

.

# The Paul Paper

Copyright © 2019 by .

*First edition*

*This book was professionally typeset on Reedsy.*

*Find out more at [reedsy.com](https://reedsy.com)*

## Preface

This paper has been written for you, the members of the council for Parable of the Vineyard and Christian Truthers, to examine the evidences in favor of, and against Paul, in an effort to let each determine according to his own discernment whether or not Paul's writings are divinely authoritative. I have done much research on the subject and humbly subject to you the compilation of my research. My goal throughout this study has been singular: to ascertain the truth about Paul, through careful study of scripture, history, and logic. I have (as far as I am aware) no personal bias in the outcome of this inquiry, and have sought to conduct this study from a completely neutral position. In fact, at the outset, I honestly would've preferred to find Paul's writings to be divinely inspired, as then we would require far less theological adjustment to our beliefs, as well as avoid the inevitable cries of heresy from those who are unwilling to look into these matters. With that in mind, after much research, prayer, and thought, I have concluded that Paul is a false apostle, and his writings should not be considered scripture or divinely inspired. I am still open however to being proven wrong.

That being said, I want to make the statement that I do believe Paul gets many things right, and has at times valuable insights into truth. However, after my research, I am currently unwilling to base any doctrine off of Paul's writings that is not echoed elsewhere in the scripture, due to the questionable nature I have found of Paul himself.

This includes many doctrines we have held, and while this research has taken much time, I fear the larger task will be adjusting theologically to a faith post-Paul if we all conclude that Paul is a false apostle. That however is something I believe we must confront and explore together, with prayer, and much discussion. For my part, throughout this letter I will merely be conveying to you my findings through the research I have done on the subject, and allowing you, the reader, to decide for yourself how to treat Paul's letters. Whether you agree with my assessment, or not, the information is here to stand for itself.

To begin with, I will offer all the arguments in favor of Paul that I have come across. Many of these arguments have come from reading articles on the defense of Paul, from many allegedly reputable sources, and others come from noticing things within scripture on my own. I list these arguments, and dismantle them as I believe they are insufficient as a defense. Thereafter I list the arguments against Paul. I want to make it clear now; I am open to correction, I am open to being proven wrong, and if anyone feels anything presented here is unscriptural, illogical, or misrepresented, I will be happy to discuss it with you and a few other brothers to ascertain the truth. This is not a finished work, and I am open to altering the paper to better reflect the truth if we find that I have made any errors. Some have also expressed interest in doing videos or writings pertaining to the subject of Paul. This paper, and I myself, am fully at your disposal should you choose to use any argument from this paper. Feel free to use this paper however the members of the council see fit.

I

Arguments In Favor Of Paul



## Paul's Inclusion in the Bible

The first argument I have seen in favor of Paul is that his inclusion in the canonical Bible is proof that he should be, because Yah would not allow something false to be in the Bible. The issues with this theory are the following. First:

*Proverbs 25:2 - It is the glory of God to conceal a matter,  
But the glory of kings is to search out a matter.*

*Second, we know that Yahusha actually ended up appearing as a stumbling block to Israel as it was written*

*Isaiah 8:13-14 - 13 The Lord of hosts, Him you shall hallow; Let Him be your fear, And let Him be your dread. 14 He will be as a sanctuary, But a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense To both the houses of Israel, As a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. 15 And many among them shall stumble; They shall fall and be broken, Be snared and taken."*

Remember that Yahusha first of all, appeared to be born out of

fornication, as she was betrothed to Joseph, but not yet married to him, and was made pregnant by the spirit. The pharisees try to use this against Him in John 8:41. Further, he came out of Nazareth, which apparently was not a great place as is denoted by John 1:46. Point being, Yahusha did not come the way they expected the savior to come, it was only to those who were seeking and searching for Him that found Him.

Yah does this both as denoted by Proverbs above, and also to test us. It is completely possible that He allowed error to be mixed in with the truth of His word, as a test to see if in spite of Paul's writings, they would seek to obey His commandments. Essentially, with the inclusion of Paul, there is sufficient writing to have similitude of excuse to abandon the law of Yah, but also sufficient verses to justify the grounds to obey the commands. Only those who truly love Him will obey His commandments and overcome the test. Also, concealing the true nature of Paul, it is glory to Yah, and an honor for us to uncover the truth of Paul if indeed he is a false apostle.

Lastly, the Bible is not something that has been around for very long. The scriptures were kept as scrolls in the collection of men. It wasn't until a little before the advent of the Roman Catholic church that people began to compile these writings into the format of singular book. That being said, our current Bible was compiled primarily by the Catholic church, who frankly, are absolutely evil. To say that our Bible couldn't possibly have any errors whatsoever is the stance of someone who has never studied it out. Mistranslations of the word Sabbaton to week, removing the name of Yah and replacing it with the title of "The Lord" and others are issues many are already aware of. Therefore it is no stretch of the imagination to think that the Bible may contain even larger errors within it, such as the inclusion of Paul's writings. This isn't to undermine our confidence in scripture, but merely to present

## PAUL'S INCLUSION IN THE BIBLE

to us the responsibility to ascertain the truth in these matters and be diligent in studying the Word.

## Paul's Verification as Scripture in 2nd Peter

Another primary argument people use to justify Paul's inclusion as scripture is a verse found in 2nd Peter, that identifies Paul's writings as scripture (2nd Peter 3:16). This is not however conclusive evidence. As with the other things here, we will delve deeper into this later in this paper, but 2nd Peter has several issues that make it very doubtful that it was even written by Peter. Nearly all scholars who study this out and weigh the evidence agree that this book is likely pseudepigraphal, that is, written by someone impersonating another, in this case Peter. During the time of the reformation, Luther considered it to be second class scripture, Erasmus completely rejected the letter, and Calvin was very hesitant to use it as a platform of biblical authority. The point here is that using one verse that kind of appears to point to Paul's writings as being scripture, from a book nearly all scholars agree is pseudepigraphal, is not conclusive evidence to include Paul's writings as scripture.

Now there are those who make excuses for 2nd Peter's evidences against it's authenticity, but their primary reasons are trying to explain away evidence, as I will expound upon later, but also that there seems to be nothing in the book that contradicts the rest of scripture, and doesn't

appear to have a specific nefarious motive. I however disagree, as this letter is the only one that suggests Paul's letters are on par with scripture, and if Paul is in fact a false apostle, then that would be all the nefarious motive needed.

## Paul's Call to Apostleship

We will go over this much more extensively in a while, from multiple aspects, but one of the arguments that people use to include Paul's writings as scripture is his apostleship. The issues with this are: Firstly, Paul and his traveling companion Luke, who was himself not an apostle and in fact never met Yahusha, are the only ones who ever identified Paul as an apostle. 22 times in the New testament Paul is referred to as an apostle. 20 of those times he proclaimed himself as such, and only twice, his personal traveling companion, referred to him as such. Secondly, Paul did not even fit the criteria set forth in Acts 1 as a suitable candidate to be called an apostle. Again, we will dive into these at length later on.

## Paul's Persecution

Another reason people offer as to why Paul should be considered an authentic apostle is the persecution he was willing to endure to carry his message. The answer to this is simple: persecution is not always unjust, and just because one is willing to endure it, does not make them right. On the first point, divine judgement and justice can often be perceived as persecution. If a man steals, and then goes to jail, he can think and claim and convince himself, and possibly even others, that he is just being persecuted for his faith. In reality, he is just bearing the penalty for his actions. To the 2nd point, zealousness and endurance of hardship is found in every religion. The Muslims blow themselves up and give their lives for their beliefs. The Catholics have had many martyrs that taught heresies. The Mormons traveled a long distance, endured much hardship, and lost many lives on their trek to find a land they wouldn't be thrown out of. The point with all this is that just because one is willing to endure hardships and persecution for their beliefs sake, it does not make their beliefs true.

## Paul's Ecclesiastical Impact

Another argument people make in favor of Paul is that it is attributed to him, that he began many churches, and that he was instrumental in the formation of the church. This is not really supported by scripture. We know Paul wrote to and visited many existing churches, but it does not explicitly tell us that he himself started these churches. Further, even if he did, it does not necessarily mean they were pure churches. We know at the time after Christ there were many heresies being spread including Marcionism, Gnosticism, and others. The men teaching these things also started churches I'm sure, but once again, these were not pure. Therefore having an impact on the church during his life is not evidence that the impact was good. Further, as far as his impact on the modern church goes, and again we will explore this more later, it isn't necessarily good fruit. Therefore we cannot use this as an argument in favor of Paul.

## 6

# Paul's Knowledge of Scripture

Paul's knowledge of scripture is also frequently cited as a reason to believe everything he says. We know he was a student of Gamaliel, and therefore (according to some historians), had to have the scriptures completely memorized. This meant he had tremendous knowledge of the scriptures, and frequently in his writings quoted scripture. This however does not act as a defense for Paul. The reason for this is that Satan also knows the scripture better than you and I even. When Yahusha went out into the wilderness, Satan tempted Yahusha at least 2 of the times using scripture. Knowledge of the scripture is no more a defense for Paul than it can be a defense for Satan. Another interesting note is that there is record of an atheist within modern times who allegedly memorized the entire Bible, cover to cover, and could quote back any portion of it he wanted to. Even with his memorization of all the books of the Bible, he was still an atheist. Therefore for the aforementioned scripture, as well as basic logic, we cannot use this as a defense for Paul.

## Paul's Miracles

Another evidence people cite as to the authenticity of the apostleship of Paul is the signs and miracles he worked. If Paul did miracles, and had the holy spirit, it stands to reason that the holy spirit would not empower him unless he were an authentic apostle or at least truly born again. This argument too however, falls flat. First of all, we know that not all signs and wonders come from Yah. In **Dueteronomy 13**, we are told to watch out for prophets who can predict the future and show signs and wonders. In **Exodus 7**, we are told that the sorcerers that pharaoh had were able to duplicate the first two signs that Moses and Aaron were given, turning Aaron's staff into a snake, and turning the water in the river into blood. In **Revelation 13** we are told explicitly that the false prophet will be able to do great signs and wonders that will deceive many. All of this is evidence that miracles are not always of the power of Yah. Many spirits can perform miracles that are not of Yah. We explore this topic more later as well. My point with all of this however, is that you cannot use this as an evidence in favor of Paul.

## Luke's Witness of Paul

Another defense people offer for Paul is that the writer of Acts bears witness of Paul as an apostle, filled with the holy spirit, and working miracles. The author of Acts of course being the same author of the gospel of Luke, Luke the physician. The issue with this defense is that Luke does not actually have the authority to make the call whether or not Paul was legitimate or not. Luke was not a disciple of Yahusha himself, contrary to popular belief. In fact, Luke never even met Yahusha. He was merely a Greek historian, who was interested in learning of and relaying the events surrounding the life of Christ, and the early ecclesia.

Just to quickly list the original 12, we have Peter, James, John, Andrew, Phillip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James, Thaddeus (who was also called Judas), Simon, and Judas Iscariot, who according to Acts 1, was replaced by Matthias. Note that Luke, and also Mark, two of the authors of the 4 canonical gospels, were not actually apostles at all. It is believed that Luke gathered his information for the relaying of his gospel from word of mouth from those who had been in Jerusalem during that time. As for Mark, it is believed that Peter had recounted to him his memories regarding the life of Yahusha, and Mark recorded

them.

The point with all of that is that Luke was not an apostle, or a figure of prominence within the ecclesia, and therefore lacked the definitive authority to declare Paul to be a true follower of Yah and a true apostle. To the contrary, and again, we will explore this later on, there is rather a large amount of evidence that the actual apostles rejected Paul, and admonished others to do the same. Further, we are able to judge whether a person is truly born again by their fruit, and as we will explore later, Paul's fruit was not necessarily as good as people make it out to be. That being said, Luke was a historian, and thus I read his writings in the same way I would read Josephus, good for history, but not infallible, and not impervious to an improper perspective of events.

## Paul's Platform to Speak

Another evidence people could cite, in defense of Paul (though I have not heard them do it but found it in my own research) is that Paul according to Acts 15 was given a platform on which to speak at the Jerusalem council. This one is a bit more difficult to argue with, and I am not fully sure what to do with it, but I will offer two points for your consideration. First of all, we know that the Jerusalem council was called rather early on in Paul's ministry, so it could have been that he had, for a time, convinced the apostles and those at Jerusalem that he was indeed a minister of Christ, but thereafter was rejected. This however has not been proven, and is only speculative. The other thing to consider is this: this chapter is the same chapter people use to claim Torah is a burden as it appears during this council, when trying to decide what to do with new gentile converts, that Peter declares the Torah to be a burden that they nor their fathers could bear. This thought contradicts other scriptures such as Moses claiming the law was not too hard for the people to bear, as well as David and others continuously praising the Torah.

Some have explained this statement away as referring to the extra laws

added on by the pharisees, but logically speaking, they would have likely rejected these man-made laws due to Yahusha constantly breaking their man made laws, and teaching against them. Therefore this is not a logical conclusion. That being said, if then the only logical conclusion was that this chapter claims Peter called the law an unbearable burden, as it contradicts scripture elsewhere, I cannot really trust this chapter to be an accurate account of the council at Jerusalem. This evidence remains to be one of the more difficult ones to explain, but I leave this up to the consideration of the reader.

## Paul's Declarations of Authority

The last (and sadly), most common argument I have seen as I have read articles of why Paul's letters should be included in scripture is because Paul said so. There is an article on Blue Letter Bible, written by a man named Don Stewart, that literally lists 5 evidences why Paul's letters were divinely authoritative, and four of those arguments cited Paul's letters as the evidence, the fifth being the verse in 2nd Peter. In other words, the evidence that Paul's letters were divinely authoritative, is because Paul said they were. This kind of self witness is (to any logical mind) not a sufficient evidence. If you were in a court of law, and were asked to prove a man innocent, you would not stake the majority of your case on the notion that the man is innocent because he claims to be. You would try to find external hard evidence that proves the innocence from multiple sources. As I have studied this out however, I have discovered that the reason they often use this kind of circular and illogical reasoning, is because they truly have no other argument they can really make in favor of Paul, and thus must resort to citing his own letters as evidence.



## II

# Arguments Against Paul



## Paul's Conversion Story

Everyone claims Paul met the ascended Yahusha on the road, yet the text does not bear this out. First of all, this was long after Yahusha had ascended into heaven. If He would've come back to earth just to see Paul, this would've been the second coming by definition. Also, if it was Yahusha in the flesh, there would've been multiple witnesses to seeing him, as He isn't in this invisible spirit type state, He has a new glorified body that Thomas touched, Yahusha ate with his disciples, and hundreds saw him ascend. This leaves the possibility of a vision of Yahusha, which the text doesn't actually bear out. (**Acts 7:1-9**) Paul saw, "a bright light" that nobody else by the way saw, and heard a voice that claimed to be Yahusha, and was struck blind. Notably, Joseph Smith, the false prophet for Mormonism had a very similar "conversion" when he received "divine revelation", as well as Muhammed, the false prophet for the Muslim faith, when he had his "divine revelation". In **2nd Corinthians 11:14**, Paul himself claims Satan masquerades as an angel of light so what does this say about his conversion? (Cross reference **1 John 2:11**)

The other issue with the conversion of Paul is that throughout Acts,

his testimony is given on three different occasions and each time bears some inconsistency. In the first account (**Acts 9:3-8**) it says the men who traveled with Paul heard a voice, but saw nothing, afterward stood speechless, and that Paul would be told in the next city what he was supposed to do. In the second account (**Acts 22:6-11**) the men who traveled with Paul saw a light, but heard nothing, and the statement “it is hard for you to kick against the goads (pricks), is removed. In the third account (**Acts 26:13-18**) the men with Paul all fell to the ground instead of standing around, it’s noted at this point the voice spoke to him in Hebrew which was absent from the first two accounts, and most interestingly, instead of being told that he would be told what to do in the next city, it seems he is given the full details of who he would become and what he would endure from Christ at that moment.

We cannot ascertain first of all who these nameless men who journeyed with Paul were, as not a single one is mentioned by name, we do not know if they heard a voice but saw nothing, or if they saw a light, but didn’t hear anything, or whether they were standing, or had fallen on the ground with Paul, as all of these details fluctuate from account to account. We also see in the first two accounts Paul was told that in the city he would be told what was next for him, but in the final account it seems he claims he was told right then, and the words are even recorded in red as words of Christ directly. Many of us have had spiritual experiences once or twice in our lives, and these moments are etched into our minds. The details of the stories do not change, and they stay in our memory better than most other memories. Paul’s inability to keep his story straight is extremely suspect in my mind.

## From Paul to Saul

This is more a note than an evidence really, but I want to address the change from Paul to Saul. There is this story regarding Paul that he, like Abraham and Jacob, had a major life event that changed him, and resulted in being given a new name to reflect a new life. This is not actually true and is a part of what I am choosing to at this point call the “Pauline mythos”. In actuality **Acts 13:9** is the first mention of him being called Paul, and it merely says, “Saul, who was also called Paul”. This in and of itself is not a big deal, but I think it bears mentioning that we seem to have attributed things to Paul that the scriptures themselves bear no witness of. Abram became Abraham. Sarai became Sarah, Jacob became Israel, but Saul did not become Paul.

## Apostolic Criteria

According to **Acts 1:21-22**, The criteria for being an apostle was that they had to have been with Yahusha from the time of his baptism in the Jordan, until He ascended. Paul was not a follower at this time, as we know, and therefore would not have been with Yahusha for any of that time. Therefore Paul does not fit the criteria laid out by the apostles, to be called an apostle. This also makes sense because the apostles were to be pillars of the church, entrusted with the message and will of Yahusha, that He directly entrusted them with. Someone who was not with Him the whole time, would not have heard and understood all of His teachings, and so could have taught something contrary to Yahusha's words and will.

Many claim that Paul met with Yahusha on the road, but as stated earlier, none of the text declares this, as he merely (allegedly) heard the voice of Yahusha. Even if this was the voice of Yahusha, it still does not qualify him to be an apostle according to the criteria found in **Acts 1**. Some have even attributed to Paul that the whole time he was blind, that he was having visions of, and was being taught by Yahusha. This too is a part of the Pauline mythos that has no basis in scripture and is once again, people trying to attribute things to Paul, outside of scripture, to

## APOSTOLIC CRITERIA

make sense of him not fitting the criteria.

## The True Apostle to the Gentiles

Peter, not Paul, was clearly identified in scripture, through multiple means, as being the apostle to the gentiles. Peter received a vision 3 times, went to Cornelius, and saw his household saved. He clearly declares that the reason for the vision was that the gentiles were no longer unclean. (**Acts 13**) Later at the Jerusalem council he declares again that he was ordained by the spirit to be the apostle to the gentiles. (**Acts 13:7-9**) Compare this with Paul's assertion that allegedly he agreed with Peter, James, and John, that he would be go to the gentiles, and the 3 would go to the circumcision. (**Galatians 2:9**) This would suggest one of three options. Either Peter got a mandate from the spirit to preach to the gentiles and 1, Peter decided to disobey; 2, God changed His mind about choosing Peter; or 3, Paul lied. Of the 3 options, Paul's lying seems to be the most plausible answer. God doesn't make mistakes and change His mind about what He plans and ordains. Peter after having announced it was his job to go the disciples wouldn't have been able to back out of it so easily. The other disciples and the rest of them at Jerusalem would then be questioning if Peter lied about the vision, or if he was being disobedient to the Spirit. Therefore Paul lying seems to be the only logical conclusion. Thus Peter, is in fact the true apostle to

THE TRUE APOSTLE TO THE GENTILES

the gentiles, not Paul.

## Paul's Relationship With the Apostles

Paul did not really get along with the actual apostles. When Paul first approached the apostles after his supposed conversion, they were wary of him, and even sent him away. In fact the verse after they sent him away says the Ecclesia in that general region had peace after he was sent away (**Acts 9:26-31**). A question this brings up to me, is would the apostles really be afraid of being put to death after Yahusha's death and resurrection, and after publicly debating with governors and pharisees that would have been able to potentially bring about their deaths anyways? It seems unlikely that the reason they feared Paul was based solely upon his past with persecuting followers of the way. Now, on the opposite point, according to Acts, Paul and Barnabas were given platform to speak during the Jerusalem council (**Acts 15:12**), however, this is the same chapter, where we see something a bit odd, in that Peter seemingly calls the law an unbearable yoke (**Acts 15:10**). If it was merely the traditions of the pharisees at that time, there wouldn't even be any dispute as to whether or not they should follow the traditions of the pharisees as this was something Yahusha frequently taught against.

Now this seems a good time to address something else. We know the

writer of the book of Acts was Paul's traveling companion, and author of one of the 4 canonical gospels, Luke. Luke (contrary to common belief) was not actually an apostle and in fact never met Yahusha at all. Luke, according to all scholars on the subject, was merely a Greek Historian and doctor, who seemingly believed in Messiah and was intrigued by the growth of the early Ecclesia. Now we know that it was the Catholic church that compiled our Bible and decided what should and should not be included. Personally, I see no mention of Luke by the works we know to be written by the apostles, and therefore I have begun to treat Luke's writings the same way the mainstream Christian church treats Maccabees, or the writings of Josephus in that they are good to reference historically, but are not necessarily inerrant. Further, as Luke was a personal companion of Paul, and had at that point traveled with him for quite a while, likely had a desire to see his spiritual leader and friend painted in a favorable light. This however is merely speculation on my part.

Moving forward on this point we have quite a bit of evidence against Paul's relationship with the apostles in **Galatians 2**. **Galatians 2:1-2** starts out with Paul claiming he had presented the gospel that he had been teaching to the apostles in private to see if he was teaching the truth, or if it had been in vain. Then he immediately shifts gears in verses 3-5, to boast how Timothy wasn't circumcised, and claim that there were some who had encroached upon their "liberty" which apparently means liberty to break the commandments of Yah, or so it would seem. In verse 6 Paul clearly states that the apostles who "seemed to be something" (then claims it doesn't matter who they were, God shows no favoritism, but back to that in a moment) added nothing to him. Yes, Paul boasts that he learned nothing whatsoever from the apostles, the pillars of the Ecclesia.

Now on the note of God not being a respecter of persons, this is true, that Yah does not judge a person based upon the respect they have from men, but judges each one equally and fairly, we also know that He is the one who establishes authorities (**Daniel 2:21, John 19:11**). On this note, Yahusha personally chose these men, and walked with them, taught them, ate with them, instructed them, and entrusted to them the Gospel that was to be preached throughout the world. These men were given their office of authority and the responsibility to build the church, by Yahusha Himself as the last order he gave before He ascended to heaven. So if we wanted to make the argument that Yah is not a respecter of persons, while this is true, he does respect positions of authority that He Himself institutes and establishes. This would be like some random new convert to the kingdom of Israel in the Old Testament going to King David, whom Yah personally chose to be king, and claiming he had just as much authority as King David, because God isn't a respecter of persons. This is absurd in the extreme and appears to be nothing but self promotion and shameless self ambition.

But getting back to Galatians, in verse 7 Paul claims that Peter had been given the gospel for the circumcision, which again, was after the vision, and salvation of Cornelius' house hold. So this appears to be a blatant lie. Verses 8 and 9 echo this idea again, that Peter, James, and John would go to the circumcision, and he to the gentiles. In verses 11-13 he boasts that he withstood Peter in Antioch, (If Peter agreed to stay with the circumcision, what was he doing in Antioch?) and then claims that Peter transgressed because of men from James. In this he efficiently did 3 things; First, he boasted of his ability to withstand one of the apostles who were no doubt looked up to as leaders. Second, threw both Peter and James under the bus, because apparently the issue arose from men that came from James. Third, he gives himself the appearance of being above the other apostles as he blatantly calls them all hypocrites. Now,

we will return to this passage later, because there is much more to be said here, but for now, it serves to show that the relationship Paul had with the actual apostles was questionable at best.

One final note is that Paul claims that he was sent away by the disciples because of their mutual agreement that he would go to the gentiles and they would stay with the circumcision, however if they did not agree that he should go to the gentiles (as it was clearly Peter's office), it looks a great deal more like they merely sent him away, for a second time, and he was trying to make it look as if he hadn't been thrown out of Jerusalem.

## Paul's Lack of Apostolic Approval

There doesn't seem to be any confirmation from any other source that Paul was approved as an apostle, or even had the blessing of the apostles to spread the gospel (more on that in a moment). Now there is a passage in 2nd Peter that claims that Paul's writings were considered on par with scripture, (**2 Peter 3:15-16**). Now this is a study unto itself, but nearly all scholars and historians agree that the book of 2nd Peter was not actually written by Peter. There are 2 primary reasons for this. First, the vocabularies we find in 1st and 2nd Peter are completely different and the vocabulary and subject matter in 2nd Peter mirrors that of Jude. I don't remember the exact numbers off the top of my head, and the article I found took a bit of digging, but of some 900 words used in each of the letters, they only share 200 in common, and the other 700 are exclusively used in each letter. This means the author of 1st Peter, (verified to be Peter) and the author of 2nd Peter (unknown) have vocabularies that are completely different. They offer the possible explanation that Peter used different scribes to write his first and second letter, but this possibility is overshadowed by the second issue with 2nd Peter, the time frame for the circulation of the letter.

Now it is claimed that Peter wrote his second epistle at the end of his life, and 1st Peter near the beginning of the growth of the Ecclesia. The issue with this is that 2nd Peter went into circulation long after the death of Peter. Now one could make the argument that the letter was written but simply didn't get released or distributed until later, but within the letter are contained warnings that would have been important for those he was writing to to receive at the time. Basically, nobody writes an important warning, and then just sticks it somewhere in their belongings until later. A warning is meant to be given and read as soon as possible as it would be an attempt to minimize potential damage to the church. Now if Peter had it written, and then he died, it still would have been the responsibility of the scribe of that letter to see that it was sent out as soon as possible, and the death of the apostle who dictated it would've, in my opinion, only strengthened the sense of duty to see that letter delivered, in a sort of last wishes kind of way. People who argue in favor of the Petrine authorship of 2nd Peter use the argument that there doesn't appear to be any motive for including a pseudepigraphal letter, but I disagree. It is the only book that claims that Paul's letters were scripture, and so Paul, or one of Paul's followers, or even the Catholic church themselves, would have had tremendous motive for mentioning that Paul's letters were scripture as Paul's letters were the only ones who even give off the hint that the law is not important, but we will look into this more later.

One last thought on this subject of 2nd Peter's verification of Paul's letters as scripture, is that nowhere are Peter's, or James' or John's letters cited as being scripture. They were written as, and cited as, letters. Now I believe we can base doctrines off of these letters as I have yet to come across any doctrines in 1,2,3 John, 1 Peter, James, and Revelation, that are not found elsewhere whether in the Gospels, in the Tanakh, or both, also the Gospel and teachings of Yahusha were entrusted to each of

these men by Yahusha Himself, but even then, we have no writings that point to their letters being scripture. I find it suspicious, that the author of 2nd Peter singles out Paul's writings as scripture. If it was written by Peter, and Paul was considered a disciple, wouldn't it have been easier to just say, be careful of twisting the letters from the apostles? Or just in general, be careful of twisting scriptures? Paul isn't the only one who's writings are able to be twisted and manipulated, so I find it highly suspect that Paul's writings in particular are mentioned specifically as scripture.

## Paul's Apostolic Title

“Paul, an apostle” seems to be the opening of the majority of Paul’s letters. Only some differ from this opening, and even if they differ, they inevitably identify Paul as an apostle later on in the letter. Now, interestingly, there are 22 times throughout the canon that Paul is called an apostle. Only 2 times of the 22 was he called an apostle by someone other than himself. This means 30 times he proclaimed himself to be an apostle. It’s like he woke up one day and decided to call himself an apostle and never stopped. Now regarding the only other 2 times he was referred to as an apostle, both other times were by his personal traveling companion, Luke. This was a while after he had been introducing himself as, and signing his letters as, the apostle Paul. Luke, being both his personal friend and historian, likely used the title as a way to differentiate which Paul he was referring to, and give his friend a bit of added validity. Even if not, and he genuinely believed Paul to be an apostle, Luke did not have the authority to make such a judgement, and as brought up prior, Paul did not fit the criteria to be called an apostle anyways. If I call myself the president, it does not make it so as I was not elected in, and don’t fit the criteria to be so. Likewise Paul cannot call himself an apostle, when those who could have elected him in did

THE PAUL PAPER

not, and he does not fit the criteria to be so.

## Paul's Lack of Adherence to Yahusha's Teachings

Back in Galatians 2 once again, we see an example of Paul blatantly (and boastfully) not following Yahusha's teachings. The event I am referring to is the aforementioned instance where Paul boasts about withstanding Peter to his face "before all" (Galatians 2:14). This is directly opposed to how Yahusha taught His disciples to settle matters of sin in Matthew 18. Assuming Paul's account was true, and assuming that Peter was in fact guilty of a sin, Paul did not go to him privately, or take one or two more and Peter refused to listen. One could try to suggest that he did, but that would be injecting things in the text that are not there, and if in fact Paul had done this, don't you think he would've mentioned it, just so he would be clear of this very allegation? He out in the open publicly attacked him and accused him of being a hypocrite. This is again completely opposite of Yahusha's teachings. There are many more examples of this as far as character and such, but this event in particular would have been a big, messy, public display, which would have damaged the names of the apostles, damaged the reputation of the Ecclesia as a whole, and damaged the very name of Yahusha Himself. Not only does this occur, but Paul then takes this account, and publishes

it in a public letter to the Galatians, who weren't even involved in this situation, and openly makes known the supposed hypocrisy and sin of the other disciples. This too, if looked at objectively, is something not only unnecessary, but also a rather vicious attack and only serves to once again undermine the other apostles, and promote Paul.

Further, in Acts 23:2-3 we see a situation arise where the high priest orders men to strike Paul on the cheek. Instead of turning the other cheek, as Yahusha taught, Paul instead decides to launch off into insults against the man who commanded it, who turned out to be the high priest, Ananias. They then accuse Paul of reviling the high priest, and Paul says, I didn't know he was the high priest. Now, I find that Paul when being struck responds in anger, with name calling, and accusations. Contrast this with Stephen's death, who when being stoned by the people he cried out "Lord, do not charge them with this sin!" as his final words. Yahusha spoke the same sentiment with His last words while he hung on the cross broken and beaten by the very men He came to save. I ask, did Paul imitate Christ, as he claimed to?

## Paul's Gospel

Paul boasts in multiple places that the gospel that he preached was “my gospel” and that he received it from no man, but from heaven directly (**Galatians 1:11-12**). He specifically makes the claim that the apostles added nothing to him, basically, he didn't benefit from their teachings at all, (**Galatians 2:6**) when specifically talking about the gospel a few verses prior. This could suggest he had a full understanding of the gospel, and wasn't missing anything, or it could suggest that his differed, and was unwilling to hear theirs. He specifically calls the gospel he received his gospel, (**Romans 2:16, Romans 16:25, 2 Timothy 2:8**) differentiating it from the gospel the other apostles preached. In fact, he even boasts that he is the one who laid the foundation that others build on. (**1 Corinthians 3:10**). Even now in modern Christianity they differentiate Paul's gospel from the other apostles gospel because Paul's was supposedly for the gentiles and as they vehemently argue, has nothing to do with obedience to the Torah. They quote “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast.” (**Ephesians 2:8-9**) but then James writes, “You see then that a man is justified by works, and not by faith only.” which seems to contradict Paul's gospel. Now, you

can postulate that James just fleshes out Paul's gospel, and expounds upon what faith is, which is perfectly possible, but is that really the most obvious answer, or is that the explanation birthed when we have been forced to stand to reconcile the two authors seeming to have conflicting ideas?

Furthermore, if Yahusha was going to just give Paul the full gospel, why bother spending 3 1/2 years teaching and instructing the apostles in the gospel? Did Yah really give one gospel to the apostles for the Jews, and then one gospel to Paul for the gentiles? Was the message in the Tanakh different based upon bloodline? For those who were born into Israel, or those who wanted to join, the message was the same: Trust in Yah, obey His Torah. If Yah had one set of expectations for those born into Israel, and another expectation for someone not born into Israel, He would be showing partiality, and not judging mankind fairly. The whole idea of a "Jewish" gospel and a "Gentile" gospel is absurd, even when viewed through Paul's writings. After all, he is the one who writes that when we are born again into Messiah, we become a part of Israel and that both Jews and gentiles become one new man. So everyone who is brought in falls under the same criteria as the "Jewish" believers, therefore negating the need for two gospels. But I digress. Suffice it to say, Paul's gospel does appear to be "his own" that he received not from the ones it was entrusted to, but from some allegedly divine revelation. Beyond that if he was in fact preaching a different gospel, he calls the other apostles accursed in a round about way (**Galatians 1:8-9**), because they have a different gospel.

One final note, is it would seem that the people who gave Paul and Barnabas the charge to preach the gospel in the first place were not the apostles, but were a group of men we know literally nothing about, except for one of them, who was Herod the Tetrarch's childhood friend

## PAUL'S GOSPEL

(Acts 13:1-2). This took place at Antioch, which seems to also be the place Peter was rebuked by Paul publicly, and the first place that the people were called Christians. I also find this odd. Now, we know Herod was a wicked, evil king, so I don't know if I trust his friend from childhood, but perhaps this man had a change of heart. I merely thought it worth mentioning.

## Paul's Signs and Miracles

When you begin looking into Paul's teachings on the holy spirit, things become a bit more odd. In the first place, Paul received the holy spirit by Ananias laying his hands on him. Paul then in turn lays hands on others and supposedly imparts spiritual gifts. (**1 Timothy 4:14, Acts 19:5-6**), and in fact seems that he has to personally be present with them to impart these gifts (**Romans 1:11**). Now the Old and New testament mention laying on of hands, however, the purpose of this is almost always one of three things, first, to heal (**James 5:14-15**), as Yahusha Himself also laid hands on people to heal them (**Matthew 9:18, Mark 6:5, Mark 7:32, Mark 8:23**). The other positive instance we see of laying on of hands, was to establish someone to a new position in the sense of passing authority of a role to a person (**Numbers 8:10, Numbers 27:18, Acts 6:6**). Lastly, all throughout Leviticus, (**Leviticus 1:4, 3:2, 8, 13, 4:4, 15, 24, 29, 33, 16:21**) and Exodus (**Exodus 29:10, 15, 19**) and **Numbers (8:12)**, we find the priests laying hands on sin offerings to impart their sins upon the animal that was to be a sin sacrifice. These seem to be the only 3 uses throughout the entire Bible as far as things pertaining to the Spirit go, outside of Paul.

By contrast, if you look at other instances of those outside of Paul's ministry receiving either the holy spirit, or power from on high, it merely fell upon them (**Acts 2:2-4, Acts 10:44-46**) or, the apostles prayed for them to receive it (**Acts 8:14-15**), or the account of Yahusha Himself breathing on the apostles and them receiving the Spirit (**John 20:22**). This seems odd that for others it falls on them, but for Paul in particular, he had to lay hands on them to receive it. Coincidentally, in the Tanakh, I can't find a single instance of a prophet having had his gift of prophecy imparted to him by the laying on of hands. Each time, the spirit of Yah would fall upon them or come to them. There is one verse however that suggests the possibility of the apostles being able to impart this gift of the holy spirit by laying on of hands, and that was when Simon the sorcerer offered to buy it from Peter (**Acts 8:18**). This seems to be inconsistent with what took place at Pentecost, as well as what took place in Cornelius' home. Unless the praying for the spirit (**Acts 8:14-15**) involved laying on of hands but they didn't mention it, which is quite possible. Nevertheless, I thought it was worth mentioning

Beyond the debate with imparting spiritual gifts we have the evidence that Paul performed miracles. Now, this one is tricky, since it could mean Paul did have divine approval, and did in fact perform heavenly miracles, however, I wanted to touch on two main thoughts here; First, Yah isn't the only spirit who can impart the power to do miracles (**Exodus 7:11, 7:22, Matthew 7:22-23, 24:24, Revelation 13:13**). Second, Paul's very first miracle he performed was actually striking a man blind (**Acts 13:8-11**) which I find interesting because this was also the first thing Paul experienced, was being struck blind. Now we have not a single instance of Yahusha, or any of His disciples using the Holy Spirit to strike anyone blind, but we see Yahusha open the eyes of the blind a few times (**Isaiah 42:7, John 9:7, Matthew 9:32-34**).

Further, we don't even find a single instance of the Holy Spirit being used to harm someone anywhere in the scripture unless you count the instance with Ananias and his wife. (**Acts 5:5,9**) which never suggests it was the Spirit who killed them, merely that they died on the spot. We also know that Yahusha holds the keys of death (**Revelation 1:18**) suggesting it wasn't the Spirit anyways. Literally the only instance we see of the Spirit being used to harm someone, was Paul's "Miracle" in striking a man blind. Food for thought.

## Paul's Lying

Now, regarding lying, I will show two primary lies. The first of which takes place in the same trial we discussed earlier in **Acts 23**. The trial was when Paul was brought in before the Sanhedrin. Now if you back up to **Acts 21:20-21**, we are told plainly why Paul was being brought before the Sanhedrin. The Jews (many of whom were born again at this time by the way), were zealous for the law, and they alleged that Paul had been teaching the gentiles against the law, and against circumcision. Coincidentally these are the same allegations the Christian church accuses Paul of today after reading his letters, though for them it's a good thing. Anyways, Paul goes before the Sanhedrin, and notices that half of them are Saducees, and half are Pharisees. Now the Pharisees believed in a future resurrection of the dead, while the Saducees did not. This was a continuous point of contention between the two groups. So Paul in **Acts 23:6** declares that he was being put on trial because he was a pharisee, and a son of a pharisee, and because he believed in the resurrection of the dead. In the following verses, 7-10, this caused a large uproar among the people, and the guards had to pull Paul out of the trial.

Now interestingly, looking at this from a purely unbiased stand point, Paul boldly lied to the council, he caused division and confusion, and acted seemingly out of fear. If he did not fear the council, why would he have declared this in an effort to escape? Where was Paul's bold declaration of Yahusha before this council? Where was the power of the spirit guiding his words? Instead he lied, and escaped. Contrast this once again with when Peter and John stood trial before the Sanhedrin in **Acts 4:8-12**. Peter preaches to the Sanhedrin with boldness and authority given him by the Spirit, and declares before them all the name of Yahusha. Throughout this entire trial, as mentioned earlier, Paul's character is questionable at best. First he lashes out at the high priest, and then lies to the council to start a fight between the factions so he can get away? This does not seem to be the actions of someone imitating my Christ.

The second lie I've already mentioned, but I will touch on it again. It takes place in **Galatians 2:9**. Paul declares to the Galatian church that he separated from the apostles at Jerusalem (Peter, James, and John), because they all agreed that he should go to the gentiles, while they stayed and preached to the circumcision. Now we know already from **Acts:10**, and later at the Jerusalem council, that Peter was given a vision, saw Cornelius and his household born again, and declared boldly before them all at the council that it was by his mouth that the gentiles will hear the gospel. So again, the only options for Paul's story to be true are only one of three possibilities. First, Yah changed his mind on who He would send. Why would He though? Yah doesn't fluctuate and change. Second, Peter decided to be willfully disobedient to his appointment as apostle to the gentiles, in which case the other apostles and all the men at the Jerusalem council who heard him testify that the Spirit gave him that job, would've questioned him and not agreed for Peter to stay with the disciples. Lastly, Peter lied about the vision, lied

about Cornelius, lied to the council, and admitted it in front of all of them, so they could then send Paul out. None of these make any sense whatsoever as explanations. It is cut and dry, plain and simple, either Peter was the apostle to the gentiles, or Paul was. Either Peter lied, or Paul did. Given the evidence, I think we can safely conclude Paul lied about this as well.

Regarding my previous point, one more thing I wanted to mention is that Peter was withstood at Antioch. Now if Peter had agreed to stay in Jerusalem with the circumcision as Paul claimed, what would he have been doing in the gentile Antioch, eating among gentiles? Paul's story doesn't even add up by itself, let alone cross referencing other scripture.

Now, there is one last thing regarding lying I want to draw your attention to. It's more of a psychological observance but still bears mentioning. One of the hallmarks of a liar, is they claim they aren't lying. They frequently assure people that they are telling the truth, and not lying. This is a consistent behavior in liars and I myself have personally experienced it a myriad of times, as likely many of you have as well. Paul, on four separate occasions (**Romans 9:1**, **2 Corinthians 11:31**, **Galatians 1:20**, **1 Timothy 2:7**), assures his readers that he was not lying. Now he really could only have one of two reasons for doing this. First, he had a reputation of lying, and really wanted people to believe him, in which case, why did he have that reputation in the first place? Or, he was doing what liars often do, and assuring people that he wasn't lying. Either way, I don't think it bodes well for him.

## Paul's Boasting

Now, there could be a lot for me to write here, but for the sake of keeping this from being too overwhelmingly long, I will merely pull out a few highlights for you. Now, when you read these things, I want you to imagine for me that it isn't Paul saying them, but someone in the modern day. Go one step further though, imagine that the person saying these things, is the spiritual leader you most look up to and admire. Now, with that person in mind, read the following statements, and just think what your reaction would be to this person, if they said these things. See, we excuse Paul's behavior because he was allegedly the greatest apostle, but if we really judged Paul fairly, by the same measure we would judge anyone else's words, we would find these statements to be obnoxious, and likely even offensive.

***Galatians 2:6 - But from those who seemed to be something—whatever they were, it makes no difference to me; God shows personal favoritism to no man—for those who seemed to be something added nothing to me.***

Keep in mind this was referring to the apostles at Jerusalem. Paul is

boasting that he didn't learn anything from them, and says though they appeared to be something, God is not a respecter of persons. This level of presumptuousness and arrogance is shocking as he is boldly declaring himself that he had no need of these so called pillars, because he already has all he needs.

*Phillipians 3:4-6 - ... If anyone else thinks he may have confidence in the flesh, I more so: 5 circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; concerning the law, a Pharisee; 6 concerning zeal, persecuting the church; concerning the righteousness which is in the law, blameless.*

Basically, Paul is saying, if anyone thinks he has a reason to boast, I have more of a reason. He claims himself to be blameless according to the law, extremely zealous, and knowledgeable of the law. Now in the following passage he says it all means nothing, but honestly, one has to question where the glory was going in this portion? Who was Paul drawing attention to? Yahusha or himself? I think the answer is pretty clear.

*2 Corinthians 11:22-29 - Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I. 23 Are they ministers of Christ?—I speak as a fool—I am more: in labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequently, in deaths often. 24 From the Jews five times I received forty stripes minus one. 25 Three times I was beaten with rods; once I was stoned; three times I was shipwrecked; a night and a day I have been in the deep; 26 in journeys often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils of my own countrymen, in perils of the Gentiles, in*

*perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; 27 in weariness and toil, in sleeplessness often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness— 28 besides the other things, what comes upon me daily: my deep concern for all the churches. 29 Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is made to stumble, and I do not burn with indignation?*

Paul here is boasting of himself, saying; look at me, I'm a Hebrew, I'm an Israelite, I'm of the seed of Abraham, I'm more of a minister of Christ than anyone, look at all the things I've been through, all the things I've done! Now again, who is this drawing attention to? Is this glorifying Yahusha, or himself? Do we see any of the other apostles speaking this way of themselves? Nope, only Paul.

I decided to save the worst for last, in that I cannot think of a more obnoxious statement than this, and I will explain why in a moment.

***1 Corinthians 11:1 - Imitate me, just as I also imitate Christ.***

It's a simple statement, short and direct, but the implications are massive. This statement suggests that somehow, if someone were to act just like him, they would be acting just like Yahusha. That his actions and character directly mirrored that of Christ. Now, I want to ask a simple question: why not just say imitate Christ? Why did Paul interject himself in that statement? Again, who does this draw attention to? Yahusha, or Paul? Now as I said from the outset, imagine if a spiritual leader you looked up to made this statement. Imagine if they got up before a group of people and said "you all should act like me, because I act just like Christ." what would your reaction be? Would this kind of statement be stomached by anyone today? Take it one step further, could you

## PAUL'S BOASTING

ever imaging yourself saying such a thing? John the Baptist, whom Yahusha called the greatest man born among women who ever lived, said there is one coming who is greater than me, who's sandal strap I'm not worthy to loose. Peter seemed horrified when Yahusha tried to wash his feet, and said no, you'll never wash my feet! This was because he too recognized that Yahusha was infinitely greater than him, and he was not worthy to have his feet washed by Yahusha. Paul's behavior however puts him neatly equal with Yahusha, the creator of all. This statement, frankly, was blasphemous, and the most arrogant thing I think I've ever heard. One final thought, regarding the antichrist, it does not necessarily exclusively mean the antithesis of Christ, but can also indicate a replacement or false replica of Christ. Paul's statement puts himself in front of Christ, and in a way, replaces Christ as the pattern we are to model our lives on. Just food for thought.

## Paul's Biblically Contradictive Teachings

There are four things I will briefly mention within this section. That being said much of what I will say here has either been said elsewhere, or later on. That being said, it will be brief.

First of all, the gospel Paul preached as has been mentioned earlier, and will be examined more in a bit, seems to differ from the apostles gospel. Yahusha taught to repent and believe on Him. The disciples taught much the same thing. Love Yah, love each other, believe on Yahusha, and keep the commandments. It isn't until we come to Paul that we see this nebulous idea of walking according to the spirit and ignoring the law. Dying to the law and living to Christ is not really logical, as Yahusha is the word made flesh, and was perfectly lawful. Further, the law in no way hinders you from obeying and loving and following Yahusha.

The second thing is the idea of becoming all things to all people. Paul echoes this a few times throughout his letters and you have to ask, what does that really mean? Paul was going around preaching to gentiles. To become like them, to win them, is kind of a big contradiction to the rest of scripture. We are not to be like the world, or imitate their ways.

We are to be set apart, and holy. Those who were among Israel, (as we have been grafted in) were never supposed to look like the nations around it. What if Israel had adopted the same idea, be all things to all people so that you can bring some into the camp? This is the opposite of what Yah spoke to them when he commanded them over and over, don't worship Him the way they worship their gods, be Holy and set apart, guard His ways. It would seem Paul is teaching them to set aside their set apart-ness, and acclimate oneself to a culture for the purpose of preaching Christ to them. This is inconsistent with the rest of scripture.

The third thing is the idea that conscience determines right and wrong. Paul taught that if you want to esteem one day over another, or esteem every day alike, all you have to do to be doing the right thing, is to be convinced in your mind. In other words, whatever you believe is right for you, is right. This kind of relativism is a plague within these modern day generations. This goes hand in hand with the idea of eating foods sacrificed to idols. Paul taught that if you don't know whether or not food has been sacrificed to idols, don't ask, it's fine for you to eat. If we apply this kind of logic to something like clean eating, it becomes obvious it's sin. Would you eat a hotdog you weren't sure was all beef or not? Everywhere I go, I am constantly asking questions like "What kind of meat is in the chili?" or "Is that Pastrami made of pork or beef?". These questions I ask, because I want to be careful to be obedient to follow Yah's commandments. Don't ask, don't tell, does not sound very scripturally sound to me.

Lastly is contained in the first point, but the idea the law is somehow done away with, or not needed any longer. The issue is however, that this doesn't consistently seem to be the message. Sometimes he speaks well of the law, and sometimes not. In Romans 2 and 3 alone he makes these two statements:

***Romans 2:13 - for not the hearers of the law are just in the sight of God, but the doers of the law will be justified***

***Romans 3:20 - Therefore by the deeds of the law no flesh will be justified in His sight***

Now for Paul, we say, we just aren't understanding what he is saying here. We need to look at everything he is saying within context, and we have to do all this bending and twisting to get everything to line up. It's like furniture from China with low resolution picture instructions, you kind of have to put it all together yourself, but without clear cut instructions. Because of this, everyone's final product comes out a bit different.

Now the question I want to ask with all of this, is simple. If you were reading Paul's letters, with the same carefulness and trepidation you would use to weigh the writings of a modern day teacher, would you accept Paul? If you were reading Paul for the first time, and you saw these kinds of seeming contradictions, would you overlook them and simply say "This man is a genius, and is just a little hard to understand.?" Or would you just think him a bit off, and possibly hypocritical and dismiss his teachings? I postulate that if we tested Paul in the exact same manner as we test other ministers, I don't think we would trust him very much. We would see lies, we would see boasting, we would see contradictions, we would see pride, and we would likely just dismiss him. The only reason we make excuses for him such as him being a genius, or being justified in his boasting, or being misunderstood, is because he is in our Bibles and we've been told his writings were inspired. That's the only reason. The issue is, the Catholics compiled our Bibles and were the first to tell us Paul was infallible.

Now with any other author contained in the Bible, you don't have to make these excuses. You don't have to make excuses for Peter, or James, or John, or the prophets, or anyone. They all say the same thing, and rather clearly as well. You can't take two verses in the book of James that contradict one another. You can't take two verses from the letters John wrote that contradict one another. You can't take 1st Peter, and any of the gospels, and find a contradicting statement. But Paul seems to constantly contradict other scriptures, and even himself. Now again, we say this is just because we are understanding it wrong, but what if it really is just as simple as a man who doesn't have a clear message that tells everyone what they want to hear? The same man who boldly claimed he became all things to all people? As stated, with all other authors, the letters are clear cut, and concise. With Paul, it becomes murky. The water of the Word is clean and pure, not murky.

## The Leaven of the Pharisees

One of the things Yahusha warned the disciples about during His earthly ministry was to beware the leaven of the scribes and Pharisees. Also the notion that a little leaven leavens the whole loaf. The pharisees followed much of the law, but they had other little things they added or took away, just a little leaven, that ended up leading to the apostasy present when Yahusha walked the earth. This is because messing with Yah's words, His ways, just a little, can open the door to sin. Now interestingly, with Paul's writings, much of them seem to be accurate, and good in many ways. They expound upon some good subjects, and they have valuable insights. However, all it takes is a little leaven, and I believe Paul introduced a little leaven to the Ecclesia. The result has been the same effect it has in bread: a complete change from the original form, a puffing up where it becomes full of hot air, and a bread that becomes unfit to be sacrificed on the alter. I believe this little bit of leaven has leavened the church into complete lawlessness and thus uncleanness. One final note on this line of thinking, Paul himself claimed to be a pharisee of pharisees, and later, a pharisee, and son of a pharisee. Could Yahusha have been prophecying to beware of Paul? Maybe, maybe not. Food for thought.

## Paul's Fruit

Now we will examine what Paul's effect on the ecclesia was. We are told by Yahusha, that we will know them (the true followers) by their fruit. So then, to test Paul, we must examine his fruit. So, how has Paul impacted the church? Well, I intended to provide arguments from the early church fathers regarding Paul, however, the records we are provided with have been filtered by the Catholic church, and much of the original writings are hidden or lost to time. I have read that Papias, who was allegedly Peter's protege, actively taught against and refuted a doctrine known as Paulinism, which I thought was interesting, however I was not able to verify this assertion at this time. Nevertheless, even if we cannot see Paul's effect on the early church, we can at least examine his effect on the church today.

The first fruit we'll examine is lawlessness. Now, as we have seen many times over, the only defense anyone seems to be able to give against following Torah, is contained within Paul's writings. This means that Paul's letters and those who teach them, are solely responsible for misleading people who are genuinely trying to be obedient to Yah. They are being led into lawlessness by Paul's teachings. Sure people bend

Yahusha's words as well, but you can't really find a single sentence that any other author in the scriptures writes that appears to say the Torah doesn't matter. In fact you find constantly the opposite. Whenever the law is mentioned, it is mentioned in a light that is positive, and with the suggestion that it is important, and should be followed. Anyone I have ever heard who refutes Torah does so solely based upon the writings of Paul. Therefore, you can safely declare that one of the fruits, or effects, of his writings, is lawlessness.

The Second fruit, is confusion. Confusion because essentially, Paul's writings can be made to say pretty much anything you want them to. The LGBTQ+ community cites Paul, "there's neither male nor female". The Christian Wiccan movement cites "to the pure all things are pure". The man who wants to celebrate pagan holidays and take part in pagan worship justifies himself with "One man esteems one day above another, and another man esteems them all equally, let each one be fully convinced in his own mind". The lawless who hate the law of Yah quote "for by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified". The lawful who love the law of Yah quote "for not the hearers of the law are just in the sight of God, but the doers of the law will be justified". The fact is, we all can freely justify our positions no matter how different or outlandish by simply pulling one of Paul's verses. Now as said, many are used out of context, but even in context, doesn't Paul teach against circumcision in Galatians? Doesn't Paul teach that it's okay to eat food sacrificed to idols as long as you don't know about it? Don't ask don't tell? Or how about his teaching to become all things to all people, whereas the rest of the scriptures say to be holy (set apart, and different from the rest of the world)? Even in perfect context, reading carefully, Paul's writings are confusing, and to use his own words against him, God is not the author of confusion.

The last fruit, is division. This has come through confusion. The lawless separate from the lawful over Paul's writings. The Baptists separate from the Pentecostals over Paul's teachings on the spirit. There are 50,000+ denominations, and it seems many of them are a separate denomination based primarily upon Paul's writings. A Bible without Paul's writings is a Bible with one basic theme running all through it: Love Yah, Love one another, Trust in Yahusha, and keep the commandments. Now even in that there are some divisions that can arise, but at least we would have several denominations of those wanting to obey Yah, than having 50,000+ denominations that are mostly all lawless. We wouldn't have people like Obama, and Katy Perry, and Jay-Z claiming to be Christians. The world doesn't hate a bunch of people who identify by the term Christian. The determining factor of how much the world hates you seems to be how much of the Torah you keep. They hate Him, and they hate His ways. Likewise in the opposite if we love Him, we keep His commandments. Paul's writings have caused more division than any other writings in the entirety of the scripture.

All in all, the three primary fruits I am seeing from Paul are lawlessness, confusion, and division. Now I ask you, are any of these fruits ones that come from Yah? We know where disobedience to the Torah comes from. We know where division and strife comes from. We know that confusion is not of our God. If the fruit isn't from Yah, than can we really confidently say that the man who produced these fruits is from Yah?

## Testing Prophets

So this next point is short and simple, but worth mentioning. There are two tests in Deuteronomy for testing a prophet. The first basically states that if a man claims a word from Yah that something will take place, and it doesn't, not to fear him. The second though, is far more interesting.

*Deuteronomy 13:1-5 - 13 "If there arises among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams, and he gives you a sign or a wonder, 2 and the sign or the wonder comes to pass, of which he spoke to you, saying, 'Let us go after other gods'—which you have not known—and let us serve them,' 3 you shall not listen to the words of that prophet or that dreamer of dreams, for the Lord your God is testing you to know whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. 4 You shall walk after the Lord your God and fear Him, and keep His commandments and obey His voice; you shall serve Him and hold fast to Him. 5 But that prophet or that dreamer of dreams shall be put to death, because he has spoken in order to turn you away from the Lord your God,*

## TESTING PROPHETS

***who brought you out of the land of Egypt and redeemed you from the house of bondage, to entice you from the way in which the Lord your God commanded you to walk. So you shall put away the evil from your midst.***

Now, I would submit to you that Paul does not pass this test, at least not the way that Paul is interpreted. It says if a prophet is teaching you to disobey Yah's commandments and serve a different God, or serve God in ways you haven't known, he is a false prophet. This means that if Paul indeed was teaching that the law is done away with, and teaching people it's okay to break it, he fails the Dueteronomy 13 test. Plain and simple.

## Two or Three Witnesses

Another interesting note is that we need to have two or three witnesses to establish things. Now if you ask for two or three witnesses to establish the doctrine of the law being done away with, people will generally pull verses from Galatians, Ephesians, and Romans. The issue with this is simple, this all still counts as one witness. If the same person wrote all these letters, then it does not count as multiple witnesses, only as one; Paul. If you were gathering evidence for a trial, and the judge said you needed to give him three pieces of evidence, and you brought to the judge three different letters written by the same person, it would still only count as evidence from one witness. Now if we apply this to doctrine, there are a few different doctrines that we cannot establish from two or three witnesses, because they only appear in Paul's writings. To accept them, would be to break Torah.

Also, on this note of two or three witnesses, it seems Paul claims that one person, himself, can be a first, second and third witness all unto himself, providing the very issue I explained above.

***2 Corinthians 13:1-3: This will be the third time I am coming***

*to you. "By the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established." I have told you before, and foretell as if I were present the second time, and now being absent I write to those who have sinned before, and to all the rest, that if I come again I will not spare- since you seek a proof of Christ speaking in me, who is not weak toward you, but mighty in you.*

He basically says, I'm coming to you for the third time, quotes "in the mouth of two or three witnesses" and then proceeds to say, "I told you before, and am foretelling it (now) as if I were present the second time..." In other words, I told you before, I'm telling you now, and I'll tell you again when I come to you, so I have three witnesses to verify what I am saying. That's simply not how that scripture is meant, or used. One person cannot be the first second and third witness, as in the original context it was established as a mode of establishing guilt or innocence, and if one person can just state the same thing three times and suddenly it constitutes three witnesses, the whole judicial system would be useless. This sort of quoting scripture but misusing it is seen elsewhere in Paul's writings as well if you begin to check the context of the scripture he is quoting each time he quotes scripture throughout his letters. Just another side note.

## Paul, Peter, and James

Now interestingly if you read James chapter 3 we find several interesting statements that seem to directly address the behaviors that we see Paul exhibiting up till now. I won't list them all, but I encourage you to read this chapter for yourself with the lens of what you've learned of Paul's behavior. I will list a few things of consideration here though.

***James 3:1 - My brethren, let not many of you become teachers, knowing that we shall receive a stricter judgment. 2 For we all stumble in many things.***

James admonishes people to be hesitant to teach, because within teaching is a stricter judgement, and it is easy to stumble. Paul was definitely a teacher and his teachings have led many astray into lawlessness.

***James 3:5 - Even so the tongue is a little member and boasts great things.***

Think of Paul's boasting.

***James 3:8-9 - 8 But no man can tame the tongue. It is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison. 9 With it we bless our God and Father, and with it we curse men, who have been made in the similitude of God.***

Think of Paul's sharp words against the apostles, and then the way he talks about the importance of love.

***James 3:13-18 - Who is wise and understanding among you? Let him show by good conduct that his works are done in the meekness of wisdom. 14 But if you have bitter envy and self-seeking in your hearts, do not boast and lie against the truth. 15 This wisdom does not descend from above, but is earthly, sensual, demonic. 16 For where envy and self-seeking exist, confusion and every evil thing are there. 17 But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, willing to yield, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy. 18 Now the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace by those who make peace.***

Now this section is packed full of things. Paul appears to be full of wisdom, but James admonishes us to test wisdom by the character and works of the source of it. Meekness, peaceableness, gentleness, mercifulness and willingness to yield, are not things we see much of from Paul at times. James says this kind of wisdom produces confusion, and every evil thing (complete lawlessness). Further if you look at Paul's self appointment as apostle to the gentiles, and attack directed toward Peter, and boasting of correcting him, it would appear that Paul was jealous of Peter's station, and wanted it for himself. This is where James

clearly states these behaviors arise from. This chapter seems a bit too applicable to Paul for me to write it off. Beyond that, the evidence that James is addressing Paul in particular is further enhanced by James' address regarding salvation found in chapter 2. The whole chapter expounds upon the idea that faith is not all it takes for salvation and ends his discourse with this statement:

***James 2:24 - You see then that a man is justified by works, and not by faith only.***

Contrast this with Paul's writings:

***Ephesians 2:8-9 - For by grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, 9 not of works, lest anyone should boast.***

***Romans 3:20 - Therefore by the deeds of the law no flesh will be justified in His sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin.***

So who would've been teaching the idea faith without works is sufficient? Where did this notion come from among the early Ecclesia and how did it become an issue big enough to warrant James' discourse on the subject? Well, Paul. It's the same gospel going forth from the church today, read right out of Paul's letters. So James teaches a whole chapter refuting a doctrine Paul was teaching, and then immediately launches off into a series of statements that seem to perfectly address Paul's behavior? It all seems a bit too much of a coincidence for my tastes.

## John's Warnings

This particular section may be the largest. I want to be thorough here, because this is a particularly important section. The apostle John gives multiple writings in his letters, to be careful and watch out for false prophets and those who are referred to as antichrists.

***1 John 4:1 - Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets have gone out into the world.***

Thankfully, John not only gave us warnings, he also gave us multiple ways to help identify whether someone is a false prophet or secretly of the spirit of antichrist. Now the shocking thing is, there are 4 different criteria that John gives us for identifying a false prophet, and believe it or not, Paul fits the criteria for every one of them. We are going to look at these in the order they are found within John's epistles, the first 3 being in 1 John, and the last being in 2 John.

\* \* \*

## The First Criterion

*1 John 2:18-19 - Little children, it is the last hour; and as you have heard that the Antichrist is coming, even now many antichrists have come, by which we know that it is the last hour. 19 They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but they went out that they might be made manifest, that none of them were of us.*

So the first criteria for identifying a false prophet is one who had been among them, but separated from them, and would not continue with them. Now if you recall, 3 years after Paul had his alleged conversion, he went up to Jerusalem to visit the apostles, and the Ecclesia.

*Acts 9:26-31 -And when Saul had come to Jerusalem, he tried to join the disciples; but they were all afraid of him, and did not believe that he was a disciple. 27 But Barnabas took him and brought him to the apostles. And he declared to them how he had seen the Lord on the road, and that He had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus. 28 So he was with them at Jerusalem, coming in and going out. 29 And he spoke boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus and disputed against the Hellenists, but they attempted to kill him. 30 When the brethren found out, they brought him down to Caesarea and sent him out to Tarsus. 31 Then the churches throughout all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria had peace and were edified. And walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit, they were multiplied.*

Now, in this passage we see Paul show up at Jerusalem. The disciples did not believe that he was really a disciple but were afraid of him, and by the way, we see nowhere in the text that during this visit that he ended up being accepted by the other apostles, merely that Barnabas brought him before them. Now if the disciples really did fear Paul, as the text suggests, is that because he had 3 years prior been putting followers of Yahusha to death? That doesn't seem logical to me, as we are told that Peter and John are brought before the Sanhedrin twice in Acts chapters 4 and 5, and in both cases, they boldly proclaim the truth before them all, even though they could be put to death. In fact, at the end of chapter 5, the pharisees forbid and threaten them that they cannot preach the name of Yahusha, and they went away rejoicing that they were fit to suffer for Christ. (**Acts 5:41**). These were the leaders of the other disciples in that area so one would have to assume that they were fearless at least in part. So when it says the disciples feared Paul, I kind of doubt it was because of the possibility of death, because they were facing death threats already and continued to preach Yahusha's name anyways. So could it be that they just did not trust Paul in any capacity, and something seemed off about him? Maybe. Regardless, the end result is Paul is sent away, and interestingly, after Paul is sent away, the churches have peace. This was the first time Paul did not continue with the disciples.

The second time takes place here:

*Acts 14:30-35 -So when they were sent off (from Jerusalem), they came to Antioch; and when they had gathered the multitude together, they delivered the letter. 31 When they had read it, they rejoiced over its encouragement. 32 Now Judas and Silas, themselves being prophets also, exhorted and*

*strengthened the brethren with many words. 33 And after they had stayed there for a time, they were sent back with greetings from the brethren to the apostles. 34 However, it seemed good to Silas to remain there. 35 Paul and Barnabas also remained in Antioch, teaching and preaching the word of the Lord, with many others also.*

So we see that right after the Jerusalem council, Paul and Barnabas were sent away from there. That in itself echoes the first time when they were escorted out of Jerusalem. Was this Paul being sent out with a warm hug and blessings on him? Or was it Paul being removed from the Ecclesia? It seems each time Paul visited Jerusalem, there were problems of division, and strife, and then he was sent away, and peace returned. Even on his last visit when they almost killed him in the later chapters of Acts, it was that he showed up, and believers from Asia testified against him, and put all of Jerusalem into an uproar. Clearly he could not stay there for very long as everytime he was present, there was trouble. This rather nicely fits John's first declaration, if they were of us, they would have continued with us.

Paul did not continue with them, and every time he went, it seemed he shortly thereafter had to leave. If that by itself wasn't enough evidence, in Galatians we know that Paul actually tells us how he separated from the disciples, with the lie that he would be the apostle to the gentiles and Peter to the circumcision. (Galatians 2:9). When Paul went up to Jerusalem the last time, it was not to see the apostles, but he had to go up to keep the feast and chaos ensued. On the other hand, you see Peter visiting different places such as Antioch, and preaching, but he would always return to Jerusalem to the rest of the apostles. Paul on the other hand, couldn't seem to stay in Jerusalem for any length of

time, and kept getting cast out. All in all, I think we can safely say Paul did not continue with the apostles who were in Jerusalem, though he went out from them a few times and therefore fits the first criterion for identifying a false prophet.

\* \* \*

## The Second Criterion

The second criterion is found here:

***1 John 4:2-3 - By this you know the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God, 3 and every spirit that does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is not of God. And this is the spirit of the Antichrist, which you have heard was coming, and is now already in the world.***

Now on the surface level, it seems that John is worried about those saying Yahusha didn't actually come, but this would have been absurd to think as at that time there were a huge amount of people that had seen Yahusha personally. Josephus had record of Yahusha, the Romans would have had records of His execution, the pharisees would've had record of how they fought against Him. The idea there were people claiming he didn't really come, but was some kind of farce, is ridiculous. Instead, if you read it again, notice that John is saying that there were people who were saying Yahusha didn't really come in human flesh. The word in the Greek here is sarx. It is believed to have been derived from the Greek word Saroos, which means meat, or flesh. What John was exposing here is that there was a movement among the church, that

Yahusha did not truly come in human flesh, but that he was something else besides a man. Now we know that John also declares in his gospel that The Word was made flesh, sarx. Interestingly there are 3 different places where Paul actually declares the very thing John seems to be warning against, that Yahusha did not come in human flesh, but merely the appearance thereof.

***Romans 8:3 -For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God did by sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, on account of sin: He condemned sin in the flesh,***

The first passage here is Romans, and it declares that Paul came in the likeness of sinful flesh. The word likeness here that he used is Strong's #3667, and here is the entry for it:

*Original Word: μοῖωμα, ατος, τό*

*Part of Speech: Noun, Neuter*

*Transliteration: homoiōma*

*Phonetic Spelling: (hom-oy'-o-mah)*

*Definition: that which is made like (something)*

*Usage: (originally: a thing made like something else), a likeness, or rather: form; a similitude.*

*HELPS Word-studies*

*3667 homoiōma (a neuter noun derived from homos, "the same") – properly, the same as; likeness, similitude (resemblance).*

*3667/homoiōma ("likeness, particular similarity") is a comparison used to increase understanding. 3667/homoiōma ("resemblance") does not require one element of a comparison to be derived from the other; indeed, it can be wholly separate from it. Rather, 3667 (homoiōma) refers to a basic analogy (resemblance), not an*

*exact copy.*

So the word was accurately translated as likeness. Other ways this word could have been translated were what I underlined: likeness, similitude, resemblance, or not exact copy of. If Paul was truly saying that Yahusha came in flesh and blood, this word would not have only been unnecessary, but misleading. The idea that Yahusha came in the resemblance, but not exact copy of human flesh was actually a popular heresy during the years shortly thereafter, but we will look at that in a moment. First, we will examine the other two verses and the Greek contained therein. The next 2 verses are back to back, and found here:

***Phillipians 2:7-8 - but made Himself of no reputation, taking the form of a bondservant, and coming in the likeness of men. 8 And being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient to the point of death, even the death of the cross.***

In verse 7 we have two occurrences of the idea of appearance, the first being in the form of a bondservant. The word there is Strong's #3444, Morphe. The entry for that word is here:

*morphé: form, shape*

*Original Word: μορφή, ς,*

*Part of Speech: Noun, Feminine*

*Transliteration: morphé*

*Phonetic Spelling: (mor-fay')*

*Definition: form, shape*

*Usage: form, shape, outward appearance.*

This word is obviously the derivation of the English word morph, which

means to take the shape of, or change ones appearance into. Once again, the idea that Yahusha did not come as a bondservant, but only appeared as one. The second word here when it says in verse 7 he came in the likeness of men, is that same word as before, homoióma. Again, translated as form, appearance, or not exact copy, but having a similitude to. The last word however, found in verse 8, is yet another word. It is Strong's #4976 schéma. The entry is as follows:

*Original Word:* σχημα, ατος, τό

*Part of Speech:* Noun, Neuter

*Transliteration:* schéma

*Phonetic Spelling:* (skhay'-mah)

*Definition:* figure, shape

*Usage:* fashion, habit, form, appearance.

*HELPS Word-studies*

*4976 sxma – properly, exterior shape (form); (figuratively) the outer “shape” (manner, appearance).*

*4976/sxēma (“outward, visible form”) is used of Jesus’ earthly body (Phil 2:7,8). Christ incarnated into a genuine physical body, which was not an “exact match with typical humanity” because His body was never touched or tainted by sin (even original sin).*

The assertion here at the end that I underlined, is the attempt by the translators to justify Paul's use of this word, but I included it because they themselves declare that Yahusha was not an exact match with humanity, but different. This word, schéma, is where we derive the word Schematics, which is roughly the drawing or likeness made of an object, especially a structure or invention with which one may craft said object. Once again though, the word very clearly denotes the idea that though Yahusha's body appeared to be fully human, it was not. Again, if Paul was trying to declare He came truly in human flesh, sarx,

flesh and bone, to use these words would have been unnecessary and misleading. Further, to reinforce this idea using 3 different words here meant he was really explaining to those reading his letters, that indeed Yahusha only came in the appearance of human flesh. This matches identically with John's warning of those teaching this doctrine. This line of reasoning by itself can be sufficient, however, I want to pull out one more thing for your consideration.

We have record of a man by the name of Marcion who actually taught this very thing, and in fact, built a whole heretical arm of the Ecclesia. His teachings included heresies such as the God of the Old Testament being a different and evil God from the God of the new Testament. He taught that Paul was the only true apostle of Yahusha, and the other twelve were false apostles and couldn't be trusted. Lastly he taught that Yahusha was not truly a man, but something else that just appeared like a man. This man, as you may have surmised, was a devout follower of Paul. The following are some excerpts from two wikipages, respectively Marcionism, and Marcion of Sinope.

*Marcion of Sinope (/mrn, -in, -sin/; Greek: Μαρξίων[1][note 1] Σινώπης; c. 85 – c. 160) was an important figure in early Christianity. Marcion preached that the god who sent Jesus into the world was a different, higher deity than the creator god of Judaism.[2] He considered himself a follower of Paul the Apostle, who he believed to have been the only true apostle of Jesus Christ.[3]*

---

*Marcion believed that Jesus was the savior sent by God, and Paul the Apostle was his chief apostle, but he rejected the Hebrew Bible and the God of Israel. Marcionists believed that the wrathful Hebrew*

*God was a separate and lower entity than the all-forgiving God of the New Testament.*

*Marcionism, similar to Gnosticism, depicted the God of the Old Testament as a tyrant or demiurge (see also God as the Devil). Marcion was the son of a bishop of Sinope in Pontus. About the middle of the second century (140–155) he traveled to Rome, where he joined the Syrian Gnostic Cerdo.[2]*

*Marcion's canon, possibly the first Christian canon ever compiled, consisted of eleven books: a gospel consisting of ten sections drawn from the Gospel of Luke; and ten Pauline epistles.[3] Marcion's canon rejected the entire Old Testament, along with all other epistles and gospels of what would become the 27-book New Testament canon, which during his life had yet to be compiled.[4][5] Paul's epistles enjoy a prominent position in the Marcionite canon, since Paul was considered by Marcion to be Christ's only true apostle.[6]*

*Church Fathers such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Tertullian denounced Marcion as a heretic, and he was excommunicated by the church of Rome around 144 CE*

Further, there is a quote from Tertullian in the book Against Marcion Book 3, that Marcion stated and taught that Yahusha “was not what he appeared to be... flesh and yet not flesh, man and yet not man.”

So this man, Marcion, rejected the Hebrew God, the Hebrew scriptures, and all other Hebrew roots of our faith, and declared that Yahusha did not come in the flesh, and that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was actually an evil God and not the God of the New testament. Marcion cited Paul as being the only true apostle, and only walked

by his teachings. He also considered Luke's gospel (as Paul's personal companion) the only trustable gospel.

Now interestingly, though Marcionism itself was denounced and dissolved over time, the actions of Marcionism seem to have carried on throughout the church. First, there are many who teach that Yah was drastically different in the Old Testament, versus the New. They don't really state it's a different God altogether, just that Yah changed somewhere in between. Many preachers wrestle with explaining why Yah was so strict with His torah and severe with punishment in the Old Testament, and then so lax (according to Paul's gospels) with law and obedience in the New Testament. Many more actually just ignore the Old Testament as a whole and teach nearly exclusively from the New Testament. One prominent teacher among the modern church (and many others eagerly agree) that we as Christians should "unhitch ourselves from the Old Testament".

Further, though few would venture to say Paul is the ONLY apostle, many constantly claim he is the GREATEST apostle. People act as if Paul takes precedence over all other apostles. Further, because we were born gentiles, and since Paul is believed to be the apostle to the gentiles, they act as if Paul's letters are the only doctrines we need. They constantly cite that the Old Testament, and Yahusha's teachings, and the writings of the other apostles, were written to the Jews, and Paul exclusively wrote to the gentiles, therefore as "gentiles" we only really need to listen to Paul. Basically, though they keep the other authors of the scripture, they may as well throw them out, as all of their doctrine and conduct comes from Paul anyways.

But, that little rabbit trail aside, it would appear that Paul also fits the criterion of teaching Yahusha did not truly come in the flesh.

## The Third Criterion

The third criterion is found here:

***1 John 4:6 We are of God. He who knows God hears us; he who is not of God does not hear us. By this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.***

John states that whoever is of God hears “us”. The word “hears” can also be translated as listens to, or to receives from. Now I believe here the us is referring to the twelve apostles stationed in Jerusalem. This would make sense once again because they were established by Yahusha Himself as the foundation of the church, as referenced by the foundations of the new Jerusalem that we will look at in a bit. Essentially, Yahusha was the chief cornerstone, the foundational stones were arranged according to the cornerstone, and the other stones have built upon that foundation. It stands to reason that John is declaring here, whoever hears us (the 12), knows Yah. Whoever does not hear us, is not of Yah. Now in Galatians 2:6, Paul boldly proclaims that he learned nothing from the disciples, and this was right before he separated from them. To further his unwillingness to learn, he claims that though they were reported to be something great, they weren’t, and then later in the chapter accuses Peter as a hypocrite, and James as sending men who led Peter astray.

In another place he claims that the gospel he preached he did not receive from men (ie the apostles) and was not taught it, but that he got it directly

from personal revelation.

***Galatians 1:11-12 But I make known to you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. 12 For I neither received it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through the revelation of Jesus Christ.***

The scenario Paul presents in Galatians is that he presented his gospel that he miraculously received to the bumbling apostles, they couldn't teach him anything new as he was already so knowledgeable, and were so impressed with him, decided they didn't need to go to the gentiles at all, because the greatest apostle, Paul, was going to go in Peter's stead. Thus Paul separated from the disciples. The far more likely scenario is that Paul preached his gospel, the apostles tried to correct him, he refused to heed them, and was sent away. This would also explain Paul's seeming bitterness towards the apostles in these chapters. If this is indeed the case, which logic seems to dictate, then Paul also fits the third criterion for being a false apostle.

\* \* \*

## The Fourth Criterion

The final criterion is found here:

***2 John 7-11 - For many deceivers have gone out into the world who do not confess Jesus Christ as coming in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. 8 Look to yourselves, that we do not lose those things we worked for, but that we may receive***

***a full reward. 9 Whoever transgresses and does not abide in the doctrine of Christ does not have God. He who abides in the doctrine of Christ has both the Father and the Son. 10 If anyone comes to you and does not bring this doctrine, do not receive him into your house nor greet him; 11 for he who greets him shares in his evil deeds.***

Now, this final criterion is a bit open to interpretation. It is that whoever does not abide in the doctrine of Christ is a deceiver and evil. Now, the doctrine of Christ could be a few different things. It could be the doctrine of who Yahusha was, being fully God, and yet fully man, which Paul teaches against Yahusha being fully man. It could be the teachings, i.e. doctrines of Christ, such as what he taught regarding loving the brethren, not speaking evil of one another, going to one another privately on matters of misconduct, and turning the other cheek, all of which Paul goes against. Or, it could simply mean the doctrine that Christ came into the world to redeem us, and forgive us, and there is no salvation without him. In only the last case does Paul not fit this criterion, so interpret this one as you will.

Altogether, looking at the 4 different warnings that John gave about false teachers, and antichrists, and the spirit of error, Paul fits into at least definitively 1, but logically all 4, criteria for being just such a false prophet and antichrist. Now as I mentioned earlier, antichrist does not necessarily mean the opposite of Christ, but can also mean the replacement of Christ. An antichrist would get people's eyes off of Yahusha, and onto themselves, overshadowing the teachings of Messiah, and causing people to turn away from the truth. Paul's teachings much of the time overshadow the teachings of Yahusha, and the rest of the Bible, and we see at least one example of Paul putting himself as a buffer

## JOHN'S WARNINGS

between us and Christ, in the statement that we are to imitate him as he imitates Christ. The only issue is, his conduct does not imitate Christ in many, many, ways. Now I am not asserting that Paul is the antichrist, but I am suggesting that perhaps he had the spirit thereof, with lying signs and wonders in order to deceive, if possible, even the elect.

## Paul in Revelation

Regarding Paul, there is a verse, that we read over, but don't really consider, who's implications are huge. I will cite the verse, and then explain why it is so big an issue.

***2 Timothy 1:15 - This you know, that all those in Asia have turned away from me***

Now the question is; why is this significant? Well, First of all, when we look at the book of Revelation, we have to ask who the first few chapters are written to.

***Revelation 1:4 - John, to the seven churches which are in Asia:***

***Revelation 1:11 - saying, "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last," and, "What you see, write in a book and send it to the seven churches which are in Asia: to Ephesus, to Smyrna, to Pergamos, to Thyatira, to Sardis, to Philadelphia, and to Laodicea."***

***Revelation 1:20 - The mystery of the seven stars which you saw in My right hand, and the seven golden lampstands: The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven lampstands which you saw are the seven churches.***

The 7 churches that are written to in the book of Revelation, are all in Asia. All of these churches were according to Revelation, genuine churches following Christ, some better than others, but one thing they seem to have had in common, is they rejected Paul, because Paul is very clear that all those in Asia had turned against him. Further, the verse in 2 Timothy said, “this you know”. This suggests that this was not hidden or uncommon knowledge. The word of this occurrence likely reached Timothy before this letter was written, thus the phrasing there. Many have made the assertion that Paul’s use of the word “all” here doesn’t really mean all, but even if pursuing this line of thinking, all at the very least means the vast majority, which doesn’t weaken this point in any way.

Now, let’s run through this logically. Paul is sent with a personal message from Christ Himself, to the gentiles in Asia. Paul preaches throughout all of Asia, but things don’t go well. He ends up being nearly completely rejected by the entirety of Asia. Yah then gives John an epic vision and Yahusha gives John specific instructions to write letters to each of the churches in Asia. Each of these letters contain what each church is doing right, what they are doing wrong, things they’ll have to endure, dangerous doctrines they hold, and specific rewards given for overcoming specific obstacles. In all of this Yahusha didn’t make a single mention of the apostle He personally chose, trained, gave the gospel to, and sent to these very people? No warnings are given to the churches in Asia like, hey, I sent my messenger to you, but you rejected him, you need to repent of that, and accept him?

Even if Revelation was written before the vast majority of Asia rejected Paul, Yahusha gave prophecies of things some of the churches would have to suffer, or what would happen if they failed to overcome the issues present within them. There's not a single mention of, hey, I'm sending a messenger to you, you're going to be tempted to reject him, but you need to hear him? And yet in all the warnings and admonitions given in Revelation, not one bit of instruction is given to accept someone they rejected, or to be on the look out for someone who would be sent to them. Not a word.

Now this already looks kind of bad, but when we dig a little deeper, it gets so much worse. I want to draw attention to one church in particular, Ephesus. Now Paul actually spoke of visiting Ephesus in particular on his journeys, and I want to point something out to you.

***Acts 19:1 - And it happened, while Apollos was at Corinth, that Paul, having passed through the upper regions, came to Ephesus.***

***Acts 19:8-10 -And he went into the synagogue and spoke boldly for three months, reasoning and persuading concerning the things of the kingdom of God. 9 But when some were hardened and did not believe, but spoke evil of the Way before the multitude, he departed from them and withdrew the disciples, reasoning daily in the school of Tyrannus. 10 And this continued for two years, so that all who dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks.***

Now, remember something important, Luke, the author of Acts, likely truly believed Paul was teaching the true way, and the true gospel. If Luke believed Paul to be a false apostle, he probably wouldn't have

accompanied him. Further, remember that in the section that we discussed Marcionism, Marcion only included the writings of Luke, outside of the writings of Paul himself. Therefore Luke would have likely perceived, and thus written, that the multitude was speaking evil of “the way”. Now if Paul came preaching a different gospel, and a different message, and they rejected it, because they had already heard the truth from the true apostle to the Gentiles, Peter, then once again, Luke would’ve thought they were just rejecting the way. In reality, they may have very well just been rejecting Paul’s way. Further, once again Paul affirms that all those in Asia heard his message, all those in Asia were written to by Yahusha, and all those in Asia rejected Paul. Again, if you want to assert that the word all doesn’t really mean everyone, we can still say that the vast majority in Asia heard Paul’s message, the vast majority rejected him, and Yahusha never made any mention of this being a problem at all when instructing John what to write to the churches in Asia.

Now as you read this next verse, keep in mind that of all those he preached to in Asia, Ephesus in particular hardened their hearts against him, and ran him out of the city.

***Revelation 2:1-2 - “To the angel of the church of Ephesus write,***

***These things says He who holds the seven stars in His right hand, who walks in the midst of the seven golden lampstands: 2 “I know your works, your labor, your patience, and that you cannot bear those who are evil. And you have tested those who say they are apostles and are not, and have found them liars;***

This is a massive argument against Paul. Remember once again that

Paul does not fit the criteria for being an apostle set forth here:

***Acts 1:21-22 - "Therefore, of these men who have accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, 22 beginning from the baptism of John to that day when He was taken up from us, one of these must become a witness with us of His resurrection."***

Further, if we go back to **Acts 21:27-29** we find Paul on trial because born again Jews zealous for the law sought an inquiry against him, (**Acts 20:21-21**) and during the trial, the Jews from Asia were the ones who stirred up the people against Paul. So it could have very easily been the Jews from the 7 churches which were in Asia that came up to Jerusalem to report to the other apostles, and try to get him put on trial for teaching against Yah's law.

All in all this is a tremendous argument against Paul. If we look deeper though, there are still some other things to consider though. I am going to throw some scripture at you, for you to judge for yourself.

***1 Corinthians 8:4-8 - Therefore concerning the eating of things offered to idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is no other God but one. 5 For even if there are so-called gods, whether in heaven or on earth (as there are many gods and many lords), 6 yet for us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we for Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and through whom we live. 7 However, there is not in everyone that knowledge; for some, with consciousness of the idol, until now eat it as a thing offered to an idol; and their conscience, being weak, is defiled. 8 But food does not***

*commend us to God; for neither if we eat are we the better, nor if we do not eat are we the worse.*

*Revelation 2:14- But I have a few things against you, because you have there those who hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to put a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit sexual immorality.*

Paul over and over seemed to have made the same statement regarding food sacrificed to idols, if you feel guilty about eating it, don't, but if not, don't worry about it. If someone up front tells you the food is sacrificed to an idol, don't eat it, but if they don't tell, don't ask, just eat it. Notice how he minimizes this commandment down to being, yeah, don't worry too much about it. He doesn't even seem to take issue with the possibility of someone eating in a pagan temple, (**1 Corinthians 8:10**) which were known to be the very places food would've been sacrificed to idols, with the caveat of, as long as a weaker brother isn't caused to stumble by it.

Now we know those in Asia turned against Paul, but we also know Paul preached his doctrines there, so even if the man himself was rejected, some of the doctrines might've been kept. Further, it only states some of them in this church (Pergamos), held this doctrine. This makes it more likely that most had rejected Paul, and his teachings, but some did not. Even in that same passage of 2 Timothy, Paul mentions by name a man who took care of him at Ephesus. Ephesus overwhelmingly turned against Paul, but Onesiphorus didn't apparently. Given what Paul wrote about food sacrificed to idols, he seems to fit the first criterion.

What of the sexual immorality?

***1 Corinthians 7:7-8 7 For I wish that all men were even as I myself. But each one has his own gift from God, one in this manner and another in that.***

***8 But I say to the unmarried and to the widows: It is good for them if they remain even as I am; 9 but if they cannot exercise self-control, let them marry. For it is better to marry than to burn with passion.***

***1 Corinthians 7:26-28 - 26 I suppose therefore that this is good because of the present distress—that it is good for a man to remain as he is: 27 Are you bound to a wife? Do not seek to be loosed. Are you loosed from a wife? Do not seek a wife. 28 But even if you do marry, you have not sinned; and if a virgin marries, she has not sinned. Nevertheless such will have trouble in the flesh, but I would spare you.***

Paul on a few different occasions in his letters talks about how it's better to be as he is in that he had no wife. He taught very clearly to those at Corinth not to seek a wife, and that having a wife will cause trouble in the flesh. He basically says, well, if you have to marry, you haven't quite sinned, but it's much better not to marry, and remain as I am, because with marriage comes problems. This is not only completely contradictive to what we see in the rest of scripture, (i.e. be fruitful and multiply, a woman is a helper and a gift from Yah, and children are a blessing), but it also puts people in a position where they think that it's better to try to abstain from sexuality completely. Now what happens when you bring a man who is very hungry into a buffet? Sexual repression based upon the idea that somehow you're more holy, or a better follower of Yah if you're single is literally a recipe for sexual immorality wrapped in the appearance of light.

Did Paul overtly teach sexual immorality? No, and he actually frequently taught against it. But did Paul's teachings cause many to stumble in the area of sexual immorality? Maybe. Let me give you an example, did the Catholic church teach sexual immorality to its priests when they commanded no priest can have a wife or sleep with a woman based upon the very words of Paul we just looked at above? No. But what was the result? Mass secretive sexual immorality in the form of homosexuality, pedophilia, and others. They remain unmarried, and seen publicly as holier for it, but secretly this abstinence has caused them to search out sexual satisfaction in places that Yah never endorsed or allowed. I would postulate that these teachings of Paul, even though Paul never taught anyone that it was okay to commit sexual immorality, has led to sexual immorality en masse.

Now regarding the comparison of the one who brought these doctrines to the church being like Balaam, consider the following:

- Balak sent to Balaam, to curse the people of Israel.
- The pharisees sent Paul, to kill the followers of Yahusha (Israel).
  
- Yah rebuked Balaam for obeying the voice of Balaak.
- Paul claims Yahusha rebuked him for obeying the voice of the pharisees and murdering.
  
- Balaam tried to curse Israel.
- Paul tried to kill Israel.

## THE PAUL PAPER

- Balaam ended up blessing Israel.
- Every death in the early church brought a new wave of zealousness and new converts, with martyrs like Stephen ultimately being a blessing in disguise.
  
- Balaam instead when he perceived he couldn't win, just told Balak how to weaken Israel with food sacrificed to idols.
- Paul after his alleged conversion taught the people it was okay to eat food sacrificed to idols.
  
- Balaam didn't outright teach the children of Israel to commit sexual immorality, he merely sent in powerful sexual temptations that the men fell to.
- Paul didn't outright teach sexual immorality, he merely put them in a position of powerful sexual temptations.

These similarities are rather striking in my opinion. Striking enough to at least loosely compare Paul to Balaam. However, whether you accept this line of reasoning or not, it doesn't change the fact that Ephesus, the very church that hardened their hearts against Paul, was commended for rejecting a false apostle, and outside of that possible reference, you will find no hint of Paul being mentioned to the churches in Asia where Paul had so much issue.

## Paul and the New Jerusalem

In the new Jerusalem there are 12 foundations, each of which contains the name of one of the twelve apostles.

***Revelation 12:14*** *Now the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them were the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.*

Now, we understand that we, as the body of Christ, are living stones being built up into a temple for Yah (**1 Peter 2:5**) We also see that the 12 foundations bear the names of the apostles. This denotes that the 12 apostles, are the foundation on which the stones were laid, with Yahusha being the chief cornerstone (**Matthew 21:42**) that aligned all the other stones of the foundation as well as being the builder who laid the foundation. It's a picture of Yahusha, coming and being the true foundation for the Ecclesia, but laying the foundation for the kingdom through his apostles, and then we, the Ecclesia, build off of that foundation. The significance of the new Jerusalem is truly beautiful. Anyways, my point is this: 12 foundations, 12 apostles, where does the 13th apostle Paul, fit in? Where is Paul's name on the New

Jerusalem? Don't you think that if he was really the greatest apostle as everyone claims, he would have some sort of high honor within the new Jerusalem? Where's the verse that talks about the biggest, thickest layer of the foundation with the name of the greatest apostle on it? It is absent.

Now some assert that Paul, and not Matthias was the true twelfth apostle, and that it would be Paul's not Matthias' name on the twelfth foundation. Let me explain why that is such a problematic argument starting with the passage where Matthias was chosen.

*Acts 1:12-26 Then they returned to Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is near Jerusalem, a Sabbath day's journey. 13 And when they had entered, they went up into the upper room where they were staying: Peter, James, John, and Andrew; Philip and Thomas; Bartholomew and Matthew; James the son of Alphaeus and Simon the Zealot; and Judas the son of James. 14 These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brothers.*

*15 And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples (altogether the number of names was about a hundred and twenty), and said, 16 "Men and brethren, this Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit spoke before by the mouth of David concerning Judas, who became a guide to those who arrested Jesus; 17 for he was numbered with us and obtained a part in this ministry."*

*18 (Now this man purchased a field with the [g]wages of iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst open in the middle and all his entrails gushed out. 19 And it became known to all those dwelling in Jerusalem; so that field is called in their*

*own language, Akel Dama, that is, Field of Blood.)*

*20 "For it is written in the Book of Psalms:*

*'Let his dwelling place be desolate,*

*And let no one live in it';*

*and,*

*'Let another take his office.'*

*21 "Therefore, of these men who have accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, 22 beginning from the baptism of John to that day when He was taken up from us, one of these must become a witness with us of His resurrection."*

*23 And they proposed two: Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. 24 And they prayed and said, "You, O Lord, who know the hearts of all, show which of these two You have chosen 25 to take part in this ministry and apostleship from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place." 26 And they cast their lots, and the lot fell on Matthias. And he was numbered with the eleven apostles.*

In order to have Paul actually be the true twelfth apostle, and not Matthias, it would suggest that appointing Matthias would have been a mistake. There's no other way around it. Either Paul was the twelfth, or Matthias was, and if the disciples chose Matthias, when it was really Paul's place, choosing Matthias was a mistake. So let me put forward the scenario presented where Matthias was mistakenly chosen.

Each of the other eleven apostles were at Jerusalem praying, with 120 other various followers including Mary and the brothers of Yahusha. Peter, upon a whim, and not led of the Spirit, stands up and declares that they had to fill the office of apostle that Judas left vacant. Peter

again upon whim, not being led of the Spirit, makes up a criteria on the spot that seems like a good idea to him. The other ten apostles, Mary, Yahusha's brothers, and the other 110 other believers who had all been praying and making supplication and seeking Yah, had no red flags and they all agreed that it was a good idea. They go through the choices of who fits Peter's mistaken criteria, and come up with two potential men, Matthias, and Barsabas. They decide to cast lots, and the lot falls on Matthias and they number him with the other apostles. Nowhere does Yah attempt to stop this proceeding, nowhere do any of the other ten apostles feel anything off about this proceeding, and there is no debate, no argument, and no hint of anything being amiss. The eleven apostles, Mary, Yahusha's brothers, and the other 120 followers who had been praying, fasting, and seeking Yah, were all unanimously duped, and Matthias was falsely counted among the twelve.

In order to accept this narrative that Mathias was a mistake, it paints a picture of the other eleven not seeming to have a clue of how the Spirit is leading, and after seeking Yah and praying about this, still end up making a mistake, and Yah doesn't bother to intervene in any of this, in spite of them seeking Him on the matter. That scenario to me is far and away more offensive than the idea that Paul may have been a false apostle.

Still others try to establish this as being the likely scenario, by stating that Paul had much more to show for his apostleship than Matthias did. They say "Look at all the wonderful things Paul did, but Matthias barely made any impact at all, so Paul must be the true twelfth apostle." The issue with this assertion is we really don't have much record of what most of the other apostles did. We have writings from Peter, James, and John, but what of Andrew Phillip or Thomas? What records do we have of the impact they made? Are their offices as apostle now in question

as well because of the lack of writings we have from or about them? This too is a weak argument. The fact that we have so many accounts of Paul, while having very little about Matthias is not proof that Paul was a mighty man of Yah, while Matthias was not, it is merely proof that Luke kept better records about Paul than about Matthias. To accept the narrative that Paul was the true twelfth apostle, while Matthias was a mistake, is clearly the more offensive and unlikely scenario.

Another argument that frequently circulates is calling into question what an apostle actually is. While it is true that apostle merely means messenger, this doesn't change the argument at all. Some claim that Paul was an apostle, and so were the other 110 at Jerusalem, and perhaps this is correct going purely by the word apostle. By this understanding, I'm an apostle too, and so are you, and so is everyone who are messengers of Messiah. The question being presented here however is not whether or not Paul was a messenger, but rather if Paul was one of the twelve Apostles, who were the foundation for the Ecclesia. Either he was one of the heads of Ecclesia, or he was not. It's clear from the text in Acts as well as the Revelation, not to mention Paul's own admission that Peter, James, and John were pillars of the early church, that this position among the other eleven apostles was an office, and a seat of authority. Yah is a God of order and structure, and He deemed it necessary to set in place these seats of authority in order to oversee, and establish order in the church.

If Paul was one of the twelve, and in one of these seats of authority, being just as authoritative as the other apostles, then we are presented with the scenario above, of Matthias being a mistake. If he wasn't counted as one of the twelve authorities in the early church, then his conduct of confronting and rebuking them (Galatians 2), claiming to receive nothing from them (Galatians 2), and his assertion of being every bit

as legitimate as the other apostles (2 Corinthians 11), can only be seen as absolute rebellion against the seats of authority that Yah established. There is no way around this.

The final argument I will present is that Paul filled the seat of one of the other apostles after death, such as when James was killed. This presents two rather glaring issues. First, it still does not change that the foundation of the New Jerusalem has written twelve names of the twelve apostles on it that are the foundation for the church. Paul still wouldn't be included on it, lest James having been martyred for his faith and faithful unto death, forfeited his name on one of the foundations. Obviously this cannot be the case, so Paul still is not counted as being one of the foundations for the Ecclesia, and therefore of having lesser authority than the others. The other issue is that if these offices of apostle constantly had to be replaced, and Paul merely took another vacancy, why didn't others fill these specific offices as they opened up, and where are these twelve apostolic seats of authority now? If that is your argument, look no further than the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and their quorum of the twelve, where they claim they have an ever changing twelve men who sit in the very same seats of authority as true apostles. I hear they are eager for new converts. All joking aside though, for the sake of your soul, do not go near that church.

After all is said and done, I see no conceivable way around the notion that Paul is not included upon the New Jerusalem, and therefore his authority as an apostle is severely called into question.

## Paul's Thorn in the Flesh

One thing many seem to overlook is Paul's thorn in the flesh that is mentioned in 2 Corinthians. I have heard a few preachers over the years try to explain what this thorn in the flesh really is. Some have said it is blindness. I myself have heard a sermon that the thorn was actually all the struggles Paul endured such as the beatings, the imprisonment, and general persecution. However, Paul tells us in no uncertain terms what this thorn is, and I think it is extremely significant. The passage that identifies his thorn is here:

*2 Corinthians 12:7-9 - And lest I should be exalted above measure by the abundance of the revelations, a thorn in the flesh was given to me, a messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I be exalted above measure. 8 Concerning this thing I pleaded with the Lord three times that it might depart from me. 9 And He said to me, "My grace is sufficient for you, for My strength is made perfect in weakness." Therefore most gladly I will rather boast in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.*

Now interestingly the text clearly says a messenger of Satan. In other words, Paul was chronically tormented by a demon. One could make an argument that this was the constant opposition Paul faced. That these people who opposed him and persecuted him were “messengers” of Satan. However, when we look at the Greek, it becomes a bit more interesting. The word for messenger here, is Strong’s #32 Aggelos. This is the entry thereof:

*aggelos: an angel, messenger*

*Original Word: γγελος, ου,*

*Part of Speech: Noun, Masculine*

*Transliteration: aggelos*

*Phonetic Spelling: (ang'-el-os)*

*Definition: a messenger, angel*

*Usage: a messenger, generally a (supernatural) messenger from God, an angel, conveying news or behests from God to men.*

The second word in the phrase “Messenger of Satan”, is the standard Satanus (Strong’s #4567) and is Satan, the adversary. Paul clearly identifies that an angel of Satan was this thorn in his flesh. A demon. This is a decidedly disturbing revelation. Further, it said he inquired three times about having this thorn removed, and he was told no, and that he would have to bear this demonic torment. Now, contrast this with the words of the disciples, and the words of Yahusha Himself.

***Luke 10:17-20 - 17 Then the seventy returned with joy, saying, “Lord, even the demons are subject to us in Your name.” 18 And He said to them, “I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven. 19 Behold, I give you the authority to trample on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall by any means hurt you. 20***

***Nevertheless do not rejoice in this, that the spirits are subject to you, but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven."***

In this portion, Yahusha sends out 70 disciples to go and preach, and they come back astounded that they have power over demons, and Yahusha clearly states He gives them authority over these spirits. Where was Paul's authority over his thorn in the flesh, this angelos Satanas, this angel of Satan? Further, Yahusha declares to His disciples, while talking about the demons, that nothing shall by any means hurt them. Now obviously He didn't mean nothing as in no physical infirmity, as we know John was boiled in oil and many followers were killed in horrific ways, but He is clearly stating that no demon would be able to hurt them. Why was Paul able then to be tormented by this demon? Consider this passage as well.

***Mark 16:17-18 - 17 And these signs will follow those who believe: In My name they will cast out demons; they will speak with new tongues; 18 they will take up serpents; and if they drink anything deadly, it will by no means hurt them; they will lay hands on the sick, and they will recover.***

Once again we see Yahusha promising that those who follow Him that they would cast out Demons, as well as other amazing feats. I ask, why couldn't Paul cast this demon out of his life? It seems contrary to the promises and declarations that Yahusha made to those who follow Him. I can't find any other reference of any other apostle being tormented, or even having any issue with any demon. They truly did trample upon them, except it seems, Paul, who was unable to get power over his. With this in mind, consider again James' writings. First he warns of becoming a teacher, and of the danger of the tongue, then he warns

of the theology of salvation by faith and grace alone without works, followed by warnings of self seeking and then this verse:

***James 3:15 This wisdom does not descend from above, but is earthly, sensual, demonic.***

I find it hard to reconcile that a man who was supposedly the greatest apostle, who did more for the Kingdom than any other, was tormented by a demon for most of his life, and that not only could he not be rid of it, but Yah refused to deliver him from it. Further, we do not know exactly how this demon tormented him. I would pose the question, if a man in the modern day began preaching the gospel, and publicly admitted to having demonic oppression, would you have confidence in him?

## Closing Thoughts

After studying these things out, and giving an honest and unbiased look at the information, I have concluded that Paul may not be as legitimate as people seem to think he is. Any one of these points by themselves is an issue worth at least considering, but altogether they build quite a hefty case against Paul. Further, this paper says nothing of the countless historical documents, letters between apostles, and dozens of other evidences that cast a doubtful light on Paul. These are merely some of the biggest ones I myself found in scripture. Ultimately, none of us have perfect theology, or a perfect understanding of scripture, and I admit freely that perhaps I'm wrong about my conclusion, however once again, all I can do is humbly pray and seek Yah on these matters, and look at the evidences, and weigh out the data for myself. Just like a jury, I have to look at the facts and evidences presented before me, and make a logical decision based upon what I see, and with all of these things in mind, I believe Paul was not a legitimate apostle. I hope this paper has been a help to you, and not a stumbling block. May Yah lead us all into all truth.

