on him, and healed him. 9 So when this was done, others also, which had diseases in the island, came, and were healed:
89 KJV 2 Corinthians 12:2 I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven.
the risen Jesus – so did Paul (Acts 23:11 90). Only a biased and/or distorted view of Paul could overlook such parallel comparisons.

Why is it so hard to accept that Paul was taught, in the Greek Text, through (Greek: *dia*) *a revelation belonging to an anointed Jesus*? “Everyone” accepts that John received a revelation from Jesus, “everyone” accepts Stephen received a revelation of the situation in Heaven, “everyone” accepts Peter received a revelation concerning the status of the Dispersion; “everyone” accepts the two on the road to Emmaus received a revelation. On the other hand, Paul’s critics simply reject that he could have received a revelation. From a religious point of view, that may be easy to do, because religious people have no idea how long it takes to learn and understand the things of the Bible. Why didn’t Jesus teach Paul by opening his mind as He did for the two on the road to Emmaus? John 21:25 91 tells us that the “Apostles” were privy to a far, far greater amount of information and insights than are recorded in the Gospels yet they were in Jesus’ personal presence for only approximately 32 weeks. However, they learnt so much in that time, that it only took the duration of the journey to Emmaus to “join the dots”. On the other hand, Paul did not have that experience. So, there was clearly much more to learn for one who was not personally present during those times. Given that Paul was appointed by Jesus to be His “Apostle”, it would be illogical for Jesus to provide Paul with less than the same insights into Scripture than He had given to the other 11 “Apostles”. But it took time for Paul to learn enough to put himself on an equal footing with the other eleven.

It is also clear from the Ethiopian official’s knowledge of Scripture, the knowledge of Apollos, and the knowledge of Anna (in the temple), that human beings who were committed to their study of Scripture, could learn all that they needed to know from the Scripture available in their day, and it only needed the connection of the events of Jesus’ life to complete the picture. We know from the text that Nicodemus, despite being a Pharisee, initially had no real understanding of Scripture, but we also know he believed Jesus, so there is precedent to believe that Paul was equally deficient in his knowledge of Scripture and so had much to unlearn and then learn anew. As mentioned above, Paul did indeed learn all that was necessary, because the Greek text tells us that when he did go to Jerusalem, he did not hear anything he did not already know (see Appendix E). And why would it not be so? Why would anyone appoint a person as an “apostle” who was not the equal of those already appointed – especially if that person would eventually have an equal hand in judging Israel (Mat 19:28 92)? We have dealt with Paul’s words concerning Peter, James and John in Appendix E.

The Gospels show us that Nicodemus believed Jesus, so were Jesus’ warnings about the Pharisees intended to apply to all Pharisees individually, or to the Scribes and Pharisees as a group? Does Mat 23:15 93 apply to Nicodemus too? Failure to understand the basis of the castigation of the Scribes and the Pharisees stems directly from the teaching of religions in general and from Paul’s criticisms in particular. None of these sources understand John 1:11 and therefore they do not understand Paul’s pronouncement of Acts 28:28. The question is: how long does it take for the rest of us to gain the correct understanding – meaning not only to comprehend the knowledge, but to apply it by extension and extrapolation to every aspect of life? Because that is what Peter, John, James and Paul did in all of their epistles. They applied the words of Jesus, and the Words of Scripture, to teach the people of Israel what they needed to know in order to believe God.

We are told that John the Baptist was the cousin of Jesus, we are told that John the Baptist identified Jesus as The Lamb belonging to The God. Yet John never personally witnessed Jesus performing His miracles. So when he heard of one performing such things, he sent his disciples to enquire

---

90 KJV Acts 23:11 And the night following the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome.
91 KJV John 21:25 And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.
92 KJV Matthew 19:28 And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.
93 KJV Matthew 23:15 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.
accordingly. Mat 11:4,5 94 records Jesus answer – and as we have seen above, Peter, James and Paul were performing the same deeds. If such evidence was good enough for John the Baptist, then it should be good enough for Paul’s critics to know that the ones performing such deeds are not false prophets or false anything else – except of course, false Christians, because none of the “Apostles” conform to the religious view of the Bible.

**Answer to questions: 89, 90, 91, 92, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 118**

- 89. Does Revelation 2:1-2 have relevance here?
- 90. Have we any proof that Paul lied? (You mention Hab 6:18. Yes, it is impossible for GOD to lie - but not me thinks impossible for Paul to lie. You mention Matthew 5:18 - but this refers to The Law which is not ALL Scripture - which in any event at that time was the OT ONLY. The word “Scripture” used in the NT, surely can only refer - at the time it was written - to the OT?)
- 91. Does Paul ever contradict himself or other parts of Scripture? (Most certainly, I accept that all Scripture is as explained in that verse (2Tim 3:16). However, I don't apply such to the words of Paul - as yet.)
- 92. Did Paul lie concerning any matters?
- 107. “Faith and works”?
- 108. Paul has much to say on such matters:
  - James 2:21 Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? James 2:24 Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. James 2:17 Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.
  - Romans 4:2 For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God.
- 109. Is he in full agreement with Scripture and the other Apostles – such as James in Chapter 2?
- 110. In Paul’s disagreement with James, who was correct? James 2 and Eph 2:8-10
- 111. Where did Paul stand on matters of faith and works?
- 112. Where did James stand on matters of faith and works?
- 113. Where did Jesus Christ and the Old Testament stand on matters of faith and works?
- 118. Instructions to the “heathen” (Gal 2:1-14 and Acts 15:25-29)

I attach a passage from Galatians:-

Some interesting items highlighted. Although it is the word “only” that is important. A small matter and yet....... Others of greater importance can be seen elsewhere if you would only look. That is your call. I'm just showing from Scripture where Paul lied. Would Scripture count as “well researched and water tight”? Of course, the Greek may not say this.

1 "Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also.
2 And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.
3 But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised:
4 And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:
5 To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.
6 But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man’s person;) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me:
7 But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter;
8 (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles;) And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.
10 Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do".

One instance eh? What did the Apostles actually require of Paul when he was to go to the "heathen"?

I attach a quote from Acts:-

24 "Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law: to whom we gave no such commandment:
25 It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul.
26 Men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.
27 We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth.
28 For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things;
29 That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well."

"Only remember the poor"?????????? There is no mention of the poor! Idols? Yes. Blood? Yes. Fornication? Yes.

94 KJV Matthew 11:4 Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: 5 The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them.
We addressed earlier the questions of Peter’s behaviour, the “seemed to be pillars” statement and the subject of circumcision with respect to Timothy and Titus.

One component behind these questions is the fact that Paul seems to say that belief was the only thing required to gain eternal life, whereas James, for example, states that belief must be accompanied by works. This is taken as evidence that Paul lies. Another component of these questions is that cited above – the apparent contradiction over the instructions to the “heathen”.

The anti-Paul hypothesis has beaten both these points into major whipping posts because it has failed, on both counts, to examine the contexts of each point. Let’s take the easiest one first.

The text from Acts is the wording of the letter sent to the called-out assembly in Antioch. If Paul’s critics bothered to read the earlier part of the chapter, surely they would have seen that it was the summary of the public side of the same meeting described in Gal 2:1-10. However, verse 10 from the Galatians reference was a personal plea to Paul and Barnabas for assistance with the poor in Judea – see the full translation and notes in Appendix E. The contrast could not be more marked. About the only two points these two references have in common is that the “Apostles” in Jerusalem are doing the talking.

On the one hand, Antioch was the third most important city in the Roman Empire. It was cosmopolitan in every sense of the word, not the least of which being the number of temples to idols within its precincts. Avoiding involvement in the three items mentioned in the letter, directly or indirectly, was presumably no mean feat in those early days of proclaiming the Good News. As mentioned before, every one of us who has eaten food in or picked up take-away from a Thai or Chinese restaurant has been guilty of eating meats offered to idols and have thereby aided and abetted in the persistence of fornication (the worship of foreign gods) within Israel. What makes Paul’s critics think we live in times that are different in any substantial way, or that we are smarter, cleverer and holier than those in Antioch? Everyone of us has failed to heed this advice. For example, we all eat blood – because none of the meat we eat today, except for Kosher killed and Halal killed meat is butchered in anything like the manner of the Mosaic Law.

On the other hand, as shown in the translation of Gal 2:1-10, the instruction in verse 10 was to remember the poor in Judea, which if Paul’s critics had read, for example, Acts 11:29,30 and Rom 15:25,26 they would have seen confirmed. This apparent “contradiction” is based on two references that have absolutely nothing in common with each other. But this is typical of the standard of “research” performed by the anti-Paul hypothesis in particular and Paul’s critics in general.

However, the inconsistencies in the anti-Paul hypothesis are again presented by these questions. Paul’s critics hold that the James of the “Apostles” is the brother of Jesus and the first bishop of the church in Jerusalem and, as such, basically never does anything wrong. That probably explains why they don’t seize on the fact that James’ says something very different in Jam 1:27, namely that the external signs of true belief are visiting orphans and widows in their trouble and keeping oneself spotless “from The order” – that is, from the order of society in which we live. (And how many of us have consistently achieved either, let alone both, of those signs?) Nothing about idols, meat, blood or the poor here – unless of course one pays attention to the wording of the Greek to realise that these are examples or instances of what we encounter in the society in which we live.

---

95 KJV Acts 11:29 Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judaea: 30 Which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.

96 KJV Romans 15:25-26 25 But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. 26 For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem.

97 KJV James 1:27 Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.
As to the point about the only Scriptures being “OT ONLY” – why is that significant? Or does it depend on playing a semantic game? For example, were the words Solomon referenced in 1Ki 8:25 and 2Ch 6:16 part of written Scripture at that time? Did the words of 2Sa 7:12-16 or Psa 89:29-37 exist in writing in Solomon’s day? And even if they did, was Solomon referencing “Scripture”? It is important to comprehend that when God says something will happen, it is, in effect, done, from His perspective, irrespective of when the event may occur in Man’s time. For example, Jesus has always held the title, The Son of The God, but it did not become a historical fact until He was manifested as such on the Earth.

The words it is written, clearly refer to the written Scriptures of the day. However, we also use the word Scripture to refer to the Word of God. Therefore anything stated by Jesus constitutes “Scripture”, whether it is written or not. Therefore, any “Apostle” or disciple that referred to the words of Jesus, was quoting the Word of God, and hence Scripture, in the general sense of the word. This is the same circumstance in which Solomon spoke.

When we had read Acts 15:13-21, which immediately precedes the citation, we see that not only was Peter’s visit to Cornelius taken as consistent with The words belonging to The prophets, but the fact that James was referring to the Cornelius event itself, as evidence of God’s actions, constitutes Scripture for all practical senses of discussion.

By the way, given the quoting of Acts 15:25, Paul’s critics might like to note that the “Apostles” and elders in Jerusalem wrote, according to the Greek text of the Textus Receptus: with The (plural) beloved (ones) belonging to us Barnabas and Paul. This whole misbegotten collection of 119 questions has been built around an incredible number of hours of misdirected effort, which amongst other points, has trumpeted loud and long that Paul was ostracised and rejected by the called-out assembly at Jerusalem because he was in such opposition to them – all based on the English text of the AV/ASV. The nonsense of this hypothesis, and the lack of understanding in those who peddle it, is laid bare by a mere 10 seconds examination of your most highly valued and regarded Greek text. Hence the specific answer to Question 24 is: Yes – all eleven “Apostles” and all the elders of the called-out assembly at Jerusalem. (We will deal with the claim in the anti-Paul hypothesis that the letter to Antioch was written before James knew “the truth” about Paul’s teaching, in the response to the next question.)
Now we can examine the more complex topic of belief and works. By the way, the Greek word translated *faith* means *belief*, nothing more and nothing less. It should be clear at this point in the document, that any serious attempt to gain a sensible grasp of what the Bible actually says requires investing time and energy working with at least an interlinear Bible and reference works such as Vine (AG) and Bullinger (X); the English translations on their own are simply misleading. The barest minimum of that work is to compare the references people cite in the interlinear and the English text and read what Bullinger and Vine have to say with respect to at least the key words of the verse. That is not an onerous task – the yoke belonging to Me is easy and the burden belonging to Me is easy to bear. For example, the following translation of Gal 3 is extracted, with very slight modifications, from work by J.O. Adams (F) and once again it shows that Paul’s critics, using the English text alone, have no idea of what Paul was actually saying:

V.1. O senseless Galatians, who has deluded ye to whom, according to those who saw it, anointed Jesus, fastened to a stake, was openly proclaimed.
V.2. I only wish to learn this from you. Did ye receive the Spirit from works of (an added) law, or from a hearing of belief?
V.3. Are ye so foolish? Having begun in Spirit, are ye now finishing in flesh?
V.4. Did ye suffer so much in vain? If indeed it was in vain.
V.5. Therefore does the One who supplies the Spirit to you and performs mighty works among you, do it from works of (an added) law, or from a hearing of belief?
V.6. Inasmuch as Abraham had belief in The God and it is accounted to him as righteousness. (See Rom 4:3 103).
V.7. Know ye therefore that these are Abraham’s sons that are sprung from belief.

Notes:

i. The preposition *ek* used here means ‘out of, from’, etc. Used of origin as here, it signifies ‘sprung from’. The A.V. simply renders it as ‘of’.
ii. Abraham had seed because of his belief in God. Hence those who have this belief inherit it from Abraham. Paul puts this plainly in Rom 4:11:

And he (Abraham) received a sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the belief, while in uncircumcision (that is, while uncircumcised), so that he should be a father of all those believing, who are in a state of uncircumcision, that the righteousness should be accounted to them.

V.8. And the Scripture, seeing that God is justifying those among the nations who are sprung from belief, announced good tidings beforehand to Abraham, that all those among the nations shall be blessed by thee.
V.9. Consequently those sprung from belief are being blessed together with the believing Abraham.
V.10. For as many as have belief from works of (an added) law are under a curse (because of that law), since it is written, that everyone who is not continuing in all the things that have been written in the Book of the (added) Law, to practise them, is cursed.
V.11. Now it is clear, that by (an added) law, no one is being justified before The God, for the righteous one shall live by belief.
V.12. And the (added) law is not from belief, but the one doing them (or ‘practising them’) shall live by them.
V.13. An anointed One redeemed us from the curse of the (added) Law, becoming a curse on our behalf, for it is written, ‘Cursed is everyone hanging upon a tree’.
V.14. In order that the blessing of Abraham that is in an anointed people belonging to Jesus, might come to the nations (or ‘those in the nations’), so that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through the belief.
V.15. Brethren, I speak as a man, NO one sets aside or makes additions to a testamentary document (or ‘will’) of a man after it has been confirmed (legally ratified).

103 KJV Romans 4:3 For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness.
V.16. Now to Abraham and his seed the promises were announced (or ‘proclaimed, spoken’); He says not ‘And to the seeds’, as concerning many, but as concerning one, ‘And to thy seed’ which is anointed.

V.17. And I say this, that the (added) law that came into existence 430 years afterwards, does not annul a testamentary document (or ‘a will’) that has been previously confirmed (legally ratified) by The God, so as to make the promise void.

V.18. For if the inheritance is from (an added) law it is no longer a promise, but The God has granted it as a free-favour to Abraham.

V.19. Why then the (added) Law? It was added (alongside the promise) on account of the transgressions until the seed should come for whom it has been declared, being arranged by angels in a Mediator’s hand.

V.20. Now a mediator is not pertaining to one, but The God is One.

V.21. Is the (added) Law then against the promises of The God? May it not be! For if a law was given that is able to make alive, truly righteousness would be from law.

V.22. But the Scripture includes the entire (nation/people) under sin, that the promise might be given to them that believe in Jesus anointed.

V.23. But before the belief came we were kept in restraint, being banded together until the belief was about to be revealed.

Paul’s use of ‘we’ here refers to both sections of Israel.

V.24. So that the (added) Law became our pedagogue (that is, a disciplinary trainer or supervisor) towards an anointed (one), in order that we may be justified out of belief.

V.25. But now that the belief has come we are no longer under a pedagogue.

V.26. For through the belief ye are all sons of God in a people anointed by Jesus.

V.27. For as many as are baptized into an anointed people, enter yourselves into an anointed people.

V.28. There is not Jew nor Greek (within it); there is not slave nor free man (within it); there is not male and female (within it); for ye are all one in a people anointed by Jesus.

V.29. And if ye are belonging to an anointed people, then ye are Abraham’s seed, heirs according to promise.

Compare this verse with verse 16.

Due to a peculiarity in the declension of the word ‘Jesus’ in the Greek, whereby both the Dative and Genitive endings are exactly the same, it is possible to translate the phrase ‘en christou iEsou’ in three ways:

i. ‘in anointed Jesus’

ii. ‘in an anointed people belonging to Jesus’

iii. ‘in a people anointed by Jesus’.

This is the end of Adams’ translation. Time and space does not permit addressing the entirety of what is contained in this translation. However, the following comments will suffice for now:

1. On the matter of the choice of the Dative versus the Genitive in Adams’ translation note, the correct choice is in an anointed (people) belonging to Jesus because the people were anointed at the time of Isaac’s conception and formally anointed by the ceremonial sprinkling of blood on the people at Sinai. There is no record of Jesus anointing all of Israel. When Jesus rose from the dead, He became the legal owner of Israel, because He had paid the price that removed them from Satan’s possession (which is why Satan could offer the Kingdom of Israel to Jesus in Mat 4:8 as part of Satan’s temptation of Jesus).

104  KJV Matthew 4:8 Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world (Greek: The kosmos – The Order (of Israel)), and the glory of them;
2. Consider verses 2 and 5. Do Paul’s critics have the faintest idea of what these two verses are addressing? Obviously not, or we would not be writing this paper. The religious view is that they refer to when “we receive Jesus into our hearts”. However, the Bible’s view is that they are referring to the event by which every Israelite acquired his permanent indwelling spirit.

3. The point is that the Levitical law, the ceremonial law, which was added, required the people to perform a series of sacrifices as a means of demonstrating that they accepted that their wrong doing could be put aside. With the advent and resurrection of Jesus, that ceremonial process ended. It was no longer necessary, because now we had the fulfilment of that added Law in the death of the Kinsman-Redeemer. If we believe that fact, and what it means, then the works of the added ceremonial law are no longer necessary or required. But if someone chooses not to accept that the Messiah has come, and wants to continue to follow the ceremonial law, then they have to bind themselves to the whole of the ceremonial law – every jot and title of it. Which in and of itself, is impossible to follow since the time when the Temple ceased to exist. Even the followers of Judaism today, who do not accept the Messiah, do not follow the whole of the Levitical Law, and so are condemned by their own non-compliance (irrespective of anything else).

In summary, the Levitical Law was inferior to the promise made by God because:

1. It dealt with sin, not holiness (that is, separation)
2. It was temporary and transitory (providing the basis for transition to the new worship)
3. It was given indirectly through Moses and the Elohim – double mediation
4. It was conditional.

Once you begin to perceive the ramifications of all that is presented above, you will see that Paul was constantly hammering the distinction between the worship of the Levitical Law and the worship that replaced it – a works–(sacrifice)–free based worship. But it was not a worship that was without works – Jesus referred to those who do the Will of My Father. And where is that Will found? In The Law. This is why Paul, Jesus and James make the point that this new belief is also demonstrated by works – works of belief, not works of worship – just as Abraham acted as he did out of belief in what God said. So there is no conflict between Paul and James, on any level.

Has it never occurred to you to ask why Abraham did not hesitate to make ready to sacrifice Isaac, even though it saddened him to face losing him? Because Abraham knew that because of the promise that God had made, and that because Isaac was the only son of promise, that even if Isaac was slain, God would raise him up, so that the promise could be fulfilled. Now that is a demonstration of absolute belief – and none of us come close to that kind of conviction in this day and age.

So when we read the passages in James and Ephesians with reference to the Greek text, and recognise that the references to law are to the added law, there is no disagreement. We only need to get one concept clear in our heads – Abraham was justified because he acted on God’s instructions to leave Ur out of belief and he believed God’s promise concerning an heir. Subsequently he was circumcised. His preparedness to sacrifice Isaac was on-going proof of his belief. Jesus and every “Apostle” declare we must believe God in order to be saved and that we demonstrate that belief through belief-based works. Neither Jesus nor the “Apostles” advocate that works alone are sufficient to gain eternal life. It is certainly not possible to believe God and not perform works consistent with that belief.

So who can we trust – the view of Paul presented by a religion or the view of Paul presented by the Bible?

105 Genesis 22:12   12 And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.
The short answer to this question is: no-one in particular. The question is based on the same lack of simple basic checking that we have seen throughout the anti-Paul hypothesis. The basis of the question is as follows from one of Del Tondo’s chapters:

**11 Was James Writing His Epistle For A Trial of Paul?**

**Introduction**

Scholars now recognize the Epistle of James was intended for a specific purpose: a trial. The epistle begins by explaining seating rules for a trial at a “synagogue,” not at a church service. However, there is more to support this trial theory than what the scholars have acknowledged. When one looks at James’ message, one has the unmistakable sense that James is dismantling the doctrines taught by Paul. This is particularly true in James’ discussion of faith and works. James explains Genesis 15:6 in a diametrically different way than Paul explained the very same verse. James tells the story of Abraham in a manner at total odds with Paul’s account. James leads the reader to a diametrically opposite doctrine of justification by works and “not faith [that is] alone.” There is also no mistaking that James defines salvation as crucially relying on faith and works, not one without the other. He, in fact, mocks the idea that salvation depends upon doctrines you only mentally agree with. If mental belief alone were the true salvation formula, he says demons would be saved. The demons know and believe the truths about God, but they do not act upon them by pursuing God. Finally, when you look through all of James, it is not just chapter two that takes Paul down a notch. It is almost every chapter and verse of James’ Epistle that does so. It is as if James is spreading out Paul’s letters on a table, finding flaws, and then writing messages that address those flaws.

Nor can we overlook that this proceeding was to take place in a synagogue. In James 2:2-4, James uses the Greek word synagoge for this meeting even though in other places in the same letter (in 5:14) he refers to Christ’s church as an ecclesia. The word ecclesia was typically used to mean church, as distinct from meetings at synagoge. Also, incongruously, this word synagoge is only used in the New Testament for a church-meeting in James 2:2-4. James intends it to be a particular gathering place for Christians. James’ context makes it clear as to this synagoge, there is “Christian ownership of and authority over this assembly.” (Stulac: 91.)

Thus, when we put these two facts together, we can deduce James was writing his letter in the context of an upcoming gathering at a Christian-controlled synagogue to conduct a trial. The event would involve a large crowd. Some would stand and some would sit. This is completely consistent with the idea of a synagogue at Ephesus at which Paul taught for three months. (Acts 19:8.) It fits the story of the synagogue at Ephesus from which Paul felt compelled to leave as recorded in Acts 19:9. It fits the place where Paul put on “his first defense” yet “all abandoned” him and “all in Asia abandoned” him. (2 Tim. 1:15; 4:14-17.) Ephesus was the capital city of Asia—Western Turkey. (For more discussion, see page 224 et seq.) James’ Epistle appears to have been written for a trial of Paul. It appears it was for the trial at Ephesus which Jesus alludes to in Revelation 2:2.

The assertion of the anti-Paul hypothesis is that James, the brother of Jesus and the first bishop of the Jerusalem church, wrote his letter to the church at Antioch in Acts 15 before he found out that Paul had not told them precisely what he was teaching when he came to Jerusalem. Hence James was preparing a trial against Paul and his wrong teachings concerning works and belief.
One problem with this assertion is that when Paul came to Jerusalem for the fifth time, some eight years after his third visit, (when James and the others wrote the letter endorsing Paul), we are told in Acts 21:17-20 that everyone, including James, received Paul and his band gladly and they glorified the Lord for the things achieved by Paul’s ministry. Note also that Luke was personally present at this event. Given that Paul was taken captive during this fifth visit, just when did James supposedly change his mind?

We have already addressed the matter of Paul’s teachings concerning works and belief, and shown he is in harmony with all other teaching on this subject. But leaving that point aside, let us examine how Paul’s critics have used the flimsiest point on which to build this particular house of cards.

Interestingly, there is no discussion concerning whom James was addressing – to The twelve tribes, to The (ones) in The dispersion. Had they stopped to consider this point alone, they just might have wondered why it was addressed to the twelve tribes of Israel, and not to “fellow churches” or some such group.

The hypothesis makes much ado about the use of the words synagogue and assembly in this letter, but it does so on the basis of the stereotyped application of these words, without paying any attention to what the words mean. Vine states that synagogue means:

... a bringing together, a collection, of persons, an assembling, of Jewish religious gathering. By metonymy, the building in which the gathering is held. ... The origin of the Jewish “synagogue” is probably assigned to the time of the Babylonian exile. Having no temple, the Jews assembled on the Sabbath to hear the Law read, and the practice continued in various buildings on their return.

There are a few misleading points here – they were not “Jews” in Babylon, because the “Jewish religion”, as foretold by Daniel, grew out of the captivity in Babylon for the very reason that they did NOT have the Law to read. This was why Nehemiah and Ezra made such radical changes to their society when they found a copy of the Law at Jerusalem. Hence the synagogue is used in its primary sense of a gathering in Jam 2:2, Acts 13:43, Acts 14:1 (because Greeks were present), Rev 2:9 and Rev 3:9.

The people James was addressing had already formed their called-out assemblies (ekklesia), at which they gathered (synagogue), which is why he used ekklesia in Jam 5:14. (The two words are used together in the LXX text of Pro 5:14.) James was simply telling them that when they gathered together, if they gave preference to the rich and well dressed, they were not acting in accordance with Jesus’ teaching. Jam 2:1 should read My kinsmen of the same womb, have ye The belief belonging to the Lord of us, an anointed Jesus, in respect of persons? No, you have not, for if there should enter ...

But on the basis of “these two facts together”, that is, the one use of synagogue and the one use of ekklesia, the hypothesis asserts “we can deduce James was writing his letter in the context of an upcoming gathering at a Christian-controlled synagogue to conduct a trial”. That is the sum total of the basis of the whole assertion. It is not exactly adequate research, is it?

So, who do we trust, the view of Paul presented by a religion or the view of Paul presented by the Bible?

106 KJV Acts 21:17 And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly. 18 And the day following Paul went in with us unto James; and all the elders were present. 19 And when he had saluted them, he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry. 20 And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law.
Answer to questions: 93, 94, 95, 96

• 93. Were Peter and the “eleven Apostles” wrong in “choosing” Matthias as the twelfth Apostle?
• 94. Was the method the Apostles used in this selection wrong?
• 95. Did Mathias receive the spirit at the same time as the eleven?
• 96. If not, why not - and is this confirmed?

Yes, they were wrong, for the very simple reason that, as the correct meaning of *apostolos* shows, a person cannot, under any circumstances, be elected to such a position. An *apostolos* can only be appointed by and given his commission by the person he represents, that is, effectively, face to face.

Mathias was not present in the room at Pentecost – but even if he was, that event was nothing to do with the appointment of the “Apostles” to their positions. It was fundamentally no different from what took place in Cornelius’ house.

The proof that Mathias was not present in the room is in the grammar, which means the answer is rather technical, but necessary.

The Greek of Acts 1:26 107 uses the preposition *meta*, with the Genitive, versus Acts 2:14 108, which uses the preposition *sun* with the Dative. In both versus, the translation is given as "with".

In the Genitive, *meta* has the sense of meaning: with, among. This fits with the logical sense of the ballot – whoever won the ballot, was going to be counted among or with the other eleven. *Sun* with the Dative of the person denotes accompaniment and association. The Greek states Peter is standing with *The eleven*. Vine states that the designation, *The eleven* is always associated with the original twelve “Apostles”, minus Judas Iscariot.

Furthermore, the purpose of the Dative is the case of location. It indicates the indirect object (in most cases the personal object) at which an action is aimed, which an action concerns, but which is not directly affected by the action. Fundamentally, it is the case of direction. Its application in Acts 2:14 shows the action of “Peter standing up” as one of the eleven who were present. Peter is included as one of the eleven, not Peter as one plus eleven. *Sun* has the meaning of besides or in addition to when a new factor is introduced, which is hardly the circumstance here. Therefore, Mathias was not present as one of the *The eleven* in the square. It also means that in Acts 2:1 109, where the wording is *they were all together*, the *they* is referring to *The eleven* of the previous verse, because it is the same eleven in verse 14.

This is confirmed by the use of the Definite Article in the 2 verses. There is no doubt in the former verse that "the eleven" refers to the 12 minus Judas. The use of the same expression, *The eleven* in the latter verse refers to the same eleven, of whom Peter was one.

(By the way, Acts 6:2 110 does not preclude Mathias being counted as one of the 12 at that point in time, because from the perspective of the ones considered or counted as "the twelve", Mathias was counted among them – at that time – but that did not qualify him to be designated as “apostle” of Jesus.)

---

107 KJV Acts 1:26 And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with (Greek: *meta*) the eleven apostles.
108 KJV Acts 2:14 But Peter, standing up with (Greek: *sun*) the eleven, lifted up his voice, and said unto them, Ye men of Judaea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words:
109 KJV Acts 2:1 ¶ And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.
110 KJV Acts 6:2 Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables.
Answer to questions: 102, 103, 104

- 102. Why, oh why did GOD, through Jesus Christ, not give The Revelation to Paul rather than John?
- 103. Did John’s Epistles identify Paul as a false Prophet?
- 104. Is it any wonder that Jesus Christ’s Revelation was not given to Paul but rather to John?

Your reference to John’s epistles is primarily to 1Jo 2:19 which we will address shortly. The questions concerning Revelation and John versus Paul stem directly from the following paragraphs by Shriner:

Back when I still thought Paul the greatest apostle, it always puzzled me why God didn't give him the book of Revelation or at least some prophetic book similar to it if indeed he was as great as he appeared to be. There are some interesting facts about the book of Revelation and some things said by Yeshua himself that would answer the question as to why Paul was not given the "Revelation". There is a good reason why Yeshua did not give such an obviously high endorsement of Paul to the world, but would much rather have himself identified with the beloved apostle John. Actually, there are two reasons for this. First, as mentioned, Paul wasn’t even close to being everything he had made himself out to be. And second, Yeshua had prophesied that John’s testimony would remain till he returned. (More on this in the chapter, Yeshua’s prophecy concerning Peter) With an endorsement like this, it only stands to reason that John would be given the testimony of the Revelation to record.

The reference to John’s “testimony” remaining until Jesus’ return (which is not what Jesus said) and the reference to the prophecy concerning Peter, leads to a rather convoluted argument. The hypothesis uses John 21:18 to claim that Paul is the one who binds Peter’s hands to take him where he did not want to go. It also points out that this was different from the statement Jesus made to Peter concerning John: If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me (John 21:20-23). The argument is that because Paul is a false prophet and liar, every time someone cites Peter’s endorsement of Paul in 2Pe 3:15, they are taking Peter’s testimony in Paul’s direction (that is, against the law) and not where Jesus intended! Notice that the hypothesis does not try to explain Peter’s statement – it just dismisses the whole book as a forgery.

For the record, Jesus’ statement concerning John had nothing to do with John’s testimony (his books and epistles). John did indeed tarry until Jesus returned. The common assumption was that John would “not die” until the Second Advent – despite John himself pointing out the error of this belief (John 21:23). Jesus returned to speak to John personally when He gave John His revelation.

The anti-Paul hypothesis also makes much of Paul’s statements in Eph 3:3,4 and Eph 6:19 concerning the “mystery”, claiming this was evidence of Paul using “cabalistic Pharisee knowledge”:

3. How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words,
4. Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ)

And, Eph 6:19:

111 KJV 1 John 2:19 They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.
112 KJV John 21:18 Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not.
113 KJV John 21:20 Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee? 21 Peter seeing him saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? 22 Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me. 23 Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?
And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel.

The word translated mystery is musterion and Vine makes the following comments:

Musterion: primarily that which is known to the mustes, “the initiated” (from mueo, “to initiate into the mysteries”; cf. Phil. 4:12, mueomai, “I have learned the secret,” RV). In the NT it denotes, not the mysterious (as with the Eng. word), but that which, being outside the range of unassisted natural apprehension, can be made known only by divine revelation, and is made known in a manner and at a time appointed by God, and to those only who are illumined by His Spirit. In the ordinary sense a “mystery” implies knowledge withheld; its Scriptural significance is truth revealed. Hence the terms especially associated with the subject are “made known,” “manifested,” “revealed,” “preached,” “understand,” “dispensation.” The definition given above may be best illustrated by the following passage: “the mystery which hath been hid from all ages and generations: but now hath it been manifested to His saints” (Col 1:26, RV).

Interestingly, Paul’s critics do not make reference to Col 1:26 because it states this “mystery” is not some cabbalistic Pharisee knowledge that Paul sought to reveal, but rather something that God had made known to the separated ones belonging to Him. Musterion is best translated as secret because the secret that Paul refers to had indeed been secret until the days of the Apostles. But when Jesus revealed the Scriptures to the two on the road to Emmaus, He revealed everything concerning Himself, which meant He explained the symbolism of the sacrifices which are the key to understanding the schoolmaster or pedagogue role of the added law of the Levites. From that information all the “Apostles” would have quickly perceived the meaning of the symbolism of the Feast of Tabernacles. In those days, without the benefits of the history we can see, this was the starting point for understanding the secret that had been hidden. No-one would have had any clear idea or possibly even an inklng of its meaning, until at least the time of the captivities, and perhaps not even then. This is why James was able to confidently make the statements of Acts 15:14-17:

14. Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles (Greek: The nations), to take out of them a people for his name.
15. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written,
16. After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up:
17. That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles (Greek: The nations), upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things.

Verse 17 highlights another key point. What is that name? The religions think they know. They generally ascribe such references to “Christianity”, by one means or another. But they do not have any inkling of which name is in view. The answer lies in Mat 28:19 which reads: Go ye therefore, and teach all nations (Greek: The nations), baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. They treat it as an expression of authority; to act in a person’s name or on their behalf. However, the Greek text of the bold words reads: into The name belonging to The Father and (into The name) belonging to The Son and (into The name) belonging to The separated spirit

114 We know from Adams’ work (T) that the baptizing was into a single name. It is the single name that belongs to all three entities. Each entity has a specific claim to that particular name. The religions miss the point completely because they don’t understand that the unity of these three entities is given by ownership of the single name they have in common. It is not The name by which one of the entities is called. This is the point of disconnection between the Trinity of religion and the “trinity” of Scripture – Scripture refers to three of the seven manifestations of the one being to uniquely identify this key name in Scripture. (This name will also continued overleaf...
Paul was not present when Jesus gave that revelation to the two on the road to Emmaus and he was not there when the two passed the knowledge to the “Apostles” in Jerusalem. The eleven certainly had an inkling of the secret before Paul was converted because they had seen it in action, or at least heard Peter’s account of it. Paul says in Eph 3:5 that it was now revealed for the first time. That is, following on virtually immediately from Paul’s pronouncement of Acts 28:28, which was near the end of his work.

The anti-Paul hypothesis clearly has no understanding or even the faintest idea of that secret, despite it having been spelled out for the whole world to read. So in the bumbling fashion that has been apparent time and time again in that hypothesis, it misses the point and draws another erroneous conclusion. Therefore it should also be no surprise that these same critics have no idea of the limitations of the scope of Revelation and hence they do not understand why it would never have been given to Paul. The scope of Paul’s “Apostleship” was very different from that of John, which was very different from that of Peter. That is why Jesus told Peter it was none of his business what may or may not happen to John, it was Peter’s job to follow Me – that is, to do what Jesus instructed him to do.

Paul was able to reveal the secret belonging to the ages only because, in keeping with the meaning of mysterion, it had been revealed to Paul. The time of its revelation to Paul is not important, otherwise we would have been told (but he certainly would have seen its outcome when he was taken to the Third Heaven).

The reference to John’s epistles identifying Paul as a false prophet is a reference to 1Jo 2:19 which the anti-Paul hypothesis conveniently cites in isolation from verse 18, because that verse makes mention of the so called antichrist. Paul’s critics are happy to proclaim that Paul is anti-Jesus, but they are not prepared to put verses 18 and 19 together. These verses belong in the series with 1Jo 2:22, 1Jo 4:3 and 2Jo 1:7 and their respective attendant context verses. This is not the place to deal with the subject of antichristos, so we will deal only with verses 18 and 19, which read, with minor modifications to the Textus Receptus (in line with the annotations of the Critical Editors):

18, Young children (with respect to your spirit knowledge) it is a final hour and you hear a counter-anointed (person) is coming, even (kai) now many counter-anointed (people) have arisen, whence we know that it is a final hour.
19. They go out from (Greek: ek – out of) us but they are NOT (Greek: ou – categorical denial) out of us, for if they were out of us, they would have remained (in accordance) with us, but they go out in order that they may be revealed (so you can see) that not all (masculine) (people) are out of us.

In this verse the word “us” is used in the same inclusive manner as it was in Luke 9:50 (and Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us). It embraces all those who are “for Jesus” at that time, not just those who were physically with Him.

Verse 19 refers to those who would have continued with us (Greek: menO). When used figuratively, it means to continue, to remain unchanged. In this verse it refers to people who left those who held to the teachings of Jesus and started to teach a message that they had changed to suit themselves. Which means they were people who were opposed to, and taught things that were counter to, the anointed people. So these verses define the adjective, antichristos, as counter-anointed and they show us that the understood noun, people, is required for this particular context. The other three verses, mentioned above, also contain the adjective, antichristos, and they give examples of the character of these people and the nature of the counter-anointed declarations made by these counter-anointed people.

belong to the eighth, and final, manifestation of God which is still to come.) By failing to understand the Greek text, religion has bypassed the significance of the name and seized on the three manifestations mentioned in the verse and seeks to worship them as one entity (correct) consisting of three individual beings (incorrect). The religions do not know who or what they are addressing and worshiping. The Greek’s “unknown god” that Paul encountered in Athens is still present in the world today.
The interesting point here is that Paul had spent 15 days with Peter and the other “Apostles” and the letter to Antioch endorsed Paul and his teachings – and it confirmed that the “Apostles” had not instructed anyone to say circumcision was a necessary component of believing Jesus. So on the one hand, Paul could be considered as “sent out from us”, but that would have made Paul an “Apostle” of The eleven. So it is not surprising to find that none of the declarations attributed to “the antichrist” in the three verses mentioned above are remotely related to things that Paul was teaching.

On the other hand, we do find people from Jerusalem had gone to Antioch and taught / proclaimed the necessity of circumcision – contrary to the view of the “Apostles”. These people are indeed examples of the counter-anointed people of verse 19. Therefore it is no surprise to find that 1Jo 2:19 is not a reference to Paul, in any way, shape or form.

**Answer to question: 115**

- 115. After Paul left the Apostles in Jerusalem, to where did he “disappear” for 14 years and why?

This statement refers to Gal 2:1,2, where Paul states in the AV:

1. Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also.
2. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that Gospel which I preach (Greek: proclaim) among the Gentiles (Greek: The nations), but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.

To infer that Paul was somehow “missing” for fourteen years prior to making a further appearance in Jerusalem shows yet again the shallow research supporting the anti-Paul hypothesis. Such an erroneous conclusion points to a partial or selective reading of Scripture because a clear account of time is present even in the AV English. As always, when the English seems confusing, a visit to the Greek text (with at least the references mentioned earlier) is typically enlightening.

The English translation of Gal 2:1 is the reason people think Paul was absent from the scene for 14 years. However, the Greek text reads, *after that, through to fourteen years* ... (see Appendix E). The word translated *after that*, is an adverb of time and it relates to the fact that Paul is giving an account of his contact with the “Apostles” in Jerusalem, not his visits to Jerusalem. The word translated *dia*, when translated with the Genitive case, carries the meaning of *through*, which Bullinger (X) states as denoting passing through whatever is interposed between the beginning and the end of such action.

To infer that Paul was somehow “missing” for fourteen years prior to making a further appearance in Jerusalem shows yet again the shallow research supporting the anti-Paul hypothesis. Such an erroneous conclusion points to a partial or selective reading of Scripture because a clear account of time is present even in the AV English. As always, when the English seems confusing, a visit to the Greek text (with at least the references mentioned earlier) is typically enlightening.

The reason for using this construction is because Paul gives an account of his first visit to Jerusalem after (Greek: *meta* – that which comes next in sequence) his conversion, in Gal 1:18-20. However he skips the flying second visit of Acts 11:30 because neither he nor Barnabas saw the “Apostles”, because the purpose of the visit was to deliver money to Jerusalem. (At that point in time, Peter was in prison, James had been killed and the rest of the “Apostles” had either gone into hiding or were elsewhere. It was presumably due to the lack of a visible presence of the “Apostles” during this particularly turbulent time that the Judeans ran low on cash, and hence Paul and Barnabas brought it in and left again with great haste, without meeting any “Apostles”). Hence the use of *epeita dia* shows Paul was skipping over the second visit to discuss his third visit that occurred in the fourteenth year after his conversion. That is, seven years after his first visit to the “Apostles” (Gal 1:18,19, Acts 9:26,27) and approximately six years after the flying second visit. Paul visited Jerusalem on two more occasions after his third visit of Gal 2, (fourth visit, to attend Pentecost (Bullinger (X)): Acts 18:21,22, and fifth visit, when he was captured: Acts 21:15) 115.

---

115 For further detail, see Alford’s [(AJ)] notes on Galatians in the Introduction to Volume 2 and the notes to the Chronology table in the Introduction to Volume 1.
Answer to question: 116

- 116. Where was Paul “martyred” and where is the proof?

This question stems from Shriner’s assertion that Acts 21:13 is a declaration of Paul’s willingness to be a martyr and then turning that assertion around to claim that Paul bailed out when given the chance to fulfill that role by appealing to Caesar for judgement. Shriner then uses that appeal to show Paul was inconsistent with his statements in 1Co 6:1-11 concerning appeals to the courts of his brethren versus foreign courts.

True to the formula of the anti-Paul hypothesis, we will see the first verse is taken out of context and no attention paid to the context of the Corinthian verses.

We are told in Acts 20:22,23 that Paul knew he had to go to Jerusalem and that imprisonment and affliction awaited him in his future. In Acts 21:11 the prophet, Agabus, arrives and tells Paul what is to befall him in Jerusalem. Acts 21:13 is Paul’s response to the people who begged him not to go to Jerusalem. The verse has been taken out of context because the words of the prophecy are quite clear in the Greek: thus the Judeans will bind in Jerusalem and will deliver (the man) into hands belonging to nations. Paul knew exactly what it meant – he would finally be captured. However, because the word translated nations was plural, Paul also knew that although he would be captured by the Edomite rulers of Judea, he would be handed over to the Romans. However, because Paul knew the secret of the ages, mentioned above, he knew he still had that task to complete. He stated that he was prepared to die in Jerusalem because he thought he would complete his task in Jerusalem but it would cost him his life.

In due course, all seemed to be going to plan – he was captured by the Edomites stirring up the crowd and they were about to kill him when the Romans intervened, bound him in chains and took him prisoner. After a formal appearance before a council of the Edomite priests and the Romans, Paul was again taken into the castle. Jesus appeared to him that evening and told him that as he had testified in Jerusalem, so he would also testify in Rome. Therefore, from that point onwards, Paul, who had been informed of the Edomite plot against him, kept moving events in the direction of remaining in Roman custody. When it became evident, two years later, that the Romans were going to return him to the Edomite priests, Paul appealed to Caesar to ensure he would be sent to Rome.

In order to understand the difference between Paul’s appeal to Caesar and his statements to the Corinthians, it is only a matter of reading 1Co 6:5 which, in the Greek text, refers to the The kinsmen of the same womb belonging to him and verse 6, refers to cases where a kinsman of the same

116 KJV Acts 21:13 Then Paul answered, What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus.

117 KJV 1 Corinthians 6:1 Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? 2 Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? 3 Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life? 4 If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church. 5 I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren? 6 But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers. 7 Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded? 8 Nay, ye do wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren. 9 Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, 10 Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. 11 And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.

118 KJV Acts 20:22 And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: 23 Save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me.

119 KJV Acts 21:11 And when he was come unto us, he took Paul’s girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said. Thus saith the Holy Ghost (Greek: The spirit The separated (one)). So shall the Jews (Greek: Judeans) at Jerusalem bind the man that oweth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles (Greek: nations – no Definite Article).

120 KJV 1 Corinthians 6:5 I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren? 6 But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers.
womb with a kinsman of the same womb is judged (that is, two Israelites, one against the other). This chapter is dealing with the Israelites in Corinth who insisted on taking their squabbles to the Corinthian courts instead of sorting them out amongst themselves, or better, not going to court at all and keeping the peace amongst themselves. Is not this an example of Paul teaching what Jesus taught – to go the extra mile, to give your shirt also to the one who asks for the coat off your back?

The difference between the statements to fellow Israelites in Corinth versus the statements to Festus was that Paul was not having a dispute with a fellow kinsman of the same womb – rather it was with the Edomite priests of Judea who wanted to take Paul and kill him forthwith. However, Paul knew his task concerning the secret of the ages was not complete, and as Jesus had told him, personally, that he was to go to Rome, Paul made his appeal.

We do not know where or how Paul died, but we do know that his task was finished with the proclamation of Acts 28:28 and Eph 3:5,6 (Greek: The nations). 2Ti 4:6-11 121 shows that Paul knew his end was near and there is no reason to believe he did not die in Rome. However, the actual place and manner of his death is not particularly important in the context of Scripture – and the same applies with regards to the death of John and all the “Apostles”.

Answer to question: 117

• 117. Why did Paul argue with Barnabas (Acts 15:36-41)?

It is not clear what is behind this question. Is it the fascination of the anti-Paul hypothesis with the Gospel of Barnabas? One hopes not, because Del Tondo states that one of the claims to fame for this “gospel” is that the Christian monk who discovered it, read it and converted to Islam.

Or is it acceptance of Tertullian’s assertion that Barnabas wrote the book of Hebrews? We have already dealt with the authorship of Hebrews. The people who make these kinds of statements clearly have no understanding of fundamental concepts such as the triune make-up of an Israelite or the nature of the two-way communication of spirit. Consequently they have no understanding of how the books of the Bible can be written to be the living Word of God without the concept of mere “dumb dictation”. Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Hebrews and 1 John are the personal communications of Jehovah or Jesus, as the case may be. The root cause of such erroneous statements is the common religious view that the Bible is a collection of books written by men and assembled by other men into a book of religion – that is, anything but the Living Word of God and all that that entails.

Or is it the overall fixation that Barnabas was also dedicated to rectifying the mis-teachings of Paul? Or is it because tradition asserts that John Mark is the author of Mark’s Gospel, and if John Mark left Paul’s company, then it is evidence of another “revolt” against Paul?

With such a wide variety of possibilities for this question, it is indeed well suited to being last. Let us take it at face value – that it concerns the person, John Mark. One thing is very clear from the literature and that is that all the commentators appear to assume God is very casual in His use of names. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Bible is absolutely precise in its use of every single name and the simple proof of that point is the precision with which the names of Israel, Children of Jacob, and Ephraim are used throughout Scripture. As the commentators in general and Paul’s critics in particular, do not understand those distinctions, it is no surprise they would be

121 KJV 2 Timothy 4:6 For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. 7 I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: 8 Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing. 9 Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me: 10 For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia. 11 Only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry.
confused concerning John Mark. Each time John Mark’s name appears in Scripture in a new context, he is accurately identified as John who is surnamed Mark.

According to the Greek text of verse 37, the reason Paul did not want to take John Mark was because John Mark had been withdrawing from them (Paul and Barnabas) part-way through a previous journey. There is no basis for applying the meaning of revolting because the revolt has to be applied to both Paul and Barnabas which does not fit with Barnabas being so keen to take John Mark on the next journey. The reason for the withdrawing is not given, but in Paul’s mind it was sufficient grounds not to want to take him again. The essence of the meaning however is that John Mark’s behaviour let Paul down and Paul did not wish to have that happen again on the next journey.

The names of John and Mark were apparently quite common in those days, so statements that each reference to Mark in the various books is to one and the same person, do not have anything substantial to support them, so it is a discussion that in and of itself, seems to be going nowhere useful.

**Conclusion**

**Answer to question: 1**

- 1. You miss my point completely which is – are Paul’s writings Scripture and was Paul the 12th Apostle?

The answer to the two parts of Question 1 — is Yes! on both counts. The anti-Paul hypothesis that gave rise to the 119 questions, the true source of which was deliberately hidden from us when presenting the questions, has been shown in this paper to be seriously lacking in facts and is poorly researched. The anti-Paul hypothesis, at least the Del Tondo portions of it, present an eminently believable façade of credible study that is next to impossible for inexperienced seekers of truth, especially the ones newly emerged from their churches, to challenge. However the logic of the hypothesis is flawed because it fails to understand the differences between:

- The created descendants of Genesis 1 versus the formed descendants of Genesis 2.
- Abram and Abraham and all that stems from that distinction.
- The descendants of Isaac versus the other sons of Abraham.
- The descendants of Esau versus the descendants of Jacob.
- Deuteronomic Law versus Levitical Law.
- The Israelites of the Judean Kingdom versus the Edomites who were present in that kingdom.
- The Israelites of the Judean Kingdom versus the Israelites of the Dispersion.
- The religion of Judaism versus the teaching of the Bible
- The religion of Christianity versus the teaching of the Bible
- Religion in general versus the Bible.

As to the 119 questions – they can be safely discarded.

---

122 KJV Acts 15:36 And some days after Paul said unto Barnabas, Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do. 37 And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. 38 But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. 39 And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder one from the other: and so Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto Cyprus; 40 And Paul chose Silas, and departed, being recommended by the brethren unto the grace of God. 41 And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches.
In terms of the title of this paper, *What can we trust: The view of Paul presented by religious critics or The view of Paul presented by the Bible?* we can see that the facts support the latter. That does not mean to say we can always immediately understand what Paul wrote (especially if we only read the AV translation). However, this paper clearly shows that a bit of judicious research will typically provide the plain and simple answers to what we are seeking.

It also shows that the answers will never lie with those who do not understand the simple fundamentals of the Bible, namely:

- The Bible is not a book of religion.
- Jesus did not found any church.
- The Bible is the book of the history, past, present and future, of one race of people and one race only – other races receive a mention only when they intersect with that one race during the course of history.
- The Bible is the record of God’s Permissive Will in allowing Satan to attempt to thwart God’s prophecies concerning that one race.
- The Bible is the record of what God will provide to those who succeed in their own personal struggle to serve God before all else.

It takes time to understand the Bible and that is why we have been given one day in seven to spend in the pursuit of that knowledge. Therefore, our time will always be better spent focusing directly on those fundamentals and everything that stems from them rather than pursuing the hypotheses of those who seek to promote a religious view of the Bible.

——— ♫♫♫ ————
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Appendix A. The Anti-Paul Questions

The list of questions, re-grouped from the order received, with numbers added for future reference, plus a very brief summary answer, are provided in Table 4. The detail behind the brief answer is given in the body of this document.

Table 4 – Questions and summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Summary Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You miss my point completely which is - are Paul's writings Scripture and - was Paul the 12th Apostle?</td>
<td>Yes. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attach below a few questions - NO ANSWERS - concerning Paul and his times. (For you and the Group) Perhaps you have considered all of these - but if so, may I respectfully suggest that certain amendments are made in some of the group's papers? If you do take the trouble to investigate any of the questions, I'm certain you will do so with your usual open-mindedness and vigour.</td>
<td>The trouble has been taken by the authors … . It is now the turn of Paul’s critics to take the same amount of open-mindedness and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The 13th?</td>
<td>Yes, but you must understand the meaning of “Apostle”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are there 12, 13 or indeed 14 Apostles appointed by GOD?</td>
<td>13 - but there were only 12 in office at any one time, as Paul was only appointed after Judas had died. See Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When Peter stood up with the “eleven”, how many Apostles were therefore present?</td>
<td>At this time, only 11 “Apostles” had been appointed by Jesus. When Saul was called, he became the 12th “Apostle” holding office at that time. See Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. After the “first” Pentecost, how many times are the 12 Apostles mentioned individually by name?</td>
<td>There are no lists of the 12 “Apostles” given after Pentecost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Was Matthias the only Apostle not mentioned by name in the New Testament after this time?</td>
<td>Matthias was not an “Apostle”. See Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was James, Jesus Christ’s brother, one of the 12 Apostles?</td>
<td>No. Corrected translation reads: different from (other than) The “apostles” I saw not (anyone) except James The brother of The Lord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Or is James just referred to as an Apostle, as are others, like Barnabas and indeed Paul?</td>
<td>To answer this, one must understand the meaning of the word “Apostle”. See Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did GOD, or anyone else, tell the 12 Apostles of the new addition to their ranks?</td>
<td>Not 12 at that time – only 11. The credentials of an “Apostle” are presented by himself, but the 11 would have already known from Ananias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Was Paul the 13th Apostle?</td>
<td>Yes, as appointed, but no, he replaced Judas to restore 12. See Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How many times is Paul referred to as an Apostle?</td>
<td>22 times, using the correct meaning of “Apostle”. See Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Did Jesus Christ, in the Book of Revelation, confirm Paul as an Apostle?</td>
<td>No. The anti-Paul hypothesis looks for a connection between Revelation and Paul that has no logical reason to exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Did Jesus Christ confirm Pauline “doctrine” in the Book of Revelation?</td>
<td>No. The anti-Paul hypothesis looks for a connection between Revelation and Paul that has no logical reason to exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Did Jesus Christ, in the Book of Revelation, stand against Pauline “doctrine”?</td>
<td>No. The anti-Paul hypothesis looks for a connection between Revelation and Paul that has no logical reason to exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How many Apostles were there then and how many will there be later, as per Rev. 21:14?</td>
<td>I’m certain that only 12 will be involved in the Kingdom and the City will have 12 foundations and in them the NAMES of the 12 Apostles. 12 at any given time. See Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Did any witness tell the 12 Apostles that Paul had been appointed as an Apostle also?</td>
<td>Not 12 at that time – only 11. The credentials of an “Apostle” are presented by himself, but the 11 would have already known from Ananias. See also Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Should we apply The Bible’s tests for a true Prophet to Paul?</td>
<td>Jesus’ test for someone coming in His name is spelt out in detail in 1Jo 4:1-3. Paul passes that test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Only Luke and Paul “report” the matter but Luke was not a witness?</td>
<td>There are a number of events recorded in the Bible without witnesses being named. For example, Jesus’ temptations and the struggle in Gethsemane, Peter’s vision of the sheet etc. Either we accept these or we reject all events recorded without witnesses. Which shall it be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Who were the witnesses?</td>
<td>See Question 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Who are the witnesses as to what occurred on the road to Damascus?</td>
<td>See Question 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Are there real and important differences, in the three reports of Saul’s “conversion”?</td>
<td>No – while each account differs in its detail, none of the accounts step outside the bounds of the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Are there any similarities between the story of Balaam and Saul’s (road) conversion?</td>
<td>There are absolutely no connections between Balaam and Paul, on any level whatsoever. Incidentally, there were no witnesses to Balaam’s encounter either, so if you consider Paul’s encounter is questionable, why bother citing Balaam?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Did Paul ever consider the words of John 5:31?</td>
<td>Yes, and he also would have considered verse 32. (But how could he do so – you claim the only Scripture available at that time was the OT.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Did Peter or any Apostle, ever endorse Paul?</td>
<td>All eleven Apostles directly and explicitly endorsed Paul. See the detail of the answer to Question 118.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Which of the 12 Apostles or any followers of Jesus Christ remained in touch with Paul?</td>
<td>We have no idea which Apostles, if any, remained in touch with Paul, or with each other for that matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Why did they all “turn away” from Paul?</td>
<td>See Question 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Some say that the Apostles were of the tribe of Benjamin. Paul certainly made a point of agreeing with this view. Yet, “Benjamin shall ravin as a wolf”. Or is that out of context?</td>
<td>(a) The Apostles other than Judas were Benjaminites from Galilee - (Mark 14:70, Luke 22:59 – and conclusively, Acts 1:11 and Acts 2:7). (b) The prophecy concerning a Tribe has been misapplied to an individual. The statement is a simile: as a wolf, that described the tribe’s behaviour and caused it to be decimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Who is the Benjamite wolf in prophecy?</td>
<td>The Tribe, not one man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Was Saul a member of the tribe of Benjamin?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. If so, where is the evidence?</td>
<td>See question 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Was Saul an Edomite and a Pharisee?</td>
<td>No – as a Benjaminite, Paul cannot be an Edomite (this is a racial distinction). Yes – can be and was a Pharisee (which is not a racial term) Phi 3:5. And many an Edomite was also a Pharisee or a Sadducee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. If so, where is the evidence?</td>
<td>Questions 28 to 33 show a failure to understand the elementary distinction between the descendants of Esau and of Jacob and which races were permitted membership of the Pharisee and the Saducee sects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. From where did all this &quot;churchianity&quot; come?</td>
<td>Not from the Bible if the Bible is correctly translated. I've never been &quot;happy&quot; with Paul - along with other matters such as the trinity, sunday, lent, holy communion, christenings, christmas, easter etc. Namely, all the &quot;churchy&quot; stuff. See Question 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Rome?</td>
<td>Yes. The bulk of the religious terminology and the trappings, such as the priest robes, all come from Rome, as well as such concepts as “hell” and living in eternal damnation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Who started matters in Rome?</td>
<td>Acts 2:10 – the “strangers of Rome” who were present at Pentecost (before Paul came into the picture).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Who spent time in Rome?</td>
<td>Any one of the reputed 7,000,000 Judeans spread over the Roman Empire, but we also know Paul and Peter were there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Who was born in Tarsus - a very &quot;Roman&quot; city?</td>
<td>Acts 22:3 – Paul, who also states he was a Judean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Do we actually know the name that Saul/Paul was given, at birth, in Tarsus?</td>
<td>Paul is merely the Roman/Greek equivalent of his Israelite name, Saul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. What do we know of Tarsus?</td>
<td>The Bible does not elaborate, thus this is of no consequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Which religion prospered in Tarsus?</td>
<td>Most religions current in the Roman Empire. However, it is irrelevant because the Bible is not a book of religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Who was a Roman citizen?</td>
<td>See Question 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. When did this occur?</td>
<td>See Question 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Who was “guarded” (protected) in Rome?</td>
<td>Just about anyone who was anyone, plus Paul, since he was a prisoner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Who could be called the Latin Man?</td>
<td>This is not of interest to the Bible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Who founded the “church” in Rome?</td>
<td>This is not of interest to the Bible, which has no interest in a “church”, whether in Rome or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Who still is guarded in Rome today?</td>
<td>This is not of interest to the Bible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Did Jesus Christ form a new “religion”?</td>
<td>No. The Bible is not a book of religion and Jesus did not found any church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. On what was the “church” founded?</td>
<td>On man’s interpretation of Jesus teaching. The ekklesia, the called-out assembly, was founded on Peter’s statement: Thou art The anointed (one), The Son belonging to The God, The living (one). This has nothing to do with a church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Did Paul form the “christianity” as we know it today?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Was it Peter’s statement to Jesus Christ in Matthew 16: 15-18, or Paul’s “teachings”?</td>
<td>Yes – and Paul did not contradict that statement at any time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Why does modern &quot;Christianity&quot; ignore Peter, James and John and all the Apostles?</td>
<td>That is a problem of Christianity, not the Bible – the Bible is not a book of religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Why don’t they proclaim the Gospels and the OT?</td>
<td>Because (a) they [the churches] are ignorant of the correct translations of the passages of Scripture they try to expound, and/or (b) they do not agree with what correctly translated Scripture plainly says.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Perhaps because Paul himself didn't do so?</td>
<td>Making assertions based on inaccurate translations of what Paul did and did not do is not the basis for stating what Paul really IS proclaiming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Looking at our churches today and indeed BI churches, we have been deceived! By whom?</td>
<td>The English text of the AV is inadequate for dealing with the substance of the Bible – any “church”/religion based on these translations provides only a kindergarten understanding. When they try to move beyond that level, it is the religion that creates the deception, not what God caused to be written. Notice your terminology: “BI churches”. (The BI “movement” degenerated into a religion about 50 years ago.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Not by a &quot;serpent&quot; nor by an evil looking guy with horns. By inaccurate translations and man’s interpretations in response to not accepting what the corrected translations say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Rather, perhaps by Pauline doctrine? &quot;Ah yes - but which Bible, from which texts and with which translation. &quot;Instruction manual&quot;? Yes of course, but we all, shall I say &quot;amend&quot; this work - do we not? Are we to think that the devil hasn’t also done so in the past? By inaccurate translations and man’s interpretations in response to not accepting what the corrected translations say. Your belief that the Textus Receptus is the inerrant Word of God is your concern – but that does not tally with the facts presented in this document or elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>What about Paul’s view of circumcision? This question arises from a complete misunderstanding of the difference between Mosaic and Levitical law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>I assume that Timothy (as well as me) was confused? Timothy was not confused – and nor was Titus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>What happened with Timothy over “circumcision”? See Question 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>In Paul’s disagreement [Gal 2] with Peter, who was correct? Paul. Because this was the second time Peter had failed to adjust his behaviour when in the company of other Judeans in the presence of Israelites from the Dispersion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Who called himself an Apostle? &quot;I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars&quot;. Paul and Peter refer to themselves as “Apostles” in the opening of their epistles – because that is what they are supposed to do – see Question 2. All “apostles” in Jerusalem called themselves “apostles” in their letter to Antioch, Acts 15:23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Who &quot;say&quot; that they are &quot;apostles&quot;? Shall we see? Why not check out who actually says that Paul is an Apostle? Once you have learned the answer to Question 2, you will understand why none of the “Apostles” addressed each other as “apostles”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Who wrote 13 Epistles? Paul – and the number 13 does not mean what is insinuated in this question. The consequences of Paul’s life are a first class example of the correct meaning of the number 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Who quotes the Greek philosophers as well as paraphrases their sayings? Paul – for the same reason we have to cite the AV and the Textus Receptus when talking to you – because, as you state, that is the limit of your understanding at this point in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Why not use the Words of Jesus Christ alone? As shown even in the AV, the “Apostles” rarely, if ever, used the actual words of Jesus. And if we were to use the words of Jesus in our replies, we certainly would not cite the AV text very often. Your persistence in using the word Christ is a simple, but precise illustration of the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Perhaps Paul didn’t know many of the Words of Jesus Christ? See Question 68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>After all, Paul wasn’t present listening was he? &quot;Or if he was, these Words had no effect on a Pharisee! Paul was not one of the disciples that listened to and followed Jesus Christ.&quot; Correct – Paul did not learn from Jesus when Jesus was alive – see Question 71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>From whom did he learn about Jesus Christ and His teachings? Gal 1:12 “by the revelation of Jesus Christ” (AV) – and that is almost an accurate translation of the Textus Receptus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>We know when Jesus Christ taught the disciples and Apostles – what about Paul? See Question 2, to understand why you can be assured that all the “Apostles” had the same understanding and see Question 71 again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, Paul didn't need instruction from the Apostles who had received their instructions directly from Jesus Christ. Mind you in Paul's eyes Peter, James and John only "seemed to be pillars".

### Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>73.</strong> When and where?</td>
<td>&quot;But though we, or an angel of heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. . . . For I neither received [the gospel] from man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. . . . I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it. . . . But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb . . . To reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles I saw none, save James the Lord's brother. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia&quot; Galatians 1:8-21. Also, Paul didn't need instruction from the Apostles who had received their instructions directly from Jesus Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>74.</strong> Why did Paul go into Arabia for three years?</td>
<td>If the Bible doesn’t explain it, then it is not important for us to know it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>75.</strong> What happened to him there?</td>
<td>See Questions 71, 73 and 74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>76.</strong> Did Paul seek advice concerning “doctrine” from any of the Apostles?</td>
<td>No. Anymore than the “Apostles” sought advice from Paul – see Question 73. Furthermore, given that, for example, Peter had to be ticked off twice concerning his behaviour towards Israelites of the Dispersion – and that was despite witnessing all Jesus did in dealing with such people – why would Paul seek to emulate Peter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>77.</strong> What did Paul say about these Apostles in this context?</td>
<td>See the corrected translation of Gal 2:1-10. He praised their contribution to the work in Judea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>78.</strong> Did Paul think that James, Peter and John were “pillars” of “Christianity”?</td>
<td>Certainly not. Here is another example of you distorting the AV (and the Textus Receptus) by associating these three with a religion. See the corrected translation of Gal 2:1-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79.</strong> How often, in an historical context, does Paul refer to Jesus Christ?</td>
<td>You can do this as easy as anyone else – you just need to decide which aspect you want to search. But if you do not know the difference between the Mosaic Law and the Levitical Law, for example, then you will not get the right answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Why did Jesus Christ warn of the false prophets?</td>
<td>Matthew 7:15 “Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves”. Luke 11:39 “And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Did Jesus Christ not also warn about the Pharisees?</td>
<td>Yes – but in what context – the Pharisees as a group or as individuals? See Question 80 and answer the question about Nicodemus, above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Of course, he couldn’t possibly be aware of Paul?</td>
<td>This is a pointless question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. How does the wolf enter the fold?</td>
<td>See Questions 28 and 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Did Jesus Christ warn of false prophets who would deny the Law?</td>
<td>See Question 80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Why does Jesus Christ mention Balaam in Revelation 2:14?</td>
<td>The lessons drawn from Balaam are not connected to Paul. There are no parallels between Paul and Balaam and there is no association between Revelation and Paul – other than the fact that Paul was taken to the Third Heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Of whom was James writing when he criticized a particular person’s false doctrine?</td>
<td>Not known. He certainly was not preparing a trial concerning Paul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Why was it that “all they which are in Asia be turned away from me”? 2 Timothy 1:15.</td>
<td>This is another of those classic translation errors that are then extended into religious assertions by men who don’t understand what they are reading. The corrected translation reads: Thou knowest that The entire (population/people) in Asia, of whom Phygelus and Hermogenes (are leaders) have been turned away from me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. So was this “turning away”, not only in Ephesus?</td>
<td>See Question 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Does Revelation 2:1-2 have relevance here?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Have we any proof that Paul lied?</td>
<td>You mention Heb 6:18. Yes, it is impossible for GOD to lie - but not methinks impossible for Paul to lie. Have we any proof that Paul lied? You mention Matthew 5:18 - but this refers to The Law which is not ALL Scripture - which in any event at that time was the OT ONLY. The word &quot;Scripture&quot; used in the NT, surely can only refer - at the time it was written - to the OT? No – but there is ample proof that he did not lie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Does Paul ever contradict himself or other parts of Scripture?</td>
<td>Most certainly, I accept that all Scripture is as explained in that verse (2Tim 3:16). However, I don't apply such to the words of Paul - as yet Paul does not contradict himself – and there is ample proof that he is always consistent in what he says and does.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Did Paul lie concerning any matters?</td>
<td>See Question 90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Were Peter and the “eleven Apostles” wrong in “choosing” Matthias as the twelfth Apostle?</td>
<td>Yes. See Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Was the method the Apostles used in this selection wrong?</td>
<td>Yes. See Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Did Matthias receive the Spirit at the same time as the eleven?</td>
<td>No, Matthias was not present in the room at Pentecost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. If not, why not - and is this confirmed?</td>
<td>Not supportable in the text – see the detail in the body of the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Why did Saul change his name to Paul, as told by Luke, Acts 13 verse 9 (1+3+9 = 13)?</td>
<td>Both names were valid – one is the Hebrew name and the other is the Greek/Roman name. Hence the Greek equivalent of “Paul” is used in the Greek text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Who said that Paul was the Apostle to the “Gentiles”?</td>
<td>Jesus (Acts 9:15) and Paul (Rom 11:13, Gal 2:8, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Who refers to Paul as an Apostle?</td>
<td>Paul. But Paul also takes the trouble to use a title that quite clearly identifies his appointment as different from the other “Apostles”. This self declaration is in keeping with the answer to Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Do any of the other 12 Apostles, ever refer to Paul as an Apostle?</td>
<td>No – nor do the other 11 – not 12 – refer to each other as “Apostles”. See Question 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Why, oh why did GOD, through Jesus Christ, not give The Revelation to Paul rather than John?</td>
<td>Because Paul and John address two completely different scopes of work. Failing to perceive this is yet another example of how religions are created by man’s interpretations of the Bible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Did John’s Epistles identify Paul as a false Prophet?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Is it any wonder that Jesus Christ’s Revelation was not given to Paul but rather to John?</td>
<td>No. See Question 102.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Did Paul at any time repent concerning his previous actions?</td>
<td>Yes. 1 Cor 15:9 expresses regret and Paul’s whole subsequent life, writings and teachings express his repentance. It is surprising that as a professing Christian you should need to ask that question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Did Paul ever repent of his “former work” of persecuting “Christians”?</td>
<td>See Question 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. “Faith and works”?</td>
<td>The fundamental difficulty here is not knowing the difference between the Mosaic Law and the Levitical Law. Furthermore, you do not appear to know that the word “faith” does not exist in the Greek text, which will make it is even harder to get to the bottom of what is involved with this question. The correct translation of the Greek word is belief. This applies to the next 6 questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Paul has much to say on such matters:</td>
<td>See Question 107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James 2:21 Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?</td>
<td>James 2:24 Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James 2:17 Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone</td>
<td>Romans 4:2 For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Is he in full agreement with Scripture and the other Apostles - such as James in Chapter 2?</td>
<td>See Question 107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. In Paul’s disagreement with James, who was correct?</td>
<td>See Question 107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James 2 and Eph 2:8-10</td>
<td>See Question 107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. Where did Paul stand on matters of faith and works?</td>
<td>See Question 107.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miscellaneous**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114. What was the problem over eating certain meats?</td>
<td>This is mistaken as an instruction for breaking “the Law” and is incorrectly linked to the so-called “Gospel of Grace” attributed by the anti-Paul hypothesis to Paul, which they suggest also breaks the Law. Paul’s doctrine at no point advocates breaking the Law. See Question 107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. After Paul left the Apostles in Jerusalem, to where did he “disappear” for 14 years and why?</td>
<td>There was no “disappearance”. This is an assertion made on the basis of not understanding what is written elsewhere in the AV text. The explicit statement refers to Gal 2:1 – see the corrected translation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
116. Where was Paul “martyred” and where is the proof?  
Since the Bible does not specify, this is irrelevant.

117. Why did Paul argue with Barnabas? (Acts 15:36-41?)  
See also: Instructions to the "heathen" (Gal 2:1-14 and Acts 15:25-29)  
The argument was about whether or not to take John Mark on a journey. Paul did not want to take him because John Mark had let Paul down.

118. Instructions to the "heathen" (Gal 2:1-14 and Acts 15:25-29)  
See also: In Paul’s disagreement [Gal 2] with Peter, who was correct?  
I attach a passage from Galatians:-  
Some interesting items highlighted. Although it is the word "only" that is important. A small matter and yet........  
Others of greater importance can be seen elsewhere if you would only look. That is your call. I'm just showing from Scripture where Paul lied. Would Scripture count as "well researched and water tight"? Of course, the Greek may not say this.

1 "Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also.  
2 And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.  
3 But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised:  
4 And that because of false brethren unwares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:  
5 To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.  
6 But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man’s person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me:  
7 But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter:  
8 (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:)  
9 And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.  
10 Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do."

One instance eh? What did the Apostles actually require of Paul when he was to go to the "heathen"?

I attach a quote from Acts:-  
24 "Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law: to whom we gave no such commandment:  
25 It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul,  
26 Men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.  
27 We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth.  
28 For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things;  
29 That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well".  
"Only remember the poor"?????????? There is no mention of the poor! Idols? Yes. Blood? Yes. Fornication? Yes. Yes.

Paul. See Questions 62 and 76.  
The corrected translation and translation notes show Paul did not lie. You owe somebody an apology.

See the corrected translation and translation notes.  
The instructions in the letter to Antioch and the statement made to Paul concerning the poor are so far apart with respect to their contexts, that the only things they have in common are that the “Apostles” were the ones making the statements, that both events took place in the same timeframe and both events occurred in Jerusalem. This is the quality of what passes for “research” by Paul’s critics.

119. Just a few thoughts and questions perhaps enough for you to take further?  
Much confusion for such as me. Yet, even I, am reasonably content and can understand most of the OT, Gospels, the so-called “Jewish Epistles” and indeed much of Revelation too. There is much more and certainly masses have been written concerning Paul.

Reading the popular translations will only provide a relatively simplistic view of the Bible. To find and understand the deeper truths, you must seek more accurate translations and make it a habit to use the terminology that God used, not the religious terminology of men.
Appendix B. Bible Sanity-check Model

General Sanity-Check Model

Assumes belief that there is a God (otherwise there is no point)

Therefore: God is perfect, honest, true etc. Not contradictory

The Bible is like a “User Manual”

Therefore: equally as flawless as its author

Orthodox religious views of the Bible

Non-denominational views of the Bible

Text-based views of the Bible (based on English versions and/or source texts)

Gloss over or ignore the hard bits

(Take specific verses or narrow themes and build what is actually a religious view of their own – just not orthodox religious views.)

Examples:

- Conventional BI: nucleus of the Kingdom
- Fundamentalists/literalists (including KJV defenders) – Bible is literally true as written in English
- Snake-handlers in the US

Inconsistent (personal interpretations leading to selective exceptions)

- OT versus NT
- Remove Paul, Jonah, Flood, Red Sea etc
- Consequences:
  - Incomplete “manual”
  - Gaps introduced by removal. For example:
    - Matt 1:1 – refers to Abraham. How do you find out about Abraham?
    - Jesus said: In the days of Noe … How do you find out about Noah?
    - It is written … . Where?
    - If remove a book(s), what is the impact?

Consistent

- OT versus NT
- Remove Paul, Jonah, Flood, Red Sea etc
- Consequences:
  - Incomplete “manual”
  - Gaps introduced by removal. For example:
    - Matt 1:1 – refers to Abraham. How do you find out about Abraham?
    - Jesus said: In the days of Noe … How do you find out about Noah?
    - It is written … . Where?
    - If remove a book(s), what is the impact?

Consistency with common / fundamental theme of the Bible.

Grammatical analysis of the source text for grammatical translations.

“Take it or leave it” approach.

Biblical Statements that provide basis for accepting what is written

- Hebrews 1:1 – God who in time past
- Luke 1:3 – perfect understanding
- Luke 24:45 – opened their minds
- 2 Pe 1:19 – more sure word of prophecy (historical evidence)
- Isa 19:19 – altar and pillar centre and border of Egypt
- Psa 19:1-6 – their line has gone into all the earth
- Num 5:8 – Gaal – Kinsman-redeemer – can only redeem His kinsmen
- Acts 17:23 – the Unknown God
- The opening lines of each epistle
- NB: there is no archaeological evidence to refute the Biblical accounts.

Hebrews 1:1 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,

Luke 1:3 3 It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus

Luke 24:45 45 Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures,

2 Peter 1:19 19 We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts:

Isaiah 19:19 19 ¶ In that day shall there be an altar to the LORD in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the LORD.

Psalm 19:1-4 KJV Psalm 19:1 <To the chief Musician, A Psalm of David.> The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork. 2 Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. 3 There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard. 4 Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun,

Numbers 5:8 8 But if the man have no kinsman to recompense the trespass unto, let the trespass be recompensed unto the LORD, even to the priest; ...

Acts 17:23 I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.
## Appendix C. Paul Sanity-check Table

Principle: cannot use any reference from within Paul’s documents to support the inclusion of his work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorship of Acts</th>
<th>Ambassador</th>
<th>Hebrews</th>
<th>Scope of Paul’s teaching</th>
<th>Paul’s pronouncement to the Dispersion</th>
<th>Consequences of removing Paul’s work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commonly accepted to be Luke, not Paul.</td>
<td>Ambassadors are always appointed by the person they represent, not elected by a group to represent someone else.</td>
<td>Claimed to be written by Paul, but the opening verse is contrary to all other epistles. It starts: God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,</td>
<td>Acts 17:23 For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.</td>
<td>Acts 28:25-28 Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, 26 Saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive:</td>
<td>How would we know that isolated Israelite communities that never knew the law, or Jesus, would be acceptable to God?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Luke 1:3</strong> It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus</td>
<td>As one of the twelve, Paul would also receive the same complete and perfect understanding.</td>
<td>2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;</td>
<td>2Pe 3:15 And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; [See 2Pe 3:1 then 1Pe 1:1 for the recipients.]</td>
<td>27 For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.</td>
<td>How would we know the detail concerning the trumpet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Luke 24:45</strong> Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures,</td>
<td>Acts 9:15 But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way (Ananias): for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles (Greek: nations), and kings, and the children of Israel: The third witness.</td>
<td>Having spoken by the prophets in the past, and now by His Son, who appointed His own ambassadors, they will speak with the same consistent message.</td>
<td>Peter’s “endorsement” of the validity of Paul’s teaching The fifth witness.</td>
<td>28 Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles (Greek: The nations), and that they will hear it.</td>
<td>How would we know that the translation from the physical body to the eternal body (the First Resurrection) is instantaneous?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two verses above are two witnesses, to Luke, and the 12 Apostles (which includes Paul), as having complete, accurate/perfect understanding.

Thus appointment of Paul is recorded by an impeccable source.

Acts records Paul’ selection by Jesus.

Panin


Luke would not record something so important unless it was absolutely correct.

How would we know the sequence of the events of the return of Jesus concerning the dead and the living?

How would we know that all Israel will be saved?

Etc, etc.
Appendix D. Multiple naming in Scripture

Given that God is not one to waste His words, it behoves us to pay special attention to things that are identified and commands that are given two and especially three times. This appendix lists the bulk of the examples of this phenomenon.

D.1. People named or addressed twice in the Old Covenant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Gen 22:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Gen 46:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Exo 3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>1Sa 3:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My God</td>
<td>Psa 22:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.2. Things named or addressed two or three times in the Old Covenant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sword</td>
<td>Eze 21:28 – twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth</td>
<td>Jer 22:29 – three times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.3. People and places addressed twice by Jesus in the New Covenant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Mat 23:37, Luke 13:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Luke 10:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Luke 22:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My God</td>
<td>Mat 27:46, Mark 15:34 – see also Psa 22:1 above, which gives a threefold mention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.4. Commands issued two or three times in the Old Covenant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comfort ye, Comfort ye</td>
<td>Isa 40:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awake, Awake</td>
<td>Isa 51:9, Isa 51:17, Isa 52:1 – a threefold occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depart ye, Depart ye</td>
<td>Isa 52:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go through, go through</td>
<td>Isa 62:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast up, cast up</td>
<td>Isa 62:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rase (destroy) it, Rase it</td>
<td>Psa 137:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overturn, overturn, overturn</td>
<td>Eze 21:27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.5. Commands issued twice in the New Covenant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Away with Him! Away with Him!</td>
<td>John 19:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.6. Words repeated two or three times in the Old Covenant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace, Peace</td>
<td>1Ch 12:18, Isa 57:19, Jer 6:14, Jer 8:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy, Holy, Holy</td>
<td>Isa 6:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.7. **Words repeated two or three times in the New Covenant**

Verily, Verily numerous times in the Gospels  
Master, Master Luke 8:24  
Holy, Holy, Holy, Rev 4:8 – threefold  
Woe, Woe, Woe Rev 8:13 – threefold  
Is fallen, is fallen Rev 14: 8, Rev 18:2 – double mention  
Alas, alas Rev 18:10, Rev 18:16, Rev 18:19 – threefold mention

D.8. **Other doubles of interest**

Other doubles of interest include:

- **Periods of time that were doubled:**
  - Time, times and half a time
  - 70 years of captivity
  - Double for her sin Isa 40:2
  - Double to her double Rev 18:6

- **Quantities that were doubled:**
  - The same amount of manna was collected on the 6th day, but it doubled when it was prepared for cooking.
Appendix E. Translation: Gal 2:1-10

This appendix contains an extract from a longer paper of translation notes. The books of Galatians, 2 Corinthians and Revelation are difficult to understand in Greek, let alone in English, because of a Figure of Speech called Anacoluthia. Anacoluthia is the change in grammatical sequence of a sentence in mid-sentence. Robertson states it is merely the failure to complete a sentence as intended when it was begun. Such changes in the sentence are common in conversation and public addresses, but they tend to occur in writing only when the writer is in a mentally stirred up state of mind. Hence the reason Paul naturally breaks away from the formal rules of structure of the sentence in the two epistles. However, when such structures occur in ordinary writing, it is not clear whether such changes are intentional or not. On the other hand, we can be sure that when such changes occur in the Bible, they are intentional, because the very jolt caused by the anacoluthon draws attention to the sentence to see what is wrong with it. But was the change intentional on the part of the writer himself? Unlikely, because the Bible does not waste words in such a manner. In Bullinger’s discussion of Anacoluthia he states:

But, in the case of the Scriptures, where the Holy Spirit is the Author, and all is perfect, the figure not only imparts grace, but strength and force to the language, and is intended to catch and fix the attention of the reader. In this case, of course, what is abandoned is not further necessary. It has served its purpose in arresting, and so the argument passes on to that to which the attention is to be given.

Therefore, what we see in the Epistles, Hebrews, Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes is the personality of the writer coming to the fore of the writing, from the tip of the pen, so to speak, whereas all the other books of the Bible contain the somewhat more measured style of books that are written after the fact of the subjects they present. In other words, the Epistles have a far more dynamic and jumbled sentence structure – but underneath it all, the rules of grammar still apply (because that is the only way to make sense of what is written).

There are several types of anacoluthon (singular). The common ones are digression and the suspended subject or object. A digression occurs when a completely separate thought is brought into the middle of a sentence, without any grammatical connection to what has gone before, and then resuming the original thought, but using a different grammatical construction. For example, “I went to see the minister [Accusative case], he really is out of touch with the Bible and should not be working in that field anymore [the anacoluthon], but the minister [Nominative case] said to me …”. The original object is left suspended without completing the original thought, because the discussion resumes using a different sentence structure.

An anacoluthon can also break the flow of the original thought to go into a digression and return to the main theme without completing the initial thought.

Another common interruption to the flow of Paul’s sentences is frequent insertion of parenthetical comments in the middle of sentences. These can occur as complete clauses, or a single participle. In Gal 2:5, there are several parentheses followed in verse 6 by an anacoluthon, followed by additional parentheses in the subsequent verses. These structures make verses 5-10 difficult to place in correct sequence in English, but somewhat easier in the Greek because it is an inflected language (meaning the spelling of the words changes according to their grammatical function in the sentence). However, it still requires paying strict attention to the grammar of each word – which is the literary equivalent of listening very carefully to someone who is speaking and jumping from topic to topic, but always going in the same direction.
It is also important to recognise that Gal 2:1-10 must be read in conjunction with Acts 15:1-29 which provides the wider background to the detail presented in Gal 2:1-10. For example, it is only through such comparison that it becomes clear that all of the Apostles, together with Barnabas and Titus were arguing the case against the Pharisees who, while professing belief in Jesus on the one hand, sought to have all converts to this new way circumcised in accordance with the added (ceremonial) law of the Levites. As the anti-Paul hypothesis has failed to make such a connection and has also failed to understand the structure of what is written in the Greek text, it has made several erroneous assertions about what Paul wrote to the Galatians.

The erroneous assertions attached to this passage are not limited to the anti-Paul hypothesis. The typical commentator views are that Paul was not one of the twelve apostles and that Paul was at loggerheads with the Apostles at Jerusalem. For example, the commentators assume that the only group in view in Gal 2:1-10 is the “Apostles” and that Paul’s comments in verse 6 are disparaging of the “Apostles” in Jerusalem. However, Ellicott (C) states in the Excursus on Notes to Galatians:

> In one respect the narrative of St. Paul is strikingly supplemented by that of St. Luke. It tells who were the “false brethren unawares brought in.” They were “certain of the sect of Pharisees which believed”, that is, Pharisees who called themselves Christians, though without forsaking their peculiar tenets, and wishing to impose them on the Church. The true opposition to St. Paul came from these. Both in the Epistles and in the work of the historian it is they who are put forward prominently. And it is a gross exaggeration, nay, a distortion of the facts, to represent the opposition as proceeding from the Judean Apostles. These appear rather as mediators, standing by birth and antecedents upon the one side, but yielding to the reasonableness of the case so far as to make large concessions on the other.

While these comments address one aspect of the various arguments, it continues to compound other erroneous assertions – and it will always be so when reading or listening to religious based views of the Bible. Perhaps the corrected translation notes can undo some of the damage that has arisen in association with these particular views.

The translation of these 10 verses shows how preconceived ideas lead to a distorted translation – that Paul was not an “Apostle” and that the “Apostles” in Jerusalem were opposed to Paul’s teaching. The corrected translation presents a different story. It is easy to see the drift of this corrected translation in the AV text, but only if you make allowances for the incorrect connections between the clauses that the AV presents, (which are somewhat independent of the grammar itself). The translators had to alter the natural connections presented by the parsing and the Figures of Speech because they clashed with their preconceptions.

The corrected translation is presented on the next page and uses indents to offset the parenthetical statements and digressions. The “straight line” or “uncomplicated” part of what Paul wrote is seen by reading only the lines that start at the left side of the page.

The remainder of the paper, following the translation, provides translation notes for the words tagged with the white-on-black numbers. The numbers correspond to rows in the table following the translation.
1. After that, through to 14 years (after my appointment) I go up to Jerusalem, with Barnabas, also taking Titus with me.

2. (Note that I go up (because of) a down-to-me revelation.) And so I myself set forth to them (people in Jerusalem) The good news that I am proclaiming among The nations (of Dispersed Israel) but down through private (meeting) to The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea) so that in no way I may be running into an empty (purpose) (that is, I may not be supporting a lost cause (on this present occasion)) or (that in no way) I run (into an empty (purpose), [or, I support an empty/lost cause at any time].

3. BUT not even Titus, the (man) with me, being Greek, is compelled to be circumcised.

4. On the other hand, (Titus is compelled to be circumcised) because of The surreptitiously introduced false kinsmen of the same womb who slip in to spy on The freedom (from the added Law), belonging to us, which we have via an anointed Jesus, in order to make us subservient (to the added Law).

5. To whom we yield not even towards an hour to The submission (required of us) in order that The truth may continue (unchanged/undeflected) towards you.

6. But (something) from The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea) is being something (important) ... (words)(that) were in time past of whatever value it (the collection of words offered) is carrying nothing through to me, (as) The God is NOT merely accepting a face belonging to a man (neither am I)) ... for The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea) themselves add nothing to me.

7. BUT on the other side, (The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea)) perceiving I was committed to The good news belonging to The uncircumcision, just as Peter (was committed to The good news) belonging to The circumcision ...

8. (For The (one) working (in) with Peter (entering) into an "apostleship" belonging to The circumcision, works also within me among The nations (of dispersed Israel)).

9. … Then, knowing (absolutely) The grace (which is) The given (grace) to me, James and Cephas (Peter) and John, (The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assembly of Israel) (are) being pillars (of the called out assembly of Israel)) give right (hands) belonging to a partnership to me and to Barnabas, that we (are) among The nations (of dispersed Israel) but they (are) among The circumcision.

10. (They asked) only that we should be remembering The poor (ones (belonging to the called-out assemblies of Judea)) which I make haste to accomplish this same (thing).
E.1. Translation notes on selected words

The phraseology at the end of the verse 2 is quite complex, not the least because it uses a Figure of Speech called an Ellipsis of Repetition. The complexity is also sufficient that most commentators simply ignore it and those that do comment, get it wrong because they did not understand it in the first place. The exception is Vine, who gets it 70% correct in his discussion of the verb run. Fortunately, the same style of wording appears in 1Th 3:5, which is easier to follow (because it does not have an ellipsis) and hence makes it easier to determine the correct expression for verse 2. 1Th 3:5 states in the AV:

\[ \text{lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labour be in vain}. \]

However, the Greek reads:

\[ \text{That in no way The (one) tempting tempts you (successfully) and the labour belonging to us may become/turn into an empty (purpose) [into an empty/lost cause].} \]

Verse 3 shows that no-one to whom Paul had made his presentation required Titus to be circumcised – because there was no ground for such a requirement. Furthermore, Acts 15:24 tells us that the “Apostles” in Jerusalem gave no such commandment to the people who had visited Antioch claiming circumcision was required. So it is clear from Acts 15:24 that there was no difference between Paul and the other “Apostles” on this point. Paul’s critics could easily have figured this out from the English text – if they had done sufficient research.

However, verse 4 moves to a different environment – the wider or more public meeting. We know this to be the case because Acts 15:5,7 tell us that certain members of the Pharisees who had become believers rose up in objection to Paul’s stance and that there was much disputing (or reasoning, depending on which text you read) – the very opposite of what has just been presented in verse 3. It is these Pharisees that are the ones who are identified in verse 4.

---

\[ An \text{ellipsis is a missing word (or words), that is omitted because it is not necessary for the sense of the sentence, but is necessary for the grammar. For example, when we greet someone for the first time in a day, we often say “Morning.” There are one or more words left out of the expression, but everyone knows what it means. An Ellipsis of Repetition tells us the omitted words can be identified from the previous clause that need to be repeated for the whole expression to make grammatical sense.} \]
1. The noun is made up of two words, the noun, *pseudos* and the noun, *adelphos*. *Pseudos* means lie, falsehood. *Adelphos* means kinsman of the same womb. As The Bible expression, *kinsman of the same womb*, is used only of Israelites (as kinsmen of Sarah’s womb), *pseudoadelphos* means false kinsmen of the same womb. If this was used figuratively, it would refer to Israelites who rejected their Israelite heritage. If it was used literally, it would point to those who say they are Israelites, but are not. The Edomites are also kinsmen of Sarah’s womb, because they are the descendants of Jacob’s brother. In this context, the expression false kinsmen of the same womb does not refer to the genetics of those involved, but to the basis of their belief and it embraces Israelites who held the wrong belief. (This is the separate topic of the Abraham ... the father of all that believe versus Jesus’ description of the Pharisees and Saducees as of your father the devil.) We know that this was only a matter of deeply held belief because following Peter’s address to the assembled people in Acts 15, there is record of harmony only – no mention of any division or departure over the matter. This means that through Paul’s private meeting, with all the Elders being of one accord, there was indeed no empty purpose here – the people at the public meeting also accepted the new status at the final summing up. Incidentally, this shows us one of the reasons, if not the primary reason, Paul was chosen to be an “Apostle” and why he was given the revelation to go into Jerusalem. He was the only one of the twelve who was suited to being able to present the case for the abolition of the added Law to the Israelites who had become Pharisees. Even after the three years it took for him to attain the necessary mastery of the truth, he was still not quite able to carry the argument when the pro-circumcision group visited Antioch. However, after that initial encounter he was able to go into Jerusalem and carry the day against the entire Pharisee teaching such that those Israelites who were trained as Pharisees accepted the new circumstances. Therefore, *pseudoadelphos* refers to anyone who is a descendant of Sarah’s womb who does not hold or support the Word of God – this includes Edomites (who are physically indistinguishable from Israelites) and Israelites. However, had the Edomites been present in the assembly, they would have continued to dispute the point with the Apostles and the elders because the Edomites would not, and could not, accept Jesus as the Son of The Living God.

The whole expression, *the surreptitiously introduced false brethren*, further indicates that this took place at the public meeting because in the private meeting with Paul, all of The (ones) counting as (leaders) from the called-out assemblies in Judea would be known to each other, and certainly to the other eleven “Apostles” (if any of them were present), so no false kinsmen of the same womb would have been present in the private meeting.

2. *Eleutheros* means the freedom to go wherever one likes and hence, in this context, to be without restraint or obligation. It is discussing *The freedom (from the added Law)* – not The Law of Deuteronomy. It is unambiguously used of freedom from law, but the mistake of the AV and most religious pundits, is not to comprehend which law. It is the law that was added (Gal 3:19), the ceremonial law of the Levitical ritual. Hence the words *from the added law* are placed in brackets to keep that aspect in mind. (Robertson seems to be the only commentator to recognise this aspect – see his comments at the end of verse 6.)

3. In English we translate the Genitive of Possession using of, but this often hides the full scope of the real meaning of the Genitive. The freedom belongs to those who believe Jesus – no-one else. Hence: belonging to us. Note that in Acts 15:6, when this dispute arose, it was the “Apostles” and elders who came together. Therefore, the *us* refers to the “Apostles” and elders, not just to Paul, Barnabas and Titus. The Greek word translated elder is *presbuteros* and in this context, is used of those with rank and responsibilities and hence includes The (ones) counted as (leaders) from verse 3 – those who were leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea. This freedom from the added Law applied to all of them who had accepted and believed Jesus is The Son of The God and that He can set aside our sins.
4. It is perhaps the most significant clause of these ten verses because it shows that what is remaining unchanged is the truth of the good news – which came from only one source – continues/remains unchanged. The Subjunctive conveys the meaning of the desire that something will occur. That good news is that the basis of acceptance is belief, but the belief itself is testified, demonstrated or proven by works – this is what Jesus taught from the beginning. This is what was so significant about the Centurion who required only that Jesus say the word and his daughter would be healed without the need for a personal visit. This is why Jesus exclaimed that in all (official) Israel He had not found such belief – as demonstrated by the Centurion’s request (his action). The simple proof: how do you demonstrate you believe Jesus – by burning your Bible or reading it? By obeying or disobeying the Mosaic Law? By praising or denigrating God? These are all works, the fruits, by which every person is known. May continue (unchanged)

The remaining verses of this collection are focused on the events at the end of this visit to Jerusalem. It wraps up the discussion concerning the The (ones) counting as (leaders) with Paul saying that he hadn’t personally learnt anything he did not already know from this particular group, but on the other hand, they learnt something for themselves. From then on, it deals only with what took place between Paul and the other “Apostles”. It deals with the cordial nature of their departure, as per Acts 15:22-26. As we shall see, these are complex verses that cover several side topics, including an anacolothon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>This is never the first word in a Greek sentence. This conjunction connects back to Verse 2. Verse 2 covered Paul’s meeting with the The (ones) counting as (leaders). At this point in his narrative, Paul is about to make his concluding remarks concerning these people. It introduces an opening comment identifying the group, and then digresses into a side discussion.</th>
<th>But</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>This is exactly the same construct that occurred in verse 2, but in a different grammatical case. This difference in case is most important in understanding the meaning of this unfinished fragment at the start of the sentence. Belonging to The (ones) counting as (leaders) – however, the belonging to is not required because on this occasion the whole noun phrase is Genitive.</td>
<td>The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies in Judea).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It can be translated being (see the detailed discussion about the linking verb in verse 9). See the discussion for the next word.</td>
<td>Being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Its indefinite nature and neuter gender means it translates as *something* (not *somebody*). Zerwick and Grosvenor (V) translate the expression as *those considered to be something* / *held in high regard*.

There are a number of points to investigate here to determine the meaning of this sentence fragment – which is important because none of the usual commentators or translations appear to have penetrated the grammar of this expression correctly:

1. This structure is a complement but as is quite common in Greek, the copular, *is*, is omitted. See the more detailed discussion of the verb *to be* in verse 9.
2. This word is used in a complement which is a structure by which the statement after the linking verb (*is*) is describing something about the “subject”.
3. In this case, the “subject” appears to be a noun phrase: *The (ones) counting as leaders*. However, this noun phrase is in the Genitive case, which is unusual because a complement always has the same case before the linking verb as after it. Usually the Nominative case is used before and after the linking verb, but the complement can be in the Accusative case if the linking verb is *to be* (*is*), as it is here, and the subject of the linking verb has been given – as it is here.
4. The use of the preposition *from* indicates that the intention is that *all or a part of* something belonging to *The (ones) counting as leaders* is seen to be moving away from them, towards Paul. Logically it can only be a *part of* something, not everything or all of what belongs to them. This means this noun phrase is a Partitive Genitive – it is referring to something which can be measured, quantified or otherwise portioned or subdivided. In this context, this can only be the words, ideas, suggestions or comments belonging to *The (ones) counting as leaders* – that is, *something*, not *somebody*.
5. Robertson (W) states that when the Partitive Genitive is used as a subject, as it is here, the indefinite pronoun can be omitted because it is understood (Acts 21:16 and Luke 11:49). This means the expression should read *But (something) from The (ones) counting as leaders* is *being something*.
6. The sequence of the verb *to be* followed by the indefinite pronoun is seen in Gal 6:3 to carry the meaning *something (important)* and other uses show there is often a need to supply the relevant noun or noun equivalent to make the meaning clear in English. This means the expression should now read *But (something – singular) from The (ones) counting as leaders of the assemblies of Judea* (*is*) *being something (singular) (important)*. This is consistent with Zerwick and Grosvenor’s translation, above. This reasoning is also confirmed by Bullinger (V) who cites the expression as an example of the figure of speech called *Tapeinasis* – where a thing is lessened and then the *same* thing is increased and intensified. Here we have the elliptical *something* increased and intensified to *something (important)*.
7. This means Paul was about to introduce a topic that was related to *The (ones) counting as leaders of the assemblies of Judea* that had an importance in its own right, but then he changed tack.
8. That is where the opening words of this new sentence end. Paul then enters into his digression. When he returns to this topic after the digression, we can see where he was going with this opening expression, but we have no grounds for speculating on what he may have intended to say – the only thing we can be certain about is that the statement at the end of the sentence is consistent with what he started to say at the opening of the sentence.

9. This is the Predicate Nominative of another complement – the verb, *were*, is the linking verb. It is an indefinite adjective of quality and it is making an assertion about the subject of the linking verb (in the same way as the expression *milk is good.*) *Of whatever value.*
This verb does not have a subject in the text and so it has to be provided as an ellipsis. From the list given in item 3 of the discussion of something (important), above, the Greek word logos, is a masculine noun and in the plural refers to the words of reasoned speech. This is certainly what took place during the private meeting with The (ones) counting as (leaders), therefore it is reasonable to infer this is the ellipsis because it agrees with the gender of the adjective in the Predicate Nominative and it is consistent with the intent of the related expression at the end of the verse. The choice of words is also consistent with the fact that the main verb is Middle Voice, they themselves add, see below. Hence the complement reads: (words) (that) were in time past of whatever value.

The subject of this verb is the complement described above. Hence the combination reads, to this point: (words) (that) were in time past of whatever value, it (singular – the collection of words) is carrying nothing through to me. That is, the reasoned arguments The (ones) counting as (leaders) were using, may have been suitable once upon a time, but not so now (in the light of what Paul gave them – which is the topic of verse 8 and 9).

LambanO means to merely receive as a self-promoted action, without necessarily signifying a favourable reception. By contrast, dechomai means to accept by deliberate and ready reception of what is offered. This verb and prosOpon (face, above) are combined in nouns that mean respect of persons and respecter of persons and a verb that means to have respect of persons. LambanO is combined with a number of prepositions to give para-lambano, ana-lambano, apo-lambano, pros-lambano, meta-lambano and hupo-lambano. These all show deeper involvement in the process of accepting something than is the case with lambanO on its own.

The whole expression thus reads: The God is NOT merely accepting a face belonging to a man – that is, title, authority etc, do not count in assessing the worth of what a man has to offer – which applied in the context of this verse highlights that the whole clause is a parenthesis within the digression.

The citation itself is either from Luke’s words (which he may have mentioned to Paul, at some point during their discussions, irrespective of whether they had been written down or not at that point in time – note that it is the form of Luke’s words that are used, not the form that is presented in the equivalent verse in Matthew) or as a statement in its own right coming out of Paul’s own study and understanding of the OT books and/or from Jesus. Ellicott states there are no shortage of examples of this stance of Jesus given in John’s gospel. So, by whichever way the idea came to Paul, it is presented here as the principle behind Paul’s statement – that is, that just because the words or reasoned speeches made in the private meeting with The (ones) counting as (leaders) were made by The (ones) counting as (leaders), it does not automatically make those words correct or even usable by others. It is a mistake to apply this clause as a direct indictment of anyone mentioned in these verses – such a mistake is made only because the translators have not understood the context of these verses.
13 This is a compound verb made up of *pros* (to) and *tithemi* (to put), hence, to put to, to add or to place beside. There is a further compound of this verb, *pros-ana-tithemi* (to lay upon in addition). *Prostithemi* is precisely the word that is used in Gal 3:19: *Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added* (prostithemi) *because of transgressions*. Thus however we choose to translate and interpret this verb in this verse 6, the same must be applied to its use in Gal 3:19. Why do the translators and commentators not see this connection? (Vine [AG] has a long comment under the heading *add* on the use of *prostithemi* and the added law that is well worth a read for those who do not yet understand the point and purpose of the ceremonial law.)

This verb is in the Middle voice, which means it is the subjects themselves that are doing the adding – *they themselves add* – which conclusively underscores that it is the words of these people that is the focus of all this discussion, not the people who uttered the words. It is highlighting the fact that although *The (ones) counting as (leaders)* had the essential understanding of everything associated with Jesus having been and gone with respect to Israel, they did not know anything beyond that. Hence they did not say anything to cause Paul to say “I did not know that” or similar.

This restatement of the opening topic of the sentence, by introducing the words *added nothing*, shows that Paul was making it clear that it was the lack of anything new that made the words of *The (ones) counting as (leaders)* of no importance to him. It is the same as if we were to hear a minister of the church give a sermon on Jesus’ death and resurrection – we would say afterwards that he had said *nothing of importance to us* – which does not mean the words were not of value to others in the congregation who may have been hearing such statements for the first time. That is, Paul was not belittling *The (ones) counting as (leaders)* or what it is they themselves had to say, but rather that it was of no value to him personally, because they did not add anything to his knowledge.

From this point, the remaining verses summarise the outcome, using various conjunctions, in the following manner (which is explained in detail in the remaining notes):

- But, on the other hand, *The (ones) counting as (leaders)* seeing … Verse 7 and 8
- And knowing … verse 9
- James, Peter and John … verse 10.

14 This is a compound word, consisting of the Definite Article and an Adverb. It is formed as a single word by what is known as *crasis*, which is where the vowel of the first word is merged with the vowel of the next word. Hence, as two words it is *to enantion*, but is written in normal text as *tounantion*. If it were treated as two words, the form of the Definite Article means it could be Nominative or Accusative, and *enantion*, is an adjective, meaning *opposite to, over against, contrary*. Hence the general meaning of the combined word is *on the contrary, on the other hand*.

The point and purpose of the word, which is used adverbially to modify the next word, the participle, *seeing*, is to show that while on the one hand, *The (ones) counting as (leaders)* did not add to Paul’s knowledge, they did gain from the private and public meetings with Paul, which is what Paul is now about to summarise.

The commentators typically want to link the conjunction and the adverb to the clause describing the actions of the three “Apostles”, James, Peter and John, to show they were the ones who finally understand Paul. But this is nonsense – the “Apostles” already knew Paul from his first visit, which included the testimony of Barnabas. Paul and Barnabas were with the “Apostles” for 15 days during that first visit (Gal 1:18), but due to the poor translation of Gal 1:19, the common view is that none of the Apostles other than Peter (and the erroneously imputed James, the brother of Jesus) knew Paul at all. (Gal 1:19 reads, in the Greek text, *different from (other than)* The “apostles” *I saw not (anyone) except James The brother of The Lord.*
This is a verbal adjective that is qualifying an understood substantive, which in this case is *The (ones) counting as (leaders)* who were the subject of the discussion in the preceding verse. This is the same root verb as we find in John 3:3: *unless a man is begotten from above, he is not able to perceive The kingdom belonging to The God.* Hence, perceiving (in the mind’s eye).

This participle leads the reader to expect a conclusion to what is being said, but instead we find the thought is not completed because verse 8 is an anacoluthon.

This verb fundamentally means *to believe*, and *to be persuaded of* and hence to place confidence in, to trust in the sense of reliance upon, not mere credence. Hence, in the Active voice, *I was committed.*

The AV’s “to me” is not in the text or in the meaning of the verb. The AV gives the impression that there was one gospel for the circumcision and a different one for the uncircumcision, but this is not the case. There is only one *good news* for both groups – but the uncircumcision had more to learn, as it were, because of their long history away from a society based on the Law of Moses and their overexposure to the Intellectualism of the Greeks.

This verse is telling us that, prior to this meeting, *The (ones) counting as (leaders)* had never met Paul, but knew him by reputation, both as a persecutor and of his work since his conversion. This is consistent with Gal 1:21,22: *Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia; And was unknown by face unto The called-out assemblies, The (assemblies) belonging to Judea, The (assemblies) in an anointed (people).* However, after listening to Paul in their private meeting and then witnessing the events of the public meeting, these leaders perceived in their own minds that Paul was indeed an “Apostle” who was committed to his work, just as Peter was committed to his work. Verse 8 is a parenthesis explaining why Paul and Peter had such strong commitment to their respective groups of Israelites.

The Accusative is the case of motion towards (without necessarily attaining the actual end point) and the preposition *eis*, means *into*, hence, in this particular context, *entering into* brings both meanings to the fore which is necessary to make sense of the following two words. That is, the purpose of the collaborative work is to build or establish what follows in the remainder of the phrase. Hence *(entering) into*, which uses the parenthesis to show the word is not a participle in the Greek, but conveying the most appropriate meaning of the preposition for the context.

Note that the Greek text does not have the Definite Article that has been inserted in the AV text. Hence, *an “apostleship”*. The absence of the Definite Article shows that Peter’s “apostleship” is just one of the “apostleships” not the one and only “apostleship”.

This verb is formed ultimately from the combination of the preposition, *en* (in), and noun, *ergon*, (work). Hence, *works in*. The Aorist is the Indefinite tense, not the Past tense, and is used for statements of truths and narrative. In this case it is stating the fact that Jesus worked in Paul and Peter before the epistle had been written, He was working in them as the epistle was written and He will be working in them after the epistle was written. We see the same wording in John 3:16 (*for God so loves ...*). It is important to remember that tense in the Greek text is always from the perspective of the speaker and what he is presenting – especially in the epistles. Hence, *works (in)*, with the parenthesis being added or not as required to make the translation readable with the next word in sequence.

The Dative is the case of location and hence *within* conveys the association of The Spirit working with the indwelling spirit, that is, *within me*.

The Accusative is the case of motion towards (without necessarily attaining the actual end point) and the preposition *eis*, means *into*. When it is used in association with a group rather than a single entity, it means *among* the group.
| 23 | The Greek word, *ethnos*, means nations; nothing more and nothing less. Combined with the Definite Article, it means *The nations (of Israel)* in virtually every instance, but needs to be further qualified as *The nations (of dispersed Israel)* according to context, to distinguish it from all the nations of Israel which can include the dispersed nations and the Judean nation, depending on which period of history is under discussion. The closing parenthesis matches the opening parenthesis at the start of the verse, because this whole verse is an anacoluthon. |
| 24 | This participle is Nominative because it introduces an adjectival phrase that is modifying a plural noun which is the subject of the verb, *ginosko* (which means *to know by experience and observation*). *Ginosko* is in direct contrast with the verb *oraO*, (*to perceive with the mind’s eye*) which described what happened in association with *The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea)*, in verse 7, so this participle is not modifying any noun, understood or otherwise, associated with that group. As a result of Paul’s 15 days with Peter and the other “Apostles” at virtually the beginning of his work, and as a result of hearing about his progress through the years, it is only the Apostles themselves who could know by experience and observation that Paul was indeed a genuine “Apostle”. Hence this participle is qualifying the three “Apostles” names, James, Cephas and John and it refers to them knowing (absolutely). This participle also provides another precise indicator of the full knowledge that all the “Apostles” had of each other’s standing and position, from the time of Paul’s first visit to Jerusalem onwards. |
| 25 | This is precisely the same expression used three times in the previous verses, and it means precisely the same thing: *The (ones) counting as (leaders)* but with two important differences:
   1. The grammar of the Definite Article states that the Definite Article points to, among other things, that which has been recently mentioned. In verse 2 we saw *The (ones)* defined by the context of the verse as *The (ones) counting as (leaders of the called-out assemblies of Judea)*. However, in this verse, three specific Apostles have been named. As will be shown in the discussion of the next word, *pillars*, the Apostles were responsible for the called out assembly (singular) of all Israel. Hence, while the expression has the same general meaning as in verses 2, 6 and 7, it now refers to three particular Apostles who are counted as (leaders of the called out assembly of Israel).
   2. To underscore precisely which type or kind of leaders Paul is discussing, this pair of words forms the subject of a grammatical complement. Despite all the other words that have marked the difference between these three men and the group discussed earlier, the complement is provided so that there can be no lingering doubts about the distinctions. These words are Nominative because they are the subject of the complement. |
| 26 | This is the verb, *to be*, and it is used as a verb and can be translated as *being*. The linking verb for this complement is, *are*, which is understood – it is plural because there are three “Apostles” in the subject. The following notes (which are almost a paper in themselves) give a reasonably full explanation of this complex complement:
   1. The Infinitive is the verbal noun, whereas the participle is the verbal adjective. The sign of the infinitive is “to <verb>” but the “to”, or the verb, can be omitted in various constructions (neither of which apply in this case). The “to” part of the construct reflects its origin as the Dative case of a noun, but came to be used as an Accusative and Nominative, etc. |
2. The infinitive is used to identify an action happening at some time not defined, without regard to its continuance or frequency. The infinitive is not declined, therefore, although it functions as a verb and a noun, its role in the sentence is actually determined by the other words in the sentence. Typically the infinitive does not have a literal subject, but can be the subject (to see is to believe) or the object (the wish to live) of a sentence and it can also function as an adjective (it is human to err) or an adverb (it is a pleasure to see you).

3. When the infinitive is being used as a noun, the Definite Article is inserted before it to show its grammatical case (this is one of two occasions when the Definite Article is not translated – the other is when the Definite Article is inserted before a Proper noun to show its role/grammatical case in the sentence). As a verbal noun, it can be translated as a participle when it is conveying the condition of its subject.

4. When the infinitive is used as a verb, it has a subject (more or less defined, expressed or implied) and it takes the adverbial or objective limitations appropriate to the verb.

5. As the sole purpose of a complement is to provide additional information about the subject, it is equally as appropriate to translate the to be infinitive in a complement as a participle in English.

6. When an articular infinitive is used with a preposition, it expresses an adverbial relation, the precise nature of which is determined by the preposition.

7. In Greek, the subject of an infinitive is in the Accusative (unless it denotes the same person as the subject of a verb of saying or thinking).

So, in this verse, we have seen that the names of James, Cephas and John, The (leaders), the participle and the noun, pillars, are all Nominative. This means that somewhere in here we are dealing with a complement. But more importantly, and this is the clue to unravelling this verse, the complement is a parenthetical comment. It praises the work/roles of James, Cephas and John. We will examine it point by point so we can see why it is so easily overlooked.

If the translator does not recognise this is a complement, the infinitive is treated as the only verb in this clause, which is incorrect. The conjugation of every verb has infinitive and participle forms. In the case of the verb “to be”, the inflections are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>I am</td>
<td>We are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>You are</td>
<td>You are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>He/she/it is</td>
<td>They are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence in the AV translation of this verse the infinitive, to be, is used as a verb. However, the missing linking verb is, are, (because there are three names involved). As Robertson points out, the verb, to be, is the most common ellipses. He states the absence of the linking verb is not an ellipsis as such, but the remnant of a primitive idiom, since primitive tongues could do without the copula (the linking verb). He states further that the copula may be absent from any kind of sentence which is free from ambiguity. Consequently, the translation of this digression reads:

The (ones) counting as (leaders) (are) being pillars.

The only difference between this complement and the one in verse 6 is that this one has the more common structure of having a Nominative case before and after the linking verb. The complex structure in verse 6 serves to highlight the anacoluthon, whereas this simpler structure is generally better suited to a parenthetical comment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Page 97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>This is Nominative because it is the complement of the expression (in grammatical complements, the nouns usually have the same case before and after the linking verb). This word means a <em>column supporting the weight of a building</em>, which is perfectly apt considering all the “Apostles” were in the process of carrying out Jesus’ intention of <em>building My called-out assembly</em> (singular – that is, the called-out assembly of all Israel). Hence the complement is identifying these three “Apostles” as mainstays of that task. As the complement is figurative, it is also reasonable to say that the statement applies to all the “Apostles” equally, because Jesus did not give any of the “Apostles” any ranking when He appointed them (and confirmed in John’s vision in Revelation). However, it is also equally reasonable to state that these three had risen to be the first three among equals on the basis of their individual personalities. In either case, while it makes no fundamental difference to the meaning of the verse or to the relationships between all the “Apostles”, Paul singles out these three Apostles to praise their work in building the called out assembly of Israel. Hence, <em>pillars</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>This is Genitive because it identifies the source or origin of the action of <em>giving right (hands)</em>. It means <em>fellowship, association, communion, sharing in common</em>. Also, the meaning of <em>society, brotherhood</em> as a closely knit majority, naturally belonging together; <em>participation (in anything), sharing</em>. Dunbar (AB), <em>participation or partaking, confederacy, alliance, social intercourse</em>. Cremer (AC) states the mode in which the fellowship appears is determined by the context … but always denotes a relation which, between persons, is based on Christian unity. Hence Zerwick and Grosvenor (V) give <em>agreement</em>. Of these meanings, partnership appears to be the most appropriate because this meeting in Jerusalem clearly involved some strategic planning – the private meeting, followed by the public meeting, the summary statements and the communiqué to Antioch at the end. Hence, <em>belonging to a partnership</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>This introduces three adverbial clauses (two here and one in the next verse) that modify the verb, <em>give</em>, which are, in effect, statements that summarise their working relationship. Hence, <em>in order that, that</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>This pair of words are Accusative because they are the direct object of the understood verb, <em>to be</em>. <em>Ta ethne</em>: this is the same word pair as discussed at the end of verse 8, above. This is a perfect example of the AV translators using a word (<em>heathen</em>) that suits <em>their religious preconception</em>, rather than one that is correct for the underlying Greek word. This is also a first class example of why you need to read Paul’s books using an interlinear Greek text. Within the space of couple of dozen words, the Greek noun, <em>ethnos</em>, has been translated <em>Gentiles</em> and <em>heathen</em>. This is not the correct way to translate any language, let alone Scripture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>This conjunction introduces the second adverbial clause that modifies the verb, <em>give</em>. It presents an opposite, but not opposing, condition, hence, in this context, <em>but</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>This is the neuter form of the word and hence is used as an adverb. The word means <em>only or alone</em>, indicating that only one thing was specifically agreed or committed. This whole verse is the third clause that expresses the nature of the partnership in verse 9. Nicoll (AB) states that a verb needs to be supplied from the expression <em>give right (hands)</em> to express this pledge from Paul and Barnabas (which is why the verb is added in the AV, even though it is not in the Greek text). This arises because the first two statements are setting forth the general areas in which the two groups will do their respective work, but this verse deals with a specific commitment to do something. Hence, <em>(they asked/requested) only</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>This word usually appears at the start of the clause it introduces, but when it does not, it is for the explicit purpose of emphasising the words that have preceded it. This is the third clause that modifies the verb <em>give</em>, in verse 9. Hence, <em>in order that, that</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This word typically means *one who crouches and cowers* and is used as a noun of beggars. In the broad sense it means *poor* in the sense of identifying the group or category of people. It is also used figuratively of those in special need of God’s help – the lowly, poor – the poor in spirit of Mat 5:3.

Nicolll states the expression refers not to the poor in Asia, but to the chronically poor in Judea: *(it) lays stress upon the poor being the central object of the appeal. Judea suffered often from famine in the apostolic times, and Christians were probably the worst sufferers owing to religious ill-will and social persecution. This passage implies chronic poverty. So also does the history of the Pauline contribution, which was not an effort to meet a special emergency, for it took more than a year to collect, but a fund organised to meet a permanent demand for systematic help.* This makes perfect sense because Jesus had already taught them that the poor are with you always. The Gospels and Acts record instances of people selling all that they had and giving it to the poor, so all the “Apostles” were well aware of the needs of the poor and did not need any reminding to keep it at the centre of their attention. Hence this statement is used in the same manner in 2Ti 2:8 where Paul is not telling Timothy to remember that Jesus rose from the dead, but rather, that Timothy keep in mind the person of Jesus. So here Paul and Barnabas are requested to remember the poor of the Judean called-out assemblies.

Ellicott also states this expression refers to the poor in Judea and Jerusalem and that Acts 11:29,30 showed that Paul had already been a conduit for bringing contributions from the wealthier churches (called-out assemblies) of Antioch to Jerusalem. This view is also consistent with Rom 15:25,26. Once again we see the complete misapprehension of the anti-Paul hypothesis in ascribing this requirement for action as applying to Paul’s everyday care for people in Asia.

The typical test of the Accusative is to ask, “who or what” after the verb – hence, *we should remember who or what?* The answer is *The poor*. It is not uncommon in Greek to find that other cases are sometimes used to express what is in fact the direct object of the verb – but, according to the grammars (for example, Winer (AA), Knoch (AE)), only when the other case captures the precise purpose better than an Accusative. However, this apparent open-ended statement might suit the grammars, but it does not suit the Bible, as such. While it may be grammatically acceptable for such changes to occur, when they do occur in the Biblical text it is for the explicit purpose of catching our attention. This has already happened at one level in this verse – by putting these two words before the usual conjunction, *ina,* (see next word), to emphasise them by position. Then they are further emphasised by being presented in the Genitive, rather than the usual Accusative case. This double emphasis provides sufficient evidence that this is not merely a matter concerning the day-to-day poor in the course of Paul’s work.

As the Genitive is the case of source and origin, it is bringing to our attention that the poor in this instance are a subpart of the larger group that constitutes the called-out assemblies of Judea, either individually or in toto. Furthermore, as the word is an adjective, we need to supply the implied noun, which in this instance, should be indicative of these people being part of a whole. Hence, *The poor (ones (belonging to the called-out assemblies of Judea)).*
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