

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #95; March, 2006 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419)-435-7571; E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my ninety-fifth monthly teaching letter and continues my eighth year of publication. We have been running a series of lessons beginning with *WTL* #88 in defense of the apostle Paul. If you have not read these previous lessons, you may not fully understand this one. Therefore, it would be advisable to obtain the other lessons in this series. In *WTL* lesson #89, I pretty much turned the narrative over to William R. Finck to address a response to the ranting of H. Graber, who was a very malicious Paul-basher.

For anyone who is interested in finding the origin of this Paul-bashing, they will discover it's all coming from the "Jews." It amazes me why anyone in Israel Identity would fall for such a Satanically contrived and oriented propaganda. Yet the Paul-bashers don't even try to hide it, but name the "Jews" from whence it emanates, brushing aside the warnings of our Savior and Messiah to "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (Matt. 16:6, 11, 12; Mark 8:15; Luke 12:1). It is regrettable, but these are victims who have been snake-bitten and glory in it. Now back again to William Finck:

We left off with Clayton Douglas' article "*The Seduction: Judeo-Christianity OR Pauline Christianity? Saul of Tarsus: Paul. A different view.*", and all of his ignorant, ill-begotten and unwarranted criticisms of the apostle Paul, where Douglas offered a quote from the novelist, Thomas Hardy. As we continue through Douglas' article, it may become evident that Douglas has taken to writing fictions of his own, where he makes all sorts of false assertions, and he offers no citations whatsoever with which to support his phony 'history'.

<Reference #10> Clay Douglas states: "*Who Is Saul of Tarsus? That is Paul's original name. Shortly after Saul claimed he had his vision of Jesus, he changed his name to 'Paul.'* Why? Did Paul seek to re-create himself for benevolent purposes? Or, was Paul deceiving everyone and his namechange was simply one of many indicators in support of this? You decide."

William Finck answers <#10>: Contrary to the opinions of those critics who often jump to such false conclusions, the truth is that Paul of Tarsus never changed his name at any time during the period of his life covered by Luke's account in Acts or by his own

epistles. Luke wrote the Acts account, not Paul. Luke calls him "Saul" 15 times in Acts chapters 7 through 13, and in Acts 13 Luke begins to refer to him as Paul, and so throughout the rest of Acts. Luke tells us: "... Saulos, who also is Paulos ...", which only indicates that Paul already had two names. Yet, for some reason Luke does not explain, Luke called him "Saul" until he related the account of their engagement with another man of the same name: Sergius Paulus, a Roman proconsul. Paul in Greek is everywhere Παῦλος (Strong's #3972), the same as "Paulus" the proconsul.

It is notable that Paul and Barnabas had ready access to a man of such rank as a Roman proconsul, which is nearly the equivalent of being governor of a state, but not elected. Rather, proconsuls were appointed by the Roman Senate for a term of two years. So it may be that Luke simply took this occasion to use the name "Paul" in order to show us that Paul indeed had some prior acquaintance with the man. It was not uncommon in Rome for a man to adopt the name of a benefactor. The historian Josephus took the surname Flavius in honor of the Roman general who became emperor and was his benefactor: Titus Flavius Sabinus Vespasianus, popularly known only as Vespasian. It was normal for Romans to have three or four names, but to use only one commonly. One of a Roman's names would be that of his *gens*, or family, which in the case of the Roman emperors Vespasian, Titus and Domitian was Flavia. "Flavius" is literally "of Flavia" in Latin, and so Josephus adopted the name "Josephus of Flavia", or Flavius Josephus.

As discussed earlier in this response, several New Testament figures had multiple names, and now it should be also evident that it was normal for Roman men to have more than one name. To criticize Paul for something Luke wrote is ridiculous, yet upon examination it is also plain that there is nothing wrong with Luke's writing! It may even be that Luke was unaware of Saul's full name until their encounter with Sergius Paulus, and from that time Luke, who was the one doing the writing, chose to call him by Paul rather than Saul. While this may all be pushed aside as conjecture, it surely is more plausible than the absolutely false conjecture that Paul changed his name!

<Reference #11> Clay Douglas states: *"Paul publicly claimed to be a 'Pharisee of the Pharisees.' He also claimed to be the son of a Pharisee. Additionally, Paul said that he was 'of the Tribe of Benjamin.' Whichever account you believe to be true does not make a difference. In either case, he is a liar. If Paul was a Pharisee, he would have been of authentic Edomite/Canannite stock. ... The family bloodline of Benjamin was Shem-ite (non-Jewish). It was a (Saxon) Israelite Tribe from the family bloodline of Issac [sic] through the paternal line of Israel. You can be one but not the other. Pharisees, or the ruling Jewish (Edomite) religious and governmental entity at that time in history, did not 'recruit' from Israelite tribes. It was a 'supremacist' clan, i.e. 'Edomite tribe only.' If Paul was truly a Benjamite (Southern Tribes, Isaac/Israel), then he was lying when he claimed to be a (former) Pharisee."*

William Finck answers **<#11>**: Oh the lies which Douglas spouts here, and the audacity he has to call Paul a liar at the same time! Yet he offers not one ancient citation or an iota of historic evidence with which to support his claims! Not one! Such is the method of a novelist, and not of a historian. The slightest examination proves to a rational mind that Clayton Douglas is a liar, and not Paul. The historian Flavius Josephus discusses the three sects among the Judaeans "at this time" in the days of the high priest Jonathan, the same man found at 1 Mac- cabees 12:1 ff., which were

the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, at *Antiquities* 13:5:9 (13:171-173). This is some years before the recorded conquest of the Edomites by the Judaeans, recorded at *Antiquities* 13:9:1 (13:254-258), which was done by the later high priest Hyrcanus. In *Antiquities* 13:10 (13:270 ff.) Josephus mentions the Pharisees and their general opposition to Hyrcanus at length. So it is apparent that the sect of the Pharisees was prominent in Judaea long before any Edomites had the chance to gain political influence there, a situation which did not fully develop until after 80 B.C.!

In Josephus' description of these three sects in *Wars* 2:8:2 (2:119-121) only the Essenes are described as **racial** separatists, being a "Judaeans by birth" a requirement for membership, and not the Pharisees or Sadducees. In his autobiographical *Life* at 1:1 (1-6), Josephus records his own genealogy and shows that he was a Levite. Josephus then tells us that he was an Essene for a time (*Life* 2, 10-12), but settled upon following the Pharisees. There were other "good" Pharisees mentioned in the New Testament, such as Gamaliel and Nicodemus. Nicodemus was certainly no Edomite! See the accounts concerning him at John 3:1 ff.; 7:50 (where he is recorded as defending Christ before the high priests who wanted to kill Him); and at 19:39, where John tells us that he assisted Joseph of Arimathea (who was on the council, the "sanhedrin", and who was likely also a Pharisee) with the body of Yahshua after the crucifixion. Here it should be absolutely apparent that Clayton Douglas, flippantly spouting accusations and offering no proof to back them up, is a liar!

While the word "Pharisee" surely does come from a Hebrew word which means "to separate", the word was used only in the sense of religious, and not racial, separatism. Strong defines "Pharisee" in his Greek dictionary "a *separatist*, i.e. exclusively *religious*" (see #5330). This surely is obvious since the sect existed before the Edomites were absorbed into Judaea and Judaism! Christ condemned the Pharisees for traveling "sea and land to make one proselyte", hardly necessary to find a willing Edomite! The Talmud attests that the Pharisees were converting people of all races into Judaism at the earliest times, for which see John Lightfoot's *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica*, volume 2, pp. 55-63. Clayton Douglas? He is a liar! There is no doubt, from the historical record, that one may have been both a Pharisee and of the tribe of Benjamin. The Pharisees were only one of several religious sects, and it was quite normal for an ambitious young man who wanted to have a voice in the governance of his nation to join one of those sects. While today we live in a so-called "secular" society, the sects in Judaea were not much different functionally than the political parties of today.

<Reference #12> Clay Douglas states: "... Paul/Saul was a Roman citizen who was born around the turn of the century 2000 years ago in Tarsus, Cilicia. The country of Cilicia was located at the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean Sea. Cilicia and the adjoining nations of Syria and Phoenicia on the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea were all under the rule of the Roman Empire. The remaining country which bordered the 'Sea' on the east was Palestine, which joined Phoenicia on the south. Palestine was also under the rule of Rome. Rome, very nicely, controlled all of her acquired territory by using native puppet kings who were subservient to Rome. Saul was well educated and highly trained as a Roman citizen, though he was an Turco-Armenian by birth. He and his family were well known Pharisees of Tarsus. He spoke several languages as well as Latin, the language of the 'empire.' Early in his life he

became a Roman soldier, and because of his nationality, he was placed in Jerusalem as a key person to both understand and help control the native Palestinians.”

William Finck answers <#12>: While Douglas has some of his geography right, Syria and Phoenicia were never properly “nations”, but only geographical entities demarcated for the purpose of governmental administration, separated by the natural boundary of the Lebanon Mountains. A nation is properly composed of a single people of a common race, history, government and language and is not but a mere geographical or geopolitical unit. A government ruling diverse peoples is an empire, and this is true even when the peoples governed are of the same general race, as with the German Reichs, or empires. “Palestine” was a loose geographic term and never used to designate any particular province.

Tarsus, in Cilicia, according to Strabo in his *Geography* was originally built by the Assyrians, and he cites an inscription “in Assyrian letters” which stated as much (14.5.9). Strabo explains that the city which occupied the site in Greco-Roman times was founded by Argives (14.5.12), and while this is shrouded in myth, there is no doubt from Strabo’s account that Tarsus is a Greek city. The Geographer states at 14.5.13: “The people at Tarsus have devoted themselves so eagerly, not only to philosophy, but also to the whole round of education in general, that they have surpassed Athens, Alexandria, or any other place that can be named where there have been schools and lectures of philosophers. But it is so different from other cities that there the men who are fond of learning are all natives, and foreigners are not inclined to sojourn there; neither do these natives stay there, but they complete their education abroad, and when they have completed it they are pleased to live abroad, and but a few go back home ... Further, the city of Tarsus has all kinds of schools of rhetoric; and in general it not only has a flourishing population but also is most powerful, thus keeping up the reputation of the mother-city [Tarsus]”. Is it no wonder that Paul had such an excellent classical education, and called himself “a citizen of no mean city” (Acts 21:39)?

Now Cilicia itself was originally colonized by the Phoenicians, and those of Cilicia originally called themselves Hypachaeans, according to Herodotus (7.91). Now it should be no surprise that these people should take well to Greek culture and learning, since in Homer’s time Greece itself was said to be colonized largely by Phoenicians, along with the Danaans (tribe of Dan) said to come from Egypt, and Homer called those people Achaeans. As George Rawlinson notes in his edition of Herodotus, “The Cilicians were undoubtedly a kindred race to the Phoenicians”, meaning the ancient Phoenicians, which, as can certainly be established, were indeed the northern tribes of Israel.

Strabo wrote before 25 A.D., the year in which he is believed to have died, and only a few years before Paul. To call Paul of Tarsus a “*Turco-Armenian by birth*” is utterly ridiculous, since the Turks, an eastern Asiatic tribe of obscure origins, did not appear in or west of Mesopotamia for another thousand or so years! The Turks, invading from further Asia, conquered Baghdad in 1055 A.D., and invaded Asia Minor in 1071 A.D. This major gaffe alone exposes Douglas’ absolute ignorance of history, which he is by no means qualified to write about.

Armenia too, until the invasions of Arabs, Turks and Mongols, was a land inhabited by the white races. Where Herodotus tells us that the Scythians conquered all of Asia (1.104), Strabo identifies them geographically with “Greater Armenia”, (11.13.5). A large part of Armenia was called Sacasene, named for the Sacae who

dwelt there (11.8.4). Herodotus affirms that the Sacae were indeed the Scythians (7.64), as does Strabo (7.3.9), who goes on to describe Iberia, the country north of Armenia, and says that the Iberians are “both neighbors and kinsmen” of the Scythians (11.3.3). Surely the Israelites who were deported by the Assyrians had called one of their first lands “Iberia”, just as the Israelite Phoenicians who settled old Spain had first called that land “Iberia”, because “Iberi” is “Hebrews” in Hebrew, whom they all were! So again, Douglas’ ignorance is wholly manifest. How many other false impressions and historical untruths does he spout forth daily?

Douglas states that early in Paul’s life “*he became a Roman soldier, and because of his nationality, he was placed in Jerusalem*”, and here he becomes a novelist, for not one iota of historical evidence is cited to support such a claim! And in fact, Douglas only knows that Paul’s “*family were well known Pharisees of Tarsus*” by guessing the “well known” part, and by Paul’s own statements in Acts 23:6. Why does Douglas choose to believe only some of Paul’s statements, and of those only the ones he can use against him! Just like a government prosecutor, Clayton Douglas is a liar and a hypocrite! Surely Paul was a Pharisee, and the son of a Pharisee (Acts 23:6), and an Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin (Ph’p. 3:5) just as Josephus was a Pharisee, and an Israelite of the tribe of Levi.

<Reference #13> Clay Douglas states: “... *Saul and his Roman troops closely followed the developments of the ‘(new Christian) cult’ led by Esu (Jesus) Immanuel in Palestine. Esu Immanuel had several close disciples who assisted in his work. One, ‘Judas Ischarioth had become disloyal to the teaching of Immanuel and he followed only his desires. He secretly gathered up among the listeners of Immanuel gold, silver and copper in his moneybag, so that he could idly indulge in his life style.’ Juda Iharioth, whose father was Simeon Iharioth the Pharisee, observed what Judas was doing and informed Esu Immanuel of this, hoping to be paid well for this information. Immanuel thanked him but did not pay him.’ Being a man of greed for gold, silver and other possessions, Juda Iharioth became very angry and sought revenge. Saul of Tarsus was a friend of Simeon Iharioth, and when Saul learned of this incident between Simeon’s son, Juda and Esu Immanuel, he reportedly arranged for the theft of the scrolls of the teachings of Esu, which had been written and kept by Judas Iscarioth (have you ever wondered why there is such little real information in the New Testament about the life and the teachings of Jesus Christ?). Judas Iharioth was paid 70 pieces of silver to steal the writings and another 30 pieces of silver to identify Esu Immanuel at night at his capture with a kiss – a sign of mockery to his enemy. Saul was – reportedly - personally responsible for the plan and gave assistance in the capture, arrest, trial and crucifixion of Esu Immanuel. Saul truly believed that the ‘christian cult’ leader, Esu Immanuel, had been destroyed forever. As Esu Immanuel Sananda had said Saul of Tarsus was his greatest enemy during his life in Palestine (and even through all of history down to this present day.) Let me explain how this came to be. Saul made it his business to know about any cult or new teaching or idea that might challenge the rule of Rome over the Palestinians. To do this, Paul/Saul worked closely with the religious leaders of the day, the Jewish Pharisees. (Many scholars have challenged Judas’ alleged role in the capture of Esu; claiming that Judas was used as Saul and Simon’s ‘Lee Harvey Oswald’ in the murder conspiracy plot.)”*

William Finck answers <#13>: Here we have a fantastic story which is a novel – a fictional prose narrative – and nothing more! None of the claims made here can be substantiated in the New Testament, or in Josephus or any other history, and so unless Douglas can tell us – and show us – where he got this story from, then he must have made it all up! Douglas whines that “*there is ... little real information in the New Testament about the life and teachings of Jesus Christ*”, which by itself is a mischaracterization, and so he goes on to invent his own story!

- Saul had Roman troops under his command, which is a lie. While it is certainly evident that Paul had some office or capacity in the service of Judaea, the province was in some degree autonomous when it came to the handling of internal affairs, and the affairs of the Judaeian people. There is no indication at all that Paul was acting as a Roman, and if he were he would have been found in violation of Roman law.

- Douglas takes the name of one single man, Judas Iscariot, in the N.T. Greek everywhere Ἰουδᾶς and either Ἰσκαριώθ or Ἰσκαριώτης (Iskarioth or Iskariotes), two different forms of the same word due to the use of two different grammatical conventions employed in transliteration from Hebrew to Greek, for the word is from the Hebrew terms for Ish (man) and Kerioth (i.e. Jer. 48:24, 41), and he splits him into two different names and people! Douglas takes one man, Judas Iscariot, and produces two men: Judas Ischarioth and Juda Iharioth. Just like the recent announcements by the cult which calls itself the Raelians which turned out to be a fraud, likewise Douglas’ attempt to clone the traitor Judas finagles a fraud.

- Earlier (see the section <#6>) Douglas claimed that “*Paul/Saul never met Jesus in the flesh*”, that none of the New Testament writers “*actually knew Him [Christ] in the flesh*” and says (section <#7>) “*Of personal knowledge of Jesus, Paul had none!*” But here Douglas states that “*Saul was – reportedly – personally responsible for the plan and gave assistance in the capture, arrest, trial and crucifixion of Esu Immanuel ... As Esu Immanuel Sananda had said of Saul of Tarsus was his greatest enemy during his life in Palestine ...*” and also that “*Saul made it his business to know about any cult or new teaching that might challenge the rule of Rome ... To do this, Paul/Saul worked closely with the religious leaders of the day ...*”. So which is it, Mr. Douglas? Did Paul know Christ or not? And from whence is this name “Sananda”, and the statements which you have attributed to Christ here? From where did any of this information come? I must conjecture, that there are only two possible sources for any of this information, which I could possibly imagine. The first would be the Talmud. No wonder Douglas doesn’t reveal his sources! The second would be Douglas’ own twisted mind, and so he has written a novel, but can’t so much as keep his plot straight! Paul knew Christ “in the flesh”, or he did not know Him! Both conditions can’t be true, except of course, in the contorted fantasizing of Clayton Douglas!

- Here Douglas claims that there existed “*scrolls of the teachings of*” Christ, which I shall also address below. However, earlier Douglas stated “*there are no known writings from Jesus, the actual Apostles, or anyone that actually knew Him ...*” for which see section <#6> in WTL #94, page 1. Is it not absolutely obvious that Douglas’ writing is full of double-speak and conflicts? Is Douglas not aware of this? Or is he just a blatant liar? If Douglas knows that “scrolls of the teachings of” Christ existed, how could there be “no known writings from” Christ?

- When one uses terms which aren't generally known, or which can't be found in a dictionary or lexicon, such as "Esu" or "Sananda", one should define the terms and also identify their sources. To do so is scholarly. One not doing so may be perceived as creating fictions! Clayton Douglas has created fictions here. When one relates historical events, to cite sources which attest to those events is scholarly, and is necessary when the events aren't generally known. Clayton Douglas claims to be a revealer of truths here, to an audience which he anticipates would not previously have heard such claims, and cites not one of his sources! Clayton Douglas has only spouted lies here. He is a novelist, one who writes fictional narratives: either he reveals the witnesses who attest to the events which he describes, or he made it up all by himself! Note that Douglas' account is peppered with phrases such as "some scholars think" and "many scholars have challenged", as if that alone made his statements authoritative. Who are "some scholars", and why do they think as Douglas purports?

There are other obviously false statements of Douglas' here, yet it would be fruitless to debate any of their merits. Without any substantiation for his fantastic claims, Douglas is a novelist. Who can debate history with someone such as Douglas, who invents his own version at leisure? How can one debate a fiction?

<Reference #14> Clay Douglas states: "... *The Edomite (Jewish) Pharisees were the dominant force controlling the economy and religious thought of the area. To identify with these leaders and to gather the information he needed, he joined their ranks. As a Roman citizen and soldier he held international power over people, and as a Pharisee, he held local power over the Palestinians. With this blending of authority the Pharisees used Saul to their advantage. Saul was encouraged to move swiftly against Esu Immanuel and his followers, who taught Truth to the people. He traveled to various cities to hunt them down and to arrest or to kill them. Paul/Saul tortured and murdered thousands of innocents, many of them mere children.*"

William Finck answers <#14>: Now there is no doubt that the Pharisees had a great deal of influence, even dominating the religious and political spheres in Judaea, but they did not have total control of it. And certainly the Pharisees did not control the economy, for the Romans did that! We see throughout the New Testament how the Pharisees despised the "publicans", who were Roman-appointed tax collectors. We also see that the Sadducees held doctrines which differed greatly from the Pharisees, and also had a strong political voice (Acts 4:1 ff., 23:6-8). At least two Sadducees even became high priests. One is recorded at Acts 5:17, which was not long after the crucifixion. The other Josephus tells us about, saying of one Ananus the younger, "he was also of the sect of the Sadducees", at *Antiq.* 20:9:1 (20:199). This was during the procuratorship of Albinus about 63 A.D., shortly after Paul was sent in bonds to Rome, and right around the time that James was murdered. The family of Herod being Edomites (as Josephus' histories attests in several places), substantiates why the Edomites of the Pharisees were favored and appointed to high office, and at Christ's time on earth, Edomites had control of the priest-hood. Yet it has already been demonstrated here (section <#11>) that not all of the Pharisees were Edomites! Our current political situation parallels that of first century Judaea to an astonishing degree. While not all Republicans are jews, the jews surely are over-represented at the top of the political hierarchy, and especially in this current administration, where most of the so-called "neo-cons" (former socialists who suddenly became "conservative", a huge

deception and a lie) are also jews. And while not all Democrats are jews, the jews are surely over-represented at the top of the political hierarchy there too! While jews claim to be only 3% of the population (though I suspect their actual number to be at least twice that) they make up at least 20% of the Supreme Court, and I count at least 16 U.S. Senators of jewish descent. Douglas' misconstrued version of history would prevent one from noticing these parallels, these repetitious patterns. The Edomite jews took over Roman Judaea the same discreet way they did 19th century England and 20th century America.

If Paul of Tarsus were a Roman soldier he would have been attached to a Roman legion and he would have taken his orders from a Roman tribune or a Roman centurion. He certainly would not have needed or sought orders from the high priest at Jerusalem (i.e. Acts 9:2) to do anything which a Roman soldier may have lawfully done! It would even have been considered treasonous for a Roman soldier to take such orders from a foreign (non-Roman) authority. Rome was a strictly disciplined society, with strict laws governing the behavior of citizens and soldiers alike. By no means could a Roman soldier take upon himself to persecute the people of a Roman province. The authority had to come from elsewhere.

Often appearing in the New Testament is the phrase "the captain of the temple" (Acts 4:1; 5:24) or also "the captain with the officers" (John 18:12, Acts 5:26). This word "captain" is the Greek word for "general", στρατηγός (4755), and of the temple in Jerusalem Liddell & Scott say of the word in their Greek-English Lexicon: "4. *An officer who had the custody of the Temple at Jerusalem.*" That the high priests used this "captain" and his temple-guards, "officers" in the N.T., as their own private army is evident in the New Testament at Luke 22:52, John 18:12, and Acts 5:24-26, where it is seen that they had their own prison. From here alone did Paul acquire the authority which he needed to persecute the Judaeans Christians, for the Romans afforded their provinces a great degree of autonomy in the governance of their own people. Roman soldiers had no such authority, unless it came from the Roman government, which Douglas has not one bit of evidence, again, with which to support his claims.

Neither does Douglas have any evidence to support his claim that Paul persecuted "thousands" of people, for the New Testament accounts give no specific number, unless he read such a number in the Talmud. Douglas, writing a novel, needn't cite any sources for his statements! Neither does Douglas document his claim that "*many of them*" were "*mere children*", which the New Testament account contradicts. Like a government prosecutor and a satanic jewish false accuser, Douglas just piles up the charges against Paul, offering no documentation, no proof, no witnesses, and many contradictions! The government awes juries with stature and authority. Who shall Clayton Douglas likewise deceive?

<Reference #15> Clay Douglas states: "*Paul/Saul claimed that he had a vision in which the crucified Jesus came to him (along with 500 other witnesses). As a result of this strange experience, Saul convinced others that he was now a 'disciple' of the Master Teacher, Esu ...*"

William Finck answers <#15>: Now I am absolutely convinced of one thing: Clayton Douglas is ignorant of many things, and probably because he simply can't read! In *WTL #92*, Clifton Emahiser inserted a remark on page 1, where H. Graber badly misquoted Eusebius, concerning Graber's reading skills. It is evident to me that

all Paul- bashers are blind as bats! Here Douglas says that Paul claimed 500 witnesses had seen Paul's vision on the road to Damascus. Did Paul claim that 500 witnesses had seen his vision? The only place in all of Paul's writing which mentions "five hundred" is at 1 Corinthians 15:6. Just look under "five" in Strong's *Concordance* to find out as much. Now let us read 1 Cor. 15:3-6 from the A.V. to see what Paul meant:

"³ For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; ⁴ And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures: ⁵ And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: ⁶ After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep."

Nothing about Damascus, nothing about Paul's vision. He only relates here to the Corinthians what he himself had been told, "**that which I also received**", about the events surrounding Christ's resurrection and appearance to the disciples, for which see Matt. 28:9-20; Luke 24:13-53 and John 20:11-21:35 for partial accounts. If Clayton Douglas **can** read, then he's a mere liar, take your pick! *W.R.F.*

* * * * *

I must apologize for quoting a passage from Diodorus Siculus in *WTL* #92 but neglecting to cite it properly. The passage is found in the short article "Paul Was Not A Misogynist" and is found near the end of page 4: "The men, however, like our married women, spent their days about the house ..."; it was taken from Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History* 3.53.2-3. *W.R.F.*

* * * * *

We cannot do otherwise but continue to defend the apostle Paul from all the false, malicious accusations being hurled at him today! And those making such charges should be ashamed of themselves! *C.A.E.*