

Adonikam is the Name of the Beast having 666 meaning

written by Alfred Persson | August 17, 2024



Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six (Rev. 13:18 KJV)

Many insist we use *Gematria* (substituting letters for numbers) to solve the riddle of 666 meaning, although they cannot point to any undisputed[1] examples of its use elsewhere in Scripture. How can we decide this issue?

John states wisdom is required to solve the riddle.[2] If Gematria revealed the name whose number is 666, it would be wise to use that method. However, Gematria results in too many possible names. Therefore, as John states wisdom is required Gematria is ruled out as a way to solve the riddle.

What is a riddle? “A question or statement intentionally phrased so as to require ingenuity in ascertaining its answer or meaning, typically presented as a game.”-Oxford Languages

John gamely invites all “that hath understanding count the number”. It follows solving the riddle depends on how the text is phrased.

Here is wisdom. Let him who has understanding calculate the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man: His number is 666. (Rev. 13:18 NKJ)

the sons of Adonikam, 666 (Ezr. 2:13 NAS)
the sons of Adonikam, 667 (Neh. 7:18 NAS)

John gives three clues how 666 points to one name.

- 1) “Calculate the number” (666+1=667 Adonikam).
- 2) “Number OF a man” (666 sons are “OF” the man Adonikam)
- 3) “His number is 666” (Only one name Adonikam is associated with the number 666)

John wasn’t like modern critics, he would consider the difference (666 in Ezra 2:13; 667 in Nehemiah 7:18) in number intentional. Experts in Hebrew Scripture will immediately recognize John’s riddle is a *asymmetric Janus Parallelism*(Gen. 6:3; 49:26; Cant. 2:12; Ezek. 20:37; Dan. 11:35; Nah. 1:8.)

Adonikam had 666 sons or counting from his father also named Adonikam, 667 sons.

From the “Janus” 666 we look back and “count” (5585 ψηφίζω psephizo) “as with pebbles” 666+1=667 to “Adonikam” as the Beast’s name.

From the “Janus” 666 we look forward, Adonikam had 666 sons, they are “of” him. Again the name Adonikam appears.

“His [Adonikam] number is 666.” The only name in the Bible closely associated with 666 is “Adonikam”.

Therefore, solution to John’s riddle is “Adonikam”.

Hebrew Scholar Cyrus Gordon discovered ancient Hebrews used parallelism to communicate meaning, today called *Janus Parallelism*. Examples can be found in Gen. 6:3; 49:26; Cant. 2:12; Ezek. 20:37; Dan. 11:35; Nah. 1:8; Mat. 16:18.

***Janus Parallelism.** This type of parallelism hinges on the use of a single word with two different meanings, one of which forms a parallel with what precedes and the other with what follows. Thus, by virtue of a double entendre, the parallelism faces in both directions. Berlin, A. (1992). Parallelism. In D. N. Freedman (Ed.), The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary (Vol. 5, p. 157). New York: Doubleday.*

Professor of Theology in Berlin E. W. Engstenberg says in his Revelation of St. John commentary:

Our business is first to discover the name of the beast which furnishes the number 666. And here we must not wander about after our own imaginations. **The Seer of the Apocalypse lives entirely in holy Scripture. On this territory, therefore, is the solution of the sacred riddle to be sought. And there also it can be found with perfect certainty. In the whole of the Old Testament there is but one instance in which the number 666 occurs in connection with a name. It is said in Ezra 2:13, "The sons of Adonikam 666." The name Adonikam must therefore be the name of the beast.** It was admirably fitted for being so. It means: the Lord arises,* and is in excellent agreement with the watch-word of the worshippers of the beast: "Who is like the beast, and who is able to make war with him?" It combines all, that in the preceding description had been said to characterize the beast. It is a name of blasphemy; it corresponds to the mouth speaking great things; it accords admirably with the demand upon all the inhabitants of the earth to worship the beast. It points to the war against the saints, and the carrying away of these into captivity, and killing them with the sword. It also perfectly agrees with the description, which St. Paul, in 2 Thess. 2:4, gives of the man of sin: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." The Lord arises—this name originally consecrated to the true God, and derived from the songs of the church, that celebrate him as the Almighty Being, who rises to avenge his enemies, the beast appropriates to himself, as his adherents had already in ver. 4 claimed for him the name Michael. By this reference of the name to its original destination, its blasphemous character is heightened; q.d. not that one, the miserable product of the vain imaginations and arrogant claims of his wretched worshippers, it is not he who is the Lord, but I, whose omnipotence is palpable to all; it is not he, who arises to help his poor worshippers, and execute vengeance on his enemies, but I that arise to extinguish those wretched saints with their crucified One and their God. Besides, the name Adonikam in its original reference to the living God reacts against the claim, as also the number 666, according to what is presently to be remarked, at once indicates the claim, and marks its presumptuous and shameful character.

[*Footnote on meaning of Adonikam]

□□□□ without the article is used of the Lord in Ps. 114:7. The Jod is commonly in the proper names a connective vowel, and not the suffix—see Ewald, p. 499, Anm. 2. So also in other proper names, which are compounded of Adon: Adoniram (Jehoram corresponds), the high lord, a designation of him, to whom the bearer of the name was devoted, as so many similar names—for example, Eliah, God-father, Joab, Joel, Jehoshua; Adonijah, the Lord is Jehovah (not my Lord). The □□□□ is used of the Lord, who rises up to the help of his people, and for vengeance on his enemies; comp. □□□□ □□□□ in Ps. 3:7, 7:6, 9:19, 10:12; also Ps. 12:5, 44:26, 68:1. The name took its rise from these passages of the Psalms; as indeed it was very natural that the Psalms, whose words were

continually sounding in the ears of the Lord's people, should especially exercise an important influence in the formation of names. A reference is found to those passages even in Is. 33:10. The name Asrikam is formed in the same way; the help (the Lord as helper) rises up, resting on Ps. 44:2.—We must take the name Adonikam in no other signification than that in which it occurs in the fundamental passages; not, for example, with Vitringa in the sense of the Lord's enemy; which is also grammatically inadmissible.—Hengstenberg, E. W. (1853). The Revelation of St. John. (P. Fairbairn, Trans.) (Vol. 2, pp. 69–71). New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. Bolding mine.

QUESTION—What person is indicated by the number 666?

It may refer to the trinity composed of Satan, the antichrist, and the false prophet. Each have the number 6 symbolizing that they each fall short of divinity whose number is seven [Hu]. All other commentaries consulted simply listed the possibilities that have been suggested by authorities, but none committed themselves to a definite answer.—Trail, R. (2008). An Exegetical Summary of Revelation 12–22 (2nd ed., p. 55). Dallas, TX: SIL International.

666 is none of those things. Rather, the great revolt against all called God (2 Thess. 2:3-4) prophesied in Daniel and Revelation make 666 the likely “flag” of the revolt against YHWH, similar to the Swastika to Nazis. Sporting the mark to proclaim one's allegiance to Beast Adonikam merits ETERNAL punishment (Rev. 14:9-12). John also reveals it is mandatory one have the mark to buy and sell (Rev. 13:16-17).

A friend asked, “wouldn't the Antichrist change his name from Adonikam to hide his identity?” That would not be consistent with the character of the “little horn” who is so boastful against God (Dan. 7:8, 11, 20, 25; 8:9-11, 23-25; 11:36-37; 2 Thess. 2:4; Rev. 13:5-6). Its more likely, if Adonikam isn't his birth name, that he would change it to “Adonikam” to boast he fulfills the prophecy of the Antichrist.

Beast worshipers will celebrate it...until they don't. Notice the subtle change, men go from boldly blaspheming “the name of God”, to grudgingly conceding His power as “the God of heaven”. This happens after the fifth bowl, when YHWH God strikes the seat of the beast with darkness causing them to gnaw their tongues for pain (Rev. 16:9-11). They became so weak at the knees upon experiencing God's awesome power a fresh dose of demonic propaganda was necessary to restore courage (Rev. 16:12-14).

On this see:

War between God and Satan

Another interesting riddle is Samson’s riddle, it reveals a blueprint for solving Biblical riddles. An important clue is the double meaning of the words “lion” and “honey” in the language of Samson and the Philistines:

The word “lion” in Hebrew (’arî) is almost identical to an Arabic word for “honey” (’ary).-Wolf, H. (1992). Judges. In F. E. Gaebeline (Ed.), The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 & 2 Samuel (Vol. 3, p. 468). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

The Riddle:

So he said to them: “Out of the eater came something to eat, And out of the strong came something sweet.” Now for three days they could not explain the riddle. (Jdg. 14:14) NKJ

“Eater” in Hebrew can be a man, beast or insect that “devours with extreme violence” (0398 אכל ‘akal Num. 23:24; 1 Ki. 13:28). As the “eater” is “strong” (05794 אַז ‘az) “mighty, fierce” the image of lion naturally arises. Confirming this describes a lion is the irony of taking food from the lion’s mouth, a definite clue.

As for “sweet” honey naturally comes to mind (Jdg. 14:18).

The “lion/honey” homonym is what made this a valid riddle. Notice these points are present in the answer the Philistines gave to Samson:

What is sweeter than honey? and what is stronger than a lion? (Jdg. 14:18)

Many commentators object the riddle was unfair, but the context contradicts that claim. They wouldn’t have wasted three days trying to solve it, or by the seventh day threaten the bride’s family if they could have simply objected it wasn’t a fair riddle (Jdg. 14:14-15). Their answer in Judges 14:18 implies they considered it fair, the answer a valid result of the clues in the riddle.

What likely prevented the Philistines from solving the riddle was the presence of many possible “strong eaters” and “sweets” at the feast. That would misdirect their attention away from the solution.

They broke the first rule for solving riddles, *thinking outside of the box is a must*.. It is likely John’s choice of “count” (ψηφίζω) is intended to “misdirect” the uninitiated to the wrong solution. If so, it worked fabulously well. Those in the habit of seeking solution to enigma outside of scripture took the bait with Gematria, as they often do appealing to apocrypha and pseudepigrapha rather than seeking the answer in scripture critically thinking on the context.

END NOTES

[1]It is disputed Matthew 1:17 is Gematria pointing to David (14). Jesus

is the subject, “carrying away into Babylon unto Christ” does not point to David without circular reasoning, eisegesis which contradicts the theory. Other suggested reasons, none of which satisfy: 1) Emphasize importance of Abraham, David and captivity, that the promises of Messianic kingdom fulfilled in Christ; 2) Show God’s grace in Israel’s rise, fall and redemption. 3) Symbolic of completeness (“7” x 2 = 14, thrice for intensity). This is not a complete list; good hunting.

[2] Ὡδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν: “Here is wisdom” (KJV); “Wisdom is needed here” (NLT); “This calls for wisdom” (NIV); “This is where wisdom is needed” (CJB).

- The Antichrist: His Names Titles and Descriptions
- The Two Phases of Antichrist: Man of Sin; Son of Destruction
- Antichrist will sit in the Temple of God: Third Temple or the Church?
- Deadly Wound Was Healed When Babylon Rebuilt
- What did the apostle John reveal when he said: “It is the last hour”?
- Where Is The Judgment Of Fallen Angels?
- Do Ancient Aliens Appear in the Bible?
- The Coming False Christ and His Followers Revealed

Jesus’ Janus Parallelism on PETROS in Matthew 16:18

written by Alfred Persson | August 17, 2024

[illegible]

1. 1804.
 2. 1804.
 3. 1804.
 4. 1804.
 5. 1804.
 6. 1804.
 7. 1804.
 8. 1804.
 9. 1804.
 10. 1804.
 11. 1804.
 12. 1804.
 13. 1804.
 14. 1804.
 15. 1804.
 16. 1804.
 17. 1804.
 18. 1804.
 19. 1804.
 20. 1804.
 21. 1804.
 22. 1804.
 23. 1804.
 24. 1804.
 25. 1804.
 26. 1804.
 27. 1804.
 28. 1804.
 29. 1804.
 30. 1804.
 31. 1804.
 32. 1804.
 33. 1804.
 34. 1804.
 35. 1804.
 36. 1804.
 37. 1804.
 38. 1804.
 39. 1804.
 40. 1804.
 41. 1804.
 42. 1804.
 43. 1804.
 44. 1804.
 45. 1804.
 46. 1804.
 47. 1804.
 48. 1804.
 49. 1804.
 50. 1804.
 51. 1804.
 52. 1804.
 53. 1804.
 54. 1804.
 55. 1804.
 56. 1804.
 57. 1804.
 58. 1804.
 59. 1804.
 60. 1804.
 61. 1804.
 62. 1804.
 63. 1804.
 64. 1804.
 65. 1804.
 66. 1804.
 67. 1804.
 68. 1804.
 69. 1804.
 70. 1804.
 71. 1804.
 72. 1804.
 73. 1804.
 74. 1804.
 75. 1804.
 76. 1804.
 77. 1804.
 78. 1804.
 79. 1804.
 80. 1804.
 81. 1804.
 82. 1804.
 83. 1804.
 84. 1804.
 85. 1804.
 86. 1804.
 87. 1804.
 88. 1804.
 89. 1804.
 90. 1804.
 91. 1804.
 92. 1804.
 93. 1804.
 94. 1804.
 95. 1804.
 96. 1804.
 97. 1804.
 98. 1804.
 99. 1804.
 100. 1804.

“thou art petros and on this kepha I shall build.”[4]

Kepha is not repeated twice as hypothetical versions of Jesus’ Aramaic suppose.

EVANGELIARIUM HIEROSOLYMITANUM

*Mention may be made here of another Syriac version of the New Testament, the so-called Jerusalem or Palestinian Syriac (Syrhr or Syrhier). This version, hitherto known almost solely from an Evangeliarium in the Vatican of the year 1030, was edited by Count Miniscalchi Erizzo at Verona in 1861–4, and an excellent edition was published in 1892 in Bibliothecae Syriacae a Paulo de Lagarde collectae quae ad philologiam sacram pertinent. And now not only have two fresh manuscripts of this Evangeliarium been discovered on Mount Sinai by J. R. Harris and Mrs. Lewis, and edited by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, but fragments of the Acts and Pauline Epistles have also been found and published, as well as portions of the Old Testament and other Church literature. **The dialect in which these fragments are written is quite different from ordinary Syriac, and may, perhaps, bear a close resemblance to that in which Jesus spoke to His disciples.**”—Nestle, E. (1901). *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*. (pp. 102–103). London; New York; Edinburgh; Oxford: Williams and Norgate.*

The NT data supports this ancient independent [5] Aramaic text of Christ’s speech if indeed He didn’t speak this particular saying in Greek. It elegantly resolves the alleged “imprecision” of the *petros* *petra* juxtaposition. [6] **Contrary to scholarly consensus Matthew 16:18 is inauthentic, i.e., the creation of a latter Christian editor; our Greek text is divinely elegant, the best possible translation that conveys the precise *Janus Parallelism* our LORD intended.** It be the later Aramaic versions that incorrectly retranslated the Aramaic *Petros* as *Kepha* because they were laboring under the same *hasty generalization fallacy* of the early Church believing it was the Greek *Petros*. [7]

Our LORD Jesus invented another meaning for *Petros*, using the transliterated PeTeR (“Firstborn”) homonym when crafting His asymmetric *Janus Parallelism*[8] double entendre on the Aramaic/Greek *Petros* homonym using both “first, firstborn” and “kepha stone” meanings combined with a *Qal Wahomer*[9] “lesser to greater” analogy using the Greek words for “stone” and “Rock” *petros* and *petra*.

Transliterated the Aramaic *Petros* becomes a homonym with the Greek *Petros* just like the Hebrew and Aramaic *bath* become the homonym *batos*[10] in Greek. The early Greek speaking church naturally mistook *petros* as Greek for “stone” and “confirmation bias” has maintained that *hasty generalization fallacy* ever since, despite all the confusion it has caused.

Both the *Janus* and *Qal Wahomer* fit details in the New Testament so

perfectly its elegance cannot be denied. *Elegance of this magnitude is characteristic of a sound explanation of the phenomena-correct exegesis:* Matthew 10:2 calls Simon the “First” (See #1 below). John 1:42 use of *petros* and not *lithos* points to Mt. 16:18 (See #2 below); Mark’s uses of the names *Simon* and *Petros* indicates a massive shift to *Petros* after the Matthew 16:18 event (See #3 below); In Galatians [TR] Paul’s switching from *Petros* to *Cephas* and back again to *Petros* is consistent with dual meanings of *Petros* (See #4 below); Romans 10:6-13 is clearly dependent upon Peter being saved in Matthew 16:16-17 (See #5 below); John 20:31 is clearly dependent upon Matthew 16:16-17 (See #6 below). Paul’s allusion to Peter’s faithlessness in 2 Timothy 2:18 implies Peter was saved in Matthew 16:16-17 (See #8 below); The Greek has Jesus speaking TO Peter ABOUT the female Rock, consistent with the Janus (See #9 below); The clear dependency of 1 Peter 2:2-6 on the *Janus* and *Qal Wahomer* in Matthew 16:18 (See #10 below).

Let’s review the classic theory:

“From the beginning it was probably thought of as the Greek equivalent of the Aramaic כֶּפֶה=Κηφᾶς: J 1:42; confer Mt 16:18”- *A Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament And Other Early Christian Literature*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), p. 654

The common noun *petros* in Job 30:6 Septuagint translates *kepha* (03710 כֶּפֶה keph).

But the supposition John is translating proper nouns in John 1:42 is a *hasty generalization fallacy*, unhistorically deeming the common nouns *kepha* and Greek *petros* in John 1:42 as proper nouns. The data indicates these became proper nouns later.

However, even if new research contradicts this conclusion (cf. Chrys C. Caragounis, *Peter and the Rock*, (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1990) pp. 9-25.) it does not render the exegesis unsound as both *kepha* and *petros* are used as common nouns in John 1:42 and Mark 3:16 in description. For clarity, I will refer to these as common nouns.

John’s transliteration of *kepha* as Κηφᾶς certainly is a translation. He then explains a *kepha* is a *petros* “stone” in Greek:

“Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation (2059 ἐρμηνεύω hermeneuo), A stone.” (Jn. 1:42 KJV)

If we permit John’s use of 2059 ἐρμηνεύω hermeneuo guide us, John is “interpreting” the meaning of Κηφᾶς (Jn. 1:38, 42; 9:7, not translating it as *petros* (cp. Jn. 1:41 3177 μεθερμηνεύω methermeneuo).

Consistent with both *kepha* and *petros* being common nouns, a translation does not explain what it denotes.

Supporting this Mark groups the epithet *petros* with *boanerges* when

nicknaming Simon, James and John:

16 And Simon he surnamed (2007 ἐπιτίθημι *epitithemi*) Peter (πέτρος *petros*);
17 And James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed (2007 ἐπιτίθημι *epitithemi*) them Boanerges (βοανηργές *boanerges*), which is, The sons of thunder: (Mk. 3:16-17 KJV)

The same *epitithemi* applies to both, the meaning of these nicknames are added to Simon, James and John. They are not additional proper names.

Therefore, the line connecting John 1:42 and Matthew 16:18 is not from *Cephas/Petros* to *Petros* as proper names, its from *kepha petros* to *petros* as common nouns with Jesus adding *stone* meaning to ܡܬܪܬܐ, the Aramaic proper name *Petros* Simon already had before he met Jesus:

18 And Jesus, walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter Petros, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers.
19 And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. (Matt. 4:18-19 KJV)

40 One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's (Petros) brother.
41 He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ.
42 And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone (petros). (Jn. 1:40-42 KJV)

The Janus in Matthew 16:18 is using BOTH the Aramaic and Greek meanings of the homonym, pivoting on the Aramaic proper name ܡܬܪܬܐ and Greek *petros* meanings.

Looking back Jesus plays upon the “firstborn” meaning of ܡܬܪܬܐ *Petros* has become actual, the PeTeR (06363 ܡܬܪܬܐ) has become the *first* πρῶτος born of the gospel He is the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Then pivoting forward in *Qal Wahomer* “light to heavy” analogy between *petros* (kepha-stone) *petra* (rock-mass), Simon is now a smaller version of the massive life giving *petra* having drunk the spiritual drink from the *petra* rock about Christ (cp. 1 Cor. 10:4). Out of “the PeTeR” now flows rivers of living water, speaking the “word of faith” Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God” which if anyone confess publicly, saves them (Rom. 10:9-11; Mt. 10:32; Jo. 20:31).

Peter has become the “first” “lively stone” of the church, who in temporal finite realm will be saved after Jesus’ resurrection (2 Pet. 2:5; Mt. 16:18-19) as the channel of God’s grace comes into existence as Jesus rises from the dead. But from God’s timeless perspective, Simon was

“born again” at that time and his relationship with God changed, therefore Christ gives him a new name, a composite name that shows both Aramaic “firstborn” and Greek “stone” meanings have achieved actuality.

Jesus surnamed Simon *petros* and said to Simon “upon this rock (4073 πέτρα *petra*) [you just confessed] I will build my church.” Matt. 16:18 KJV)

Consistent with this, ancient interpreters believed the rock was ‘this specific point of faith that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God, and upon it Jesus will build His church.’

The Greek speaking Church had lost all knowledge of the Aramaic ܡܬܪܝܬܐ *Petros* That unique Palestinian Aramaic speaking Jewish culture was lost to the Greek speaking church when the Romans dispersed the children of Israel and those knowing it died off. So when they read πέτρος *petros* “stone” in the NT they naturally assumed it was the Greek word for “stone”.

Therefore, all rejection of the text as inauthentic because the *kepha petros petra* wordplay hypothesis results in ambiguity and metaphor incoherence, is unsound. What should be rejected is the hypothesis.

Moreover, it requires a suspension of disbelief a Petrine Party editor—too stupid to simply write PETROS twice or delete the demonstrative pronoun declaring “upon you I will build my church” was smart enough to corrupt every available Bible version on earth.

Confirming the pericope is authentic beyond all reasonable doubt, the Matthew 16:16-19 the event is woven in the very fabric of scripture. For example:

πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος (Mt. 10:2)

First Simon the one called Peter=*Petros firstborn*. (Compare Billerbeck op. cit.)

4413 πρῶτος protos

Meaning: 1) first in time or place – Strong’s Concordance

Protos is not part of a numbering system as no second or third listed. Simon is “the first [in time], the one called “firstborn” [of the Gospel of Christ] from whose belly now flows rivers of living water. Peter’s confession is unique, the direct result of Divine Revelation to him and Jesus confirms this event is special declaring in a Makarism how blessed Peter is (Mt. 16:17)

16. And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

17. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not (ἀποκαλύπτω) revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. (Matt. 16:16-17 KJV)

Compare the special divine revelation leading to Peter receiving the keys to the kingdom (Mt. 16:19) and Paul’s empowerment to preach to the heathen:

- 15. But *when it pleased God*, who separated me from my mother’s womb, and called me by his grace,
- 16. To (ἀποκαλύπτω) *reveal his Son in me*, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: (Gal. 1:15-16 KJV)

Why was God’s revelation of Jesus as “the Christ” superior to that of flesh and blood? Human origin does not bring about the new birth. We see that in Matthew 14:24-33, the confession was from human fear (Mk. 4:40-41). Nathanael’s confession human awe (Jo. 1:48-50). Flesh and blood did not reveal Christ in such a way as to change the individual, as it had with Peter. A Makarism indicates paradoxical reversal in circumstance (3107 μακάριος makarios, cp. Mt. 5:3-11).

“Simon was now *Barjona*, retaining the Aramaic βᾱρ is Matthew’s way of drawing attention to this. In contrast, its Greek when referring to his literal father Σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωνᾶ. Simon is “after the order of” prophet Jonah” doing as he, having figuratively rose from the dead preaching divine revelation (Jonah 2:1-3:1), which if any believe will be saved (Rom. 10:5-13).

Protos cannot refer to Simon’s primacy among the apostles as they were still arguing among themselves who was the greatest after the Matthew 16:18 event Mk. 8:29 cf. Mk. 9:34.

Hence, Peter not the “leader” of the group.

Suggestions it means “first among equals” is meaningless tripe.

The parsimonous reason: Simon is first born because of his publicly confessing the Word of Faith (Rom. 10:9-11) and THAT is why Jesus declares him “blessed,” the reversal in his status had begun.

2. “All NT passages using λίθος which are extent in the various Syriac sources, are uniformly rendered with ܠܝܬܗܐ , apart from ‘mill-stone’, which has a special term in Syriac, ܠܝܬܗܐ ܕܡܝܠܝܢ .”-Chrys C. Caragounis, Peter and the Rock, (Berlin, NY, Walter de Gruyter, 1990) p. 32.

This indirect evidence of the Aramaic Christ spoke raises the question why John chose *petros* and not *lithos* to denote *kepha*. The most likely reason is allusion to the Janus parallelism on the *petros* homonym in Matthew 16:18.

3. Mark’s usage of the names *Simon* and *Petros* confirm the time of Simon’s surnaming (Mark 3:16) is at Matthew 16:18.

Simon appears in Mark 1:16, 29, 30, 36 and in Mark 3:16 where *Petros* *Peter* makes its first appearance, categorizing it with the epithet

Boanerges. *Petros* makes another appearance in Mark 5:37 where Peter's place among Christ's inner circle was relevant (cf. Mk. 14:33). Except when quoting Christ in Mark 14:37, *Simon* doesn't appear again. Consistent with Simon being surnamed *petros* during Matthew 16:18 event in Mark 8:29 we read "But who do you say that I am?" *Petros* *Peter* answered "You are the Christ". Then a burst of *Petros* references- (Mark 8:32-33; 9:2,5; 10:28; 11:21; 13:3; 14:29, 33, 37, 54, 66-67, 70, 72; 16:7).

This indicates Jesus put upon (ἐπιτίθημι) the Aramaic *Petros* the Greek meaning of *kepha petros* "stone" at Matthew 16:18. Peter's new name indicated a new relationship in Christ and Mark accordingly begins using it instead of *Simon*.

4. In Galatians [TR] Paul switches from *Petros* (Gal. 1:18; 2:7, 8) to *Cephas* then reverts back to *Petros* (Gal. 2:11, 14) without explaining why. He is listed with two others, James the half brother of the Lord Jesus, and John the disciple whom Jesus loved (John 19:26; 20:2; 21:20). *Cephas* emphasizes Peter's special place just as it does in 1 Corinthians 9:5 "the other apostles, the brothers of the Lord, and Cephas." Paul is astonished Cephas who is among the inner circle of the LORD's apostles, First to drink the grace of God, first to open the door to the Gentiles (Ac. 10:34-35) channeling the living water from massive *petra* Rock that is Christ, to the world—was now so gracelessly a fountain of bile separating himself his fellow Priests in the Royal priesthood.

Therefore, Paul's use of Cephas indicates what Paul was visualizing as he wrote, from what he had fallen.

5. Romans 10:6-13 is clearly dependent upon the Matthew 16:16-17 event. Paul speaks of Christ being brought down from heaven and the "word of faith" appearing "even in thy mouth" which is precisely what happened to Peter. The Father divinely revealed Christ's identity and the belief and words appeared in the heart and mouth of Peter (Mt. 16:16-17). Confessing "the Lord Jesus" then is confessing Jesus is "the Christ, the Son of the living God" (cf. Jo. 20:31).

6. "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." (Jn. 20:31 KJV) Implicit is the Matthew 16:16-19 event where the church is built by believing the *petra* life giving Rock truth He is the Christ the Son of the Living God and upon that belief/public confession the church is built one soul at a time.

7. One must be consistent and follow Christ's lead interpreting the symbols in Matthew 16:16-19 precisely as Jesus did in the wise man parable Matthew 7:24-25. Nothing pertinent to the "apples to apples" usage of these symbols contradicts that conclusion: 1. Jesus' Divine revelation "These sayings of mine" = Father's divine revelation "Jesus is 'the Christ the Son of God'"; 2. "built his house" = "build my church"; 3. "he built house upon a *petra* rock" = "upon this *petra* rock I will build my church"; 4. "rain...floods...winds beat upon that house and it fell

not” = “Gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

Some object Matthew 7:24-25 is prophecy. That isn't pertinent to Christ's parallel use of symbol. Also, its clearly wrong as the text is Sermon on the Mount classic two-way Genre (cp. Dt. 30:19). That is how Paul understood it when he reworked the material in Ephesians 6:10-16: 1. “built his upon rock” = “be strong in the Lord, and in the strength of His might”; 2. “rain...floods...winds” = “spiritual forces of wickedness in the heavenly places”; 3. “it fell not” = “extinguish all the flaming missiles of the evil one”; 4. “built...upon a petra” = “stand firm”.

It is consistent we interpret the symbols in Matthew 16:16-19 precisely as Jesus set up Matthew 7:24-25 because Jesus is our only infallible Teaching Authority Mt. 23:8.

8 In 2 Timothy 2:18 Paul alludes to Peter's faithlessness denying Christ thrice (Mt. 26:34, 69-75; Jo. 21:15-17) implies Peter was saved before his denials (Mt. 16:17) as Paul concludes with the *eternal security* of the believer: “If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself. (2 Tim. 2:13 KJV)”.

9. Both the grammar and metaphor of Matthew 16:18 (καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ) exclude Peter, the demonstrative has Jesus speaking TO Simon ABOUT this the female *petra* rock. Neither Peter who is called Satan a few verses later (Mt. 16:23) or his confession which he thrice contradicted (Mt. 26:34, 69-75) are “rock like” consistent with the rock metaphor. One can watch a rock their entire life, it won't change.

Both Peter and his confession changed. The only thing “rock like” in this context is the unchanging divine revelation of God the Eternal Son, that He is the Christ, the Son of the living God. Only that unchanging divine truth the Gates of Hell cannot prevail against can be the *petra* from which flows the “spiritual drink” (cf. 1 Cor. 10:4) giving life to the church and so building it “one soul at a time.”

10. The obvious dependency of 1 Peter 2:2-6 on the Matthew 16:16-19 the Janus and Qal Wahomer. Peter is speaking to “newborn babes” who have “tasted” the living water of the Lord, and now are “lively stones.” Note the Aramaic *kepha* and Greek *petros petra* are now *lithos* whether he refers to Christ or the church.

In conclusion, the Asymmetric Janus Parallelism Christ crafted in Matthew 16:18 and which Matthew faithfully preserves restores precision to grammar, syntax and metaphor used. In a word, the text's elegance is restored, its expert weave radiates into the fabric of the NT itself. That is sufficient proof this exegesis is true to the data.

The inelegance manifest in the scholarly consensus making Peter the rock ultimately results in rejecting the context as inauthentic, sufficient proof it is the theory that should be rejected.

Its poorly made, I apologize in advance for the deficiencies in production.

Another Janus in the NT?

Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six. (Rev. 13:18 KJV)

The children of Adonikam, six hundred sixty and six. (Ezr. 2:13) KJV
The children of Adonikam, six hundred threescore and seven. (Neh. 7:18) KJV

John’s riddle is an OT style Janus parallelism:

This type of parallelism hinges on the use of a single word with two different meanings, one of which forms a parallel with what precedes and the other with what follows. Thus, by virtue of a double entendre, the parallelism faces in both directions. Berlin, A. (1992). Parallelism. In D. N. Freedman (Ed.), The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary (Vol. 5, p. 157). New York: Doubleday.

Whether we “interpret the apposition” with 666 or count forward “as with pebbles”

667-1= 666, 666 points to the same man with the same name “Adonikam”.

There is need for shrewdness here: anyone clever may interpret the number of the beast: (Rev. 13:18 NJB) [11]

John accepted both Ezra 2:13 and Nehemiah 7:18 are correct, therefore he deduced both father and son are named “Adonikam.”

666 is where the Janus pivots, using the two senses of “count” (5585 ψηφίζω psephizo), “interpret”. [12]

“Interpret” the name from the “number OF a man” :

Looking back, we interpret Adonikam’s 666 children make that number OF him.

“Count as with pebbles” to the name who has the “number OF the beast”:
Looking forward, the same Adonikam has the number OF the Beast,
667-1=666 counting from Father Adonikam to firstborn son Adonikam.

Whether we “interpret the apposition” with 666 or count forward “as with pebbles”

667-1= 666, 666 points to the same man with the same name “Adonikam”.

Therefore, name of the Beast = Adonikam.

ENDNOTES

[1]That there was in Aramaic a proper name Petros (H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch, 1922 ff., I, 530) which perhaps meant “firstborn” (J. Levy, Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim, 1876 f., new imp. 1924, sub voce, פֶּטְרוֹס; Gustav Dalman, Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Wörterbuch, 1901, sub voce) might have influenced the preference for Petros, but this is by no means certain.” -Oscar Cullmann, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, VI, 101 Footnote 8; Grand Rapids, MI 1968: Eerdmans.

[2]*Petros as a Jewish Name?*

But it remains desirable to ask what Jewish dimensions, if any, this name is likely to have had. And is it conceivable that even the Greek name could have featured in a Hebrew or Aramaic source? It is after all only John 1:42 which, on a certain reading, might be taken to suggest that ‘Peter’ is a *secondary translation* of an existing name *Kēfa*’. It is instructive to note, however, that two verses earlier the evangelist seems to undermine even this conventional assumption of the priority of ‘Cephas’ by referring casually to ‘Simon Peter’ (1:40). Taken at face value, the text implies that it is this Simon, nicknamed Petros, who from now on ‘shall be called Cephas’. All four gospels, indeed, allow for the possibility that Matthew 16 merely affirms and interprets in Aramaic an existing Greek nickname that Peter had all along...See Mark 3:16; Matt. 4:18; Luke 5:8; John 1:40, 42.”- Bockmuehl, Markus. 2004. *Simon Peter’s Names in Jewish Sources*. Journal of Jewish Studies) Vol. 55, p.71

[3] “The currency of Peter’s name is confirmed in Tal Ilan’s identification of three additional first and second-century Palestinian Jewish individuals who bear the name Petros. It is worth noting that the Palestinian Talmud and midrashim repeatedly feature an early Amoraic Rabbi Yose ben Petros, whose father constitutes proof that even this Greek name was by no means unknown in the early rabbinic period.”- Bockmuehl, Markus. 2004. *Simon Peter’s Names in Jewish Sources*. Journal of Jewish Studies 55:71-72

[4] Chrys C. Caragounis, *Peter and the Rock*, (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1990) pp. 34.

[5]The Palestinian version *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* is “independent of other Syriac Versions”-(Chyrs C. Caragounis, *Peter And The Rock* (Walter de Gruyter, NY, 1990, p. 34).

[6] Citing Aramaic and Syriac evidence Caragounis rejects *kepha* underlies *petros* *petra* in Mt. 16:18 (Chrys C. Caragounis, *Peter and the Rock*, (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1990) pp. 26-43). He argues ܡܬܢܐ and ܡܬܢܐ are just as likely beneath the Greek. However, his evidence for ܡܬܢܐ appears flawed, he disputes Cullmann: “the Aramaic ܡܬܢܐ [*mount,mountain-Jastrow*] corresponds more to the Heb. הר [Hebrew **02022** הר, *hill, mountain*]” rejecting correspondence to **06697** צוק *tsuwr* (*rock cliff, rocky wall*) concluding as the “Targumin abstain from using ܡܬܢܐ for ܡܬܢܐ indicates that ܡܬܢܐ could not cover semantically the meaning of ܡܬܢܐ .-Op. cit. pp. 28-29. However, Jastrow agrees with Cullmann.-Jastrow, M. (1903). *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature and II* (London; New York: Luzac & Co.; G. P. Putnam’s Sons.), Vol. 1, p. 526. The association is clear. The evidence its not *kepha* twice is unaffected by this flaw. A better candidate is the Aramaic/Greek homonym *petros*. That conclusion manifests maximum parsimony.

[7]

14...There was, on the contrary, as already mentioned (note 12), an Aramaic name ܡܬܢܐ (*Petros*), which perhaps is to be connected with ܡܬܢܐ (*patar*) “firstborn.” The theory that the Greek *Petros* was first derived from it and gave occasion for a false retranslation *Kepha* into Aramaic is quite impossible, in view of the fact that in Paul’s letters *Cephas* is already the usual designation and *Peter* clearly was only a derivation from it.”-*PETER Disciple-Apostle-Martyr*, by Oscar Cullmann, translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson (Westminister Press, Philadelphia, 1953), pp18-19.

Cullmann’s argument is unhistorical. Apart from John 1:42, the chronological appearance of Peter and Cephas suggests two different people, not derivation. Especially the switch from Peter (Gal. 2:7-8) to Cephas (Gal. 2:9, 11, 14). Cephas appearing after James (Gal. 3:9) is consistent with that thesis. Therefore, Cullmanns argument is unsound.

Given my preference for the “Received Text”, Cullmann’s argument remains unhistorical. Galatians (AD 49-50) written five years before 1 Corinthians *Petros* is the usual designation (Gal. 1:18; 2:7, 8, 11, 14) and *Cephas* appears only in 2:9 [TR]. By then Cephas had assumed a subordinate position to James (Ac. 15:13) which explains being listed after James. Paul’s use of Cephas no doubt was inspired by his astonishment “the Cephas” “lively stone”, the one who first channeled God’s grace to the Gentiles (Ac. 10:48) was now secreting the bile of sectarianism (Gal. 2:11-14).

Unfortunately, the precise *false retranslation hypothesis* Cullmann rejects is unknown to me, but he failed to make a valid case against the premise. *False retranslation* of the transliterated Aramaic *Petros* would predict many of the anomalies in Syriac translations noted by Caragounis (Chyrs C. Caragounis, *Peter And The Rock* (Walter de Gruyter, NY, 1990,

pp. 30-43). It would be odd indeed translators do otherwise, given the universal *hasty generalization* of אבן with *petros* “stone”.

[8] **Janus Parallelism.** This type of parallelism hinges on the use of a single word with two different meanings, one of which forms a parallel with what precedes and the other with what follows. Thus, by virtue of a double entendre, the parallelism faces in both directions. Berlin, A. (1992). Parallelism. In D. N. Freedman (Ed.), *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* (Vol. 5, p. 157). New York: Doubleday.

Not poetry only: Christensen, D. “*Janus Parallelism in Genesis 6:3,*” Hebrew Studies 27 (1986) 20–24. Also scroll down to bottom of this post, for the near Janus in Revelation 13:18.

[9] That is, using the logic of a rabbinic “light to heavy” *qal wahomer* argument: You are *Cephas/kepha/petros/lithos* “lively stone” out of whose belly flows rivers of living water because you drank from the massive *petra* Rock of Christ spiritual drink that has given you eternal life.

[10] The Aramaic name Petros אבן is a homonym of Greek πέτρος when transliterated just like the Hebrew BATH (01324 בַּת Ki 7:26, 38 & c.) and Aramaic BATH (01325 אַבְתָּא Ezra 7:22) are spelled the same when these are transliterated: βάτος (943, Lk. 16:6); βάτος (942, Mk 12:26; Lk 6:44; 20:37).

[11] Here is wisdom (4678 σοφία sophia). Let him that hath understanding (3563 νοῦς nous) let him count * 5585 ψηφίζω psephizo) the number of the beast.

Its the same “wisdom...understanding/mind” combination in Rev. 17:9 where critically thinking on the symbols given is required. That cannot occur without Holy Scripture, the book of Daniel:

And here is the mind (3563 νοῦς nous) which hath wisdom(4678 σοφία sophia). (Rev. 17:9 KJV)

Hence the New Jerusalem Bible nails it:

There is need for shrewdness here: anyone clever may interpret the number of the beast: (Rev. 13:18 NJB)

Wisdom is cleverness, shrewdness, the ability to look critically at a problem and see it from various perspectives and discern the wisest way to proceed:

Since the LXX normally uses σοφία/σοφός for the Hbr. stem אָבִן, in essentials this alone need be considered. The verb אָבִן occurs 26 times

(q 18, pi 3, pu 2, hi 1, hitp 2), σοφία as adj. or noun occurs 135 times, the noun 147 σοφιστής times and in the plur. 485 σοφιστῶν times. 73 instances are in the historical books (, (39 σοφιστής ,31 σοφίαν ,3 σοφία in the prophets (13 , (16 σοφιστής ,24 σοφίαν ,1 σοφία in the Psalms (σοφία 180 86,(7 σοφιστής ,2 σοφίαν ,4 in the Wisdom lit. proper (σοφία ,18 σοφία 87,(86 σοφιστής ,76 and 5 in the other books. Thus about three-fifths of the total may be found in the Wisdom books. It is worth noting that in the historical books the words mostly denote technical or artistic ability or cleverness and knowledge such as the wisdom of Solomon.- Wilckens, U., & Fohrer, G. (1964–). σοφία, σοφός, σοφίζω. G. Kittel, G. W. Bromiley, & G. Friedrich (Eds.), Theological dictionary of the New Testament (electronic ed., Vol. 7, p. 476). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

[12]ψηφίζω...

ψηφίζω to add up digits and calculate a total, count (up), calculate, reckon (lit. ‘w. pebbles’) ...

ψηφίζω to probe a number for its meaning, interpret, figure out τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηπίου Rv 13:18.- TW.-Arndt, W., Danker, F. W., Bauer, W., & Gingrich, F. W. (2000). A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature (3rd ed., p. 1098). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Adonikam is the Name of the Beast having 666 meaning
The Asymmetric Janus Parallelism in Daniel 11:35
Riddle of Armageddon Meaning Solved: Solution Hiding in Plain Sight
Save Family and Friends using the keys of the Kingdom: Mt 16:18
What did the apostle John reveal when he said: “It is the last hour”?
Where Is The Judgment Of Fallen Angels?
Where Is The Judgment Of Fallen Angels?
The Coming False Christ and His Followers Revealed