

# **WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER**

Monthly Letter #103; November, 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 one hundred and third monthly teaching letter and continues my ninth year of publication. Starting with *WTL #88* we have been continuing a series defending the apostle Paul from the horrendously false charges that are being hurled at his epistles, and these accusations have their origins among the lowest moral sources one can imagine. Let's reassert here what had been presented first in *WTL #96*, p.4, that Yahshua Christ Himself highly praised the Ephesian assembly at Rev. 2:1-8, of which Paul was the founder. Inasmuch as that assembly had lost its first love surely shows they had a high degree of love at their inception with Paul's leading. Based upon this passage, either Yahshua Christ is a liar or the Paul-bashers are liars, and one can't have it both ways! If the Paul-bashers are correct, Yahshua Christ did us a great disservice at Rev. 2:1-8, or if Yahshua Christ is correct, all the Paul-bashers are doing us a momentous disservice, reminiscent of the early centuries! We will now again continue this subject with William Finck:

Here we shall continue our address of the second of Clayton Douglas' Paul-bashing articles, *SAUL OF TARSUS AND HIS DOCTRINE OF LAWLESSNESS*, which he published in the January, 2004 issue of his *Free American Newsmagazine*. While I already hope to have fully demonstrated on many occasions that Clayton Douglas' accusations against Paul of Tarsus are all vain and empty, that none of them stand upon examination, yet all of Douglas' two articles on this topic must be addressed, for we would not want to leave anything out. While many of the arguments Douglas makes in this second article are just repackaged from his first, he does add new material and raise some new issues. Now we shall continue with Douglas' article where we left off last month:

<Reference #55A> Clayton Douglas states: "*Here's what Paul says: 'I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ lives in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me.'* Galatians 2:20

*"Even the most devoted Paul followers will detect a whiff of a bad odor here. Paul/Saul is narcissistic. He claims to have been crucified with Christ; and - let us try to be fair ... perhaps he meant 'spiritually'. But, it's the next line that is spell-binding.*

*'Nevertheless I live.'* In other words, Paul celebrates that it is he, not Immanuel, who lives. He is chortling, as they say. Paul chortles further. Paul states, *'(He) gave himself for me'.*"

William Finck answers <#55A>: Here Paul makes an important analogy, which Douglas has perverted with his own misunderstanding, so typical of this deceitful man. Sin is violation of the law. The penalty for such sin is death, when reparation cannot be made. Since the entire nation of the Israelites sinned and cannot possibly make reparation for their errors, the entire nation is condemned by the law. The penalty for adultery alone is death, and every one of our Israelite ancestors is guilty of this: the worship of false gods. We have all broken the vows which our fathers took long ago, and to which we are bound by ancient tradition. This is independent of any sin which each of us have committed personally, and who among us can claim not to have sinned at all? Under the Old Covenant, rather than a man confessing his sins and condemning himself, an animal was sacrificed at the altar in his place as atonement for the sin, i.e. Lev. 4:13-35. Yet this was only symbolic, as Paul explains in Hebrews chapter 10, looking forward to the day when Yahweh Himself would make reparations for the sins of the children of Israel, for which see section <#46> of this response in WTL #101.

Because all Israel has sinned, all Israel is condemned by the law. Yet Yahshua Christ redeemed, made reparations for, each and every one of the children of Israel, and without exception! So Paul says of Yahshua that "He gave Himself for me", and he is wholly correct in his assessment. Each and every White Adamic man on the face of the earth today should have such an understanding! Where Paul says "I am crucified with Christ", each one of us should understand that Christ had substituted Himself in our condemnation. Then Paul says "nevertheless I live" because, except for the will of Yahweh, it is each of us who should have suffered that penalty. Paul explains all of this in Romans chapters 3 through 7. Then Paul says "yet not I, but Christ lives in me", and this Douglas completely fails to comprehend, so he scoffs even further. This shall be addressed shortly, after we see the rest of Douglas' comments on the matter. First, Douglas takes a short diversion:

<Reference #55B> Clayton Douglas states: *"I want you to ponder that one statement for a moment. Remember that Immanuel's life was made miserable by His archenemy, Saul of Tarsus, 'The Pharisee of the Pharisees.'* Paul/Saul had stalked Immanuel and His followers for years upon years, trying to set up Jesus Christ. Saul wanted desperately to kill Jesus Christ. It was his one purpose in life. Saul wanted to 'shut Him down.' Ultimately, Paul and his Pharisee gangsters satisfied that mission. Christ was hideously butchered by the hidden hands of the Pharisees who hated Him so. But, Paul does not want you to remember that. He would much rather have you think that Christ's death is a 'celebration' and that 'Christ died for Paul.' Perhaps, there is a kernal [sic] of Freudian truth there."

William Finck answers <#55B>: Douglas wants us to "remember" nothing factual, but only the novel which he has been concocting since the beginning of his first article, which became evident and was addressed here beginning at section <#13> of this response in WTL #95. There is not one bit of evidence that Paul had anything to do with the crucifixion of Yahshua, or that Paul was even in Palestine at any time during Christ's 3½ year ministry, never mind his being a leader in Judaea. In section <#32>, WTL #99, it has been shown that it is quite unlikely that Paul was a leader among the

Pharisees during the time of Christ's ministry. It is also evident that, before Paul's conversion, it was the Sadducees who were the leading persecutors of Christians (Acts 4:1; 5:17), although the Pharisees were doing so also. Notice that, as usual, Douglas cites no sources for any of his statements. He invented the entire story himself! And where he refers to "Freudian truth", he shows himself to be a follower of yet another anti-Christ jew miscreant. Douglas continues:

<Reference #55C> Clayton Douglas states: "... Paul says it is not really 'him' that you see, the [sic] 'he' was crucified, and it is 'not I but Christ' living in his body. He is claiming that he is essentially Christ, and for this reason he is superior to all of Christ's Disciples who opposed him at every turn. Since 'Christ' lived in Paul, this 'Christ' was calling the shots. The direction that 'the church' would go in was now up [sic to] the dictation of a man who may have met Jesus only once, and then only to be rebuked for being an oppressor of the Disciples."

William Finck answers <#55C>: And picking up where we left off two paragraphs above, Paul says "yet not I, but Christ lives in me", and Douglas scoffs. At 2 Corinthians 6:16, where Paul admonishes the children of Israel to separate themselves from the unclean races (not the unclean "thing", as the A.V. conjectures), he quotes several Old Testament verses, such as Leviticus 26:11, Jeremiah 31:33 and Ezekiel 37:27, and he says "... ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said. I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people." Adamic bodies are the vessels for the real "us", so to speak: the spirit which Yahweh gave to Adamic man (cf. Gen. 2:7; 6:3). That this is so is supported by the scriptures at Jer. 2:13; Isa. 52:11; Romans 9:22-23 and 2 Tim. 2:20-21, discussed at length in the second of my *Broken Cisterns* pamphlets. Adamic spirits, having come from Yahweh, are part of and one with Him. Paul certainly taught that the vessels which bear such spirits – as those of the children of Israel do – should be treated accordingly (i.e. 1 Thess. 4:1-5). And so Yahshua Christ Himself, as recorded in the gospel of John, says: "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and **we will come unto him, and make our abode with him**" (14:23). So Clayton Douglas scoffs not at Paul, but at Yahshua Christ Himself. In his ignorance, Douglas rejects Christ and the prophets, which Paul taught justly and correctly.

Paul never claimed superiority over the other apostles, but rather acceded to the advice of the elder James (Acts 21:18-26) without contention and regardless of what he thought of it. Conversely, he professed to being least of all apostles (1 Cor. 15:9) and least of all saints ("saints" being the children of Israel who accept the gospel, not phony Romish church 'saints') because of his prior role in persecuting the Christian assemblies. If the "church" went in the direction dictated by Paul, what a fine collection of assemblies (not a single, overpowering "church") they would have been! This has been discussed here in section <#4> of this response in *WTL #93* and in section <#18> in *WTL #96*. Paul taught nothing which resembles what the Romish or Greek orthodox or later Protestant "churches" became. Clayton Douglas is an ignorant man, and a liar of his own making.

<Reference #56A> Clayton Douglas states: "*Jesus' Brother James is almost entirely written out of the picture, and is referred to - quite disrespectfully and in a very revealing fashion - by Paul/Saul in Acts by a descriptive noun rather than by his name.*"

*Not that the 'slur' mattered much to James. James continued to issue warnings about Paul."*

William Finck answers <#56A>: I can't imagine where in Acts it is recorded that Paul referred to James "quite disrespectfully". Notice again that Douglas makes no citation, and so he is either a deceiver, or an idiot. If he could have made a citation, you can bet all your marbles he would have waved it at us like a red flag. Yet if perhaps Douglas is not an idiot, he certainly must think that his readers are idiots! For he babbles on:

<Reference #56B> Clayton Douglas states: "*In regards to Paul's egotism and boastfulness, James wrote: 'If any man among you seems to be religious, and does not bridle his tongue, but deceives his own heart, this man's religion is vain.'* James 1:26

*"So the tongue is also a little member, and boasts great things. See how a small fire can spread to a large forest! And the tongue is a fire. The world of iniquity among our members is the tongue, which defiles the whole body, and sets on fire the course of nature, and is set on fire by Hell.'* James 3:5-6

*"There are further examples. Find them for yourselves. ... Line for line, the debate matches up; point by point through the admonitions of James regarding the wickedness of Paul. Yet still there are so many who will never choose to see that their master Paul was a murderer, deceiver and imposter [sic] from the beginning, and still to this very day, nothing has changed."*

William Finck answers <#56B>: Yet James' epistle is clearly addressed to "the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad", and Paul is never mentioned by name in this epistle. James 1:26, speaking in general to these people and about no particular individual, is clearly an admonition to "any man among" those twelve tribes, and has nothing at all to do with Paul! Douglas would have us believe that the Liar of the Dead Sea Scrolls is Paul, which is impossible in context, and now this in James, where every negative admonition is supposed to be directed at Paul. This is absolutely ridiculous, and if Douglas is not being purposely deceptive, he is a total moron! This isn't even close to believable, and shows that Clayton Douglas would stop at nothing to slander Paul of Tarsus! He'll unabashedly invent any ridiculous imagining and vain device hoping to gain some poor unsuspecting simpleton to fall for such idiocy in the name of "**patriotism**", which is the most **unpatriotic** thing one can do since Paul is our brother and a co-descendant with us in descent from Abraham our common "**patriarch**". Or is it (as we have demonstrated before at section <#15> in WTL #95 of this response) that he simply can't read? So, neither is Clayton Douglas literate, nor is he an informed patriot.

<Reference #57> Clayton Douglas states: "*Paul even admitted to theft and swindling churches. These are his own words: 'I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service.'* 2 Corinthians 11:8

*"So you see, it is nothing new when we see these charlatans and thieves stealing the money of those trying to do what they have been taught is right. When there are individuals making millions off of the ignorance of the masses, using a religion crafted after the Pharisees themselves to psychologically enslave them to the status quo, such thieves are only following after their master Paul, who admitted to stealing from churches."*

*“Again, Paul does little to hide his true purpose from you. And, yet most of you will continue to defend Paul/Saul until your dying day. Why? Because Paul/Saul is a Tradition.”*

William Finck answers <#57>: Here Douglas’ nefarious charges shall again be proven vain, empty of any substance. From my own translation, 2 Cor. 11:7-9 reads: “<sup>7</sup> **Can it be that I have made an error, humbling myself in order that you may be elevated, because I have announced the good message of Yahweh to you freely?** <sup>8</sup> **I have deprived other assemblies, taking provisions for your service.** <sup>9</sup> **And being present with you and wanting, I had burdened no one, (indeed my need had been filled by the brethren who came from Makedonia,) and in everything I have kept and will keep myself unburdensome to you.”** The events Paul refers to are recorded in Acts chapter 18. Both Timothy and Silas were among “the brethren who came from Makedonia” who supplied Paul’s needs (Acts 18:5). Paul certainly didn’t “rob” the assembly in Makedonia, and he makes another brief visit there, recorded in Acts chapter 20. The word which the A.V. translated *robbed* at 2 Cor. 11:8 is *συλλάω* (4813) and also means *to deprive*, according to Liddell & Scott. There are many Greek words which mean *to rob* or *to steal*, yet this is certainly not what Paul is inferring. Paul is only telling the Corinthians that he attended to their service yet asked nothing of them, and did so while the Makedonians in turn provided for him. Now again, Clayton Douglas will find anything at all that he can twist to support his slander of Paul. Like a ‘good’ jew should, as one can expect, Douglas will go to any length to discredit Paul and Christianity, while at the same time pretending to be patriotic and a Christian, which he is neither! This is the sort of man which all Paul-bashers are following!

<Reference #58> Clayton Douglas states: “*Remember that Paul/ Saul taught that faith ALONE is your Passport into Heaven, contrary to the teachings of both God and His Son. Paul’s mind:twist [sic] teachings can be described in this manner. Let us say that you wish to become a great ice skater. You have great faith in your ability to become a great ice skater. But, does that faith make you a great ice skater? Of course not. You must be faithful in your practice ... faithful in your ACTS. You must train, train, train. Your acts, together with your faith, make you into a very good ice skater. Faith without faithfulness translates into an iceskater [sic] with many bruises and lacerations.*”

William Finck answers <#58>: Paul’s idea of faith clearly included the performing of good works, or deeds. This has been fully discussed in section <#37> of this response, in WTL #100. So here Douglas insists that his reader should “remember” something which just isn’t true. Paul clearly states that “we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things *done* in *his* body, according to that he hath done, whether *it be* good or bad” (2 Cor. 5:10). Douglas’ ice skater analogy is interesting. Paul, teaching the need for self-control, said at 1 Cor. 9:27: “Rather I beat my body, and bring it into subjection”, much like an athlete must do in order to succeed. This has been discussed in section <#22> of this response, in WTL #97. Paul tells Titus at 3:8: “... those trusting in Yahweh should take care to prefer good works. These things are good and advantageous to men.” Surely Paul and James (2:20) did not differ in this teaching, except in their approach to the subject. Who is a liar, but Clayton Douglas?

<Reference #59> Clayton Douglas states: “*SAUL OF TARSUS HAD TO BELIEVE THAT FAITH ALONE – AND NOT HIS ACTS – WOULD GET HIM INTO*

HEAVEN. He HAD to delude himself. After all, Saul was a mass murderer. Correct? I find it incredible that the very same people who volunteer to personally strap David Westerfield into the electric chair because he murdered the little Von Damme girl are calling for complete forgiveness of genocidal trickster Saul/Paul because he's 'annointed' [sic]. And, who made the announcement that Saul/Paul was annointed [sic]? Why, that was Saul/Paul himself.

"One might ask: under the Laws of the Old Testament, why wasn't Saul/Paul ever brought to justice for his mass murders?

"One might also ask: CAN YOU FIND ANY SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES IN WHICH PAUL/SAUL APOLOGIZES TO THE APOSTLES OR TO ANYONE FOR HIS HORRIBLE CRIMES AND MURDERS?"

William Finck answers <#59>: It should be fully evident in the preceding section of this response, and in sections <#22> in WTL #97 and <#37> in WTL #100, which are also referenced above, that Clayton Douglas has absolutely misrepresented Paul's positions regarding faith and salvation. And since his premise is wrong, everything that follows is wrong. It should also have been made fully evident, as it was discussed in section <#39> of this response in WTL #100, Paul was certainly no murderer. Douglas takes the same position, and thus the same mind-set, as did the jews at the insistence of Chaim Weizmann, to conduct the kangaroo Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal trials against German leaders. Men who perform the will and the functions of their government under the laws of that government are not murderers by any stretch of the imagination, and that is all that Paul had done, until he learned that his government (the high priests and elders in Jerusalem) was wrong. Then Paul very nobly stopped supporting his government's cause, and stopped persecuting the innocent whom he had at one time supposed to be rebels. Paul murdered no one! While his government was wrong, Paul and surely many others within it thought they were doing right. This same circumstance has existed all through the history of our race even unto this very day. Clayton Douglas, writing for Christian-Patriot publications about the government we have today, should know this better than most of us, but is woefully ignorant of the true situation!

Now who is Clayton Douglas to insist that Paul never offered an apology for his persecution of Christians, and this being a lawful (under Judaeian law) act when Paul committed it? Peter commended Paul (2 Pet. 3:14-16) and wasn't wanting an apology. The apostles received Paul in Jerusalem on at least two occasions (Acts chapters 15 and 21) and evidently were not wanting an apology. Who then, is Clayton Douglas to insist that an apology was never made? The events outlined in the Acts cover a period of about 30 years, and in a very short space, hardly a complete record! Paul's 14 epistles are certainly not all that he wrote, and these which we have were all written towards the end of that 30 year period. Again, hardly a complete record! Douglas barks loudly, but his logic has no teeth. Yet we shall see that even many years after his conversion Paul did indeed apologize for his actions, since many years later he was still doing so!

From *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, the definition of *apology*: "1. An acknowledgment expressing regret or asking pardon for a fault or offense. 2. a. A formal justification or defense. b. An explanation or excuse." And the verb *apologize*: "1. To excuse or regretfully acknowledge a fault or offense. 2. To defend or justify

formally.” These English words came from like Greek words, and since Paul was speaking and writing in Greek, we should look at those. From the Liddell & Scott lexicon, the noun ἀπολογία (627): “a speech in defence, defence” and the verb ἀπολογέομαι (626): “to speak in defence, defend oneself ... explain, excuse ...”.

And so an apology is not simply uttering “I’m sorry” or “I apologize”, as we are accustomed to this hollow form of apology today, but rather is an explanation and acknowledgment of one’s actions, not necessarily expressing regret, although that may be an element expected depending upon the circumstances. While Paul’s persecution of Christians was done as a function of the legal government of Judaea at that time, an apology is not necessarily in order, yet we shall see that some of Paul’s later statements certainly fulfilled the criteria to qualify as an apology.

Paul’s arrest in Jerusalem happened about 57 A.D. (Acts 21-22), or about 25 years after the stoning of Stephen at Acts chapter 7. At his defense before the people Paul acknowledged his persecution of Christians (Acts 22:4-5). Paul was then sent to the governor, Felix, and over two years later (Acts 24:27) Paul spoke about Christianity before Felix’ successor Festus and Herod Agrippa II. Here again Paul acknowledged his persecution of Christians (Acts 26:9-11), admitting all of his errors in what may easily be perceived as a regretful manner. Paul seems to have written his epistle to the Galatians about 54 or 55 A.D., from either Makedonia or Ephesus. At Galatians 1:13 Paul acknowledged his persecution of Christians many years beforetime. 1 Corinthians was also written about this time, 55 A.D., from Ephesus (1 Cor. 16:8, 19). In it Paul states “For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God” (1 Cor. 15:9), and here we certainly have “an acknowledgment expressing regret”, the dictionary definition of an apology! Paul apologized for his sins over and over again, and was apologizing over 25 years afterwards! Who is a liar, but Clayton Douglas?

**<Reference #60>** Clayton Douglas states: “... *This prophecy mentions Paul by name in the original Hebrew. The Hebrew did not use diacritical vowel markings. In Hebrew the word for ‘Hades’ or ‘The Grave’ is ‘Sheol’ meaning simply the Neatherworld [sic]. It is not synonymous with ‘Hell’ which is ‘Geyhenum’ or the ‘Pit.’ The name ‘Sheol’ (and ‘Sha’ul’) or ‘Saul’ as English renders it, are identical terms in Hebrew. As well, to those who understand the true origins, nature and identity of Paul, they will understand the full prophecy of Habbakuk as relating to this figure, who all the Prophets since the time of Noah have warned their people of.*

*“In an interpretation of the above Habakkuk 2:4, the Dead Sea Scrolls (found only 50 years ago, in caves near Jericho) tell us its interpretation ‘Concerns all doers of the Torah in the House of Y’hudah (Judah), whom El (God) will save from the House of Judgment because of their works and their Faith in the Teacher of Righteousness.’ Habakkuk Peshar 7:17-8:3*

*“The ‘Teacher of Righteousness,’ or ‘Rightous [sic] Teacher,’ leads a Messianic Movement befuddled by ‘The Spouter of Lies, who leads many astray in order to build his city of vanity on blood and erect an Assembly upon Lying, for the sake of his glory, tiring out many with a worthless service and instructing them in works of Lying, so that their works will be of Emptiness. And they will be brought to the same Judgments of Fire with which they insulted and vilified the Chosen of God.’ Habakkuk Peshar 10:9-13”*

William Finck answers <#60>: Since Douglas apparently failed to include “this prophecy” in his article, which is evidently Habakkuk 2:5, we shall repeat it here from the A.V.: “Yea also, because he transgresseth by wine, *he is* a proud man, neither keepeth at home, who enlargeth his desire as hell, and *is* as death, and cannot be satisfied, but gathereth unto him all nations, and heapeth unto him all people.” Douglas here asserts that the word “hell” in Hab. 2:5 should read “Paul”. I must comment, that it is odd that Douglas cited Hab. 2:4 rather than 2:5, for 2:4 ends “... the just shall live by his faith.” How could Douglas pay so much attention to the one verse, yet despise the other?

Now let us read Habakkuk (Ambakoum in Greek) 2:5 from the Greek Septuagint, to see how the earliest translators understood it, from Brenton’s translation: “But the arrogant man and the scorner, the boastful man, shall not finish anything; who has enlarged his desire as the grave, and like death he is never satisfied, and he will gather to himself all the nations, and will receive to himself all the peoples.” The word “grave” here is the Greek word “Hades”, which Brenton chose to translate “grave”. Now taken out-of-context, I can see where Douglas may want “hell” to read “Paul” in the A.V. version. Yet let’s read Hab. 2:6-8, still from the LXX: “Shall not all these take up a parable against him? and a proverb to tell against him? and they shall say, Woe to him that multiplies to himself the possessions which are not his! how long? and who heavily loads his yoke. For suddenly there shall arise up those that bite him, and they that plot against thee shall awake, and thou shalt be a plunderer to them. Because thou hast spoiled many nations, all the nations that are left shall spoil *thee*, because of the blood of men, and the sins of the land and city, and of all that dwell in it.” Reading the entire prophecy, it is obviously incredulous that the subject of verse 5 could be Paul of Tarsus, because the subject doesn’t change through verse 8, and the subject of verse 8 certainly can’t be Paul of Tarsus! The subject of this prophecy is surely “the arrogant man, and the scorner, the boastful man”, which is here an epithet for Satan, the Adversary in a collective sense, the children of the devil who have plundered every city and nation throughout history.

We have seen that the Peshers in the Dead Sea Scrolls use the epithets “Man of the Lie”, “Man of Lies”, or “Spreader of the Lie”, and that these terms were used to describe Satan, or the Adversary, and not Paul. This was discussed at length in section <#43> of this response in WTL #101, where **all** of the Peshers where these epithets were used by the Qumran sect were discussed, and not just this one verse in Habakkuk, which Clayton Douglas excises from its context in order to mold it into his twisted theory. It is evident that there is no limit to Clayton Douglas’ subterfuge.

Another aspect which may be taken into account here is the grammar of Hab. 2:5, whether we examine the A.V. or the LXX. The phrase “as the grave”, or “as hell” in the A.V., is an adverbial clause, and by no means can it be the subject of the sentence, even if it did say “as Paul”, as Douglas desires it to say.

Douglas’ plot here takes advantage of the fact that in Hebrew, the words *Sheol*, which is the Hebrew equivalent to Hades, and *Saul*, which was also the name of the first Israelite king, are spelled alike in palaeo-Hebrew (old Hebrew used no diacritical marks), at least on many occasions in the Hebrew which we know today. There were, according to Strong’s concordance, two spellings for *sheol* (# 7585): שְׂאוֹל or שְׂאֹל. *Saul* is spelled שְׂאוֹל. Strong defines *sheol*: “from 7592; *hades* or the world of the dead



(as if a subterranean *retreat*), including its accessories and inmates” and *Saul*: “passive participle of 7592; *asked*; *Shaül*, the name of an Edomite and two Israelites.” So we see that both of these words are derived from another word, a verb, 7592, spelled לִשַׁא (sha'al), and this is exactly how the alternative form of *sheol* is spelled. Strong defines *sha'al*: “a primitive root; to *inquire*; by implication to *request*; by extension to *demand*.”

So we see that not only are *sheol* and *Saul* spelled alike, but both words are derived from *sha'al*, and sometimes *sheol* and *sha'al* were spelled alike. But that doesn't mean that these words are interchangeable, wherever doing such may offer us a convenient interpretation. Because Hebrew had no proper vowels, many words were spelled identically, and nearly every Hebrew name, if not every one, is also a word with a meaning in the Hebrew language. Imagine the confusion in English, with words such as fan, fen, fin, fine, fun and fauna, or gam, game, gem, gum and gym, if we had no vowels. Douglas could find thousands of word-substitution games to play in the Bible, because context matters so little to him!

Let us look at Hab. 2:5 one more time, from the A.V.: “Yea also, because he transgresseth by wine, *he is* a proud man, neither keepeth at home, who enlargeth his desire as hell, and *is* as death, and cannot be satisfied, but gathereth unto him all nations, and heapeth unto him all people”. It is obvious that the proud man – and no one in particular – is compared to hell and to death, not to Saul and to death, an interpretation utterly out-of-context! Now from *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* by Florentino Garcia Martinez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, volume 1, p. 17, from the *Pesher to Habakkuk*, 1QpHab Column VIII, where the Qumran sect comments upon Hab. 2:5-6, we have this: “Surely wealth will corrupt the boaster, and not will he last, he who widens his throat like the abyss, and he, like death can not be satisfied. All the peoples ally against him, all the nations come together against him.” Now is this, as Douglas claims, really describing Paul? Can we take “the abyss” and substitute “Paul” here, because in the Hebrew that is the word *sheol*, and would it make sense to do so? Or is Clayton Douglas weaving a web of deceit? And how many other things have we observed Clayton Douglas lie about? No sleight-of-hand magic trick is too risky for Douglas to attempt. Douglas quotes from the Habakkuk Pesher interpretation of Hab. 2:4, but the word *sheol* does not appear in Hab. 2:4! The word *sheol* only appears in 2:5! Douglas is trying to pull off a “bait and switch”! Like a ‘good’ Jew, he’ll go to any length to misrepresent Paul, and discredit Christianity in the process! *W.R.F.*

The reader should now be starting to comprehend just how dangerous this scam of Paul-bashing really is and from whence it emanates. How can a true “Christian” stoop to the lowest of the low?! It is simply amazing to me just how gullible some in Israel Identity are, not taking the time or effort to check out the sources from which these prevarications are generated.