

RBM - Feedback - 3

11-27-2014, Thursday, 11:55pm, Movement

Reply to Everett was sent 11-28-2014, 11:38am, A Document Reply to Movement

Everett Leisure,

Thank you for the response to my book, you have far too many questions for me to answer in depth on every detail mentioned. What could take years weeks or months to answer every critique, and you would pose a hundred more on each word. Please keep it brief and that means quantity also. Give me five or ten direct questions at a time for a best response session.

My responses on some pieces are highlighted in gray. You made some great questions and I wish you could have given some of them before it was published, so that more thorough answers or references could be given in the book. In all, this book is a general outline of events and not nearly as speculative as you are stating. ALL my statements tried to get at least three references, or direct statements, before I put it in the book. The very rare event of speculations were directly stated as an assumption. Not all references are given in the book, for if they were all listed, it would be a very boring read, with too much junk to look around. I did think of doing a theology version with all references, but that would have delayed publishing at least a year, and I have never seen two theologians that completely agree on anything when you broaden the statements.

This book is for all levels of readers, and the theologians are going to have to get into the Josephus books to get deeper answers. It is a starting point for other writers to dig into each component and write their own piece.

You could write a complete book just on the piece where Peter spoke about Paul! I am not going to do that, I have too many other parts to tell and lead people to an overall understanding that the deception is real, and your favorite “apostle Paul” is the cause of the deception. It is not blaspheme to question a prophet to understand the truth. It is blaspheme to add to and change the ways, as Paul and “Titus” Josephis did.

11-27-2014, Thursday, 11:55pm, Movement

Hello Steve!

I hope all is well. I'm beginning to climb out of my festival backlog hole. I still have lots of leads picked up at SOOJ to investigate, but I thought I'd at least check in with you and mention a couple things.

First, I strongly recommend you check your translation of 2 Pet 3:14-18 against that on Scripture4all.org. I have found their work to be brutally honest, but it doesn't at all agree with your translation.

I did investigate their translation of 'dusnoEtos' (G 1425) in 2Pet 3:16. They claim the primary meaning of that word is ill-minded, but they allow that the intended meaning is 'hard to apprehend'. Somehow those don't seem connected. However, the Liddell & Scott lexicon, Thayer's, Arndt & Gingrich and Strong's all put the meaning as 'hard to understand' or something like that. Sometimes Scripture4all forms their meanings based on the short words that make up a longer word. Perhaps they've done that here, but I can't tell.

The only reason I can see for ill-minded is that the next word in most of these lexicons is 'δύσνοια' which means ill-willed. Below is from the Liddell & Scott Lexicon

δυσ-νόητος, ον, *hard to be understood*, Darius ap. D.L. 9.13, 2
Ep.Pet.3.16; χρησιμοί Luc.Alex.54.11. Act., *slow of*
understanding, Vett.Val.345.26.

p. 459

δύσ-νοια, ἡ, *disaffection, ill-will,*
malevolence, S.El.654, E.Hec.973, Pl.Tht.151d, Plu.Demetr.3, Phld. Lib.p.29 O
., etc.

If you really think they're missing some things point out the word(s) and we can discuss them.

The following two pages are from the Greek Interlinear translation that matches with the Latin versions. All the Greek versions are nearly identical, so picking the most exacting source should have a minimal effect on content. This author, S. C. Buren, retranslated the Greek text to English, and placed each translated word, immediately following each Greek word. This allows discerning 'skeptics' to verify every word and source.

Do a Mouse - over, do not click on the blue words

2 Peter 3:14 Greek Apostolic Study Bible (translations by Author)

Διὸ, Therefore ἀγαπητοί, Beloved ταῦτα It Is προσδοκῶντες To Expect σπουδάσατε Diligently Made ἄσπλοι Without Spot καὶ And ἀμώμητοι Blameless αὐτῷ By Him εὑρεθῆναι To Find ἐν In εἰρήνῃ. Peace

KJV with Strong's

Wherefore beloved seeing that ye look for such things be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace without spot and blameless

Authors Translation

14 Therefore beloved, it is to expect diligently made unblemished and innocent by him, to find in peace.

2 Peter 3:15 Greek Apostolic Study Bible (translations by Author)

καὶ Also τὴν The τοῦ The κυρίου Lord ἡμῶν Among Us μακροθυμίαν Patiently σωτηρίαν delivered ἠγεῖσθε Leaders καθὼς Accordingly καὶ Even ὁ The ἀγαπητὸς Beloved ἡμῶν Among Us ἀδελφός A Brother Παῦλος Paul κατὰ Against τὴν The δοθεῖσαν Giving αὐτῷ He σοφίαν Skillfully ἔγραψεν Wrote ὑμῖν, You

KJV with Strong's

And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you

Also the 'The Lord Among Us' patiently delivered leaders accordingly
Even the beloved among us, a brother Paul against the giving.
He skillfully wrote you.

Authors Translation

*15 Also the Lord among us (Yahshua), patiently delivered leaders accordingly.
Even the beloved among us (trusted friends), a brother Paul, was against the giving.
He skillfully wrote you.*

2 Peter 3:16 Greek Apostolic Study Bible (translations by Author)

ὡς As καὶ Even ἐν In πάσαις Every ἐπιστολαῖς Letter λαλῶν Speaking ἐν In αὐταῖς His περὶ Regard τούτων, Things ἐν In αἷς Which ἐστὶν Are δυσνόητα Complicated τινα, Him ἃ Of οἱ The ἀμαθεῖς Unlearned καὶ And ἀστήρικτοι Unstable στορεβλοῦσιν Distorted ὡς As καὶ Even τὰς The λοιπὰς Remaining γραφὰς Scriptures πρὸς Advantage τὴν The ἰδίαν Distinct αὐτῶν Self ἀπώλειαν. Destruction

KJV with Strong's

As also in all his epistles speaking in them of these things in which are some things hard

[to be understood which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest as they do also the other scriptures unto their own destruction](#)

As even in every letter speaking in his regard, things in which are complicated, he who the unlearned and unstable distorted as even the remaining scriptures advantage the distinct self-destruction.

Authors Translation

16 In every letter, speaking in his regard (view) things which are hard to understand. Him of the unlearned and unstable; twisted even the remaining (ancient) scriptures to the advantage of certain destruction.

2 Peter 3:17 Greek Apostolic Study Bible (translations by Author)

[ὑμεῖς](#) Ye [οὖν](#), Therefore [ἀγαπητοί](#), Beloved [προγινώσκοντες](#) Forwarned [φυλάσσεσθε](#), Keep Watch [ἵνα](#) So That [μὴ](#) No [τῇ](#) To [τῶν](#) Of [ἀθέσμων](#) Lawless [πλάνη](#) Wanderers [συναπαχθέντες](#) Misdirect [ἐκπέσητε](#) You Astray From [τοῦ](#) The [ιδίου](#) Your Own [στηριγμοῦ](#), Firmness or Commitment

KJV with Strong's

[Ye therefore beloved seeing ye know these things before beware lest ye also being led away with the error of the wicked fall from your own stedfastness](#)

You then beloved and forewarned, keep watch so that none of the lawless wanderers misdirect you astray from your own firmness.

17 Ye therefore, beloved (trusted friends), knowing you are forewarned, keep watch so that no lawless wanderers can lead you astray, to fall from your own commitment.

2 Peter 3:18 Greek Apostolic Study Bible (translations by Author)

[αὐξάνετε](#) Enlarge [δὲ](#) But [ἐν](#) In [χάρτι](#) Kindness [καὶ](#) And [γνώσει](#) Knowledge [τοῦ](#) Of [κυρίου](#) Lord [ἡμῶν](#) Of Us [καὶ](#) And [σωτήρος](#) A Savior [Ἰησοῦ](#) Yahshua [Χριστοῦ](#). The Anointed [αὐτῷ](#) To Him [ἢ](#) The [δόξα](#) Glory [καὶ](#) Both [νῦν](#) Now [καὶ](#) Both [εἰς](#) For [ἡμέραν](#) Day [αἰῶνος](#). Of Age

KJV with Strong's

[But grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ To him be glory both now and for ever — Amen](#)

Enlarge but in kindness both knowledge of Lord of us, and deliverer Yahshua the anointed, to him the glory both now and into a day of age.

Authors Translation

18 Enlarge but in kindness and in knowledge of the Lord of us (God), and Savior Yahshua the anointed, to him the glory, both now and into a day of ages.

I thought I should read the Forward in your book if I'm going to offer suggestions on the whole book. It seemed appropriate if I were to take an orderly approach. I ran into trouble in the first sentence. 'Denominations of doctrines' threw me. I understand different perceptions have fostered divisions/groups of believers as opposed to a unity of believers. I don't know that I've ever seen doctrines grouped. How are they grouped? People who hold to certain doctrines are sometimes all put in the same bucket. One person might group based on certain things and someone else might group based on other things. Denominations are generally fairly well defined. I'm not sure I know what a denomination of doctrines is. Maybe a sub category rather than a group? I don't know. Denominations would be Catholic, Baptist, Methodist --- Doctrines would be Jews, Muslims, Buddhist, --- Then you have sub categories of Denominations - Baptist, Southern Baptist, - Reform, Orthodox --- And sub categories by Reverend A's and Reverend B's congregations - they are all different in some ways ---

'Denominations' are referred to in the next sentence and seems to indicate church groups. That same definition doesn't seem to fit in the first sentence. So I'm already a little lost.

The third sentence doesn't clarify anything for me. The deceivers evidently have intricate identifications. Is that a special name with many descriptive parts? Part of this sentence seems to be saying that the deceivers own methods and their own pieces of scripts (I assume the historical record) link a historical/heritage analysis of the kings of 1st century Israel. I gather this is evidently in your book, but it's not clear to me whether you are doing the analysis or just getting it from the 'scripts'. To me a dialogue involves at least two speakers. If a book doesn't record conversations between two people or something like that, I'm not sure I would think of it as a dialogue. At this point I'm not at all sure I know what you're saying.

Generally speaking it seems the sentences in this Forward suffer from being long, complex and oddly worded. Perhaps someone more intelligent and academically inclined than I am could easily sort it all out. If you want to be intelligible to a general audience I think you should shorten the sentences and bend over backwards to be perfectly clear about your purpose.

A FORWARD is a summary only. It can never be exacting, only a brief outline. The writer's guides of publishers ALWAYS state that any information detail should go into the body and not the forward outline that is written for the "skimmers" in the bookstore to see what it is about.

Since I examined some of Paul's lineage when we were still in MO. I thought I would complete that section.

P. 89 Para 2 you claim a young man is between 12 & 20. Some source for that would be helpful.

Numbers 26:2 from twenty years old and upward, throughout their fathers' house, all that are able to go to war in Israel.

Then the age of puberty is normally when a child becomes a young man.

Acts 8:3 KJV 'haling' evidently means to drag off especially to a judge for prosecution. Do you mean hauling? On what basis do you think Saul is calling names from a list? Do you mention that you default to the KJV? I don't remember seeing that anywhere. See page 110 for the Josephus story, and page 152 on why I use KJV.

Para 3, the last phrase beginning with 'haling' I would tend to put in another sentence. It doesn't really have any connection with the previous thoughts.

Haling is the word and spelling used in KJV Acts 8:3, I would call it hailing. It is not described in KJV, but Josephus stated that he had written the names of those at gatherings and then Costobarus and Saulus because of their kindred to Agrippa, used the prisoners to help them round up people and plunder. (page 110)(Antiq 20.9.4)

Para 5 You make many unproven statements. How do you know all these men were escorted to Antioch by Saul and the king? Do you mean everyone mentioned in 13:1? Barnabas brought Saul to Antioch(Acts 11:25). You seem to think 'being brought up with' applies to both Herod and Saul. The surface reading indicates that Saul was included in the verse because he was there in Antioch just like Barnabas, not that he was listed because he also grew up with Manaen. The rest of this paragraph seems to be speculation based on a questionable reading of Acts 13:1.

Be careful about saying that these are unproven, you are wrong! These all have references, but not all say what you have stated that they say. You have too many details here to itemize.

P. 89 para2. Antipater an Egyptian priest in Tarsus. Source? Again long sentences cloud meanings. Do you mean Boethus was removed in the Maccabee revolt? Antiq 14.7.4 and 14.16.4.

P 91, top Mat 2:16 This verse doesn't seem to have anything to do with the incident or people you are talking about except Herod. It may show him to be volatile, but that's not the subject. That also seems to be the case with Mat 2:22 about the middle of the page. There are many things directly related to your subject for which there is no support given. Why do you reference these distant connections but not support the more important things?

Mat 2:16 is when children of Bethlehem were killed, this is the same period the same week when Josephus wrote of Herod killing his sons and wife. Matt 2:22 was the end of that week when Archelus took over from his father's death. THAT IS ONE WEEK OR TWO ONLY. That is how long the Messiah stayed in Egypt, not 9 to 12 years as depicted by ALL historians.

P. 92 mid page you mention Alexander the Great and his general Marcus Agrippa going to Rome on behalf of Herod. Since Alexander the Great died about 323 BC this seems highly unlikely. Certainly all his generals were dead by 230 BC.

Alexander the Great died -341, 1-year before the 115 Olympiad (Apion 1:22) There were many Alexander's and many Agrippa's and Caesar's after that.

The reference to Antiquities 16.5.1 supports only the territories mentioned and nothing else in a paragraph that includes important but unsubstantiated assertions. Because of the words not included from the quote it appears to me someone wants to add Syria and Egypt to Herod's existing territory. It appears to me he already had Syria.

I apologize for some of the material that is missing from my reference clips. This was at the end of 16.5.1, but I missed putting that part in my clips. They are updated now.

And it is related that Caesar and Agrippa often said, that the dominions of Herod were too little for the greatness of his soul; for that he deserved to have both all the kingdom of Syria, and that of Egypt also.

Bottom para. Second line I think you want thought not taught. Acts 3:1 seems to have nothing to do with the subject. Line 9, 'was located' I think should be 'were located'. The sacred mountain and one of the temples were located. King Philadelphus I gather is the young Herod the Great, not sure.

Page 101, Ptolomy Philadelphus requested Eleazar to send seventy priests to Alexandria to interpret the Jewish scrolls into Greek. (Antiq 12.2.5) This was 40 years after Alexander the Great.

P. 93 para 3. The surface reading indicates to me many came out even with wives and children to see them off. You seem to say that Paul & Co were traveling with wives and children who they left at Tyre. That seems odd since the only reason given for going to Tyre was that the ship needed to unload its cargo (Acts 21:3). Acts 21:3-7 doesn't say anything about Paul's father, Antipas or the Libertine council, so would fit better after the previous sentence. It seems to me the reference to Acts 21:8 should be reconsidered too. It doesn't seem to support the points you're trying to make. I think you need a stronger connection between the Philip there and the Tetrarch.

Philip was the one that built Caesarea after his father started it. He expanded it to honor Agrippa and Caesar for the Olympics, and he lived there and Saul was his stepson, his wife was Herodias. Many Josephus references and even entire chapters on this.

Revelation 17:11 uses the word 'seven' and talks of kings. The seven does potentially connect, beyond that these two scriptures have little in common. I hope you provide some solid support of your connection between Antipas, Saul/Paul and this scripture in Revelation elsewhere. At this point it seems wild speculation. The references in Josephus mention a Saul and Costobarus, but there is nothing to tie them to Saul of Tarsus of Acts 9 fame. The connection seems to be wild speculation if your Josephus references are your basis.

You can interpret this in a hundred ways, but if you read it exactly as it says, you will see it as I explained it. Antipas was the first husband of Herodias and they had children. In Romans, Paul introduced his mother Herodias, kin to Agrippa. Philip had no children, he was the second husband of Herodias.

Since you didn't give a source in support of a para 1 statement about Herod's son Philip being called 'the evangelist' it is hard to give much credibility to that connection on p. 93, para. 3 and Acts 21:8. The last record of the Philip chosen among the seven of Acts

6:3-7 has him in Ceasarea (Acts 8:40). That's where the Philip of Acts 21:8 is too. Certainly he had been evangelizing. If two different people fit that description and one is the king, wouldn't that be stated? Lesser connections to royalty are mentioned (Acts 13:1, Phl 4:22). Why would there be 15 references to Philip of Acts 8 in Acts, many of them revolving around his evangelizing, but only one to Philip the evangelist, but that is a different person? ...yet there is no explanation of the difference. Could King Philip not spare a few donkeys or a cart to transport Paul & Co. to Jerusalem? (Acts 21:15). King Philip had been replaced by Agrippa, and he had been sent to Alexandria to fetch priests to replace all those in the Temple. He was then in the role as a leader of the priests. This was Alexandria (the temple) in Turkey near Greece, between Troas and Assos where Paul walked across the peninsula.

The statement 'one of the seven' is intended to be sufficient clarification of who this Philip is. If the statement was 'one of the seven Herod's or 'one of the seven kings' it would certainly clarify it as you propose. However, the only seven Acts describes that includes a Philip is found in Acts 6:5. This Philip has no apparent connection to the tetrarchs.

Herod, Philip and Lysanias are all identified as being tetrarch's in the New Testament. From what I can see none of the seven kings are designated as 'one of the seven kings', unless Philip is an exception. Since the Apolostic Writings use tetrarch to identify those rulers, it seems that 'tetrarch' would be what they would use in Acts 21:8 if they were intending that Philip was one of the Herodian rulers.

Philip II, the Tetrarch supposedly died about 34 AD/CE according to Wikipedia.

Certainly Acts 21 occurred long after that.

The timeline of our current Theology of the first century is way off. Read page 98 and on through the restructured timeline. Page 105 - Year 58 Philip dies, the 20th year of Tiberius. (Antiq 18.4.6, and 18.5.1).

Many of these dates were determined by the Olympiads listed as the year of an event. The Olympiads are counted as five years in Josephus, Tacitus, and Seucondus. But our modern historians count them as four years. That is why none of the dates match in my book or in other studies of Greek Roman Egyptian or others. But all these dates do match if they count the Olympiads as five years, as is done in my book. ALL of my dates match ALL first century writers. NONE of the dates match modern history writers.

P. 94 top: You seem to be saying Antipas was one of the seven chosen in Acts 6:5. He's not on any list I've found. The Saulus mentioned by Josephus is involved in mayhem, but there is no connection with the mayhem of Acts 6. Your reference to Saul in Wars places him in the agitation that led up to the destruction of Jerusalem. This may well be the Saulus mentioned earlier, but eliminates him as possibly being Saul of Tarsus. If Paul was still alive at this time he was certainly out of politics, on missionary journeys or incarcerated by the Romans. At least that perception is what you need to overcome. Saul and Titus Flavius Josephus were the Pharisee and the Lawyer that Yahshua spoke of in Luke 7 & 11.

p. 94 Middle; You make a connection between Mariamne I and a Hasmonian High priest. Supposedly this allows Paul to claim to be of the tribe of Benjamin. As I remember the Hasmonian's were not direct decedents of the previous high priests, but they were sons of Aaron and therefore Levites. How does this make Mariamne a Benjamite? When Paul explains why he might have confidence in the flesh he mentions nothing of this royal heritage, but puts his emphasis on his lineage from Benjamin (Phil 3:4-6).

They stated that she was a Benjamite, so that is the reference. Antiq 15.2.7, Daughter of Hyrcanus Wars 1.22.2, Many of the direct family of Herod-I are listed in Wars 2.11.6. Then Josephus names and details every priest from Alexander's Days to Herod in many books. Go into the Josephus book beyond my reference clips for a broader view. You have a free link on my website for 1700 pages of Josephus.

P. 95, para 1: Rufus is believed to be Paul's brother evidently because of 'his mother and mine'. Two other families are greeted as relatives or kinsmen in Romans 16, but Rufus is not. He's listed in the middle of a long list with no special connection except for the comments about Paul's mother. Is this how one greets his mother and/or brother? It seems odd to me that they are just one of many greeted in a long list. Particularly the greeting of his 'mother' is not consistent with a birth mother, but with someone who may have cared for him at some time as he mentions that others did as well. Many are singled out as beloved, but not his mother!?! This makes little sense for a birth mother. There is no hint of context about a greeting to the Roman Senate.

Herodias had lived in Rome with her first husband Antipas, and that is where Philip picked her up to be his wife. (Antiq 18.5.1) The Senate already knew of Herodias and Rufus, because they had lived there.

You indicate that Aristobulus is Paul's Herodion kinsman. The text indicates two greetings, one to each of two different people. Herodion is evidently a kinsman of some sort. Aristobulus is not designated that way. Herod Aristobulus was killed about 7 BC. Why would he still have a household in Rome some 60+ years later?

You constantly rely on modern historians to set dates. They are wrong and adding to the deception! Check page 98.

There was a Narcissus who was in the upper echelon of Roman politics and at times close to Caesar. He was killed around 54 CE. The Narcissus of Rom 16:11 was evidently not a believer although some of his household were. Whether these are the same Narcissus I do not know. When in Rome Paul indicated some of Ceasar's household were believers(Phil 4:22). I don't think this establishes a connection to the Herod's or the Roman Senate.

Para 3: The wording of the second sentence is hard to follow. Who had the children removed? Removed?... don't you mean killed?

Killed to put it blunt, if a loved one dies, is killed, you might say they are gone, or they have passed on, they are no longer with us. The poetry of writing is to keep a story active. This is a readable story to learn a great lesson. If you shred every word of every work, you may never understand the stories.

I understand dealing with Revelation is very subjective. You suggest that the seven Herods and Paul are intended in Rev 17:10-11 as the seven kings with Paul the 8th. This seems a real stretch since as of the writing of Revelation '...Five have fallen, one is, and the other has not yet come.' Only one of these people was still alive as of the writing of Revelation and he already had his kingdom. It seems to be talking of events just before Messiah returns. That is yet to come. The Herod's are long gone. Do you expect some of them to be resurrected before Messiah returns?

That is a great point that I wish I had added to the book. When the seven Herod's were five down, Agrippa was last king that died in the Bible, and after him came Agrippa-II, but Antipas was still in Rome, but no longer king. So Revelation would have been written about when Paul went to Rome, because Agrippa-II was at the trial, but not yet king.

The ten kings you also connect with the Herods. 12 "The ten horns which you saw are ten kings who have received no kingdom as yet," Some did receive a kingdom. Are they starting over again?

There were 10 rulers of Herod the Great counting him too. Page-97

P 96: What makes you think Saul of Tarsus used Roman guards to help round up Christians? Acts 9: indicates he got his authority from the High Priest. I don't see anything about Roman guards. The High Priest had his own troops (Mat 27:65). You claim Josephus was the emperor's eyes in the region. Evidently you are talking of Jerusalem since that is the area mentioned in the previous sentence. Although, Josephus was loyal to the rulers in Judea he fought against the Romans until 67 or so. This would not support him being the emperor's eyes. Also you mention he followed Paul. If this is the Saul/Saulus referenced in your quotes I did not see any link between that person and Saul of Tarsus. Since Saul was the name of Israel's first king it is likely it was a fairly common name. Its appearance in Josephus hardly indicates it was the same Saul of Tarsus.

The Romans were patrolling and controlling the state. They set the kings in position that ran everything. Go to Washington and round up 4000 people and plunder their homes without the police getting involved. This was a dictatorship and the king's son and in-law were the outlaws. They had full authority, but read page 110 and you will see that king Philip was eventually beheaded for it when Caesar got word what was going on.

Pg 96 Also indicates that Paul was preaching based on the beliefs of his Edomite Fathers. An example of some of these beliefs might be in order. Page-87 Paul's Laws Also based on Acts 24:14 his father's believed all things written in the Law and the Prophets. Acts 22:3 indicates he was zealous for the teaching he received from Gamaliel, which he calls our fathers' law. Are either of those the belief or teaching of the pagan temple at Tarsus? He was talking to the Jews seeking to kill him Acts 22:3. He's claiming a shared ancestry with them.

And our president says he's American too!

If Paul was the son of Antipas and Herodias it seems likely governor Felix would have known that. He asked for his origins (Acts 23:34) and was evidently not told of any

connection with the Herods'. Herod Agrippa II, before whom Paul witnessed would have been his first cousin according to your reckoning. There is no recognition of this in the Acts account.

In Acts 13:17, 22:3, 26:6-7, Rom 15:8 Paul uses 'fathers' in a way obviously referring to fathers of Israel not Edom. In Acts 22:14 he quotes Ananias saying he was being chosen by the God of his fathers. Ananias being a believer and at that time the message was not targeting gentiles, so he was very likely a Jew. His father's would be Israel too. The witness is that our Savior chose Saul/Paul.

Steve, you're making some very radical statements. From what I've seen so far the evidence you cite is not substantial at all. I've heard of a number of people that have tried to discredit Paul. It seems to me they don't like some of what he says in his epistles. I would suggest they don't like what he says because they don't understand the record of Moses or the Law.

Read II-Peter chapter-2 that the preachers are and will be led astray following the ways of Balaam they love to beguile. They are wells without water (teaching against the laws).

You seemed to appreciate the booklet I gave you about the effects of the golden calf. The point of that booklet was that we need to reconsider the purpose for the Law of Moses and reconsider what is meant by 'the Law' in the New Testament. In fact there are two laws documented by Moses. One at Sinai by which Israel would be priests and representatives of Yah and the other in Deuteronomy which would override the threat of death Israel was under and allow them to live and inherit the Promised Land. It was a compromise not intended to be permanent. When considered in light of this, Paul's statements make perfect sense.

I may have given you my booklet that identifies the Old Covenant. I don't remember for sure. I will attach a digitized version in case I didn't. Actually, I have a more complete version I'll throw in for free too. ☺ Everything in the short version is in the longer version too, but the longer version deals more completely with what is a very large subject. We don't need to be defensive about what Paul said. We need to read the record of Moses more carefully and not assume our teachers understood it.

I need to take care of a number of other things before I'll be able to get back to your book. If you have a particular area you'd like me to look at next let me know. Otherwise I'll probably just pick something that strikes my interest.

I hope you'll find something worthwhile in there somewhere.
Everett