

consider what the victim had to say about his accuser. For that, we must turn to Second Peter 3:12-17.

By way of introduction, Pauline devotees and Christian apologists alike cite errant translations of a portion of Second Peter 3:16 completely out of context to justify affording Scriptural status to Paul's letters specifically, and to the whole corpus of their "New Testament" generally. It is ironic, however, albeit not surprising, that "Peter," the man "Paul" condemned in Galatians for being wrong in opposing him, is somehow right when he is construed to be providing an endorsement. Also paradoxical, when Shim'own's evaluation of Sha'awl's veracity is considered in the context of this presentation, rather than endorsing the wannabe apostle's letters, the Disciple is seen trashing them.

The damage "Peter" inflicts on Paul's credibility is so devastating, Eusebius and Jerome claimed that "Peter" wasn't the author of this epistle. And Calvin wrote: "I do not here recognize the language of Peter." He postured the notion that the letter may have been compromised by mental atrophy: "now that he was in extreme old age...and near his end." Then, demonstrating religious duplicity, Calvin said that the criticism of Paul's letters in Second Peter, where they are called, "hard to understand," suggests that the Apostle Peter could not have written that work. The patriarch of the Christian reformation in his commentary on 2nd Peter 3:15, wrote: "And yet, when I examine all things more narrowly, it seems to me more probable that this Epistle was composed by another according to what Peter communicated, than that it was written by himself, for Peter, himself, would have never spoken thus."

And while it would be impossible to prove that Shim'own did or did not write either or both of the letters ascribed to him, it does not actually matter. If Yahowsha's Disciple authored them, and if he was inspired, all of Paul's letters have to be discarded as "misleading," because Shim'own wrote this of them. And if Second Peter is fraudulent, then there is no justification whatsoever for considering Paul's epistles Scripture.

The reason Christian theologians like Eusebius and Jerome, and later Calvin, want Second Peter expunged from their "New Testament" is because it accurately and effectively denounces Paul's letters, calling them nonsensical. Their religion, and thus their livelihood, was predicated upon those epistles. Should they, along with Hebrews and Luke's account of Paul in Acts, be stricken from the canon, nothing of Christianity would remain.

And yet, no informed and rational person disputes the fact that Paul's letters are poorly crafted and are thus difficult to understand. And that's indeed strange, because when Paul convolutes and contradicts Yahowah's Torah and Yahowsha's

testimony throughout his letters, Christians universally believe Paul rather than God.

Turning to the text of the letter, itself, we find Shim'own conveying:

“Waiting expectantly (*prosdokao* – looking forward to the future) **and** (*kai*) **having been eager regarding the suddenness** (*pseudo* – having urged the hastening) **of the** (*ten*) **presence of the coming day of Yahowah** (*parousia tes tou* ΘΥ *hemera* – arrival of the day of Almighty God) **on account of** (*dia* – because) **which** (*en*), **the sky** (*ouranos* – the heavens) **will be ablaze** (*pyroomai* – being on fire, fiery, flaming, consumed, and burning in distress), **with the elements** (*stoicheion* – the substance and power of nature, its most basic principles and materials) **being released** (*luo* – they being untied and loosened, breaking apart), **even** (*kai*) **becoming molten** (*tekomai* – melting and dissolving, turning from solid to liquid) **as a result of becoming intensely hot** (*kausoomai* – being consumed by fire and heat while appearing to burn feverishly).” (2 Shim'own / He Listens / Peter 3:12)

This statement can be construed conveying one or both of the following ideas. Yahowah's return will be so spectacular, and He will be so brilliant, the sky itself will be ablaze. This is akin to what Yahowsha' had told His Disciples on the Mount of Olives. The inference was, appearing more like the stars in the heavens than a man, the whole world would simultaneously witness the glory of God.

The second option seems to suggest, at least as clearly as a first-century lexicon would allow, that a nuclear holocaust will precede His arrival. While Yahowah will return as the sun sets in Yaruwshalaim on the commencement of Yowm Kippurym in year 6000 Yah (6.22 PM October 2nd, 2033), those alive during this time will be pleading with God to come quickly, before man destroys this planet and extinguishes all life on it. If this is so, at least regarding the nuclear exchange during the waning days of the tribulation, then this prophecy is one of the most exacting and specific recorded by one of Yahowsha's Disciples. The depiction of the inherent power of the elements being released in accordance with the principles of nature generating heat so intense solid objects become molten, is apt even by today's standards.

Beyond this, by saying that Yahowsha's return is still future, and that the occasion will be so brilliant the sky will appear to be on fire, Shim'own is refuting Sha'awl. The wannabe apostle has already claimed to have seen Him as a flash of light, an encounter not witness by anyone else on earth.

If you think I'm extrapolating here, please hold that conclusion. Shim'own will soon warn us specifically about Sha'awl. But first, Yahowsha's Disciple wants to reassure the Covenant's children. While the sky ablaze and elements liquefying is a frightening vision, Shim'own knew that it was not the end of the

story. The testimony Yahowsha' shared as part of His Revelation to Yahowchanan, He evidently conveyed to this man as well...

“However (*de*), a new (*kainos* – recently created, fresh, and previously unknown) universe and spiritual realm (*ouranos* – heavens) and (*kai*) a new (*kainos* – freshly created and previously unknown) earth (*ges* – material realm) according to (*kata*) the promise (*to epangelma*) of Him (*autou*) we await and expect (*prosdokao* – we look forward to with great expectations, favorably anticipating). In which (*en ois*) the righteous and vindicated (*dikaiosyne* – upright and approved in the correct relationship as a result of being observant and acceptable) will live (*katoikeo* – will reside and dwell as a result of being settled).” (2 Shim'own / He Listens / Peter 3:13)

A combination of factors, including the realization that Shim'own relied on Yahowchanan Marcus as a translator, and that the Qumran Scrolls are rife with ordinary letters written in Hebrew, lend credence to the notion that this epistle was translated out of Shim'own's native tongue into Greek. The reason I share this with you is because I took liberty with the tenses. Since it is obvious that Kephas was speaking about the future, something he makes abundantly clear at the opening of this very chapter, and realizing that in Hebrew there is no past, present, or future tense, I rendered his statements appropriately in English.

Shim'own is looking forward to eternity. He knows, because Yahowsha' told him, that the Ma'aseyah's fulfillment of the Towrah's promises regarding Passover, Un-Yeasted Bread, and FirstFruits will vindicate the Covenant's children, enabling those who have embraced His Towrah to live forever in the new heaven and earth God will create on behalf of His family. Few realizations are as enticing.

The operative word in this prophetic proclamation is *dikaiosyne*, which was conveyed “righteous and vindicated,” but could just as easily be translated “acceptable, correct, and approved.” It is the opposite of “*anthistemi* – hostile opposition” and the antithesis of “*kataginosko* – convicted and condemned,” the terms Paul used against Peter. *Dikaiosyne* is “focused upon the manner in which souls are approved by God.” It speaks of “being observant and thinking correctly so as to become acceptable.” It is based upon *dikaiois*, which is defined as “becoming upright by observing God's instructions.”

Dikaiosyne is, therefore, the fulcrum upon which “Peter's” evaluation of Paul will pivot in this circumstance, especially since Sha'awl is seen opposing the Torah. In this regard, it is also instructional to know that *dikaiois* is based upon *dike* and *deiknuo* which convey the idea of “exposing the evidence to determine if something is consistent with that which is authorized.”

Continuing to speak of becoming acceptable so that we are prepared to live in heaven with God, Shim'own wrote:

“Therefore (*dio* – for this reason), **loved ones** (*agapetos* – dear friends, those who are unique and welcomed), **those eagerly anticipating** (*prosdokao* – confidently look forward to) **this** (*tauta*), **earnestly make every effort to become** (*spoudazo* – engage, diligently endeavoring to do your best to be ready) **pure and spotless, without blemish or defect** (*aspilos* – undefiled without fault) **and** (*kai*) **blameless** (*amometos* – beyond reproach, without fault, avoiding judgment) **for Him** (*auto*), **learning to be found with** (*heuriskomai en* – discovering how to attain) **reconciliation leading to salvation** (*eirene* – the closest Greek analog to *shalowm* – being united in a harmonious relationship which brings restoration and salvation).” (2 Shim'own / He Listens / Peter 3:14)

Those who earnestly make every effort to observe the Torah can expect to experience Yahowah in a purified state. The Covenant's children avoid judgment because the benefit associated with responding to this relationship's third codicil, which is to “walk to Yahowah to become perfect,” makes us immortal and blameless in God's eyes.

As an interesting aside, in two verses we have already benefited infinitely more from Shim'own than we have gained in two Pauline chapters. Kephas wrote about how we can be made right with God while Paul has written about how he is right.

Thus far, Shim'own has predicted the sky being ablaze upon Yahowah's return – perhaps even to thwart the devastation of a nuclear exchange. He has said that God is going to create a new universe for those His promises have saved. As a result, he has encouraged us to be observant so that we learn how God vindicates, thereby becoming perfected and righteous, reconciled in the relationship. Therefore, Yahowsha's Disciple realizes that the Covenant's children are not judged and should eagerly anticipate entrance into heaven. Having listened to Yahowsha', he knows that God perfects those who actively observe His Guidance, those act upon the terms of His Covenant, those who capitalize upon the Torah's promises. And to these insights, and in the context of being observant regarding Yahowah's testimony, Shim'own adds this warning:

“Also (*kai*) **this regarding** (*ten tou* – of, about, and in association with in the accusative feminine addressing reconciliation and genitive masculine addressing) **our** (*emon*) **Upright One, Yahowah** (KY – a Divine Placeholder used by Yahowsha's Disciples and in the Septuagint to convey Upright Pillar of the Tabernacle and Yahowah's name): **steadfast endurance and constraint** (*makrothymia* – show restraint under trial, always analyzing while expressing righteous indignation toward the adversary, being hostile, even exasperated,

willing to wage war with great passion) **considering forming opinions** (*hegeomai* – thinking in matters pertaining to an directions and guidance, influence, authority, and counsel) **regarding the process of salvation** (*soteria* – when the object is being saved) **inasmuch as it pertains** (*kathos* – just as accordingly in the manner) **then** (*kai*) **to this** (*o*), **our** (*emon*) **esteemed** (*ho agapetos* – unique and dear, welcoming and entertaining) **countryman** (*adelphos* – brother and / or fellow Yahuwd / Jew [and thus not afforded the title Apostle title he craved]), **Paulos** (*Paulos* – Latin for Little and Lowly), **throughout** (*kata* – pertaining to and in accordance with) **the** (*ho*) **clever use of human philosophy** (*sophia* – wisdom and insights gleaned and capacity to understand derived from man’s knowledge, intelligence, and experience [and thus not Godly inspiration]) **having been produced** (*didomai* – having been given, granted, entrusted, and appointed) **by him** (*auto*) **in writing** (*grapho*) **to you** (*umin*).” (2 Shim’own / He Listens / Peter 3:15)

Shim’own Kephass is saying, “make every effort to become blameless” “learning about and finding reconciliation,” because he wants us focused on the testimony “regarding our Upright One, Yahowah,” so that we are properly prepared to show “steadfast endurance and constraint concerning forming opinions regarding the process of salvation” “inasmuch as” Yahowah’s approach differs so dramatically from his “countryman, Paulos.” So after undermining the veracity of Paul’s alleged conversion experience, the man Yahowsha’ called, “the Rock,” is now prepared to provide a life and death contrast between this man and God.

The Rock has established that salvation is a steadfast and unwavering process, neither instant nor capricious. No one stumbles into God’s lap. Those who find their relationship with Yahowah “*shalowm* – reconciled and restored” are observant and engaged, traveling to Him along the path He has articulated. Even this is in sharp contrast to Sha’uwl, who has promoted the myth that faith rather than thinking provides access to salvation.

The first of many intriguing words, *makrothymia*, is from *makrothymos*. It was translated “steadfast endurance and constraint” because of the words from which it was comprised. *Macros*, meaning “lengthy and for a long time,” is defined by Strong’s as “longanimity,” a Latin compound of “*longus* – long” and “*animus* – reasoning.” It speaks of “calmly suffering through an adversary’s injurious attack.” The second aspect of *makrothymia* is from *thymos*, meaning “to be hostile, inflamed with righteous indignation.” It is used to convey “being exasperated with someone” and of “waging a war with great passion against them, overtly showing animosity and anger.” *Thymos*, itself, is derived from *thuo*, which speaks of “a sacrifice whereby the victim dies,” so it is a very serious concept.

Therefore, the English translations which render *makrothymia* as “patience,” which is often the lack of a response, or as “forbearance,” which suggests acceptance, grossly shortchange and misrepresent the word’s etymology. Shim’own, as we should be, is “inflamed with righteous indignation,” he is “exasperated and angered” by what Sha’uwl has written. And, therefore, he wants everyone to be “steadfast and circumspect, to calmly and methodically examine the evidence” so that we are “neither swayed nor capricious, showing constraint.” Paul is “sacrificing lives” and “injuring” souls by representing the “adversary,” and “Peter” passionately disapproves. That is a lot to convey in a single word, and yet every facet is revealing.

Hegeomai also presents a challenge to communicate properly within the construct of a single sentence. While it was rendered “considering forming opinions,” it specifically addresses the idea of “thinking diligently regarding matters pertaining to the directions, guidance, and influence of those in positions of leadership who claim that their counsel has been authorized.” Based upon *ago*, the emphasis is on “being led,” and thus “misled,” succumbing to the wrong influence. Rather than believe Paul, rather than follow Paul, “Peter” wants us “to think” so that we aren’t “mislead.”

Recognizing that there are few things as vital to our wellbeing than “*soteria* – the process of salvation,” since there is nothing controversial about the term, let’s move on to Shim’own’s curious depiction of Sha’uwl. To the great dismay of Christians, he does not refer to him as an “Apostle,” the title Paul not only craves but has bequeathed upon himself. He is simply an “*adelphos* – brother” which is used to identify someone from the same race or nation. It is akin to acknowledging that Sha’uwl, now Paulos, was still a Jew.

At first blush, *agapetos*, is awkward in this derogatory evaluation. But it does not always mean “beloved,” or even “dear,” rather “esteemed, unique, welcoming, and entertaining.” And at the time this letter was written, for some, Paul was all of those things. Many adored him then as now – as they were and continue to be mesmerized by his bold assertions. And few men have ever been as esteemed, even venerated. But Paul was most of all, unique. From the beginning, it has been Paul against everyone, including God. He stood with no man. And his message was his own. Yet in a way, even through his hostility and hatred, he was welcoming, because in his faith, believers didn’t need to know or do anything. And as the subject of countless books and bible studies, it would be hard to find something more entertaining.

However, based upon how Sha’uwl treated Shim’own, and based upon the fact that he vociferously condemned him in the very letter Peter was now referencing, it strains credulity to believe that that Yahowsha’s Disciple penned the word “*agapetos* – dear and esteemed”—unless the “esteemed” connotation

was a tongue-in-cheek reference to Paul's notorious ego. It is, to my mind, much more likely that second- or third-century scribes operating under Marcion's influence augmented the text to serve their religious masters. It is the most reasonable explanation. But, more on this in a moment.

So, since the status Paul craved most was not afforded him, and since "Peter" has now associated Paul with the race the wannabe apostle has been opposing, we would be wise to see Shim'own's tongue planted firmly in his cheek, and his eyebrows raised mockingly, regarding the notion of "esteemed." And realizing that Paul was now virtually unknown as Sha'awl, Shim'own addressed the man now identified with the letters that have become the bulk of the "Christian New Testament" by his chosen name: Paulos. I suspect he did so in light of Yahowsha's foreboding warning: **"I, Myself, have come in the name of My Father, and yet you do not receive Me. But when another comes in his own name, that individual you all will actually receive."** (Yahowchanan 5:43)

The next phrase, *kata sophia didomai auto grapho umin*, contains this passages most controversial terms. This begins with *kata*, whose primary connotation is "downward and against," but can also convey "throughout, among, opposed, with regard to, or in accordance with," even "in the name of." I selected "throughout," but any of these options, so long as they can be worked into the sentence, could be justified.

Sophia, usually translated "wisdom" was also chosen to the chagrin of Christians. They would have preferred "inspiration." And while *sophia* can describe any form of wisdom, most every lexicon identifies it first and foremost as "the wisdom of men—the synthesis of education and experience, of philosophy and science." For example, in Acts 7:22, *sophia* was used by Luke to convey: **"Moses was learned in all the wisdom (*sophia*) of the Egyptians."**

In this light, consider the difference between Shim'own and his adversary, Sha'awl. The Disciple was a fisherman with no formal education. He had learned everything he knew from walking in the footsteps of Yahowsha'. Sha'awl, by contrast, had been born into a wealthy family. He was a Roman citizen. He was educated in Tarsus of Cilicia, the home of what was then a most prestigious university. And Sha'awl studied Judaism in Jerusalem at the feet of the world's leading religious scholar. From Peter's perspective, Paul was steeped in human understanding.

Since it implies "insights gleaned from man's knowledge," the statement "throughout the clever use of human philosophy having been produced by him in writing to you" should not be construed as a compliment, much less an endorsement of Paul's message—especially as presented in the Galatians epistle. Considering Paul's over the top protestation in Galatians, one he contradicted in

Acts, that he was inspired by God and not taught by men, this was written to rebuke those claims. It was a punch to the gut, an attempt to knock the wind out of the man.

You may have noticed that the final clause of 2 Peter 3:15 speaks of a specific letter which had been written by Paul to a common audience. So to understand which letter Peter was referring to we have to conduct a little investigation. In 2 Peter 3:1, Shim'own says that this is "the second letter I am writing to you." And in 1 Peter 1:1, we learn that Shim'own's first epistle was addressed to "those who reside as foreigners scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappodocia, Asia, and Bithynia." The lone point of intersection between Paul's letters and Peter's recipients is "Galatia." And not so coincidentally, this is the letter in which Peter was openly condemned by Paul.

Before we press on, remember that Paul continually insisted that Peter's ministry was limited to Jews, while the wannabe and self-proclaimed apostle's realm was comprised of the rest of the world. Obviously Shim'own didn't agree. Last time I checked, "foreigners scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappodocia, Asia, and Bithynia," could not have been Jews in Judea. Therefore, when Paul implied that Shim'own, Ya'aqob, and Yahowchanan had agreed with him that their ministries were limited to "the circumcised," he was either misinformed or lying.

This known, Peter's next line reads: "**And even** (*kai* – also) **as** (*hos* – like and in a similar way, when and because) **in** (*en* – throughout) **all** (*pas*) **letters** (*epistole* – epistles), **inside** (*en*) **them** (*autais* – they) **speak** (*laleo* – proclaim and convey a message) **all around and on the other side of** (*peri* – about, encompassing the proximity or sides concerning an account, with regard to or remotely about; from *peran* – beyond the extremity to the other side, and *heteros*, that which is different and opposed to) **this** (*touton*)." (2 Shim'own / He Listens / Second Peter 3:16)

Yahowsha's Disciple is announcing to all who will listen that there is a common and universal theme in all of Paul's letters: "throughout they proclaim the message of the other side" – meaning that they speak for the Adversary. Sure, they talk all around God and His plan of salvation, but just as circular reasoning is designed to mislead, and just as going around someone never gets you to them, Paul's letters have this effect.

The subject has been and remains diligently observing and acting upon Yahowah's unwavering nature and unchanging plan in order to live with Him. In contrast, Paul's epistles were penned to speak "all around" this subject. That is to say that circular reasoning was deployed to convey a view which is "opposed and different." So if Yahowah's message is from God, if His message is truthful and

reliable, if His message saves, what might we reasonably conclude about a different message which is opposed to His?

And so now you know the reason Christian theologians want Peter's epistle expunged from their "New Testament." They don't want you to consider these questions.

To fully appreciate Shim'own's next line, it behooves us to contemplate the meaning of *dusnoetos*, which will be translated "difficult to understand," below. As a compound of "*dus* – difficult, injurious, detrimental and in opposition" and "*noeo* – thinking, perception, consideration, and understanding," the word literally means: "opposed to understanding and detrimental to thinking." And that would make what follows considerably worse than it already appears to be.

“Within (*en*) which (*ais*) there are (*hos eimi* – there is the existence and presence of) some things (*tina* – a considerable number of important issues) difficult to understand (*dusnoetos* – hard to comprehend, detrimental to thinking, and injurious to comprehension), which (*tina*) the (*ho*) uneducated (*amathes* – unlearned and ignorant who have not been properly taught) and (*kai*) malleable (*asteriktos* – the unstable and poorly established with flexible and wavering views, perspectives, and attitudes) misinterpret and distort, turning away (*strebloo* – pervert and twist deriving a false meaning which turns people away, tormented and suffering as a result),...” (2 Peter 3:16)

Strebloo is an especially undesirable term, so unpleasant that it is often translated "torture and torment," including the "wrenching limbs on a rack designed to inflict anguishing pain and suffering to the point of agony." Its root, *trope*, speaks of "turning way from heaven." It is about distortions which lead away from God, about perversions which prompt many to turn away from the Torah, about the undue suffering caused by misinterpreting and then twisting Yah's testimony.

Having studied Yahowah's testimony and Sha'awl's letters, I unequivocally agree with "the Rock's" assessment. As a result of the writing quality and ambiguity, as a result of circular reasoning and his irrational approach, as a result of his affinity for self-promotion and his tendency to contradict himself, Paul's letters are at the very least difficult to understand, especially in light of his propensity to twist the truth and misquote Scripture. And because of their deficiencies, the Pauline epistles are remarkably easy to misinterpret and distort, especially among those who are unaware of what the Torah actually reveals, in addition to by those who ignore most of what Yahowsha' said and did. And that is why Paul's letters have become a stumbling block for so many.

And while that is reprehensible and inexcusable, this represents the least condemning interpretation of *dusnoetos* and *strebloo*. More literally rendered,

Paul's epistles are "torturous and agonizing" to those who know and love Yah's Torah because they are "detrimental to understanding – a genuine hindrance when it comes to knowing Yah." Precluding this is the one thing even worse than misleading someone. It's the very reason Yahowah condemned Sha'awl by name, speaking through the prophet Chabaquwq / Habakkuk, calling the author of half of the Christian New Testament the "plague of death." By replacing knowing with faith, by denouncing and obsolescing the Torah, God's primary source of answers, by misrepresenting the purpose of Yahowsha', Sha'awl created a scenario where it becomes difficult, if not impossible, for those who ingest his poison to find God's remedy. The one place they should look is the last place they'd consider.

In the six-thousand years Satan has been given to come up with a scheme to undermine Yahowah's Towrah testimony and to negate Yahowsha's life, this is his crowning achievement. And even the combination of Yahowah's prophetic warning, Yahowsha's Instruction on the Mount, and the Disciple Shim'own's written condemnation were collectively insufficient to keep a lone insane, irrational, perverted, ruthless, and demon-possessed megalomaniac from luring billions of souls away from God.

One of the reasons that Sha'awl's letters are so prone to misinterpretation is the window dressing that accompanies them. He claims to be an Apostle, although he was not appointed as such. He claims to speak for God, and yet he consistently misquotes Him. He claims to represent the Ma'aseyah and yet by separating Yahowsha' from the Torah, Sha'awl, not the Rabbis nor Romans, wielded the most deadly and devastating blow against Him. He claims that he cannot lie, and yet that is all he has done. These things combined with the placement of his letters in the "Bible," as if they were "Scripture," work to enhance the credibility of the world's most egregious deceiver. This man's twisted rhetoric became the recipe for religious perversions of monstrous proportions.

Even here, steeped in Pauline Doctrine, Christian apologists will claim that I am misinterpreting "Peter's" testimony to impugn Paul. And yet all I'm actually doing is presenting the Disciple's words as accurately as is possible in the hope that a few more people will be saved from Paul. And of course, I am trying to relate to you what Yahowah had to say of him so that all who will listen with an open mind might choose to trust God rather than believe Sha'awl.

If you recall, Yahowah said: **"Moreover, because the intoxicating wine and inebriating spirit of the man of deceptive infidelity and treacherous betrayal who tries to influence and control others without justification through trickery and deceit is a high-minded moral failure, an arrogant and meritless man of presumption, so he will not rest, find peace, nor live, whoever is open to the broad path, the opportunistic, duplicitous, and improper way**