

# **Logic in the Lions' Den**

**An Investigation into Christianity**

**© 2024**

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	4
<b>Part 1 – Division among the Gospels</b> .....	10
<b>Part 2 – The Testimony</b> .....	31
The First Four Centuries .....	33
Something Hidden .....	47
The Beloved Disciple .....	53
The Empty Tomb and the Resurrection .....	85
The Anointing of Christ .....	108
The Case for the First Century Christian Revolution .....	118
Eyewitness Testimony .....	121
Instances of an Unnamed Disciple .....	134
<b>Part 3 – Enigma</b> .....	139
The Beginning of Christ’s Ministry .....	139
The Last Supper .....	150
The Crucifixion .....	162
The Resurrection .....	164
The Old Testament .....	171
Adam and Eve .....	185
Genesis and Exodus .....	193
Yahwism and the Development of Ancient Israel .....	204
Remnants of the Real Ancient Israel .....	208
Dating the Productions of Old Testament Narratives .....	211
The Formation of Judaism .....	221
The Immaculate Conception and the Following Years .....	222
<b>Part 4 – The Logic</b> .....	228
The Reason for Existence .....	228
Necessary and Inherent .....	234
The Case for the Christian Revolution .....	238
Dating the Resurrection .....	247
Summary of the Case .....	275
God is One .....	280
The Crucifixion .....	285
The Teacher .....	289
Evil and Suffering .....	291
The Framework of Discipleship .....	294
Prophecies about the Coming Messiah .....	295
Why They Wanted Christ Crucified .....	306
Prophecies about the Second Coming of Christ .....	314
<b>Part 5 – The Dividing Line</b> .....	328
The Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts .....	329
Authorship and Dating of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew .....	356
Luke’s Responses to John .....	375
Authorship and Dating of the Gospel of John .....	384

The Twelve .....	398
Early Circulation of the Gospels .....	403
<b>Part 6 – Your Chosen Sister</b> .....	429
Egypt .....	431
Rome .....	438
Early Development of the Christian Community in Rome .....	460
The Great Fire .....	464
<b>Part 7 – Lines of Succession</b> .....	472
<b>Part 8 – The Revolution</b> .....	492

# Introduction

Faith in Christianity is dependent on faith in the Resurrection of Christ. Information about the Resurrection of Christ comes from the Bible; but the Bible gives four different accounts of the discovery of the empty tomb that all disagree with each other and five different accounts of the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection that all disagree with each other, and there are several disagreements among the other Resurrection narratives as well. This book asserts belief in Christianity, but there is clearly something going on with the text in the Bible.

As we proceed, we will continue to find issues and mystery with the Bible. Many Christians argue that we shouldn't or don't need to investigate anything and that we should simply rely on our faith. It is true that we should rely on our faith, but there are reasons why there are certain issues with the Bible and there is a story to be discovered that every Christian needs to know.

Information about Christianity comes from the Bible, so serious issues with the Bible need to be investigated. Even if you don't pay much attention to the Bible, the Bible is still the source of information that has been passed down to you after having been passed down from generation to generation for nearly 2,000 years. How much of what you know about Christianity came from the Bible?

Christianity calls for Christians to know their religion. If there is information to be known, then a Christian needs to find it. We can proceed with this investigation while maintaining faith in the Resurrection of Christ, and there are important details hiding in plain sight that every Christian needs to know. If you simply examine the information that is available, you will find that there are reasons why there are certain issues with the Bible and you will discover the untold true story that every Christian needs to know.

This book unravels the many layers of the Bible to understand why the different documents were produced the way that they were and combines that with other historical evidence to give a clear view of what really happened in the first century, leading up to then, and since then. More specifically, extensive evidence will be shown for the Resurrection of Christ and it will be shown that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple of Christ, led the development of the Christian community in Rome, and was among those who were persecuted after the Great Fire of Rome in 64, and that there was a campaign beginning in the first century to conceal this information. This book also examines how the Bible was put together, how and when different documents in the Bible were produced, whether Adam and Eve are real people, the development of ancient Israel, the formation of Judaism, the societal dynamics of the ancient world, and how information has changed over the course of thousands of years.

From here, we will continue to explore a high-level view of some issues with the Bible showing the mystery of the information and the need for investigation. The most obvious place to start is with the narratives about the Resurrection of Christ. As already shown, faith in Christianity is dependent on faith in the Resurrection and the mainstream source of information that we have, the Bible, disagrees with itself in several different ways about the Resurrection.

In relation to the discovery of the empty tomb, the Gospel of Mark names Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome; the Gospel of Matthew names Mary Magdalene and “the other Mary”; the Gospel of Luke names Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, and “the others with them”; and the Gospel of John only names Mary Magdalene. The Gospels disagree with each other about who discovered the empty tomb. The Bible actually gives four different accounts of one of the most important scenes in the entire Bible. None of these accounts can be corroborated by any of the other Gospels. That shows that at least three of the four Gospels are incorrect when describing who discovered the empty tomb. At most, only one of them can be trusted.

In relation to the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, Mark and John only name Mary Magdalene; Matthew names Mary Magdalene and “the other Mary”; and Luke first refers to two men, one of whom goes unnamed while the other is named Cleopas, and then presents Peter (“Simon”) as the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. Only Mark and John agree on who Christ first appeared to after the Resurrection. That means that at most, only two Gospels can be trusted about who Christ first appeared to after the Resurrection. Furthermore, as many modern Bibles mention, the earliest manuscripts of the Gospel of Mark and some other ancient sources do not include verses 9-20 of chapter 16. So Mark 16:9-20 seem to be a later addition, and so the original version of the Gospel of Mark may have ended with verse 16:8; and if it did, then the original version of the Gospel of Mark would not agree with John.

Mark 16:8

*Trembling and bewildered, the women went out and fled from the tomb. They said nothing to anyone, because they were afraid.*

Mark 16:9

*When Jesus rose early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had driven seven demons.*

Verse 16:8 describes multiple women having fled from the empty tomb and then the very next verse shifts away from that by describing Christ as having only appeared to Mary Magdalene. Such a shift is further evidence that Mark 16:9-20 seem to be a later addition. Furthermore, it shows that the original version of the Gospel of Mark seems to have ended with verse 16:8, which presents Mary Magdalene as having been with two other women who are described earlier in chapter 16, Mary the mother of James and Salome. The specific group of Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome is not described in any other Gospel. So excluding Mark 16:9-20, none of the Gospels agree about who Christ first appeared to after the Resurrection, and so at least three of the Gospels are incorrect when describing the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection.

1 Corinthians disagrees with all of the Gospels about who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection. That letter claims that Christ first appeared to Peter after the Resurrection, which contradicts at least three of the Gospels; claims that Christ appeared to Mother Mary’s son James after the Resurrection, which isn’t described in any of the Gospels; and claims that Christ appeared to more than 500 people after the Resurrection, which also isn’t described in any of the Gospels. Furthermore, the one Gospel that isn’t in contradiction with the assertion that Peter was the first person to see Christ after the Resurrection is still contradicted by 1 Corinthians because Luke describes Cleopas and an unnamed person as also seeing

Christ after the Resurrection and 1 Corinthians doesn't make any mention of that. Therefore, this account in 1 Corinthians contradicts all four Gospels.

In relation to the discovery of the empty tomb, all of the Gospels disagree with each other. In relation to the Resurrection, all of the Gospels disagree with each other and 1 Corinthians disagrees with all of the Gospels. The Gospels also disagree in several other ways, including who the first disciples of Christ were and what day the Last Supper occurred on.

We can see another major issue when we look at the Gospel of Matthew.

Matthew 1:21-23

*She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins."*

*All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet: "The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel", which means "God with us".*

These verses refer to the Isaiah 7:14-17 as shown below.

Isaiah 7:14-17

*"Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and will call him Immanuel. He will eat curds and honey when he knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right. But before the boy knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right, the land of the two kings you dread will be laid waste. The Lord will bring on you and on your people and on the house of your father a time unlike any since Ephraim broke away from Judah – he will bring the king of Assyria."*

Isaiah 7:14-17 are about a prophecy about the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by the Assyrian Empire, which is indicated by the text that states "he will bring the king of Assyria". The text that states "before the boy knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right" seems to refer to a time-period that was after "the boy" was born and while the Assyrian Empire was attacking the kingdom of Israel. Therefore, Isaiah 7:14-17 seem to refer to the birth of a boy that was to occur before the Assyrian Empire destroyed the kingdom of Israel, which seems to have been in the 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE, about 800 years before Christ physically appeared in the first century CE. So the prophecy contained in Isaiah 7:14-17 does not appear to be a prophecy about Christ, but instead seems to be a prophecy about the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by the Assyrian Empire in the 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE and the birth of a boy that was to occur before that. Therefore, the Gospel of Matthew appears to take writing about the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by the Assyrian Empire that happened 800 years before Christ physically appeared in the first century and incorrectly uses it to represent a prophecy about Christ.

We can see more issues as we continue to look at the letters in the New Testament.

1 Corinthians 14:34-35

*Women should remain silent in the churches. They are not allowed to speak, but must be in submission, as the Law says. If they want to inquire about something, they should ask their own husbands at home; for it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in the church.*

1 Timothy 2:9-15

*I also want women to dress modestly, with decency and propriety, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes, but with good deeds appropriate for women who profess to worship God.*

*A woman should learn in quietness and in full submission. I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent. For Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner. But women will be saved through childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness with propriety.*

1 Peter 3:5-7

*For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to make themselves beautiful. They were submissive to their husbands, like Sarah, who obeyed Abraham and called him her master. You are her daughters if you do what is right and do not give way to fear.*

*Husbands, in the same way be considerate as you live with your wives, and treat them with respect as the weaker partner and as heirs with you of the gracious gift of life, so that nothing will hinder your prayers.*

Ephesians 6:5

*Slaves, obey your earthly masters with respect and fear, and with sincerity of heart, just as you would obey Christ.*

1 Peter 2:18

*Slaves, submit yourselves to your masters with all respect, not only to those who are good and considerate but also to those who are harsh.*

1 Corinthians asserts that women are not allowed to speak in churches, that they must be in submission, and that they should ask their husbands at home if they want to inquire about something. The letter goes further by stating that it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in church. 1 Timothy asserts that women are to dress modestly, that they should learn in quietness and in full submission, that they are not allowed to teach or to have authority over a man, and that they must be silent. The letter goes further by stating that women can be saved through childbearing as if a woman who does not bear a child can't be saved. 1 Peter asserts that holy women were submissive to their husbands, suggests that women should call their husbands "master", and claims that women are weaker than men.

Ephesians condones slavery, and advises slaves to fear their master and to obey their master just as they would obey Christ. So Ephesians not only condones slavery and advises slaves to fear their master, but also actually compares slave masters to Christ. It is believed that Ephesians 6:5 was used by many slave owners to condone slavery. Going back to 1 Peter, that letter also condones slavery and advises slaves to submit to their masters.

Again, this book asserts belief in Christianity. However, there are obviously some incredibly serious issues with the Bible. Among several other ways, the Bible disagrees with itself about who the first disciples of Christ were, what day the Last Supper occurred on, who discovered the empty tomb, and who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection. Additionally, 1 Corinthians, 1 Timothy, and 1 Peter assert that women are inferior to men; Ephesians and 1 Peter condone slavery; and Ephesians advises slaves to fear their master and to obey their master just as they would obey Christ.

One of the most concerning verses in the Bible comes from the book of Isaiah.

Isaiah 45:1

*“This is what the Lord says to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I take hold of to subdue nations before him and to strip kings of their armor, to open doors before him so that gates will not be shut.”*

Isaiah 45:1 refers to Cyrus, a Persian king, as God’s “anointed”. The Hebrew word מָשִׁיחַ (“mashíakh”), which means “anointed” and is the Hebrew word that gets translated as “Messiah” in other verses, is included in what gets translated in Isaiah 45:1 as “to his anointed”. The original meaning of “Messiah” comes from the title of “anointed one”. Isaiah 45:1 refers to Cyrus as God’s “anointed”. After prophecies about the coming Messiah were produced, a reference to “God’s anointed” was a reference connected to prophecies about the coming Messiah. From that perspective, Isaiah 45:1 seems to refer to Cyrus, a Persian king, as the coming Messiah. So the Bible seems to even disagree with itself about who the Messiah is. That’s obviously a major fundamental problem.

There are many other verses in the Old Testament that present serious concerns.

Exodus 21:2-11

*“If you buy a Hebrew servant, he is to serve you for six years. But in the seventh year, he shall go free, without paying anything. If he comes alone, he is to go free alone; but if he has a wife when he comes, she is to go with him. If his master gives him a wife and she bears him sons or daughters, the woman and her children shall belong to her master, and only the man shall go free. But if the servant declares ‘I love my master and my wife and children and do not want to go free’, then his master must take him before the judges. He shall take him to the door or the doorpost and pierce his ear with an awl. Then he will be his servant for life. If a man sells his daughter as a servant, she is not to go free as menservants do. If she does not please the master who has selected her for himself, he must let her be redeemed. He has no right to sell her to foreigners, because he has broken faith with her. If he selects her for his son, he must grant her the rights of a daughter. If he marries another woman, he must not deprive the first one of her food, clothing, and marital rights. If he does not provide her with these three things, she is to go free, without any payment of money.”*

Exodus 21:20

*“If a man beats his male or female slave with a rod and the slave dies as a direct result, he must be punished, but he is not to be punished if the slave gets up after a day or two, since the slave is his property.”*

Exodus 30:12

*“When you take a census of the Israelites to count them, each one must pay the Lord a ransom for his life at the time he is counted. Then no plague will come on them when you number them.”*

Leviticus 12:2-5

*“Say to the Israelites: ‘A woman who becomes pregnant and gives birth to a son will be ceremonially unclean for seven days, just as she is unclean during her monthly period. On the eighth day the boy is to be circumcised. Then the woman must wait thirty-three days to be purified from her bleeding. She must not touch anything sacred or go to the sanctuary until the days of her purification are over. If she gives birth to a daughter, for two weeks the woman will be unclean, as during her period. Then she must wait sixty-six days to be purified from her bleeding.’”*

Leviticus 15:19-24



*When a woman has her regular flow of blood, the impurity of her monthly period will last seven days, and anyone who touches her will be unclean till evening. Anything she lies on during her period will be unclean, and anything she sits on will be unclean. Whoever touches her bed must wash his clothes and bathe with water, and he will be unclean till evening. Whoever touches anything she sits on must wash his clothes and bathe with water, and he will be unclean till evening. Whether it is the bed or anything she was sitting on, when anyone touches it, he will be unclean till evening. If a man lies with her and her monthly flow touches him, he will be unclean for seven days; any bed he lies on will be unclean.”*

These verses show that the Old Testament condones slavery, including slavery of children; condones violence against slaves; condones forced marriage; claims that a plague will come upon people unless they pay a ransom for their life; asserts that a woman is unclean for twice the amount of time after giving birth to a daughter than to a son; and asserts that contact with a woman could render someone unclean for seven days. Every Christian should be concerned that the Bible contains such disturbing information.

There are reasons why there are such serious issues with the Bible and those details matter. Christianity calls for Christians to know their religion and there are serious concerns about the information that has been passed down to us. More specifically, the information that we have disagrees with itself about the Resurrection of Christ. Obviously, anyone who believes in the Resurrection of Christ needs to figure out what's going on.

Join this investigation and discover the untold true story that every Christian needs to know.

## Part 1 – Division among the Gospels

The four Gospels in the New Testament are believed by many to represent accounts passed down from eyewitnesses of Christ's Ministry. That's not to say that eyewitnesses necessarily wrote the Gospels or that all of the information in the Gospels came from eyewitnesses, just that whoever wrote them was using some information that originally came from an eyewitness of Christ's Ministry. Others believe that the Gospels represent truth but not necessarily that they represent eyewitness testimony, rather that the authors were inspired by God in a special way to know what to write. Most of the perceived validity of the Gospels derives from the belief that the information contained in the Gospels came from eyewitnesses of Christ's Ministry and/or other people who were inspired by God in a special way to know what to write. These accounts have been passed down for nearly 2,000 years and Christians around the world put their faith in these Gospels.

Many believe that the four Gospels tell the same general story as each other; however, that is far from the case. The Gospels contradict each other in many ways. We've already seen that the Gospels disagree with each other in relation to the Resurrection of Christ.

The following verses relate to the discovery of the empty tomb.

Mark 16:1

*When the Sabbath was over, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices so that they might go to anoint Jesus' body.*

Matthew 28:1

*After the Sabbath, at dawn on the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went to look at the tomb.*

Luke 24:9-10

*When they came back from the tomb, they told all these things to the Eleven and to all the others. It was Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, and the others with them who told this to the apostles.*

John 20:1

*Early on the first day of the week, while it was still dark, Mary Magdalene went to the tomb and saw that the stone had been removed from the entrance.*

Mark names Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome. Matthew names Mary Magdalene and "the other Mary". Luke names Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, and "the others with them". John only names Mary Magdalene. As previously explained, these discrepancies show that at least three of the four Gospels are incorrect when describing who discovered the empty tomb. At most, only one of them can be trusted.

The following verses relate to the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection.

Mark 16:8

*Trembling and bewildered, the women went out and fled from the tomb. They said nothing to anyone, because they were afraid.*

Mark 16:9

*When Jesus rose early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had driven seven demons.*

Matthew 28:8-10

*So the women hurried away from the tomb, afraid yet filled with joy, and ran to tell his disciples. Suddenly, Jesus met them. "Greetings", he said. They came to him, clasped his feet and worshiped him. Then Jesus said to them, "Do not be afraid. Go and tell my brothers to go to Galilee; there they will see me."*

Luke 24:13-16

*Now that same day two of them were going to a village called Emmaus, about seven miles from Jerusalem. They were talking with each other about everything that had happened. As they talked and discussed these things with each other, Jesus himself came up and walked along with them; but they were kept from recognizing him.*

Luke 24:18

*One of them, named Cleopas, asked him, "Are you only a visitor to Jerusalem and do not know the things that have happened there in these days?"*

Luke 24:33-34

*They got up and returned at once to Jerusalem. There they found the Eleven and those with them, assembled together and saying, "It is true! The Lord has risen and has appeared to Simon." Then the two told what had happened on the way, and how Jesus was recognized by them when he broke the bread.*

John 20:16

*Jesus said to her, "Mary."*

*She turned toward him and cried out in Aramaic, "Rabboni!", which means Teacher.*

John 20:18

*Mary Magdalene went to the disciples with the news: "I have seen the Lord!" And she told them that she had said these things to her.*

Mark and John only name Mary Magdalene; Matthew names Mary Magdalene and "the other Mary"; and Luke first refers to two men, one of whom goes unnamed while the other is named Cleopas, and then presents Peter ("Simon") as the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. As previously explained, only Mark and John agree on who Christ first appeared to after the Resurrection. That means that at most only two Gospels can be trusted about who Christ first appeared to after the Resurrection. Additionally, if Mark 16:9-20 are a later addition, then the original version of the Gospel of Mark may have ended with verse 16:8; and if it did, then the original version of the Gospel of Mark would not agree with John. At most, only two of these accounts can be trusted and probably only one of them can be trusted.

The Gospels are obviously different from each other. The first classification that should be made is that the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, and Luke are known as the “Synoptic Gospels” because they have a certain level of information that is common among all three of them that the Gospel of John does not have while the Gospel of John has a certain level of information that the Synoptic Gospels don’t have. So the Gospel of John is in a class of its own. The differences between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John relate to historical events as well as to theology.

The next difference to look at between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John is the time-frame that they seem to allocate to Christ’s Ministry. The Synoptic Gospels only describe one Passover, which suggests that the time-period covered was one year or less than one year. That is representative of a popular belief. Movies and TV shows about Christ’s Ministry typically present only one Passover. In contrast, the Gospel of John describes three Passovers, which suggests that the time-period covered was at least two years and less than three years. That is an issue because all four of the Gospels describe some of the same historical events about the beginning of Christ’s Ministry and they all end with descriptions about the Resurrection of Christ, and so they should represent approximately the same amount of time in relation to the duration of Christ’s Ministry.

All four Gospels contain narratives about John the Baptist. However, the Synoptic Gospels all describe Christ as having been baptized by John the Baptist and the Gospel of John does not. Additionally, the temptation of Christ narratives, which describe Christ as having been tempted for 40 days in the desert, are shown after the baptism of Christ narratives in the Synoptic Gospels, but such a narrative is not in the Gospel of John at all. So all of the Synoptic Gospels include narratives about both the baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ, but the Gospel of John doesn’t include either of them.

One might think that it’s not important that the Gospels differ in these ways. Different Gospels might just include different narratives. However, there are several reasons to believe that something is amiss. First and foremost, the Synoptic Gospels describe God, or a voice from heaven, as having identified Christ’s divinity while the Gospel of John describes John the Baptist as having identified Christ’s divinity. So there are contrasting accounts as early on as the narratives about the identification of Christ’s divinity. Furthermore, with the temptation of Christ, if Christ was actually tempted by the devil for 40 days, it would be incredibly strange and suspicious that the Gospel of John does not include such a narrative. We should also remember that the Gospels are supposed to be representative of eyewitness testimony and/or special inspiration given to a writer by God. So if there are major narratives excluded, then that brings into question the truthfulness of such writing. On the other hand, if there are false narratives, then such writing is obviously not reliable. So did the baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ really happen? If so, why aren’t they included in the Gospel of John? If not, why are they included in the Synoptic Gospels? Why does the Gospel of John present a different description of the identification of Christ’s divinity? Which account is true?

The Gospel of John claims that Christ’s first miraculous sign was turning water into wine, but the Synoptic Gospels don’t make any mention of that.

John 2:1-3

*On the third day a wedding took place at Cana in Galilee. Jesus’ mother was there, and Jesus and his disciples had also been invited to the wedding. When the wine was gone, Jesus’ mother said to him, “They have no more wine.”*

John 2:7-11

*Jesus said to the servants, "Fill the jars with water"; so they filled them to the brim.*

*Then he told them, "Now draw some out and take it to the master of the banquet."*

*They did so, and the master of the banquet tasted the water that had been turned into wine. He did not realize where it had come from, though the servants who had drawn the water knew. Then he called the bridegroom aside and said, "Everyone brings out the choice wine first and then the cheaper wine after the guests have had too much to drink; but you have saved the best till now."*

*This, the first of his miraculous signs, Jesus performed at Cana in Galilee. He thus revealed his glory, and his disciples put their faith in him.*

The Gospel of John is the only Gospel to describe Christ as having turned water into wine, is the only Gospel to describe a miracle as the first of Christ's miraculous signs, and is the only Gospel that specifically describes disciples as having put their faith in Christ after Christ revealed glory through a miraculous sign. There isn't any narrative about the baptism of Christ or the temptation of Christ in the Gospel of John, and what is described as Christ's first miraculous sign is not described at all in the Synoptic Gospels.

All of the Gospels contain narratives about the calling of the first disciples, but the Synoptic Gospels differ from each other and all of the Synoptic Gospels differ greatly from the Gospel of John. In the Gospel of John, the first two disciples are described as Andrew and a mysteriously unnamed disciple, and are also described as first having been disciples of John the Baptist. Then Peter is described as the third disciple, and then Philip as the fourth, and then Nathanael as the fifth. In the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, the first two disciples are Peter and Andrew, and then the third and fourth disciples are James and John. In the Gospel of Luke, the first three disciples are Peter, James, and John, but not Andrew. Also, none of the Synoptic Gospels refer to any disciple as having been a disciple of John the Baptist, unlike the Gospel of John. These accounts cannot be reconciled. At least two of them must be false, if not three of them, or even all of four of them.

The baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ narratives are important to the Synoptic Gospels, but are excluded from the Gospel of John for some reason. The Gospel of John describes the identification of Christ's divinity differently than the Synoptic Gospels for some reason. The narrative about Christ's first miraculous sign is important to the Gospel of John, but is excluded from the Synoptic Gospels for some reason. Even though all of the Gospels contain narratives about the calling of the first disciples, for some reason, only Mark and Matthew give the same list of names as each other and the Gospel of John differs greatly from all of the Synoptic Gospels.

The timing of the historical events described in these narratives is in contrast as well among the Gospels. The Synoptic Gospels present the following order: the introduction of John the Baptist, the baptism of Christ, the identification of Christ's divinity, the temptation of Christ, and the calling of the first disciples. The Gospel of John presents the following order: the introduction of John the Baptist, the identification of Christ's divinity, the calling of the first disciples, and Christ's first miraculous sign of turning water into wine. These orders of narratives by themselves don't provide a contradiction, and one can easily argue that narratives are just ordered differently among the Gospels. However, the Gospel of John is very specific in terms of the timing of the first days of Christ's Ministry, and it's that specific timing that seems to provide a contradiction. The Gospel of John describes Philip and Nathanael as having become

disciples on the second day of Christ's Ministry and describes Christ's first miraculous sign as having happened on "the third day". "The third day" could refer to the third day of Christ's Ministry or the third day of the week. Even if it is a reference to the third day of the week, it would still appear that the first days of Christ's Ministry are being described because the reference to a specific day of the week without further description suggests that the first week of Christ's Ministry is being described. Mark and Matthew, on the other hand, describe Christ as having gone into the desert presumably on the same day that John the Baptist is described as having identified Christ, and they also describe Christ as having stayed in the desert for 40 days.

John 1:43

*The next day Jesus decided to leave for Galilee. Finding Philip, he said to him, "Follow me."*

John 2:1

*On the third day a wedding took place at Cana in Galilee. Jesus' mother was there, and Jesus and his disciples had also been invited to the wedding.*

Mark 1:12

*At once the Spirit sent him out into the desert, and he was in the desert forty days, being tempted by Satan. He was with the wild animals, and angels attended him.*

Matthew 4:1

*Then Jesus was led by the Spirit into the desert to be tempted by the devil. After fasting forty days and forty nights, he was hungry.*

All of the Gospels include a narrative about John the Baptist. What happens after that varies greatly though, and the conciseness of the timing in John, Mark, and Matthew seems to show a contradiction. John 1:43 specifically says "the next day" and John 2:1 specifically says "on the third day". As shown before, Mark and Matthew seem to describe Christ as having gone into the desert for 40 days right after the supposed baptism of Christ. It doesn't seem that these accounts can be reconciled. If the narratives in Mark and Matthew about the temptation of Christ are true, then the narratives in the Gospel of John about the calling of the first disciples and the first miraculous sign would seem to be false. On the other hand, if the narratives in the Gospel of John about the calling of the first disciples and the first miraculous sign are true, then the narratives in Mark and Matthew about the temptation of Christ would seem to be false.

Not only do the Synoptic Gospels fail to mention what the Gospel of John describes as Christ's first miraculous sign, but they also exclude a narrative about the raising of Lazarus. Furthermore, this miracle is used in the Gospel of John to help explain why there is a crowd described as having followed Christ when Christ is described as having gone to the temple just days before the Crucifixion. None of the Synoptic Gospels contain such an explanation.

John 12:9-11

*Meanwhile a large crowd of Jews found out that Jesus was there and came, not only because of him but also to see Lazarus, whom he had raised from the dead. So the chief priests made plans to kill Lazarus as well, for on account of him many of the Jews were going over to Jesus and putting their faith in him.*

John 12:17-19

*Now the crowd that was with him when he called Lazarus from the tomb and raised him from the dead continued to spread the word. Many people, because they had heard that he had given this miraculous sign, went out to meet him. So the Pharisees said to one another, "See, this is getting us nowhere. Look how the whole world has gone after him!"*

So either the Gospel of John is dishonest in describing the raising of Lazarus and that having been a major reason for why there is a crowd described as having followed Christ when Christ is described as having gone to the temple, or the Synoptic Gospels fail to mention someone having been raised from the dead by Christ and that having been a major reason for why there is a crowd described as having followed Christ when Christ is described as having gone to the temple.

All of the Gospels include a narrative about Christ having been anointed by someone. However, only Mark and Matthew seem to be mostly similar.

Mark 14:3

*While he was in Bethany, reclining at the table in the home of a man known as Simon the Leper, a woman came with an alabaster jar of very expensive perfume, made of pure nard. She broke the jar and poured the perfume on his head.*

Matthew 26:6-7

*While he was in Bethany in the home of a man known as Simon the Leper, a woman came to him with an alabaster jar of very expensive perfume, which she poured on his head as he was reclining at the table.*

Luke 7:36-38

*Now one of the Pharisees invited Jesus to have dinner with him, so he went to the Pharisee's house and reclined at the table. When a woman who had lived a sinful life in that town learned that Jesus was eating at the Pharisee's house, she brought an alabaster jar of perfume, and as she stood behind him at his feet weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears. Then she wiped them with her hair, kissed them, and poured perfume on them.*

John 12:1-3

*Six days before the Passover, Jesus arrived at Bethany, where Lazarus lived, whom Jesus had raised from the dead. Here a dinner was given in Jesus' honor. Martha served, while Lazarus was among those reclining at the table with him. Then Mary took about a pint of pure nard, an expensive perfume; she poured it on Jesus' feet and wiped his feet with her hair. And the house was filled with the fragrance of the perfume.*

All of the Synoptic Gospels leave the woman who anointed Christ unnamed. Luke goes further by describing this woman as a sinner. The Gospel of John, however, describes this woman as having been named "Mary". Mark and Matthew place this narrative in the home of "Simon the Leper", Luke places this narrative in the home of "one of the Pharisees", and John places this narrative in the home of Lazarus and his sisters Mary and Martha. So we again have an example of an exclusion of Lazarus in the Synoptic Gospels; and this time, the exclusion also relates to his sisters Mary and Martha. If the accounts in Mark and Matthew are truthful, then the accounts in Luke and John are likely false. If either the account in Luke or the one in John is truthful, then likely three of the four Gospels contain a false narrative about Christ having been anointed.

All of the Gospels include narratives about Christ having turned over tables at the temple. The Synoptic Gospels all present this as having happened a few days before the Crucifixion. The Gospel of John presents this as having happened about two years before the time presented in the Synoptic Gospels. As mentioned before, the Gospel of John seems to allocate a longer period of time to Christ's Ministry. The Gospel of John presents Christ as having turned over tables at the temple within days of the first Passover described in the Gospel of John in chapter 2 while the Synoptic Gospels move that narrative towards the back near the Crucifixion narratives.

The Last Supper is commonly thought to have been a Passover Seder (the feast for Passover). The Synoptic Gospels all describe the Last Supper as having been a Passover Seder. The Gospel of John, however, describes the Last Supper as having occurred before the Passover Seder.

Mark 14:12

*On the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, when it was customary to sacrifice the Passover lamb, Jesus' disciples asked him, "Where do you want us to go and make preparations for you to eat the Passover?"*

Matthew 26:17

*On the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the disciples came to Jesus and asked, "Where do you want us to make preparations for you to eat the Passover?"*

Luke 22:7-8

*Then came the day of Unleavened Bread on which the Passover lamb had to be sacrificed. Jesus sent Peter and John, saying, "Go and make preparations for us to eat the Passover."*

John 13:1-2

*It was just before the Passover Feast. Jesus knew that the time had come for him to leave this world and go to the Father. Having loved his own who were in the world, he now showed them the full extent of his love. The evening meal was being served, and the devil had already prompted Judas Iscariot, son of Simon, to betray Jesus.*

John 13:1-2 describe an evening meal that is before the Passover Seder. If you think that the phrase "It was just before the Passover Feast" is referring to an earlier time during the same evening as the Passover Seder, the phrase "the evening meal was being served" should indicate that the meal that was being served was not the Passover Seder. The Passover Seder is unlikely to have been referred to as if it was just another "evening meal". Furthermore, the reference to the "evening meal" is a part of the same narrative as the statement "It was just before the Passover Feast" and comes very shortly after that statement, so this evening meal seems to have been just before the Passover Feast and so seems to have not been the Passover Feast. Additionally, we can turn to a verse that is about Christ having been taken to Pontius Pilate after the Last Supper and after Christ was arrested.

John 18:28

*Then the Jews led Jesus from Caiaphas to the palace of the Roman Governor. By now it was early morning, and to avoid ceremonial uncleanness the Jews did not enter the palace; they wanted to be able to eat the Passover.*



John 18:28 is very clear about the Passover Seder having not happened yet. This shows that according to the Gospel of John, the Last Supper was not the Passover Seder but before the Passover Seder. So the Synoptic Gospels contradict the Gospel of John regarding what day that the Last Supper occurred on. That contradiction then carries forward and also applies to what day that the Crucifixion occurred on as well. The timing of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion in this way is very important. If the Last Supper was a Passover Seder, then Christ would seem to have been crucified after the Passover Seder on the first day of the week of unleavened bread, which is incredibly unrealistic because that day is an annual Sabbath day. Furthermore, all of the Synoptic Gospels seem to describe the day of the Crucifixion as a preparation day, which means that the Synoptic Gospels seem to present both the day of the Last Supper as well as the day of the Crucifixion as the day of preparation for Passover and the week of unleavened bread. So it matters a great deal whether or not a Gospel describes the Last Supper as having been a Passover Seder. The timing of the Last Supper in the Synoptic Gospels cannot be reconciled with that of the Gospel of John.

We can now turn to the witnesses that the Gospels describe as having been present during the Crucifixion.

Mark 15:40-41

*Some women were watching from a distance. Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome. In Galilee these women had followed him and cared for his needs. Many other women who had come up with him to Jerusalem were also there.*

Matthew 27:55-56

*Many women were there, watching from a distance. They had followed Jesus from Galilee to care for his needs. Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's sons.*

Luke 23:27

*A large number of people followed him, including women who mourned and wailed for him.*

Luke 23:48-49

*When all the people who had gathered to witness this sight saw what took place, they beat their breast and went away. But all those who knew him, including the women who had followed him from Galilee, stood at a distance, watching all these things.*

John 19:25-26

*Near the cross of Jesus stood his mother, his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus saw his mother there, and the disciple whom he loved standing nearby, he said to his mother, "Dear woman, here is your son", and to the disciple "Here is your mother." From that time on, this disciple took her into his home.*

All of the Synoptic Gospels describe women as having been witnesses of the Crucifixion, but they also all describe these women as having been relatively far away from the Cross. Only the Gospel of John describes anybody as having been near the Cross. It's very strange that the Synoptic Gospels specifically refer to the witnesses of the Crucifixion as having been at "a distance" from the Cross during the Crucifixion. Regardless, the witnesses of the Crucifixion were either near the Cross or far from the Cross, and so these accounts cannot be reconciled.

The Gospel of John provides the only description throughout all of the Gospels of Christ having communicated during the Crucifixion with a human being other than Roman soldiers or the people who are described as having been crucified at the same time as Christ. The Gospel of John also provides the only description throughout all of the Gospels of the two men who are described as having been crucified at the same time as Christ as having had their legs broken. Roman soldiers would do that sometimes to bring the completion of a crucifixion sooner. Crucifixions often took days to complete. The desire that Jewish priests seem to have had to have the Crucifixion of Christ completed sooner seems to have given way to the request described in the Gospel of John for Roman soldiers to break the legs of the bodies that are described as having been crucified. According to the Gospel of John, the Crucifixion of Christ appeared complete to the Roman soldiers and so they instead pierced the side of the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ with a spear. None of this is described in any of the Synoptic Gospels.

One of the most striking issues about any of the accounts of the Crucifixion in the Synoptic Gospels is the mention in Mark and Matthew of a woman named Mary who is mentioned separately from Mary Magdalene and who is not explicitly described as Mother Mary. Mark and Matthew both describe a woman named Mary who was the mother of people named James and Joses and who witnessed the Crucifixion.

Mark 15:40-41

*Some women were watching from a distance. Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome. In Galilee these women had followed him and cared for his needs. Many other women who had come up with him to Jerusalem were also there.*

Matthew 27:55-56

*Many women were there, watching from a distance. They had followed Jesus from Galilee to care for his needs. Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's sons.*

Mark and Matthew also both include references to Mother Mary's children earlier on in each Gospel.

Mark 6:3

*"Isn't this the carpenter? Isn't this Mary's son and the brother of James, Joseph, Judas, and Simon? Aren't his sisters here with us?" And they took offense at him.*

Matthew 13:55-56

*Isn't this the carpenter's son? Isn't his mother's name Mary, and aren't his brothers James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas? Aren't his sisters with us? Where then did this man get all these things?"*

All of these mention the names Mary and James, Mark 15:40-41 and Matthew 27:55-56 mention the name Joses, and Mark 6:3 and Matthew 13:55-56 mention the name Joseph. Mark translates the Greek word Ἰωσήτος ("Iōsētos") as "Joseph" in verse 6:3 and as "Joses" in verse 15:40 in the Crucifixion narrative. Matthew translates the Greek word Ἰωσήφ ("Iōsēph") as "Joseph" in verse 13:55 and as "Joses" in verse 27:56 in the Crucifixion narrative. Mark uses "Iōsētos" to describe one of Mother Mary's sons and to describe a son of a woman named Mary who witnessed the Crucifixion. Matthew uses "Iōsēph" to describe one of Mother Mary's sons and to describe a son of a woman named Mary who witnessed the Crucifixion. Different Greek words are used in each Gospel, but the main point is that Greek versions of

Mark and Matthew each refer to one of Mother Mary's sons in the same way that they each refer to a son of a woman named Mary who witnessed the Crucifixion. There is also Mother Mary's son James and the person named James who is also described in Mark and Matthew as having been a son of a woman named Mary who witnessed the Crucifixion. Were there two different women with the same name who both gave the same two names to two of their sons? Who is the woman named Mary who witnessed the Crucifixion and who had two sons who have the same names as two of Mother Mary's sons? Could Mary the mother of James and Joses who witnessed the Crucifixion be Mother Mary? If she is Mother Mary, then why isn't that specifically explained? If she isn't Mother Mary, then why isn't Mother Mary specifically described as having been present during the Crucifixion? None of the Synoptic Gospels specifically describe Mother Mary as having been present during the Crucifixion, but the Gospel of John does.

The Synoptic Gospels include other verses that can shed some light.

Mark 3:31-35

*Then Jesus' mother and brothers arrived. Standing outside, they sent someone in to call him. A crowd was sitting around him, and they told him, "Your mother and brothers are outside looking for you." "Who are my mother and my brothers?" he asked. Then he looked at those seated in a circle around him and said, "Here are my mother and my brothers! Whoever does God's will is my brother and sister and mother."*

Matthew 12:46-50

*While Jesus was still talking to the crowd, his mother and brothers stood outside, wanting to speak to him. Someone told him, "Your mother and brothers are standing outside, wanting to speak to you." He replied to him, "Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?" Pointing to his disciples, he said, "Here are my mother and my brothers. For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother."*

Luke 8:19-21

*Now Jesus' mother and brothers came to see him, but they were not able to get near him because of the crowd. Someone told him, "Your mother and brothers are standing outside, wanting to see you." He replied, "My mother and brothers are those who hear God's word and put it into practice."*

These all present Mother Mary very differently than how the Gospel of John does when describing communication between Christ, Mother Mary, and the beloved disciple during the Crucifixion. In the accounts in the Synoptic Gospels, Christ seems to not have had a special relationship with Mother Mary. In the Gospel of John, Mother Mary is near the Cross during the Crucifixion and Christ is described as having communicated with her during the Crucifixion. Furthermore, the Gospel of John describes Mother Mary as having been involved leading up to what the Gospel of John describes as the first of Christ's miraculous signs, changing water into wine.

So the Gospel of John describes Mother Mary as having influenced and witnessed Christ's first miraculous sign, having been near the Cross during the Crucifixion, and having been in communication with Christ during the Crucifixion. Meanwhile, the Synoptic Gospels portray Christ as not having had a special relationship with Mother Mary, and either don't describe Mother Mary as having been present during the Crucifixion or refer to her in a way that does not explicitly describe her as Mother Mary. There

is obviously a severe difference with how Mother Mary is being portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels versus the Gospel of John.

The differences between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John in the accounting of historical events are incredibly substantial. The Synoptic Gospels cannot be reconciled with the Gospel of John. Many believe that the Bible is the inerrant Word of God. Believing that the Bible is inerrant means believing that the Bible is 100% accurate and cannot be incorrect in any way. Contrasting that belief is the fact that the Bible contains clear contradictions, which has been shown by comparing the Gospels. It is absolutely impossible for 100% of contradicting information to be true. That means that it is absolutely certain that less than 100% of the information in the Bible is true; and more specifically, that less than 100% of the information in the Gospels is true. That doesn't mean that the Resurrection of Christ didn't happen. The Resurrection of Christ did happen, and extensive evidence will be shown later to support that assertion. Christianity is beyond written documents, and the written documents in the Bible were written by human beings. If the Bible is wrong in any way, that simply means that a human being was wrong in what they wrote. It's important to remember that when analyzing the text.

If one Gospel describes Mary Magdalene as having been the only person present when she is described as having seen Christ after the Resurrection and another Gospel describes Mary Magdalene as having been with another person, the fact that those accounts contradict each other doesn't mean that Christ didn't appear to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection. It simply means that at least one of those accounts must be incorrect about who they describe as having been present. If Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection and no other person was present, then a Gospel describing another person as having been present would be incorrect in doing so, but it would still be true that Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection. Again, the Resurrection of Christ did happen. However, obviously something is wrong with the text in the Gospels.

It is not only historical events that differ, but also theology. At the base of Christianity is how Christ is defined. Jesus has been known as "the Son of God". What does "the Son of God" mean? What is the relationship between God and "the Son of God"? What exactly is the distinction between God and "the Son of God"?

As we proceed, we will need to assess these questions along the lines of divine decision making. Is "the Son of God" a separate decision maker than God? In other words, is "the Son of God" a separate thinker than God? Would it be fair to say that "the Son of God" is the Creator of the world? Or is "the Son of God" the Son of the Creator of the world?

Are Christ's thoughts God's thoughts, and are God's thoughts Christ's thoughts? Is Christ's will God's will, and is God's will Christ's will? Is Christ's Plan God's Plan, and is God's Plan Christ's Plan? Is Christ the Creator of the world or the Son of the Creator of the world? These are the questions that we need to keep in mind as we continue to analyze the differences between the Gospel of John and the Synoptic Gospels.

John 1:1-3

*<sup>1</sup> In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. <sup>2</sup> He was with God in the beginning. <sup>3</sup> Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made.*

John 1:14

*The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth.*

John 1:1 specifically states that “the Word was God”. John 1:14 specifically states that “the Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us”. So the combination of those statements asserts that the Word is God and that the Word became flesh, which therefore asserts that God became flesh. The combination of these verses asserts that Christ is God. However, verse 1 also states “the Word was with God” and verse 2 states “He was with God”. Those statements suggest that the Word has an identity that is separate from God. A common interpretation among Christians is that “the Word” relates specifically to “the Son of God”, or God’s “spoken Word”. There are two points to now make.

The first point is that “Word” is translated from the Greek word λόγος (“logos”). “Logos” can be defined as logic or thought. It has been recorded that “logos” was used as far back as the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE when Heraclitus, an ancient Greek philosopher, used the term for a principle of order and knowledge, which is similar to the definitions of logic and thought. In other words, “logos” was used in Ancient Greek philosophy to represent logic, which can also mean thought, reason, and wisdom. Heraclitus believed that there was Logos analogous to human reasoning that was involved with the cosmos. Later on, Stoic philosophers thought of Logos as an active reasonable and spiritual principle encompassing all of existence. Philo of Alexandria, a Hellenistic Jewish philosopher who lived in the first century CE, taught that the Logos of nature is a single law governing the entire world. Philo interpreted the Logos as the divine Mind who encompasses all forms and ideas. From this perspective, we can view the Word as the Mind of God, or the Logic of God. That interpretation allows us to reconcile the statements “the Word was with God” and “the Word was God”. The divine Mind is with God and the divine Mind is God. The divine Logic is with God and the divine Logic is God. So the Word is with God and the Word is God.

It might seem redundant or unnecessary to express both that the Logic is with God and that the Logic is God. It might seem that it was only necessary to simply state that the Logic is God. Those two statements are the product of John 1:1 relating two different Greek words to each other. “Logos” is logic and Θεός (“Theos”) refers to God. Someone can discuss logic without specifically referring to God and can refer to God without explicitly referring to logic. As already shown through Heraclitus and Philo of Alexandria, plenty of philosophy was being developed about the concept of “Logos” over the course of hundreds of years. A person didn’t necessarily have to be a monotheist (belief in one God) to believe in some philosophy about “Logos”. So the author of John 1:1 decided to express the same general concept in two different specific ways given that two different Greek words are being related to each other and therefore that two different sets of philosophy were being related to each other. The Mind of God is in fact with God, and the Mind of God is in fact God. Although there may appear to be some redundancy there, both statements are true.

The second point is that verse 2 uses the word “He” and that is translated from the Greek word Οὗτος (“houtos”), which is often translated in the Bible as “this”. So another translation could read as “This was with God in the beginning”, which is very different than “He was with God in the beginning”. The use of “He” suggests that the Word has an identity that is separate from God, but the use of “This” does not because “This” can be used to generally refer to the preceding sentence rather than specifically in relation to the Word as if the Word has a separate identity from God. “He” would seem to refer to a separate

identity from God and “This” seems to refer to the preceding sentence. “This was with God in the beginning” is a more accurate translation. Furthermore, “the beginning” can be interpreted as referring to the state of existence before God created the world, so “This was with God in the beginning” can be interpreted as referring to the preceding sentence, John 1:1, as the state of existence before God created the world.

The bottom line is that “the Word” doesn’t specifically refer to “the Son of God”, but instead simply specifically refers to God. As Philo of Alexandria expressed in the first century, the Logic is the divine Mind who encompasses all forms and ideas and governs the entire world. The Logic is God and God possesses all logic.

The following is an alternative translation of John 1:1-2.

*<sup>1</sup> In the beginning was the Logic, and the Logic was with God, and the Logic was God. <sup>2</sup> This was with God in the beginning.*

John 1:1-2 express that the Logic is God and that the Logic was God before God created the world.

As we move to verse 14, we can translate such a verse as saying “The Logic became flesh and made his dwelling among us”. From this perspective, we can interpret verse 14 as referring to Christ as one with the Mind of God. That would mean that Christ has the identity of God and that Christ’s will is God’s will. According to the combination of John 1:1 and 1:14, the Logic is God and the Logic became flesh, which therefore asserts that God became flesh. The combination of John 1:1 and 1:14 asserts that Christ is God, and therefore that Christ’s will is God’s will. The combination of John 1:1 and 1:14 asserts that Christ does not think separately from God. Christ’s thoughts are God’s thoughts. The Logic of Christ is the Logic of God, so Christ does not make decisions separately from God. Christ’s decisions are God’s decisions. The combination of John 1:1 and 1:14 asserts that the Logic is God and that the Logic became flesh. That means that the physical appearance of Christ is the embodiment of God. In other words, Christ is God.

It should now be noted that the Gospel of John does not include any narrative that describes a physical birth of the physical appearance of Christ. Those narratives are only in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. So those kinds of narratives should not affect our understanding that the Gospel of John portrays Christ as God.

Later in Chapter 1, Christ is specifically portrayed as the Creator of the world.

John 1:10

*He was in the world, and though the world was made through him, the world did not recognize him.*

John 1:10 describes the Creator of the world having been in the world and having not been recognized by the world. The phrase “the world was made through him” specifically indicates that John 1:10 is referring to the Creator of the world, the phrase “He was in the world” specifically indicates that the Creator of the world was in the world, and the phrases “He was in the world” and “the world did not recognize him” specifically indicate that Christ is being referred to. So John 1:10 refers to Christ as the Creator of the world. John 1:10 is a specific reference to the Creator of the world having been in the world, and therefore expresses that Christ is the Creator of the world. So even if someone wanted to argue that John

1:1 and 1:14 should be interpreted differently, John 1:10 clearly portrays Christ as the Creator of the world by expressing that the Creator of the world was in the world. Therefore, according to the Gospel of John, the physical appearance of Christ is the embodiment of the Creator of the world.

The Gospel of John clearly portrays the physical appearance of Christ as the physical appearance of the Creator of the world. However, the Gospel of John also portrays Christ as “the Son” of “the Father”, which somewhat blurs the understanding that we’ve just previously established that Christ is the Creator of the world. If Christ is the Creator of the world, then how is Christ “the Son” of “the Father”? What exactly is the distinction between the “the Son” and “the Father”?

The following verses will move us further in our understanding of how the Gospel of John defines Christ.

John 8:19

*Then they asked him, “Where is your father?”*

*“You do not know me or my Father”, Jesus replied. “If you knew me, you would know my Father also.”*

John 8:23

*But he continued, “You are from below; I am from above. You are of this world; I am not of this world.”*

John 8:58-59

*“I tell you the truth”, Jesus answered, “before Abraham was born, I am!” At this, they picked up stones to stone him, but Jesus hid himself, slipping away from the temple grounds.*

John 10:30-33

*“I and the Father are one.”*

*Again the Jews picked up stones to stone him, but Jesus said to them, “I have shown you many great miracles from the Father. For which of these do you stone me?”*

*“We are not stoning you for any of these”, replied the Jews, “but for blasphemy, because you, a mere man, claim to be God.”*

John 14:7

*If you really knew me, you would know my Father as well. From now on, you do know him and have seen him.”*

*Philip said, “Lord, show us the Father and that will be enough for us.”*

*Jesus answered: “Don’t you know me, Philip, even after I have been among you such a long time? Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, ‘Show us the Father’? Don’t you believe that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me? The words I say to you are not just my own. Rather, it is the Father, living in me, who is doing his work.”*

While the Gospel of John sometimes refers to Christ separately from “the Father”, the Gospel of John equates Christ to “the Father” thereby asserting that Christ’s Logic is the same as the Logic of God, which shows that Christ’s will is God’s will. The titles “the Father” and “the Son” are titles used by the authors of the Gospels and different people interpret those titles differently. According to the Gospel of John, “the Son” has the same identity as “the Father”. In other words, “the Son” is the embodiment of “the Father”, which represents the assertion previously established through the combination of John 1:1 and 1:14 that the physical appearance of Christ is the embodiment of God.

John 8:19 expresses that if someone knows Christ then they would know “the Father”. That asserts that God and Christ have the same identity, which is consistent with the assertion previously presented through the combination of John 1:1 and 1:14. John 8:23 expresses that Christ is not of this world. That asserts that Christ existed before physically appearing in this world, which is consistent with the assertion previously presented through the combination of John 1:1 and 1:14. John 8:58-59 express that Christ existed before Abraham, which by itself expresses that Christ existed before physically appearing in this world. Furthermore, the phrase “I am” is a specific reference to self-identification as God, which can also be seen in Exodus 3:14. Additionally, John 8:58-59 describe stones having been thrown at Christ. Stoning was used for the charge of blasphemy. Some people would have likely wanted to charge Christ with blasphemy if they thought that Christ claimed to be God. John 8:58-59 are consistent with the assertion previously presented through the combination of John 1:1 and 1:14. John 10:30-33 also describe stones having been thrown at Christ. John 10:30-33 express that Christ and “the Father” are one and describe people having thrown stones at Christ specifically because they thought that Christ claimed to be God. John 10:30-33 are consistent with the assertion previously presented through the combination of John 1:1 and 1:14. John 14:7 expresses that if one knows Christ then they know “the Father” and that if one has seen Christ then they have seen “the Father”. John 14:7 specifically expresses that “the Father” lives in Christ and carries out work in Christ. John 14:7 is consistent with the assertion previously presented through the combination of John 1:1 and 1:14.

As shown by these verses, while the Gospel of John sometimes refers to Christ separately from “the Father”, the Gospel of John equates Christ to “the Father” thereby asserting that Christ’s Logic is the same as the Logic of God, which asserts that Christ’s will is God’s will. That means that the physical appearance of Christ is the embodiment of God. The Logic is God and the Logic physically appeared in this world. Christ is God.

John 6:27 also provides an important description of Christ. However, the verse as shown in modern versions of the Bible has been translated improperly.

John 6:27

*“Do not work for food that spoils, but for food that endures to eternal life, which the Son of Man will give you. On him God the Father has placed his seal of approval.”*

The last sentence of John 6:27 is translated from the following Greek words.

τούτου (“touton”) γὰρ (“gar”) ὁ (“ho”) Πατήρ (“Pater”) ἐσφράγισεν (“esphragisen”) ὁ (“ho”) Θεός (“Theos”)

Those Greek words can be translated as “Him for the Father has sealed the God”. That is very different than “On him God the Father has placed his seal of approval”. The current translation is incorrect by showing “God the Father” as one name. The word “Father” is translated from the Greek word Πατήρ (“Pater”), which is the fourth word shown in the Greek version just previously presented. The name “God” is translated from the Greek word Θεός (“Theos”), which is the seventh word shown in the Greek version just previously presented. So based on the Greek version that the English version is translated from, the word “Father” is separate from the name “God”, and so the English translation should not show “God the Father” as one name. Instead, the correct translation separates those words and shows that the name “God” is in reference to Christ. Additionally, there isn’t any word in the Greek version that should



be translated as “approval”. The incorrect translation expresses that “the Father” has placed a seal of approval on Christ, and the correct translation expresses that “the Father” has sealed Christ the God. The incorrect translation distinguishes between “the Father” and Christ, and the correct translation expresses that Christ is sealed the God. The correct translation of John 6:27 explicitly describes Christ as God and so is consistent with the assertion previously presented through the combination of John 1:1 and 1:14.

So chapter 1 of the Gospel of John clearly portrays Christ as the Creator of the world; and then other parts of the Gospel of John portray Christ as “the Son” of “the Father”, which seems to be somewhat different but equates “the Son” to “the Father” thereby agreeing with chapter 1 that Christ’s Logic is the Logic of God. As we will go into more detail on later, there seems to have been different layers to the Gospel of John, meaning there were contributions from different authors at different times. We already saw an example of that in the Gospel of Mark with verses 16:9-20, which seem to have been a later addition. The same also seems to be the case with the Gospel of John but to a greater extent. The different pieces of writing from different authors seem to blur the understanding of how the Gospel of John portrays Christ. Nevertheless, through these different pieces, the Gospel of John expresses that the Logic is God, that the Logic became flesh, that Christ is the Creator of the world, that “the Son” has the same identity as “the Father”, and that “the Son” is the embodiment of “the Father”. So through these different contributions from different people, it remains consistent that the Logic of Christ is the Logic of God, and therefore that Christ’s will is God’s will. That is the conclusion that we need to keep in mind as we move forward to the Synoptic Gospels.

Mark 10:18 and Luke 18:19 provide irreconcilable contradictions to what we just went over from the Gospel of John.

Mark 10:18

*“Why do you call me good?” Jesus answered. “No one is good – except God alone.”*

Luke 18:19

*“Why do you call me good?” Jesus answered. “No one is good – except God alone.”*

Those verses portray Christ as a separate being from God. To be clearer, the last sentence of those verses is translated from the following Greek words.

οὐδεὶς (“oudeis”) ἀγαθός (“agathos”) εἰ (“ei”) μὴ (“me”) εἷς (“heis”) ὁ (“ho”) Θεός (“Theos”)

The word “alone” is translated from the Greek word εἷς (“heis”), which can be more accurately translated as “one”. A better translation of the last sentence of those verses is “no one is good, if not one God”, which can be interpreted as “no one is good, if one is not God”, or more plainly as “no one is good, except God”. This verse specifically states that God is good and questions why Christ would be called good. If God’s goodness is described in contrast to Christ, then Christ would be described as a being who is not God, and more specifically as a being who is not one with the Logic of God. The Gospel of John expresses that the Logic is God, that the Logic became flesh, that Christ is the Creator of the world, that “the Son” has the same identity as “the Father”, and that “the Son” is the embodiment of “the Father”. According to the Gospel of John, there shouldn’t be any distinction between the goodness of Christ and the goodness of God just as there isn’t any distinction between the Logic of Christ and the Logic of God.

Mark 10:18 and Luke 18:19 are very definitive in trying to separate Christ from God. These verses set the tone for what we are about to cover.

Matthew 12:32

*Anyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven but anyone who speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come.*

First we saw the Gospels of Mark and Luke describe the goodness of Christ in contrast to the goodness of God, which presents Christ as separate from God. Now we can see that the Gospel of Matthew is similar in describing Christ as separate from God. Matthew 12:32 describes the Spirit of God as separate from Christ by expressing that speaking against “the Son of Man” can be forgiven but speaking against the Spirit of God will not be forgiven. Portraying speaking against Christ as forgivable but speaking against the Spirit of God as unforgivable portrays Christ as a separate being from the Spirit of God.

Mark 13:32

*“No one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, or the Son, but only the Father. Be on guard! Be alert! You do not know when that time will come.”*

Matthew 24:36

*“No one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, or the Son, but only the Father.”*

Mark 13:32 and Matthew 24:36 both express that “the Father” has knowledge that “the Son” does not. Those verses clearly present the knowledge of “the Son” as separate from the knowledge of “the Father”; and therefore, present Christ’s Logic as separate from the Logic of God, which contradicts what we’ve seen from the Gospel of John.

Matthew 10:23

*Jesus said to them, “You will indeed drink from my cup, but to sit at my right or left is not for me to grant. These places belong to those for whom they have been prepared by my Father.”*

Matthew 10:23 expresses the idea that “the Father” grants places for people that Christ does not. Matthew 10:23 specifically tries to separate the decision making of “the Father” from the decision making of Christ.

Luke 2:52

*And Jesus grew in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men.*

Luke 2:52 expresses that Christ grew in wisdom and stature. If Christ didn’t possess all wisdom, then Christ would not possess the Logic of God. Additionally, Luke 2:52 specifically tries to separate Christ from God by expressing that Christ grew in favor with God. If Christ grew in favor with God, then Christ would not be God and would not possess the Logic of God.

Moving further, both the baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ narratives present issues when interpreting information about the divinity of Christ. Why would Christ have been baptized? Why would the Logic of God have been baptized? For the forgiveness of sins? As an initiation process? To begin a new chapter of life? What does a baptism represent? Are we to think that the Logic of God was forgiven for sins, was initiated into a human formed religion, or began a new chapter of life? What was

accomplished by the supposed baptism of Christ? The Synoptic Gospels specifically describe the baptisms that were performed by John the Baptist as having been for repentance for the forgiveness of sins. So it appears that they imply that Christ was baptized for repentance for the forgiveness of sins. Why would the Logic of God have ever sinned? How could the Logic of God have ever sinned? Why would the Logic of God need to be forgiven by God?

Why would Christ have been tempted for 40 days in the desert? Why would the Logic of God have been tempted for 40 days in the desert? Are we to believe that God tempted the Logic of God for 40 days in the desert?

The baptism of Christ narratives describe a voice from heaven as having expressed satisfaction with Christ, which tries to present Christ's will as separate from God's will. The temptation of Christ narratives describe Christ as having been led by the Spirit into the desert, which tries to present Christ's will as separate from God's will. Both of them describe Christ's will as separate from God's will. They both describe Christ as separate from God.

These narratives refer to repentance for the forgiveness of sins as well as to temptation. Regardless of what form the Logic of God appears as, why would the Logic of God need to be forgiven for anything and why would the Logic of God ever be tempted for 40 days in the desert? It should now again be recognized that the Gospel of John does not include these narratives and that the Synoptic Gospels don't include the kind of information that is in John 1:1 and 1:14. There is an incredibly harsh contrast between these narratives and the verses shown from the Gospel of John. The Gospel of John describes Christ as God in flesh, and the Synoptic Gospels try to separate Christ from God and they seem to try to connect Christ to sin and temptation.

Both of these narratives show that the Synoptic Gospels venture into incredibly questionable territory and potentially contrast with the truth about the divinity of Christ. Now we should look at a difference between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John in relation to Christ having prayed before Christ was arrested.

Mark 14:33-36

*He took Peter, James, and John along with him, and he began to be deeply distressed and troubled. "My soul is overwhelmed with sorrow to the point of death", he said to them. "Stay here and keep watch." Going a little farther, he fell to the ground and prayed that if possible the hour might pass from him. "Abba, Father", he said, "everything is possible for you. Take this cup from me. Yet not what I will, but what you will."*

Matthew 26:37-39

*He took Peter and the two sons of Zebedee along with him, and he began to be sorrowful and troubled. Then he said to them, "My soul is overwhelmed with sorrow to the point of death. Stay here and keep watch with me." Going a little farther, he fell with his face to the ground and prayed, "My Father, if it is possible, may this cup be taken from me. Yet not as I will, but as you will."*

Luke 22:41-44

*He withdrew about a stone's throw beyond them, knelt down and prayed, "Father, if you are willing, take this cup from me, yet not my will, but yours be done." An angel from heaven appeared to him and strengthened him. And being in anguish, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was like drops of blood falling to the ground.*

John 17:1

*"Father, the time has come. Glorify your Son, that your Son may glorify you."*

Mark describes Christ as having been "deeply distressed and troubled". Both Mark and Matthew describe Christ as having been "overwhelmed with sorrow to the point of death". Luke describes Christ as having been strengthened by an angel, having been "in anguish", having "prayed more earnestly" as if Christ doesn't always pray earnestly enough, and having had "sweat that was like drops of blood". All of the Synoptic Gospels describe Christ as having wanted to have "this cup" taken from Christ. The Synoptic Gospels actually describe Christ as having not wanted to move forward with the Plan of God. Many people try to rationalize these narratives by appealing to beliefs about the "humanness" of Christ. However, the Synoptic Gospels describe Christ as having not wanted to move forward with the Plan that God established for Creation. If Christ didn't want to move forward with the Plan that God established for Creation, then how could anyone consider Christ to be God, or Christ's will to be God's will? Why would God not want to move forward with God's Plan? If God did not want to move forward with God's Plan, then how could God's Plan even be considered God's Plan? Furthermore, all of the Synoptic Gospels explicitly mention Christ's will as separate from God's will. Mark states "Yet not what I will, but what you will", Matthew states "Yet not as I will, but as you will", and Luke states "yet not my will, but yours be done". The Gospel of John, on the other hand, describes Christ as having been ready and willing to move forward with the Plan of God, which is consistent with the belief that Christ's will is God's will, and is therefore consistent with the conclusion previously reached through the combination of John 1:1 and 1:14. Again, the Gospel of John expresses that "the Father" and "the Son" have the same identity, so it's somewhat confusing to see a description of "the Son" praying to "the Father". We must keep in mind that there were contributions to the Gospel of John from multiple people and that we will analyze the different layers of the Gospel of John in more detail later, so no one verse should dictate our understanding so far. Also, John 17:1 can be interpreted in different ways and the reference to "the Father" glorifying "the Son" can be interpreted as a reference to God glorifying the embodiment of God. Regardless of one's interpretation of John 17:1, the main point is about the contrast between John 17:1 portraying Christ as ready and willing to move forward with the Plan of God and the Synoptic Gospels portraying Christ as unwilling to move forward with the Plan of God. Portraying Christ as ready and willing to move forward with the Plan of God is consistent with the portrayal of Christ's Logic as the Logic of God and Christ's will as God's will. Portraying Christ as unwilling to move forward with the Plan of God portrays Christ as separate from the Logic of God and the will of God, and as previously shown, the Synoptic Gospels explicitly mention Christ's will as separate from God's will.

There is another example of Christ being described in a way that shows separation between Christ and the Plan of God. The following verses are in the Crucifixion narratives in Mark and Matthew.

Mark 15:34

*And at the ninth hour Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachtani?" – which means, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"*

Matthew 27:46

*About the ninth hour Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachtani?" – which means, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"*

Both Mark and Matthew describe Christ as having asked God why God had forsaken Christ. If Christ's will is God's will, then how could God have forsaken Christ? If Christ's Logic is the Logic of God, then how could Christ have felt forsaken? These verses cannot be reconciled with the belief that Christ's Logic is the Logic of God and Christ's will is God's will.

So we now have examples of Christ being described as having not wanted to move forward with the Plan of God and examples of Christ being described as having felt forsaken by God during the carrying out of the Plan of God. These examples clearly describe Christ's will as separate from God's will and Christ's Logic as separate from the Logic of God.

While Mark and Matthew describe Christ as having felt forsaken by God, Luke describes Christ as a "prophet, powerful in word and deed before God and all the people".

Luke 24:19

*"What things?" he asked.*

*"About Jesus of Nazareth", they replied. "He was a prophet, powerful in word and deed before God and all the people."*

If Christ is merely a prophet, then Christ would not be God and so Christ's Logic would be separate from the Logic of God. Muslims believe that Christ was a prophet, so the Gospel of Luke seems to take a step towards Islamic beliefs by describing Christ as a prophet. That is extremely far removed from the information presented in the Gospel of John. Additionally, Luke 24:19 specifically describes Christ as separate from God by stating "before God and all the people".

Mark includes a verse that describes Christ as having not been able to perform certain miracles in a certain area.

Mark 6:5

*He could not do any miracles there, except lay his hands on a few sick people and heal them.*

If Christ couldn't perform certain miracles in a certain area, then Christ's will would be separate from God's will. It doesn't make sense to describe God's will as having not been able to perform certain miracles in a certain area, and so we can see that Mark 6:5 describes Christ's will as separate from God's will.

Mark and Luke both describe Christ as having lost power by someone touching Christ.

Mark 5:30

*At once Jesus realized that power had gone out from him. He turned around in the crowd and asked, "Who touched my clothes?"*

Luke 8:46

*But Jesus said, "Someone touched me; I know that power has gone out from me."*

If Christ could have lost power by someone touching Christ, then Christ's Logic would not be the Logic of God. It doesn't make sense to describe the Logic of God as having lost power, and so we can see that Mark 5:30 and Luke 8:46 describe Christ's Logic as separate from the Logic of God.

All of the Synoptic Gospels explicitly describe Christ's will as separate from God's will; and describe Christ as having been baptized by a human being, having been tempted in the desert for 40 days, and having not wanted to move forward with the plan of God. Two of the Synoptic Gospels describe God's goodness in contrast to Christ. One of the Synoptic Gospels expresses that speaking against the Spirit of God will not be forgiven but speaking against Christ can be. Two of the Synoptic Gospels portray Christ as having less knowledge than God, and the other one describes Christ as having grown in wisdom and in favor with God. Two of the Synoptic Gospels describe Christ as having felt forsaken by God and the other one describes Christ specifically as a prophet before God. One of the Synoptic Gospels describes Christ as having not been able to perform certain miracles in a certain area and two of the Synoptic Gospels describe Christ as having lost power. The Synoptic Gospels clearly portray Christ as a separate being from God. The Synoptic Gospels portray Christ as if Christ is not God, and more specifically, as if the Logic of Christ and the will of Christ are separate from the Logic of God and the will of God.

The Synoptic Gospels portray Christ as a separate being from God while the Gospel of John expresses that the Logic is God, that the Logic became flesh, that Christ is the Creator of the world, that "the Son" has the same identity as "the Father", and that "the Son" is the embodiment of "the Father". The theology in the Synoptic Gospels is so fundamentally different than the Gospel of John that there are actually two different religions represented among the Gospels. What shows that the Synoptic Gospels represent a different religion than the Gospel of John is how they define the Christ. What does it mean to be the Christ? Such a question gets us into what has been called "Christology". All of the Gospels describe the Christ, but represent different definitions of the Christ. Is the Logic of Christ and the will of Christ one with the Logic of God and the will of God, or is Christ a separate being from God? The two different possible answers to that question represent at least two different religions. The belief that the Logic of Christ and the will of Christ is one with the Logic of God and the will of God cannot be contained within the same religion as one that contains the belief that Christ is a separate being from God. If the Christ is defined as one with the Logic of God and the will of God, then that belief system is a different religion than one that defines the Christ as a separate being from God.

The division among the Gospels is much more than just some small differences. There are two different religions represented among the Gospels. For many reasons, it seems that a Christian would have to pick and choose different parts of the Bible to believe in any part of the Bible. Given that there are clear contradictions in the Gospels, a Christian cannot believe in all of the information contained in the Gospels without opposing their own beliefs.

How do you define the Christ? Like the Gospel of John does or like the Synoptic Gospels do? If you agree with the Gospel of John, then you are rejecting 75% of the Gospels. If you agree with the Synoptic Gospels, then you are rejecting the Gospel of John and viewing Christ as a separate being from God. Which side do you choose? Do you know?

What happened in the first century and since then that has led us to this? Where do we go from here?

## Part 2 – The Testimony

It is justified to believe in the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of Christ. However, the Gospels contain clear contradictions. It is absolutely impossible for 100% of contradicting information to be true. That means that it is absolutely certain that less than 100% of the information in the Gospels is true. Therefore, some details in the Gospels must be incorrect.

There are many people who have asserted that if any part of the Bible is incorrect then we can't depend on the Bible at all. That is not a sound conclusion to reach. As previously stated, Christianity is beyond written documents and the written documents in the Bible were written by human beings. If the New Testament is wrong in any way, that simply means that a human being was wrong in what they wrote.

If one Gospel describes Mary Magdalene as having been the only person present when she is described as having seen Christ after the Resurrection and another Gospel describes Mary Magdalene as having been with another person, the fact that those accounts contradict each other doesn't mean that Christ didn't appear to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection. It simply means that at least one of those accounts must be incorrect about who they describe as having been present. If Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection and no other person was present, then a Gospel describing another person as having been present would be incorrect in doing so, but it would still be true that Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection. The Resurrection of Christ did happen. However, obviously something is wrong with the text in the New Testament.

The Bible was not originally one book. The Bible that we have today is a set of historical documents that came from different sources that were compiled together. The four Gospels were produced independently from each other. Paul's letters and the other documents found in the New Testament were produced independently from the Gospels. These documents were eventually compiled together to form one book. There being contradicting accounts in the Bible is a result of people compiling documents together from different sources.

It is believed that most of the documents found in the New Testament were compiled together by the second century. There were many texts produced in the first few centuries and many of them did not make it into the Bible. One text that did make it into the Bible actually seems to refer to one that didn't.

Jude 14-15

*Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied about these men: "See, the Lord is coming with thousands upon thousands of his holy ones to judge everyone, and to convict all the ungodly of all the ungodly acts they have done in the ungodly way, and of all the harsh words ungodly sinners have spoken against him."*

Jude 14-15 refer to Enoch, who is also referred to in Genesis. Below is what Genesis says about Enoch.

Genesis 5:18-25

*When Jared had lived 162 years, he became the father of Enoch. And after he became the father of Enoch, Jared lived 800 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Jared lived 962 years, and then he died.*

*When Enoch had lived 65 years, he became the father of Methuselah. And after he became the father of Methuselah, Enoch walked with God 300 years and had other sons and daughters. Altogether, Enoch lived 365 years. Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, because God took him away.*

That is all that Genesis says about Enoch; however, the book of Jude describes details that are not in the details found in Genesis. Where did those details come from? Most likely from the book of Enoch, which is a book that didn't make it into the Bible and that has been dated to 300-100 BCE. The absence in Genesis of details about Enoch found in the book of Jude is evidence enough to show that the book of Jude is drawing on information from a source that isn't found in the Bible. In addition to that, verses from the book of Enoch show even further evidence as they are very similar to information found in the book of Jude.

1 Enoch 1:9

*Behold, he comes with myriads of his holy ones, to execute judgment on all, and to destroy all the wicked, and to convict all flesh for all the wicked deeds that they have done, and the proud and hard words that wicked sinners spoke against him.*

Both Jude 14-15 as well as 1 Enoch 1:9 describe the coming of "holy ones"; that judgment will be executed; and that the ungodly or wicked will be convicted or destroyed for their ungodly acts or wicked deeds, and the harsh or hard words that sinners have spoken against God. Just by examining Genesis, we can come to the conclusion that information in Jude 14-15 came from the book of Enoch, and the information contained in 1 Enoch 1:9 furthers support for that conclusion. It appears that the author of the book of Jude was drawing on information from the book of Enoch.

The book of Enoch was deemed heretical and was not included in the Bible. Nevertheless, there seems to be a reference to it in the New Testament. If the people who compiled the Bible together deemed the book of Enoch to be heretical, then it seems that according to their own standards they shouldn't have included any reference to it. There being a reference in the New Testament to what seems to be writing that was deemed heretical is evidence that the compilation of documents that turned into the Bible was a faulty process carried out by human beings who made mistakes, and we could already easily come to that conclusion with all of the contradictions among the Gospels.

Analyzing the origin of information about Christianity shows justification for believing in the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of Christ. On the other hand, the path of information can lead to some incorrect information being passed along. We can trust the origin of information about Christianity but the path of information can lead to some incorrect information being passed along. So if there is any incorrect information in the New Testament, that doesn't necessarily mean that all of the New Testament is incorrect. It simply means that some incorrect information was included in the compiling of documents that eventually led to the development of the New Testament.

It is justified to believe that some of the New Testament is true, but unjustifiable to believe that all of the New Testament is true. We can therefore see that the level of validity of the New Testament is between 0% and 100%, and is not equal to either 0% or 100%.

Part 4 will present evidence and analysis to show justification for believing in the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of Christ, and some of that evidence and analysis will be shown later here in Part 2. But first,



we need to address other details. We need to analyze the path of information. For now, we will proceed with the premise that it is justified to believe in the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of Christ, but we will also proceed with speculation about all other details.

In analyzing the New Testament, the first step is to recognize that the documents contained in the New Testament were originally produced by real human beings in the real past. The documents contained in the New Testament are historical documents that were produced by human beings and copied over and over again for hundreds of years by human beings. The second step is to recognize that there are clear contradictions, and therefore there must be incorrect information somewhere. Many Christians deny this fundamental point and that leads to wrong conclusions. We must proceed by assuming that some information is incorrect. We must be prepared to find incorrect information as we proceed in our analysis so that we can come to reasonable conclusions. Again, it is absolutely unjustifiable to assert that 100% of contradicting information is true.

To better understand how people produced incorrect information in documents about Christianity and how those documents are still thought of as authority even today, we should explore the environment of the first few centuries that these documents were originally produced in.

### **The First Four Centuries**

The New Testament that we have today includes the four Gospels, the Book of Acts of the Apostles (commonly known as “Acts”), Paul’s letters, and some other documents. The four Gospels include narratives about Christ’s Ministry, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection. Acts, Paul’s letters, and the other documents in the New Testament present information about early Christianity after the Resurrection. Acts refers to some of the people named in the Gospels and introduces some new people, including Paul, who is described as having persecuted Christians and having later converted to Christianity. Paul’s letters and the other documents in the New Testament represent letters written after the Resurrection. A popular storyline about the disciples is that there were 12 main disciples, some women who helped out, and some other followers. Many people believe that Peter was the leader among the original group of disciples and it is popular to believe that he was the first bishop of Rome. It is also popular to believe that as Christianity spread there was a divide between spreading Christianity to Jews and spreading Christianity to gentiles (non-Jewish people). Many people believe that Peter was the leader of spreading Christianity to Jews and that Paul was the leader of spreading Christianity to gentiles. To make matters more complicated, some people believe that James, one of Mother Mary’s sons, eventually took a leadership role over Peter. The leadership status of everyone is questionable, but generally speaking, it is popular to believe that Peter and Paul were two giants of early Christianity. Additionally, some people also believe that James son of Mother Mary as well as the sons of Zebedee, James (a different James) and John, were also leaders. Despite the image Peter, James son of Mother Mary, James son of Zebedee, and John have as leaders, many people give more credit to Paul for leading the spreading of Christianity during that time-period. That is because of how Acts describes his efforts, there is so much of his writing in the New Testament that describes his efforts, and there was a large gentile population to spread Christianity to. When one reads the New Testament, Paul has a strong presence, at least outside of the Gospels. Peter is commonly given credit for being a leader and being the top leader among the original group of disciples; Paul is commonly given credit for being a leader and being the most

productive with spreading Christianity during the first generation after the Resurrection; and James son of Mother Mary, James son of Zebedee, and John are also given credit by some for being leaders.

The verses below outline an environment in the first century that involved multiple accounts of Christ's Ministry, division among Christians, false teachers, spies infiltrating Paul's ranks, and a battle between Peter and Paul in which Paul opposed Peter to his face and referred to him as a hypocrite. Additionally, the reference to "Cephas" in 1 Corinthians 1:11-12 is a reference to Peter. "Cephas" comes from the Hebrew word for "rock" and "Peter" comes from an English translation of the Greek word for "rock" ("pitros"). Peter's original name is translated as "Simon", but he went by a name that means "rock" and that is where "Cephas" and "Peter" come from. So 1 Corinthians 1:11-12 refers to division between the followers of Peter ("Cephas") and the followers of Paul, which further shows that there was division between Peter and Paul.

Luke 1:1-2

*Many have undertaken to draw up an account of the things that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed down to us by those who from the first were eyewitnesses and servants of the word.*

Romans 16:17-18

*I urge you, brothers, to watch out for those who cause divisions and put obstacles in your way that are contrary to the teaching you have learned. Keep away from them. For such people are not serving our Lord Christ, but their own appetites. By smooth talk and flattery they deceive the minds of naive people.*

1 Corinthians 1:11-12

*My brothers, some from Chloe's household have informed me that there are quarrels among you. What I mean is this: One of you says, "I follow Paul"; another, "I follow Apollos"; another, "I follow Cephas"; still another, "I follow Christ."*

1 Corinthians 3:3-4

*You are still worldly. For since there is jealousy and quarreling among you, are you not worldly? Are you not acting like mere men? For when one says, "I follow Paul", and another, "I follow Apollos", are you not mere men?*

2 Corinthians 11:12-15

*And I will keep on doing what I am doing in order to cut the ground from under those who want an opportunity to be considered equal with us in the things they boast about. For such men are false apostles, deceitful workmen, masquerading as apostles of Christ. And no wonder, for Satan himself masquerades as an angel of light. It is not surprising, then, if his servants masquerade as servants of righteousness. Their end will be what their actions deserve.*

Galatians 1:6-7

*I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting the one who called you by the grace of Christ and are turning to a different gospel – which is really no gospel at all. Evidently some people are throwing you into confusion and are trying to pervert the gospel of Christ.*

Galatians 1:20

*I assure you before God that what I am writing you is no lie.*

Galatians 2:4-5

*This matter arose because some false brothers had infiltrated our ranks to spy on the freedom we have in Christ Jesus and to make us slaves. We did not give in to them for a moment, so that the truth of the gospel might remain with you. As for those who seemed to be important – whatever they were makes no difference to me; God does not judge by external appearance – those men added nothing to my message.*

Galatians 2:11-14

*When Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he was clearly in the wrong. Before certain men came from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they arrived, he began to draw back and separate himself from the Gentiles because he was afraid of those who belong to the circumcision group. The other Jews joined him in his hypocrisy, so that by their hypocrisy even Barnabas was led astray. When I saw that they were not acting in line with the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter in front of them all, “You are a Jew, yet you live like a Gentile and not like a Jew. How is it, then, that you force Gentiles to follow Jewish customs?”*

Galatians 4:17

*Those people are zealous to win you over, but for no good. What they want is to alienate you from us, so that you may be zealous for them.*

Galatians 5:12

*As for those agitators, I wish they would go the whole way and emasculate themselves.*

2 Peter 2:1-3

*But there were also false prophets among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you. They will secretly introduce destructive heresies, even denying the sovereign Lord who brought them – bringing swift destruction on themselves. Many will follow their shameful ways and will bring the way of truth into disrepute. In their greed these teachers will exploit you with stories they have made up. Their condemnation has long been hanging over them, and their destruction has not been sleeping.*

2 Peter 2:12

*But these men blaspheme in matters they do not understand. They are like brute beasts, creatures of instinct, born only to be caught and destroyed, and like beasts they too will perish. They will be paid back with harm for the harm they have done.*

2 Peter 2:21

*It would have been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than to have known it and then to turn their back on the sacred command that was passed on to them.*

These verses show incredible division, disagreement, conflict, and anger. This is supposedly the first generation of disciples and they were apparently writing letters to people about division, disagreement, conflict, and anger. That is very different than what a lot of Christians believe, but this information comes straight from the New Testament. The New Testament describes intense scenes among the disciples after the Resurrection. More specifically, the New Testament describes a fierce battle between Peter and Paul, who many believe to be the two biggest giants of early Christianity. These verses go even further than just one encounter and describe general division between Peter and Paul. If these two people who many believe to be the two biggest giants of early Christianity were in such conflict with each other, then we

should be able to imagine an environment in which some incorrect information was recorded on documents. Even aside from the conflict between Peter and Paul, there is plenty from the verses just previously shown that describes different people spreading different information and disagreeing with each other. There's even the claim in Paul's letter to the Galatians that describes "false brothers" infiltrating their ranks and spying on them. Based on this information, we can obviously see that conflict and disagreeing beliefs were spreading, so we can also see how incorrect information could have gotten recorded on documents.

Specific evidence that the division between Peter and Paul led to incorrect information having been recorded on documents can be seen by a comparison of Acts and Paul's letter to the Galatians. The following verses show that Acts and Galatians give very different accounts of Paul's relationship with Peter, James son of Mother Mary, and John. These verses describe what has been called "the council at Jerusalem". This council at Jerusalem was a meeting that took place between Peter, James son of Mother Mary, Paul, Barnabas, and some other people about the issue of circumcision. The conflict was about whether it was acceptable for Paul to teach that Christians don't need to be circumcised. Jewish law states that every Jewish male must be circumcised, so it was a major issue for Peter, James son of Mother Mary, and some other people when Paul started teaching that Christians don't need to be circumcised. As a result, Paul and Barnabas traveled to Jerusalem to meet Peter, James son of Mother Mary, and some other people. The account in Acts describes people accompanying Paul and Barnabas after the council at Jerusalem and delivering a letter, and then goes on to describe an argument between Paul and Barnabas. The account in Galatians describes the lead-up to the council at Jerusalem and the conclusion of the council at Jerusalem, and then goes on to describe an interaction at a later time after Peter had traveled to where Paul was.

Acts 15:22

*Then the apostles and elders, with the whole church, decided to choose some of their own men and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas. They chose Judas (Called Barsabbas) and Silas, two men who were leaders among the brothers.*

Acts 15:29

*You are to abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals, and from sexual immorality. You will do well to avoid these things.*

Acts 15:30-34

*The men were sent off and went down to Antioch, where they gathered the church together and delivered the letter. The people read it and were glad for its encouraging message. Judas and Silas, who themselves were prophets, said much to encourage and strengthen the brothers. After spending some time there, they were sent off by the brothers with the blessing of peace to return to those who had sent them.*

Acts 15:36-40

*Some time later Paul said to Barnabas, "Let us go back and visit the brothers in all the towns where we preached the word of the Lord and see how they are doing." Barnabas wanted to take John, also called Mark, with them, but Paul did not think it was wise to take him, because he had deserted them in Pamphylia and had not continued with them in the work. They had such a sharp disagreement that they parted company. Barnabas took Mark and sailed for Cyprus, but Paul chose Silas and left, commended by the brothers to the grace of the Lord.*

#### Galatians 2:4-14

*This matter arose because some false brothers had infiltrated our ranks to spy on the freedom we have in Christ Jesus and to make us slaves. We did not give in to them for a moment, so that the truth of the gospel might remain with you. As for those who seemed to be important – whatever they were makes no difference to me; God does not judge by external appearance – those men added nothing to my message. On the contrary, they saw that I had been entrusted with the task of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles, just as Peter had been to the Jews. For God, who was in work in the ministry of Peter as an apostle to the Jews, was also at work in my ministry as an apostle to the Gentiles. James, Peter, and John, those reputed to be pillars, gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship when they recognized the grace given to me. They agreed that we should go to the Gentiles, and they to the Jews. All they asked was that we should continue to remember the poor, the very thing I was eager to do.*

*When Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he was clearly in the wrong. Before certain men came from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they arrived, he began to draw back and separate himself from the Gentiles because he was afraid of those who belong to the circumcision group. The other Jews joined him in his hypocrisy, so that by their hypocrisy even Barnabas was led astray. When I saw that they were not acting in line with the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter in front of them all, “You are a Jew, yet you live like a Gentile and not like a Jew. How is it, then, that you force Gentiles to follow Jewish customs?”*

Acts describes that people in Jerusalem demanded that the Gentiles abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals, and from sexual immorality. Galatians describes that those people in Jerusalem only requested that people remember the poor. Acts describes the letter as being received well. Galatians describes Paul becoming upset and “opposing” Peter “to his face”. Acts describes Paul and Barnabas parting ways over a disagreement about Mark. Galatians describes Paul and Barnabas parting ways because Barnabas was led astray by the hypocrisy of Peter and some other Jews.

The contrast between the account in Acts and the account in Galatians gives us a prime example of how different people wrote different information about the same historical event and how those contradictions ended up in the Bible. Whoever first gave that information contained in Acts wanted us to believe something different than the information contained in Paul’s letter to the Galatians. At least one of these sources produced false information and that false information is still in the Bible to this day.

In the first century, many people were illiterate and oral tradition was very common. One possibility for the development of false information is through oral transmission of information. Beyond that, the process of producing documents back then gave way to many opportunities to make mistakes or to otherwise produce false information. Printing presses didn’t exist back then. All documents were handwritten. After the original production of a document, a scribe would then copy that document by hand. Mistakes happened a lot. We can see from the archeological evidence that has been recovered that there are many variations between different manuscripts. A lot of these are small and don’t appear to be major, probably just mistakes. Mistakes happen often. On the other hand, there are observations one can make that point out what looks to be false information that was produced with the specific intention of deceiving people. The contrast between Acts and Galatians that was just previously presented provides an example of what appears to be false information that was produced with the specific intention of deceiving people. Again, whoever first gave that information contained in Acts wanted us to believe something different than the information contained in Paul’s letter to the Galatians. They wanted us to

believe that everything was sorted out and that there wasn't a conflict. Meanwhile, Paul apparently opposed Peter to his face and referred to Peter and Barnabas as hypocrites. Whoever first gave that information contained in Acts seems to have not wanted us to know about that, and they even specifically contradicted that account. They even provided an entirely different reason for why Paul and Barnabas parted ways. The reason given in Galatians, that Barnabas joined Peter and other Jews in their hypocrisy, would have obviously been very damaging to Peter and the "orthodox church", which shows the obvious motivation for coming up with a completely different account that contradicts Galatians and makes no mention of this intense altercation between Peter and Paul. The comparison of Acts and Galatians in these ways shows specific evidence in the Bible that someone intentionally produced false information to deceive people. That person may not have been the first person to write down that account. The account may have been verbally communicated incorrectly before it was ever written down. Regardless, the comparison of Acts and Galatians shows specific evidence in the Bible that someone intentionally produced false information to deceive people and that such information is still in the Bible to this day.

Even if someone wanted to argue that the author of the verses in Acts simply didn't know that there was such a conflict between Peter and Paul, the verses specifically about Paul and Barnabas parting ways shows intent to be dishonest. There being two completely different and contradicting explanations for why Paul and Barnabas parted ways shows that one of those explanations is not based on the reality of what actually happened, which shows that someone made a decision within their own mind to provide a different explanation that diverges from the truth of what actually happened and that shows evidence that someone was intentionally dishonest. Maybe the author of those verses wasn't the person who was intentionally dishonest and maybe they were just recording the information that they had, but someone along the line was dishonest and that dishonest information ended up in the Bible. What shows that the account in Acts is the dishonest account is the apparent motivation for coming up with such an account. There doesn't seem to be much reason for Paul to have falsely made up this elaborate and explosive account in his letter to the Galatians, but there would have been plenty of motivation to cover that story up and produce an entirely different explanation that avoids any mentioning of a conflict between Peter and Paul because Paul's account is very damaging to the legacy of Peter and the "orthodox church". Therefore, we can easily conclude that the account in Acts is not only false but was also specifically produced with the intention of deceiving people.

So far, evidence has been shown that there was division and disagreement between different groups of Christians, even between Peter and Paul and to a great extent with them, and that there is writing in the Bible that was produced with the specific intent to deceive people. In the midst of all of this division and disagreement, a hierarchy of bishops and deacons was implemented to try to stabilize Christian communities. 1 Timothy provides evidence of the establishment of this hierarchy and expresses expectations for bishops, deacons, and their wives (a reference to an "overseer" is a reference to a bishop).

1 Timothy 3:1-15

*Here is a trustworthy saying: If anyone sets his heart on being an overseer, he desires a noble task. Now the overseer must be above reproach, the husband of but one wife, temperate, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, able to teach, not given to drunkenness, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money. He must manage his own family well and see that his children obey him with proper respect. If anyone does not know how to manage his own family, how can he take care of God's church? He must*

*not be a recent convert, or he may become conceited and fall under the same judgment as the devil. He must also have a good reputation with outsiders, so that he will not fall into disgrace and into the devil's trap.*

*Deacons, likewise, are to be men worthy of respect, sincere, not indulging in much wine, and not pursuing dishonest gain. They must keep hold of the deep truths of the faith with a clear conscience. They must be first tested; and then if there is nothing against them, let them serve as deacons.*

*In the same way, their wives are to be women worthy of respect, not malicious talkers but temperate and trustworthy in everything.*

*A deacon must be the husband of but one wife and must manage his children and his household well. Those who have served well gain an excellent standing and great assurance in their faith in Christ Jesus. Although I hope to come to you soon, I am writing you these instructions so that, if I am delayed, you will know how people ought to conduct themselves in God's household, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and foundation of the truth.*

In the first few centuries, the position of pope wasn't really firmly established yet and bishops were the main leaders of the "orthodox church" while deacons were assistants to bishops. Even some of the people who were later considered to have been popes were really simply bishops of Rome.

Moving further with examining 1 Timothy, we can see that this letter not only expresses expectations for bishops, deacons, and their wives, but also expresses opinions on women in general as shown by the following verses. It will be questioned later as to whether Paul actually wrote this letter. Regardless of who the author is, the letter provides clear evidence of the dynamics that existed back in the first few centuries.

1 Timothy 2:9-15

*I also want women to dress modestly, with decency and propriety, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes, but with good deeds appropriate for women who profess to worship God.*

*A woman should learn in quietness and in full submission. I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent. For Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner. But women will be saved through childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness with propriety.*

So not only was a hierarchy established, but that hierarchy specifically carried on with treating women as inferior to men. These verses go as far as to instruct how women should dress, demand that they be silent and in full submission, claim that a woman was the first sinner, and claim that women will be saved through childbearing alone as if a woman couldn't be saved otherwise.

Not only were women treated as inferior, but 1 Timothy also condones slavery and advises slaves to submit to their masters.

1 Timothy 6:1

*All who are under the yoke of slavery should consider their masters worthy of full respect, so that God's name and our teaching may not be slandered.*

1 Timothy also gives instructions for widows and which widows deserve to be helped.

1 Timothy 4:9-10

*No widow may be put on the list of widows unless she is over sixty, has been faithful to her husband, and is well known for her good deeds, such as bringing up children, showing hospitality, washing the feet of the saints, helping those in trouble, and devoting herself to all kinds of good deeds.*

1 Timothy 4:11-14

*As for younger widows, do not put them on such a list. For when their sensual desires overcome their dedication to Christ, they want to marry. Thus they bring judgment on themselves, because they have broken their first pledge. Besides, they get into the habit of being idle and going about from house to house. And not only do they become idlers, but also gossips and busybodies, saying things they ought not to. So I counsel younger widows to marry, to have children, to manage their homes, and to give the enemy no opportunity for slander.*

So far, 1 Timothy has shown clear evidence of a hierarchy of bishops and deacons; instructions for bishops, deacons, and their wives; instructions on how women should dress; demands that women be silent and in full submission; condonement of slavery and instructions for slaves to obey their master; and instructions on how widows should behave and which widows deserve to be helped.

Some other verses that were previously presented in the introduction should now be reexamined to show the consistency of certain ideas.

1 Corinthians 14:34-35

*Women should remain silent in the churches. They are not allowed to speak, but must be in submission, as the Law says. If they want to inquire about something, they should ask their own husbands at home; for it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in the church.*

Ephesians 6:5

*Slaves, obey your earthly masters with respect and fear, and with sincerity of heart, just as you would obey Christ.*

1 Peter 2:18

*Slaves, submit yourselves to your masters with all respect, not only to those who are good and considerate but also to those who are harsh.*

1 Peter 3:5-7

*For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to make themselves beautiful. They were submissive to their husbands, like Sarah, who obeyed Abraham and called him her master. You are her daughters if you do what is right and do not give way to fear.*

*Husbands, in the same way be considerate as you live with your wives, and treat them with respect as the weaker partner and as heirs with you of the gracious gift of life, so that nothing will hinder your prayers.*

These verses show that there is plenty more writing about women not being allowed to speak, women being submissive, condonement of slavery, and instructions to slaves to obey their masters. All of these verses are proposed to have been written by Peter or Paul. It's not necessarily the case that they wrote these verses. There were letters that were written back in the first few centuries in the name of Peter or Paul that weren't actually written by them. Also, scribes have added writing to previously existing letters. So any given letter wasn't necessarily written by the author that it claims to have been written by; but even if a letter was originally written by Peter or Paul, it could also be the case that someone else added to



it. We will go into more detail on that later. For now, regardless of who wrote what, the main point is that there is plenty of writing that presents very serious concerns about the dynamics of certain leadership within the Christian population during the first few centuries.

In addition to all of that, the following verses from 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy show that bishops and deacons claimed to hold spiritual power.

1 Timothy 4:14

*Do not neglect your gift, which was given you through a prophetic message when the body of elders laid their hands on you.*

1 Timothy 5:22

*Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands, and do not share in the sins of others.*

2 Timothy 1:6

*For this reason I remind you to fan into flame the gift of God, which is in you through the laying on of my hands.*

These verses claim that people were given special spiritual gifts by having hands laid on them. The laying on of hands was thought to give someone the Spirit and/or give them special status. 2 Timothy 1:6 specifically claims that someone gave “the gift of God” to someone else by laying their hands on them. This tradition was started very early on according to the following verses from Acts.

Acts 8:14-17

*When the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had accepted the word of God, they sent Peter and John to them. When they arrived, they prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit, because the Holy Spirit had not yet come upon any of them; they had simply been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. Then Peter and John placed their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit.*

These verses show that the tradition of laying on of hands to supposedly give the Spirit to others began to be practiced very early on; and the verses from 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy show that the hierarchy of bishops and deacons continued this tradition. These verses from Acts specifically claim that Samaritans didn't receive the Spirit until hands were laid on them. This tradition supposedly gave bishops the power to claim who received the Spirit.

All of this shows that there was a hierarchy of bishops and deacons; that at least some of those bishops claimed that they had the power to give other people the Spirit and claimed that people couldn't receive the Spirit unless hands were laid on them by certain people; that there were instructions for how bishops, deacons, and their wives should conduct their lives; that there were instructions on how women should dress; that there were demands that women be silent and in full submission; that slavery was condoned; that there were instructions for slaves to obey their master; and that there were instructions on how widows should behave and which widows deserve to be helped.

One could argue that this information is taken from limited writing and that maybe most bishops were really in line with Christianity. However, this information is taken straight from the Bible and so realistically represents a lot of what was happening in the first few centuries. In addition to that, we will now examine letters from bishops that are not included in the Bible.

The following verses are from a letter that has been proposed to have been written by Clement of Rome in the first century. Clement was a bishop Rome towards the end of the first century. There is a good possibility that this letter was not written by Clement, but it states at the beginning “The church of God which sojourns at Rome, to the church of God sojourning at Corinth”, which shows that it was written by someone in Rome, likely a bishop of Rome or something like that, and it is addressed to Christians in Corinth.

*But we see that you have removed some men of excellent behaviour from the ministry, which they fulfilled blamelessly and with honour.*

*But that inclination for one above another entailed less guilt upon you, inasmuch as your partialities were then shown towards apostles, already of high reputation, and towards a man whom they had approved. But now reflect who those are that have perverted you, and lessened the renown of your far-famed brotherly love. It is disgraceful, beloved, yea, highly disgraceful, and unworthy of your Christian profession, that such a thing should be heard of as that the most steadfast and ancient church of the Corinthians should, on account of one or two persons, engage in sedition against its presbyters. And this rumour has reached not only us, but those also who are unconnected with us; so that, through your infatuation, the name of the Lord is blasphemed, while danger is also brought upon yourselves.*

*You therefore, who laid the foundation of this sedition, submit yourselves to the presbyters, and receive correction so as to repent, bending the knees of your hearts. Learn to be subject, laying aside the proud and arrogant self-confidence of your tongue.*

This letter addresses the removal of “some men” “from the ministry” in Corinth. Apparently, some bishops and/or deacons of Corinth were removed from their positions as decided by the Christian community in Corinth, and someone in Rome wrote to them to try to change their minds. In doing so, they accused the Christian community in Corinth of wrongdoing, accused them specifically of sedition, demanded that they submit themselves and be subject, and even claimed that danger had been brought upon them. All of that just to try to put certain people back in charge of other people. Christianity is about knowing and practicing Christian teachings. Either people know and practice Christian teachings or they don’t, but there doesn’t need to be certain people who are in charge of other people. If anyone wants an exalted status in relation to Christianity, then they simply need to know and practice Christian teachings. Nobody should be trying to force anyone to be supervised who doesn’t want to be and then claiming that it’s all in support of Christianity and that any opposition is against Christianity, which is what this letter is ultimately doing.

Not only that, but this letter also insults, discriminates against, blames wrongdoing on a group of women while describing them having been tortured and murdered.

*Through envy, those women, the Danaids and Dircaë, being persecuted, after they had suffered terrible and unspeakable torments, finished the course of their faith with steadfastness, and though weak in body, received a noble reward. Envy has alienated wives from their husbands, and changed that saying of our father Adam, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. Envy and strife have overthrown great cities, and rooted up mighty nations.*

The first sentence of that text refers to a group of women who were tortured and murdered. The second sentence of that text shows that there was separation between “husbands” and “wives”, that the letter is opposed to that, and that the letter blamed that separation on envy. Since that separation is described immediately after describing the torture and murder of a group of women, that separation seems to be in connection with those women. Furthermore, the references to “the Danaids” and “Dirce” are references to Greek mythology. The myth about the Danaids describes them as a group of women who murdered their husbands and were condemned to carry water for eternity. The myth about Dirce describes her as ordering another woman to be murdered and then describes her being murdered by her two sons by being tied to the horns of a bull. Long story short, it was obviously insulting to refer to someone as a “Danaid” or as “Dirce”. So this author from Rome not only tried to control the Christian community in Corinth by accusing them of sedition, demanding that they submit themselves and be subject, and even claiming that danger was brought upon them, but this author also insulted, discriminated against, and blamed wrongdoing on a group of women while describing them having been tortured and murdered. All of this from someone who claimed to represent the Church of God in Rome, which makes them appear to have been a bishop or something like that in Rome.

We can continue to see disturbing claims as we move on to letters written by Ignatius of Antioch, a bishop of Antioch in the first and/or second centuries who is also considered one of only three “apostolic fathers” along with Clement of Rome and Polycarp, Christian theologians in the first and second centuries who are believed to have personally known some of “the Twelve” or to have been significantly influenced by them. Pay attention to how he exalts the status of the bishop and asserts that the bishop should be in control of the people. He even goes as far as to assert that the bishop should be looked upon as people would look upon God and should be revered as Christ. He referred to himself and other bishops as divine beings who should have complete control of the people.

The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians:

*being subject to the bishop and the presbytery, you may in all respects be sanctified*

*Wherefore it is fitting that you should run together in accordance with the will of your bishop, which thing also you do. For your justly renowned presbytery, worthy of God, is fitted as exactly to the bishop as the strings are to the harp.*

*Let us be careful, then, not to set ourselves in opposition to the bishop, in order that we may be subject to God.*

*It is manifest, therefore, that we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord Himself.*

The Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians:

*Since, then, I have had the privilege of seeing you, through Damas your most worthy bishop, and through your worthy presbyters Bassus and Apollonius, and through my fellow-servant the deacon Sotio, whose friendship may I ever enjoy, inasmuch as he is subject to the bishop as to the grace of God, and to the presbytery as to the law of Jesus Christ.*

*while your bishop presides in the place of God, and your presbyters in the place of the assembly of the apostles*

*As therefore the Lord did nothing without the Father, being united to Him, neither by Himself nor by the apostles, so neither do anything without the bishop and presbyters.*

*with your most admirable bishop, and the well-compacted spiritual crown of your presbytery, and the deacons who are according to God. Be subject to the bishop, and to one another, as Jesus Christ to the Father, according to the flesh, and the apostles to Christ, and to the Father, and to the Spirit; that so there may be a union both fleshly and spiritual.*

The Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallesians:

*In like manner, let all reverence the deacons as an appointment of Jesus Christ, and the bishop as Jesus Christ, who is the Son of the Father, and the presbyters as the sanhedrim of God, and assembly of the apostles. Apart from these, there is no Church.*

The Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrnans:

*See that you all follow the bishop, even as Jesus Christ does the Father, and the presbytery as you would the apostles; and reverence the deacons, as being the institution of God. Let no man do anything connected with the Church without the bishop.*

*It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or to celebrate a love-feast; but whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also pleasing to God, so that everything that is done may be secure and valid.*

*It is well to reverence both God and the bishop. He who honours the bishop has been honoured by God; he who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, does [in reality] serve the devil.*

Ignatius refers to the people as “subject to the bishop”, refers to presbyters as “worthy of God”, claims that people should look upon a bishop as they would look upon God, claims that the “bishop presides in the place of God” and “presbyters in the place of the assembly of the apostles”, claims that people shouldn’t “do anything without the bishop and presbyters”, claims that people should reverence the bishop as Christ, claims that there is no church apart from the bishop, claims that people are honored by God if they honor the bishop, and claims that anyone who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop serves the devil. Ignatius claimed that bishops have a similar status as that of God and claimed that the people are subject to the bishop. Ignatius described bishops as if they are like God and are in control of the people, and he is considered one of only three “apostolic fathers”.

The following is writing from Tertullian, a bishop of Carthage in the second and/or third centuries who has also been called “the father of Latin Christianity” and “the founder of Western theology”.

*If there dwelt upon earth a faith as great as is the reward of faith which is expected in the heavens, no one of you at all, best beloved sisters, from the time that she had first known the Lord, and learned (the truth) concerning her own (that is, woman's) condition, would have desired too gladsome (not to say too ostentatious) a style of dress; so as not rather to go about in humble garb, and rather to affect meanness of appearance, walking about as Eve mourning and repentant, in order that by every garb of penitence she might the more fully expiate that which she derives from Eve, — the ignominy, I mean, of the first sin, and the odium (attaching to her as the cause) of human perdition. In pains and in anxieties do you bear (children), woman; and toward your husband (is) your inclination, and he lords it over you. And do you*

*not know that you are (each) an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age: the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the devil's gateway: you are the unsealer of that (forbidden) tree: you are the first deserter of the divine law: you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God's image, man. On account of your desert — that is, death — even the Son of God had to die.*

This writing criticizes women for how they dress, claims that every woman has derived “ignominy” (public shame) from Eve and has “the odium” (hatred or disgust) of “human perdition” (eternal punishment), labels every woman as “an Eve”, claims that “the sentence of God” on the entire female race “lives in this age” and “the guilt must of necessity live too”, claims that women are “the devil’s gateway”, claims that every woman is “the first deserter of the divine law”, claims that every woman “destroyed so easily God’s image, man”, and even blames the Crucifixion of Christ on the entire female race. All of this from someone who is renowned as a bishop and leader of the “orthodox church” and who has been called “the father of Latin Christianity” and “the founder of Western theology”.

Just within the Bible, evidence has been shown that there was division and disagreement between different groups of Christians going all the way back to Peter and Paul; that there is writing in the Bible that was produced with the specific intent to deceive people; that there was a hierarchy of bishops and deacons; that at least some of those bishops claimed that they had the power to give other people the Spirit and claimed that people couldn’t receive the Spirit unless hands were laid on them by certain people; that there were instructions for how bishops, deacons, and their wives should conduct their lives; that there were instructions on how women should dress; that there were demands that women be silent and in full submission; that slavery was condoned; that there were instructions for slaves to obey their master; and that there were instructions on how widows should behave and which widows deserve to be helped. Outside of the Bible, evidence has been shown that a bishop of Rome in the first century tried to force a Christian community to be overseen by unwanted appointed leadership by accusing that community of sedition, demanding that they submit themselves and be subject, and even claiming that danger had been brought upon them; that the same bishop insulted, discriminated against, and blamed wrongdoing on a group of women while describing them having been tortured and murdered; that a bishop from the first and/or second centuries who is considered one of only three “apostolic fathers” demanded full control of the people and claimed to be like God; and that a bishop from the second and/or third centuries who is considered “the father of Latin Christianity” and “the founder of Western theology” claimed that all women are “the devil’s gateway” and blamed the entire female race for destroying “God’s image” and for the Crucifixion of Christ.

This hierarchy of bishops claimed to represent the “orthodox church” and continued to grow throughout the second and third centuries and so on. In the fourth century, the Roman emperor Constantine declared tolerance for Christianity and then a massive amount of power entered the scene, although the bishops already had power even before that with the control that they asserted over Christians. The Christian population was very large by that time, which, as we will go into more detail on shortly, is probably the main reason why tolerance was declared for Christianity. With such a large Christian population and the level of control that bishops asserted over Christians, bishops already had power even before tolerance was declared for Christianity.

Constantine oversaw the Council of Nicaea in 325, which included hundreds of bishops from around the Roman Empire. Within just a few hundred years of the Resurrection, there were already at least a few hundred bishops and maybe many more. This political structure had grown so large and it was likely in part what attracted the Roman emperor to Christianity. Later in the fourth century, Roman emperor Theodosius I adopted Christianity as the state religion of the Roman Empire.

Many believe that Constantine had a vision from God and that's why he tried joining forces with Christianity. However, there are four points to make in opposition to that belief. First and foremost, the legalization of Christianity by the Roman emperor is a clear indication that Christianity was incredibly widespread throughout the Roman Empire. Christianity was in direct opposition to the Roman Empire because the Roman Empire required people to make blood sacrifices to pagan "gods" and the Roman emperor was often portrayed as divine. There is plenty of writing in the New Testament about refraining from sacrificing to idols. Turning to Christianity meant turning away from societal norms in the Roman Empire and Roman emperors had people executed for that. Given that Christianity opposed the Roman Empire and seems to have been very popular throughout the Roman Empire, the legalization of Christianity was probably just a political move. The Roman Empire continued to carry on with pagan traditions so it seems quite unrealistic to believe that Constantine favored Christianity. Instead, he probably just used Christianity for political purposes. If a significant percentage of the upper class were Christians, then the legalization of Christianity would have allowed for the easing of tensions throughout the population and an opportunity to regulate. The second point is that Christianity presented an opportunity to Constantine to gain more control over the population by controlling the hierarchy of bishops. The third is that there is evidence that Constantine did not give any input into the decisions made during the Council of Nicaea, which if true, would show that Constantine was probably not a real Christian at that time and was just using Christianity for political purposes. The fourth is that there is evidence showing that Constantine was probably not baptized until shortly before he died, which if true, is further evidence that he was probably not a real Christian during most of his reign and was just using Christianity for political purposes. That's not to say that a person must be baptized to be a Christian. It's to say that Constantine having been baptized shortly before his death shows a long delay in getting baptized; and if he felt that that he was supposed to get baptized, then his delay in doing so shows evidence that he was not a real Christian for most of his reign.

The Council of Nicaea technically oversaw the compilation of the New Testament, but the four Gospels that are in the New Testament today seem to have been fairly established as the four Gospels well before the Council of Nicaea. It was likely by the end of the second century that a biblical canon was produced that included the four Gospels. So the four Gospels likely were each originally produced in the first century, and then by the end of the second century, were all fairly established by the "orthodox church". The biblical canon that the "orthodox church" seems to have put together in the second century is likely what eventually grew into the New Testament as officially mandated by the Roman Empire.

The second and third centuries have been characterized by a battle between the "orthodox church" and so-called "heretics". Christianity spread throughout the Roman Empire and there were a lot of different beliefs flying around. We already saw some of the division that existed in the first century. As time goes on, division grows further. The second and third centuries seem to have been even more far gone than the first century. This division seems to have grown, and meanwhile, there was that hierarchy of bishops who seem to have considered themselves to be the "orthodox church", called other people "heretics", and tried

to control the people, while at least one of those bishops claimed that bishops were like God. It seems that it was during all of this that the four Gospels were compiled together, representing contradicting information and describing Christ differently from each other. The division and confusion of the first few centuries gave way to two different religions being compiled together into one book. But it wasn't just differences in the Gospels that went wrong in the first few centuries.

## **Something Hidden**

There have been some important discoveries of the writings of Origen, a Christian scholar who lived in the second and third centuries and who is also known as a "Church Father". In the third century, Origen wrote "Contra Celsum", which has been described as the most influential work of early Christian apologetics. "Contra Celsum" was a defense of Christianity and a response to anti-Christian writings from Celsus, an anti-Christian philosopher. The writings of Celsus have not been recovered but "Contra Celsum" has been recovered and it contains information about Celsus and his writings. "Contra Celsum" consists of eight books. Book V Chapter 62 contains the following text.

*He next pours down upon us a heap of names, saying that he knows of the existence of certain Simonians who worship Helene, or Helenus, as their teacher, and are called Helenians.*

*Celsus knows, moreover, certain Marcellians, so called from Marcellina, and Harpocrations from Salome, and others who derive their name from Mariamme, and others again from Martha.*

*We, however, who from a love of learning examine to the utmost of our ability not only the contents of Scripture, and the differences to which they give rise, but have also, from love to the truth, investigated as far as we could the opinions of philosophers, have never at any time met with these sects.*

In the first part, Origen is describing Celsus making accusations about Christians. The second part describes different sects of Christianity, all of which he connects to names of women. Those whose names are associated with these sects are Marcellina, Salome, Mariamme, and Martha. The name "Martha" is mentioned in John and Luke as Martha of Bethany. "Mariamme" can be interpreted as equivalent to "Mariam" and "Mary", and some think that this mention of Mariamme refers to Mary Magdalene, and it is also possible that it refers to Mary of Bethany, Martha's sister. Another familiar mention is of a woman named "Salome", which is a name that appears in the Gospel of Mark.

John 11:1

*Now a man named Lazarus was sick. He was from Bethany, the village of Mary and her sister Martha.*

John 11:5

*Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus.*

Mark 15:40-41

*Some women were watching from a distance. Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome. In Galilee these women had followed him and cared for his needs. Many other women who had come up with him to Jerusalem were also there.*

Mark 16:1

*When the Sabbath was over, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices so that they might go to anoint Jesus' body.*

So it seems that there were sects of Christianity existing into at least the second century that were formed in connection with women named Marcellina, Salome, Mariamme, and/or Martha. Some of these women may be women who are mentioned in the Gospels. We don't know whether that's the case or not, but we can certainly see that as a possibility. Regardless of whether that's the case, there seems to have been women in the first few centuries who were Christian leaders. Furthermore, Origen describes these sects as if they were heretical. Most likely, either they were heretical or the "orthodox church" was heretical and discriminated against female leadership. This information sets a foundation for a story that is very different than any we find in the New Testament or the most popular traditions.

The following text is from Book II Chapter 59.

*And discrediting the narrative of Mary Magdalene, who is related to have seen Him, he replies, "A half-frantic woman as you state." And because she is not the only one who is recorded to have seen the Saviour after His resurrection, but others also are mentioned, this Jew of Celsus culminates these statements also in adding, "And some one else of those engaged in the same system of deception!"*

In this text, Origen singles out Mary Magdalene just as Celsus seems to have done. Celsus' writing has been dated to the second century and Origen's writing has been dated to the third century. So the likely scenario is that an anti-Christian singled out Mary Magdalene in the second century, and in response to that, a Christian apologetic singled out Mary Magdalene in the third century. There are two points that are very striking about that. The first is obviously that Mary Magdalene is specifically named. The second is that Mary Magdalene is referred to separately from and before everyone else who Celsus apparently referred to as "engaged in the same system of deception". It is recognized that other people were involved, but all other people thought to have been involved are grouped together and referred to separately from Mary Magdalene, who is referred to first. In Origen's response, he then only specifically named Mary Magdalene. So not only is Mary Magdalene specifically named, but also, she is the only person named, she is referred to separately from everyone else, she is referred to first before everyone else, and all other people thought to have been involved are grouped together in one general description.

Celsus apparently referred to Mary Magdalene as a "half-frantic woman", which is likely a reference to John 20:10-15. Those verses are the only ones in the New Testament that describe Mary Magdalene as crying. If Celsus was reading off of the Gospel of John, then that would explain why he apparently singled out Mary Magdalene because the Gospel of John is the only Gospel that singles out Mary Magdalene similar to how Celsus apparently did. Therefore, Mary Magdalene being singled out in Origen's writing is further evidence that Celsus was probably reading off of the Gospel of John. The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that singles out Mary Magdalene the way that it does, and the Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes Mary Magdalene as crying. So Celsus, an anti-Christian in the second century, was likely using the Gospel of John for his research and analysis against Christianity. That is evidence that the Gospel of John was a popular Gospel in the second century, and that there is a good possibility that the Gospel of John was the most popular Gospel at that time considering Celsus was an anti-Christian and he likely would have used the most commonly used Gospel in his area. So the probable scenario is that an anti-Christian in the second century took what he thought was authoritative text of the Christian religion, which seems to have probably been the Gospel of John, and then decided to



single out Mary Magdalene in his own writing similar to how the Gospel of John does, and then Origen singled out Mary Magdalene in his writing in the third century in response to that.

According to Origen's writing, it appears that Celsus was using the Gospel of John, which would indicate that the Gospel of John was probably a commonly used Gospel and maybe even the most commonly used Gospel. There are two important points to make about the Gospel of John. The first is that the Resurrection narratives in the Gospel of John single out Mary Magdalene in ways that none of the Synoptic Gospels do. The second point is that there are several instances of a mysteriously unnamed disciple in the Gospel of John, which we don't see in the same way in any of the Synoptic Gospels. But the Gospel of John is not the only place in which people go so mysteriously unnamed in the New Testament.

The second letter attributed to the name "John" contains another mention of a mysteriously unnamed person. This time, the person is described as "the elder" and as a "chosen sister".

2 John 1

*The elder,*

*To the chosen lady and her children, whom I love in the truth – and not I only, but also all who know the truth – because of the truth, which lives in us and will be with us forever*

2 John 13

*The children of your chosen sister send their greetings.*

The second and third letters attributed to the name "John" are the only two letters in the New Testament that refer to the supposed author and conceal their name. In the second letter, the author was apparently important enough to have been described as "the elder" and as a "chosen sister", but their identity has been concealed. Additionally, since the author seems to have been a woman given the ending refers to a "chosen sister", the letter does not appear to have been written by anyone named "John". The naming of the letter as "John" shows further effort to conceal someone's identity, more specifically a woman's identity.

We should now turn to Paul's second letter to the Corinthians for another example of a mysteriously unnamed person. Verse 17 describes the plan for Titus to go to Corinth. Verses 18 and 19 refer to a person who was planning to go to Corinth with Titus.

2 Corinthians 8:17

*For Titus not only welcomed our appeal, but he is coming to you with much enthusiasm and on his own initiative.*

2 Corinthians 8:18-19

*And we are sending along with him the brother who is praised by all the churches for his service to the gospel. What is more, he was chosen by the churches to accompany us as we carry the offering, which we administer in order to honor the Lord himself to show our eagerness to help.*

As we look at 2 Corinthians 8:18-19, let's compare those words to some of the Greek text found in Papyrus 46, a recovered ancient Greek New Testament manuscript that has been dated to the first quarter

of the third century. The part of Papyrus 46 that has been identified as a representation of 2 Corinthians 8:18-19 contains the following text.

συνεπεμψαμεν (“synepempsamen”) δε (“de”) μετ (“met”) αυτου (“autou”) τον (“ton”) αδελφον (“adelphon”) ου (“hou”) ο (“ho”) επαινος (“epainos”) εν (“en”) τω (“to”) ευαγγελιω (“euangelio”) δια (“dia”) πασων (“pason”) των (“ton”) εκκλησιων (“ekklesion”) συνεκδημος (“synekdemos”) ημων (“hemon”) συν (“syn”) τη (“te”) χαριτι (“chariti”) ταυτη (“taute”) διακονουμενη (“diakonoumene”) υφ (“hyph”) ημων (“hemon”)

That Greek text can be translated as follows.

“We have sent now with him the brother whose praise in the gospel through all of the churches; fellow traveler of us, with grace this being administered by us.”

That translation seems to describe a disciple who received praise in the gospel through all of the churches. The modern version of 2 Corinthians 8:18-19 describes a disciple as “the brother who is praised by all the churches for his service to the gospel”. The English translation of the Greek text from Papyrus 46 describes a disciple as “the brother whose praise in the gospel through all of the churches”. The modern version describes a disciple as having received praise by all of the churches for service to the gospel and the version in Papyrus 46 describes a disciple as having received praise in the gospel through all of the churches. There is a fundamental difference between these two versions about where the praise comes from and what the praise is for. The modern version describes praise as coming from the churches and that the praise was for service to the gospel. Papyrus 46 describes praise as being possessed within the gospel through all of the churches. One describes praise by churches for service to the gospel while the other describes praise in the gospel through all of the churches. There is a big difference between receiving praise by churches for service to the gospel and receiving praise in the gospel through all of the churches. It seems that a much larger claim is being made in Papyrus 46 than in the modern version of the New Testament. Papyrus 46 is claiming that someone was receiving praise in the gospel through all of the churches. Who is this disciple who received praise in the gospel through all of the churches and why do they go unnamed?

Whoever it is, that person must have been a very important leader of Christianity. Furthermore, this person is mysteriously unnamed and is simply referred to as a “brother”. It seems very strange that there be anyone unnamed in these verses in 2 Corinthians, especially a disciple who was praised in the gospel through all of the churches. Why would someone be simply referred to as a “brother” when identifying them? Describing someone as a “brother” isn’t very effective in identifying who they are, yet Paul seems to have felt the need to identify them. So why aren’t they named then? Paul named Titus, but this person goes mysteriously unnamed. Who is this person and why are they unnamed? We’ve already acknowledged the presence of an unnamed disciple in the Gospel of John as well as an unnamed author in the second letter attributed to the name “John”. We appear to be dealing with a similar situation here in 2 Corinthians.

There are three points to make here. The first is that both Papyrus 46 and the modern version of the New Testament seem to describe a disciple who was important enough to receive praise through all of the churches. The second is that a greater claim seems to be made in Papyrus 46 than in the modern version of the New Testament. The third is that this person goes unnamed in both Papyrus 46 and the modern

version of the New Testament. Regarding the first and second points, regardless of whether the interpretation about the praise should be “in the gospel” or “service to the gospel”, this person nevertheless was apparently receiving praise through all of the churches. So even if Papyrus 46 is making an equivalent claim as the modern version, both versions claim that this person received praise through all of the churches. Either this person was so important that they didn’t need to be named or this person’s name was fraudulently concealed when the letter was copied. Considering Titus is named right before that and then there’s a mysterious absence of a name for someone Paul was trying to identify, it is justified to believe that this person’s name was probably included in the original version of the letter and was then fraudulently concealed later on in a copy of that letter. Again, it seems strange to identify someone without using their name and by simply describing them as a “brother”. That is reason enough to believe that this person’s name was included in the original version of the letter. So whoever is being described in 2 Corinthians 8:18-19, they were probably a very important leader of Christianity and there was probably someone else who wanted to conceal their identity in 2 Corinthians 8:18-19. Furthermore, since the earlier version found in Papyrus 46 doesn’t provide a name for this person, there seems to have been motivation to conceal their name that began within the first few centuries. In addition to that, the contrast between Papyrus 46 and the modern version of the New Testament indicates that there also seems to have been motivation later on to further suppress information about them to portray them as less important than they were previously described as being. So who is this disciple who received praise in the gospel through all of the churches, who goes unnamed in Paul’s second letter to the Corinthians, and who was later described with a lesser degree of importance than they were previously described with?

Further evidence of suspicious material can be found when verse 19 is examined more closely. Verse 19 in the modern version states, “What is more, he was chosen by the churches to accompany us as we carry the offering, which we administer in order to honor the Lord himself to show our eagerness to help.” The English translation of Papyrus 46 states, “fellow traveler of us, with grace this being administered by us”. Both versions refer to administration being done, but Papyrus 46 doesn’t make any mention of this person having been chosen by the churches. Avoiding describing someone as having been chosen by God and instead describing them as having been chosen by the churches would likely be motivated by a desire to portray them with a lesser degree of importance. So who is this disciple who received praise in the gospel through all of the churches, who goes unnamed in Paul’s second letter to the Corinthians, who was later described with a lesser degree of importance than they were previously described with, and who was later described as having been chosen by the churches after previously not having been described that way?

2 Corinthians 8:22 describes another unnamed person who was going to be accompanying Titus and the previously mentioned unnamed person. Then verse 23 shows all three people, Titus and the two unnamed people, being mentioned together in one sentence.

2 Corinthians 8:22

*In addition, we are sending with them our brother who has often proved to us in many ways that he is zealous, and now even more so because of his great confidence in you.*

2 Corinthians 8:23

*As for Titus, he is my partner and fellow worker among you; as for our brothers, they are representatives of the churches and an honor to Christ.*

Verse 23 mentions Titus separately from the “brothers”. Titus was presumably a man. Men are called “brothers”. Why is there the mentioning of “brothers” that specifically excludes Titus? If the use of the word “brothers” refers to a general mentioning of a group of men, then why is Titus mentioned separately? Since Titus is specifically named, why aren’t the other two people named and why are they mentioned in a general way as a group of men separately from Titus who was presumably a man? The only realistic scenario that would produce that result is one in which both unnamed people were women, and that is probably why those people went unnamed and why they are mentioned separately from Titus even though they are referred to as “brothers” and Titus was presumably a man. Even if they weren’t women, it seems obvious that someone wanted these people’s identities concealed. There doesn’t seem to be any other obvious motivation for these people to go unnamed, and it is mysterious and suspicious that they are not named.

So there were sects of Christianity existing at least into the second century that were formed by women; those sects of Christianity that were formed by women were thought of as heretical by the “orthodox church”; Mary Magdalene was mentioned separately by an anti-Christian in the second century and by a so-called “Church Father” in the third century; the Gospel of John gives more attention to Mary Magdalene in the Resurrection narratives than any of the Synoptic Gospels do; there are several instances of a disciple going unnamed in the Gospel of John; a person described as “the elder” and as a “chosen sister” goes unnamed in the second letter attributed to the name “John”; and there seems to be a person who apparently received praise in the gospel through all of the churches whose identity seems to have been concealed in 2 Corinthians, and there also seems to have been further efforts later on to downplay their importance and describe them as having been chosen by “the churches”. Meanwhile, there was that hierarchy of bishops who considered themselves to be the “orthodox church”, called other people “heretics”, and tried to control the people, while at least one of those bishops claimed that bishops were like God.

A disciple goes unnamed in the Gospel of John. A person described as “the elder” and as a “chosen sister” goes unnamed in the second letter attributed to the name “John”. Someone who apparently received praise in the gospel through all of the churches goes unnamed in Paul’s second letter to the Corinthians. It seems obvious that information was changed. A comparison of Papyrus 46 and the modern version of the New Testament shows that information actually was changed. Furthermore, the Synoptic Gospels cannot be reconciled with the Gospel of John, so it also seems obvious that the Gospels show that different people wanted different information spread. The New Testament even explicitly describes different people competing with each other and spreading different information, and a comparison of Acts and Galatians shows that someone seems to have intentionally produced false information to deceive people. The information contained in the New Testament came from different people who wanted different information spread, and then that information was copied and edited over and over again for hundreds of years.

Early Christianity involved politics and modern Christianity obviously does too. With the process of producing documents in the times of early Christianity, the politics of early Christianity, and the control that bishops asserted over the people, it’s easy to see how fraudulent documents could have been produced and could have been accepted within Christian communities.

The documents in the New Testament should be viewed as historical documents rather than as authoritative text. Real people in the real past produced these documents and then these historical documents were copied and edited over and over again for hundreds of years. The production and copying of these historical documents resulted in two different religions being represented in one book, different Gospels contradicting each other and describing Christ differently from each other, a disciple going unnamed in the Gospel of John, a person described as “the elder” and as a “chosen sister” going unnamed in the second letter attributed to the name “John”, and a person who apparently received praise in the gospel through all of the churches going unnamed in Paul’s second letter to the Corinthians. Given these issues with the New Testament, a very particular form of textual criticism needs to be applied to find truth surrounded by so much deception. We need to slice the New Testament text to separate truth from fraud. Truth is there, but there is also a lot of fraud, so we need to know how to find the truth that is there.

You may be wondering about why God would allow the Bible to be spread all over the world if it contains fraud. A similar question could be asked about why God would allow the existence of evil and suffering. We will go into more details on those questions in Part 4. Here in Part 2, we’re merely examining the information that the Bible gives us. We’re not yet trying to decipher the overall reason for why the Bible was shaped the way that it was. So for now, we can simply rely on the fact that everything happens for a reason and we can proceed with examining the information that the Bible gives us. Furthermore, as we will see throughout this investigation, the discovery of fraud leads to truth.

This question still remains: whose identity is being concealed in the documents in the New Testament?

### **The Beloved Disciple**

John 19:25-27 may give us the best first step from here in trying to find out what happened back in the first century that resulted in such mystery and such contradicting accounts of early Christianity.

John 19:25-27

*Near the cross of Jesus stood his mother, his mother’s sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus saw his mother there, and the disciple whom he loved standing nearby, he said to his mother, “Dear woman, here is your son”, and to the disciple, “Here is your mother.” From that time on, this disciple took her into his home.*

Why is there a disciple described as the disciple whom Christ loved? Why are they unnamed? Who is the disciple whom Christ loved? Why is this information only contained in the Gospel of John and nowhere else in the New Testament?

The most popular tradition has been that the beloved disciple is John son of Zebedee. That is based on the fact that the Gospel of John is labeled with the name “John”. Additionally, a popular belief is that the Gospels are named after their respective authors, so many believe that John son of Zebedee wrote the Gospel of John. However, the naming of the Gospels appears to have not been done through a valid process. The Gospels were given names later on after they had already been in circulation. So the names of the Gospels don’t necessarily reflect the authors of the Gospels. We already saw that the second letter attributed to the name “John” seems to have been written by a woman and so not by someone named

“John”. So we already have one example of an incorrect naming of a New Testament document and that example just so happens to be in reference to the name “John”, which is the same name that we’re analyzing right now with the Gospel of John. So it’s easy to see how the author of the Gospel of John may very well have not been named “John”. Furthermore, regardless of who wrote the Gospel of John, it’s still very risky to assume that the author is the beloved disciple. The beloved disciple could very well be someone other than the author. So the basis for the argument that the beloved disciple is John son of Zebedee doesn’t stand on much, if anything at all. Additionally, the only John who is named in the Gospel of John is John the Baptist besides Peter’s father in reference to Peter as “Simon son of John”, and the Gospel of John seems to show a more personal relationship with John the Baptist than the other Gospels. So the naming of the Gospel of John may have derived from John the Baptist rather than John son of Zebedee. But even if the Gospel of John is named after John son of Zebedee, the naming of the Gospel of John appears to have not been done through a valid process and the author wouldn’t necessarily be the beloved disciple anyway, so the naming of the Gospel of John does not appear to be an indication of who the beloved disciple is.

Not only does the main reasoning for the belief that John son of Zebedee is the beloved disciple seem to be unreliable, but it also appears that the beloved disciple is specifically someone other than John son of Zebedee because it appears that he wasn’t a witness of the Crucifixion and the beloved disciple appears to have been. None of the Gospels describe John son of Zebedee as having been a witness of the Crucifixion and they all only name women as having been witnesses. If any of “the Twelve” were a witness of the Crucifixion, then all four Gospels would probably have provided that information or at least one of them would have; but instead, none of the Gospels do. So it appears that none of “the Twelve”, including John son of Zebedee, were a witness of the Crucifixion. Therefore, it appears that John son of Zebedee is not the beloved disciple.

One objection could relate to the legend that John was exiled to the island of Patmos by the Roman government and John went unnamed in the Gospel of John because it was somehow considered dangerous to name him since he was supposedly considered a criminal by the Roman government. We’ll go into more detail about how legends have been made up to provide explanations for missing information, and how such legends are false. But for now, we can see that John’s absence in the Crucifixion narratives in the Synoptic Gospels can’t be explained by such a legend because John is given plenty of attention throughout the Synoptic Gospels in other narratives. Not only is he proudly proclaimed as one of “the Twelve”, which by itself wouldn’t be the case if the authors were afraid to name him, but he is consistently named as one of the top three in many of the narratives. There are plenty of narratives that only name Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John. The Gospel of Mark even describes James son of Zebedee and John as the brothers of thunder. There isn’t really any holding back in the Synoptic Gospels in relation to not only naming John but exalting him to a great extent as well. So if John was present during the Crucifixion, the Synoptic Gospels would have obviously probably named him in those narratives. Therefore, the absence of John in the Crucifixion narratives in the Synoptic Gospels is defining evidence that he was not present during the Crucifixion.

One of the reasons that people don’t want to move away from believing that John son of Zebedee is the beloved disciple is because the words “son” and “his” are used in relation to the beloved disciple, which presents the beloved disciple as supposedly a man. However, we should consider the discrimination towards women and the easy alteration of information when copying documents back in the first few

centuries. We've already seen evidence of the fraudulent concealment of someone's identity in Paul's second letter to the Corinthians and the second letter attributed to the name "John", and both of those seem to be concealing the identity of a woman. So we shouldn't be surprised that we could be dealing with writing that was fraudulently altered to conceal a woman's identity. The main point here is that we shouldn't assume that the beloved disciple is a man simply based on the words "son" and "his".

The concealment of someone's identity who is presented with so much importance shows the presence of two different authors. These verses probably weren't originally produced to present an unnamed person with such importance, so the original version of these verses probably contained the name of the beloved disciple and then a later version was produced in a way that concealed that person's identity. Additionally, as we will go into more detail on shortly, there likely wouldn't be much motivation to add these verses in the first place unless they were true, so these verses likely represent real eyewitness testimony that was later fraudulently altered to conceal the identity of the beloved disciple. So the fact that the beloved disciple goes unnamed is defining evidence that they are a real person and that they are of particular importance because it's unrealistic that anyone who wanted them to go unnamed would have included their presence at all if they weren't already included or would have placed so much importance on them unless that importance was already placed on them. Realistically, the only way that there is an unnamed beloved disciple is if the original author wrote about a real person who was of particular importance and then a later author concealed their identity. Furthermore, as we will go into more detail on later, the reason why their presence remained at all rather than those verses having been completely taken out is most likely because those verses actually represent real eyewitness testimony of the Crucifixion. So the importance of the verses themselves likely prevented them from being taken out completely, and therefore the presence of someone of particular importance remained; but their identity was later concealed because it conflicts with the popular mainstream storyline that Peter was the top disciple.

Some other people who some believe could be the beloved disciple are Lazarus and his sisters Martha and Mary of Bethany. People look to them because the Gospel of John describes Christ as loving them. There are two points in objection to that. One is that they are not described as having traveled with Christ and so are unlikely to have been described as disciples in the way that disciples are described in the Gospels. The second point is that when Christ is described as loving them, they don't go unnamed in the way that the beloved disciple does. If any of them were the beloved disciple, then they would likely have gone unnamed when they are described as being loved by Christ just as John 19:26-27 shows the beloved disciple as unnamed.

Another belief by many is that the beloved disciple is a figurative reference that could represent anyone who believes in Christianity. In opposition to such a belief, the Gospels are supposed to represent the real past, not a figurative past. Additionally, this disciple is described as having been a witness of the Crucifixion and having taken Mother Mary into their home, which is an indication that the beloved disciple appears to be a real person, not a figurative reference that could be applied to anyone.

Despite these theories being believed by many, at this point in the investigation, we should recognize that there is work to do to try to discover who the beloved disciple is.

The presence of a beloved disciple at all contrasts with the idea that Peter was the top disciple, which all four Gospels seem to show, especially the Synoptic Gospels but even the Gospel of John does to a lesser extent. The fact that the Gospels exalt Peter and also show his disownment of Christ shows that Peter

probably really disowned Christ. That information wouldn't have likely been included unless it were true because it contrasts with the intention of trying to exalt Peter; and as we will see later, there was likely pressure to include that information because it is true and was widely known among Christians. How could anyone who disowned Christ and abandoned Christ during the Crucifixion be considered the top disciple? Well, according to the popular mainstream storyline, Peter and the others redeemed themselves after the Resurrection and went on to spread Christianity. But there is at least one major problem with that storyline: Paul.

If Peter is to be considered the top disciple even after disowning Christ and abandoning Christ during the Crucifixion, it would seem to be necessary that Peter led the spread of Christianity after the Resurrection. However, Peter seems to have had relatively little success compared to the vast success of Paul. Regardless of the legends that have been made up, the Bible itself only gives Antioch as a place of travel outside of Israel for Peter. Meanwhile, the Bible says that Paul not only went to Antioch, but also to Damascus, Tarsus, Cyprus, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome, and suggests that Paul also went to Thessalonica, Colosse, and Philippi. Paul is widely known as having been much more successful than Peter in the spread of Christianity in the first century. Additionally, the verses below show just how problematic Peter's practices had become.

Galatians 2:11-14

*When Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he was clearly in the wrong. Before certain men came from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they arrived, he began to draw back and separate himself from the Gentiles because he was afraid of those who belong to the circumcision group. The other Jews joined him in his hypocrisy, so that by their hypocrisy even Barnabas was led astray. When I saw that they were not acting in line with the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter in front of them all, "You are a Jew, yet you live like a Gentile and not like a Jew. How is it, then, that you force Gentiles to follow Jewish customs?"*

So Peter disowned Christ and abandoned Christ during the Crucifixion; and then after the Resurrection, Paul far exceeded Peter. In addition to all of that, as Galatians 2:11-14 show, Peter was apparently trying to force people to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself. It's unrealistic to believe that anyone who fits that profile would be even close to being the top disciple of Christ. Peter actively threw away his discipleship and chose to not be present during the Crucifixion, and then still couldn't rise to the position of top disciple after the Resurrection. Therefore, it seems that both before the Resurrection as well as afterward, Peter was not the top disciple. The Bible indicates that the beloved disciple, which by the nature of that title would have seemed to have been the top disciple, was present during the Crucifixion, as the top disciple would realistically have been; and the Bible also indicates that Paul was a better disciple than Peter after the Resurrection. Even if someone wants to ignore that Peter made a conscious decision to throw away his discipleship, thereby obviously not being the top disciple, the legend that Peter redeemed himself after the Resurrection would appear to be obviously false given Paul's accomplishments, especially since Peter seems to have tried to force people to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself.

The Gospels portray Peter as if he was the top disciple, but the Gospel of John describes the beloved disciple who was apparently not Peter. That contrast shows that one of them seems to have been fraudulently exalted, and it has already been shown that the fact that the beloved disciple goes unnamed in



the Gospel of John seems to indicate that a different author than the original author fraudulently concealed information about them. Since it seems that information about the beloved disciple was fraudulently concealed, they don't seem to have been fraudulently exalted. Since it seems that either Peter or the beloved disciple were fraudulently exalted and it doesn't seem to have been the beloved disciple given the fraudulent concealment of information about them, it seems obvious that Peter was fraudulently exalted, which matches the evidence that shows his disownment of Christ before the Resurrection and his lack of success after the Resurrection as well as Galatians 2:11-14 asserting that he tried to force people to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself. Only one of them could have been the top disciple, and Peter disowned Christ while the beloved disciple was present during the Crucifixion. We will continue to dive into more evidence, but it already seems obvious that someone other than Peter was the top disciple and that such information about them was fraudulently concealed while Peter was fraudulently exalted.

Judging just from the Gospel of John, which is the only Gospel that describes the presence of a beloved disciple, Mary Magdalene is one of four people named as having been present during the Crucifixion, is the only person named as having first discovered the empty tomb, and is the only person named as having first seen Christ after the Resurrection. Just from that, we can see that it is probable that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple. We will go into further detail about why verse 19:25 names Mary Magdalene while verses 19:26-27 leave the beloved disciple unnamed. The reasoning mostly centers on the fact that verse 25 lists the witnesses of the Crucifixion and it was important to name the witnesses while verses 26-27 contain the particular information that they do about a particular person being spoken to by Christ during the Crucifixion and being described in the way that they are in relation to Mother Mariam. By the nature of verses 26-27, the beloved disciple is singled out as the most important disciple. We will also go into more detail about any objections related to other instances of descriptions of someone being portrayed as the beloved disciple in other chapters. As we will see, there are different circumstances surrounding each of these instances and each one needs to be analyzed in particular ways to properly assess the evidence available. Simply judging from chapter 19 of the Gospel of John alone, we can already conclude that Mary Magdalene is probably the beloved disciple; and plenty of more evidence will be shown.

From a broader view of all of the Gospels, we can begin to see even further that the inclusion of Mary Magdalene at all in the Gospels shows that she is the beloved disciple. Mark, Matthew, and John all name Mary Magdalene as having been present during the Crucifixion while Luke simply refers to a group of women without naming any of them. All four Gospels name Mary Magdalene as the first or one of the first to have discovered the empty tomb. Mark and John name Mary Magdalene as the first to have seen Christ after the Resurrection while Matthew names her as one of the first to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. All of that strongly supports the conclusion that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple.

Before getting into more evidence, we can fast forward to almost a millennium and a half later to take a look at what is not necessarily evidence but at the very least what appears to be agreement from someone who is thought of by many as one of the most brilliant minds in history. There have been a lot of theories and legends about the painting "The Last Supper" by Leonardo da Vinci, many of them specifically about Mary Magdalene. This painting depicts the scene described in John 13:23-24.

John 13:23-24

*One of them, the disciple whom Jesus loved, was reclining next to him. Simon Peter motioned to this disciple and said, "Ask him which one he means."*

In this scene, the beloved disciple is described as having sat next to Christ during the Last Supper and Peter is described as having spoken to the beloved disciple. Leonardo's painting of this scene shows Peter saying something to the beloved disciple just as John 13:23-24 describe. The original painting seems to show the beloved disciple as a woman. There have been modern copies of the painting that change the appearance of this figure to look more like a man. Such alterations show that future copies were trying to cover up the idea that the beloved disciple was originally painted as a woman. The original painting shows the beloved disciple as having long hair and wearing a necklace. Additionally, the outline of the figures that represent Christ and the beloved disciple in the painting going from the left of the beloved disciple (from the perspective of the viewer facing the painting) to the right of the figure that represents Christ forms the shape of an "M". That is further confirmed by the change in the shade of green worn by the figure that represents Judas, in between Peter and the beloved disciple. Going from right to left, the green changes to a darker shade and then back to a lighter shade. Going from right to left, the shift to a darker green lines up with the extension of the "M". The "M" is extended downward with the lighter green on the inside of the "M" and the darker green on the outside. That conclusion is further confirmed by the fact that the darker green transitions back to a lighter green so that there is only a thin area of the darker green. A change in shade would represent a change in light. So there presumably would only be one shift. The fact that a lighter green shifts into a darker green and then right back to a lighter green shows that the darker green is merely being used to extend the "M".

That "M" seems to signify that the name of the woman who is shown as the beloved disciple begins with the letter "M". The beloved disciple is presumably not Mother Mary. It has already been shown that neither Martha nor Mary of Bethany is likely the beloved disciple. Meanwhile, the Gospel of John portrays Mary Magdalene as present during the Crucifixion and the only person to have first seen Christ after the Resurrection. So this woman in Leonardo's painting whose name begins with "M" is obviously presumably Mary Magdalene. Therefore, it seems that Leonardo portrayed Mary Magdalene as the beloved disciple, and so it seems that Leonardo da Vinci believed that Mary Magdalene was the beloved disciple.

Just because Leonardo da Vinci seems to have portrayed Mary Magdalene as the beloved disciple, that doesn't necessarily mean that she was. However, Leonardo's apparent portrayal of Mary Magdalene as the beloved disciple appears to be agreement from someone who is thought of by many as one of the most brilliant minds in history.

For further evidence, we can turn to a source that is not in the New Testament, the discoveries of previously unknown gospels. These gospels have been called "Gnostic Gospels". Some of them have also been called the "Nag Hammadi Scriptures" because they were discovered in Nag Hammadi, Egypt. These documents have been dated to the second, third, and/or fourth centuries. These documents are quite strange at times and they probably aren't very legitimate. However, there is still some information that they contain that can be at least somewhat validated and useful for our investigation. Some of these documents describe Mary Magdalene as having a unique relationship with Christ. Some of these documents also describe the other disciples as having had negative feeling towards Mary Magdalene.

Regardless of the other information that they contain, what we should want to know is: Why were people writing so much about Mary Magdalene and presenting her with such a high status?

The most important of these documents that we should look at are the Gospel of Philip, Pistas Sophia, the Dialogue of the Savior, and the Gospel of Mary.

The Gospel of Philip

*Three women always walked with the Master: Mary his mother, her sister, and Mary of Magdala, who is called his companion. For "Mary" is the name of his sister, his mother, and his companion.*

The Gospel of Philip

*Wisdom, who is called barren, is the Mother of the angels. The companion of the [Savior] is Mary of Magdala. The [Savior loved] her more than [all] the disciples, [and he] kissed her often on her [mouth]. The other [disciples] ... said to him, "Why do you love her more than all of us?" The Savior answered and said to them, "Why don't I love you like her? If a blind person and one who can see are both in darkness, they are the same. When the light comes, one who can see will see the light, and the blind person will stay in darkness."*

Pistas Sophia

*"Mary, thou blessed one, whom I will perfect in all mysteries of those of the height, discourse in openness, thou, whose heart is raised to the kingdom of heaven more than all thy brethren."*

Pistas Sophia

*"Well done, Mary. You are more blessed than all women on earth, because you will be the fullness of fullness and completion of completion."*

Pistas Sophia (Peter is described as talking)

*"My Master, we cannot endure this woman who gets in our way and does not let any of us speak, though she talks all the time."*

Pistas Sophia (a woman is described as talking, probably Mary Magdalene)

*"My Master, I understand in my mind that I can come forward at any time to interpret what Pistas Sophia has said, but I am afraid of Peter, because he threatens me and hates our gender."*

Pistas Sophia (Christ is described as talking)

*"Any of those filled with the spirit of light will come forward to interpret what I say: no one will be able to oppose them."*

The Dialogue of the Savior

*Mary said, "So. The Wickedness of each day [is sufficient]. Workers deserve their food. Disciples resemble their teachers." She spoke this utterance as a woman who understood everything.*

The Dialogue of the Savior

*Mary said, "There is only one saying I shall [speak] to the Master, about the mystery of truth. In this we stand and in this we appear to those who are worldly."*

The Gospel of Mary

*Then Mary stood up. She greeted them all, addressing her brothers and sisters, “Do not weep and be distressed nor let your hearts be irresolute. For his grace will be with you all and will shelter you. Rather, we should praise his greatness, for he has prepared us and made us human beings.” When Mary said these things, she turned their heart toward the Good, and they began to debate about the words of [the Savior].*

#### The Gospel of Mary

*Peter said to Mary, “Sister we know that the Savior loved you more than all other women. Tell us the words of the Savior that you remember, the things you know that we don’t because we haven’t heard them.”*

#### The Gospel of Mary

*Peter responded, bringing up similar concerns. He questioned them about the Savior, “Did he then speak with a woman in private without our knowing about it? Are we to turn around and listen to her? Did he choose her over us?”*

*Then Mary wept and said to Peter, “My brother Peter, what are you imagining? Do you think that I have thought up these things by myself in my heart or that I am telling lies about the Savior?”*

*Levi answered, speaking to Peter, “Peter, you have always been a wrathful person. Now I see you contending against a woman like the adversaries. For if the Savior made her worthy, who are you then for your part to reject her? Assuredly the Savior’s knowledge of her is completely reliable. That is why he loved her more than us. Rather, we should be ashamed. We should clothe ourselves with the perfect human, acquire it for ourselves as he commanded us, and announce the good news, not laying down any other rule or law that differs from what the Savior said.”*

*After [he said these] things, they started going out [to] teach and to preach.*

The part in the Gospel of Philip about Mary of Magdala being kissed by the Savior is often used to propose that Christ and Mary Magdalene were married. However, there are multiple references in the New Testament about greetings made by a kiss, and there is plenty of evidence that shows that Christ and Mary Magdalene have a teacher/student relationship.

Not only is a woman named “Mary” being shown as a leader, but she is specifically referred to as someone who would likely be the beloved disciple. “Mary” is described in the Gospel of Mary as someone who taught the other disciples, including Peter. She is even described as knowing certain teachings of Christ that were not known by Peter and the others, which specifically portrays her as the top disciple by portraying her as knowing more about Christ’s teachings than others. The Gospel of Philip states “Why do you love her more than all of us?”, which specifically presents Mary Magdalene as someone who would likely be the beloved disciple. Additionally, the name “Mary of Magdala” is used in the Gospel of Philip and is described as someone who is one of three people who “always walked with the Master”, the other two people being Mother Mary and Mother Mary’s sister. We should now remember that Mother Mary, Mother Mary’s sister, and Mary Magdalene are three of the four people mentioned in John 19:25-27 as having been near the Cross during the Crucifixion. “Mary of Magdala”, obviously presumably Mary Magdalene, is described as being in an exclusive group of three that includes Mother Mary and Mother Mary’s sister. Even if none of this information is true of Mary Magdalene, it’s still incredibly striking that any of it was written at all. The popular account asserts that Mary Magdalene was a sinful prostitute, but there are documents that seem to describe her as being a teacher to the other

disciples, as being loved by Christ more than any other disciple, and as being in an exclusive group of three that includes Mother Mary and Mother Mary's sister. So again, regardless of whether any of this information is true, the fact that it was written at all shows that there is much more to the story of Mary Magdalene; and we will continue to see that as we move further with our study of the Gospel of John.

There is already plenty of evidence showing that Mary Magdalene is probably the beloved disciple. We should now turn to the New Testament to see what we can find out. So getting back to John 19:25-27, given the information contained in those verses, it is reasonable to consider the people mentioned in those verses to be all of the realistic possibilities of who the beloved disciple is. One objection to that could be that the people mentioned are all women and the words "son" and "his" are used in relation to the beloved disciple. In response to such an objection, as explained earlier, we should consider the discrimination towards women and the easy alteration of information when copying documents back in the first few centuries. We've already seen evidence of the fraudulent concealment of someone's identity in Paul's second letter to the Corinthians and the second letter attributed to the name "John", and both of those seem to be concealing the identity of a woman. The New Testament appears to be riddled with fraudulent alterations, many of which are likely the result of suppression of information about women. Words like "son" and "his" shouldn't deter us from recognizing the obvious possibilities of who the beloved disciple is, all of whom are women. One may then ask: If a verse contains fraud, then how can we trust any of it?

When scribes would make copies of documents, they could make any small adjustment and such small adjustments wouldn't necessarily change an entire narrative. There are many verses in the New Testament that seem to contain much of the original information but seem to have been altered over the years in some way. Many of the revisions done over the years to any document in the New Testament seem to have been minor and unsubstantial. So the removal of a name and words like "son" and "his" could be fraudulent alterations while the fundamental structure of the narrative in question could still be truthful. A very diverse way of textual criticism needs to be applied to the New Testament to understand what really happened in the first few centuries of Christian history. We are faced with opposing forces. When there is truth, not necessarily everything is truthful. When there is fraud, not necessarily everything is fraudulent. There is fraud mixed in with truth giving way to a very messy compilation of truth and fraud. As we proceed to analyze the Gospel of John, we need to be very careful about trying to decipher between truth and fraud. We shouldn't be too quick to trust any piece of information, but we also shouldn't be too quick to believe that something is fraudulent either. It's a very challenging balance, knowing that there is some truth and that there is also some fraud. Assessing potential motives to commit fraud in the New Testament is a crucial avenue for finding truth.

It will be shown that we can accept certain important parts of the Gospel of John and evidence will be provided that shows that certain parts appear to be fraudulent. The identification of fraud actually makes truth more obvious. So while the probable removal of a disciple's name and the words "son" and "his" are likely fraudulent alterations, that doesn't necessarily mean that all of John 19:25-27 are fraudulent. We would be foolish to consider the entirety of John 19:25-27 to be fraudulent just because of an unnamed disciple and the words "son" and "his". John 19:25-27 could contain truth despite certain potential fraudulent alterations. The beloved disciple goes unnamed, but Christ may really have communicated with Mother Mary and the beloved disciple during the Crucifixion. If Christ did communicate with Mother Mary and the beloved disciple during the Crucifixion, then the description of that communication is some of the most important information in the entire Bible. So we shouldn't dismiss that information

just because there is an unnamed disciple described and words like “son” and “his” likely represent fraudulent alterations. The presence of an unnamed disciple shows that the true identity of the beloved disciple was probably first concealed sometime after the original production of those verses. Otherwise, someone’s name would probably be there or those verses probably wouldn’t have been produced in the first place. It’s very unlikely that those verses were originally produced with the beloved disciple’s identity concealed.

There seems to have been many different revisions to the Gospel of John and one may wonder if we can trust the Gospel of John at all. Well, as previously expressed, most revisions were probably very minor and probably don’t affect the fundamental structure of the Gospel. However, there seems to also have been some very serious revisions. We can see one example of that by observing that there is an unnamed disciple described as the beloved disciple. Not only is this person unnamed, which is suspicious enough by itself, but this is also apparently the person who is the beloved disciple. In fact, as mentioned earlier, there are numerous examples of an unnamed disciple in the Gospel of John. There are also other important details that point to what appears to be a fraudulent concealment of something. What were they trying to conceal? Why would there be such significant revisions? Why would any disciple go unnamed, especially the beloved disciple?

If they wanted to revise the Gospel of John in such significant ways, then why did they include it in the biblical canon at all? The combination of the inclusion of the Gospel of John in the biblical canon and the level of revision that appears to have been done to the Gospel of John is incredibly telling about what happened back then. With such severe elements as the concealment of the beloved disciple’s name, the Gospel of John obviously seems to have been very problematic for the “orthodox church”. If that wasn’t the case, then there likely wouldn’t have been the concealment of the beloved disciple’s name. Additionally, it’s very strange that they ended up including the Gospel of John in the biblical canon if they disliked it that much. The Gospel of John seems to have been problematic for them but they ended up including it in the biblical canon anyway. Why? Likely because of the level of usage of the Gospel of John among Christians and/or a testimony that it represents. Regardless, we can see that there was obviously motivation to include it in the biblical canon because it was in fact included, and we can see that there obviously seems to have been issues that the “orthodox church” had with it because there seems to have been a severe level of revision done. They decided to include it but only in a version that was different from the original, in a version that conceals the identity of the beloved disciple. There seems to have been something about the Gospel of John that was a big problem for the “orthodox church” back then. More specifically, there seems to have been something about the beloved disciple that was a big problem for the “orthodox church” back then. So there are two opposing forces. There was influence and/or pressure to include the Gospel of John in the biblical canon; but there seems to also have been desire to change certain information, including information related to the identity of the beloved disciple.

The presence of an unnamed disciple shows evidence that the description of the communication between Christ, Mother Mary, and the beloved disciple during the Crucifixion was likely a part of a testimony that originally identified who the beloved disciple is, and that there was likely an effort made later on to conceal the identity of the beloved disciple. The probable scenario is that a problem existed that the “orthodox church” sought to find a solution for. That problem probably wouldn’t have existed if the description of the communication between Christ, Mother Mary, and the beloved disciple during the Crucifixion hadn’t already been produced before the decision was made to present an unnamed disciple in

those verses. The decision to present an unnamed disciple in those verses was likely made because the description of the communication between Christ, Mother Mary, and the beloved disciple during the Crucifixion had already been produced before that decision was made. If the entirety of those verses was fraudulent, then those verses would have likely been formed without mysteriously concealing someone's identity. The description of that communication likely wouldn't have originally included an unnamed disciple; and therefore, the concealment of the identity of that disciple is likely a later fraudulent alteration, which shows that the description of that communication was likely a part of a testimony that originally identified who the beloved disciple is. Additionally, John 19:26-27 wouldn't seem to hold as much significance if they aren't truthful. It doesn't seem like there would have been much motivation to add those verses if they aren't truthful, so it is unlikely that those verses were fraudulent upon their original production. Therefore, that information likely came from real eyewitness testimony and then was later fraudulently altered to conceal the identity of the beloved disciple.

So in John 19:25-27, we have a list of names of who was near the Cross during the Crucifixion and we have been told that the beloved disciple was near enough to the Cross for that communication to have taken place during the Crucifixion, but the beloved disciple is oddly not named. In this scenario, the obvious fraud revolves around someone not being named. As shown, that is actually evidence that most of the rest of the narrative is probably truthful. The fraud is focused on someone's name, so that is where the fraud likely is and the rest of these verses were probably fairly preserved. The designation of a beloved disciple may have been a part of a testimony that originally identified the beloved disciple or that may have been added later on, maybe to replace someone's name. The designation of a beloved disciple, whether authentic or fraudulent, shows that there is probably some disciple of particular importance. Even if it wasn't in a testimony that originally identified the beloved disciple, the people who may have committed this kind of potential fraud wouldn't have likely designated the unnamed disciple as a beloved disciple if this disciple didn't have some sort of particular importance. If they wanted to conceal the identity of the beloved disciple, then they probably wouldn't have then decided to describe them as the beloved disciple if this disciple didn't have some sort of particular importance. It doesn't seem like a good strategy to place fake importance on an unnamed person. That is evidence that such importance was probably placed on this unnamed person precisely because they are a disciple of particular importance. The probable scenario, regardless of whether the designation of a beloved disciple was in a testimony that originally identified the beloved disciple, is that there really is a disciple of particular importance who is being referred to. In this case though, they are unnamed for some reason. There was some motive to refer to an unnamed disciple as the beloved disciple. That motive probably wouldn't have existed if a disciple of particular importance wasn't already described in those verses. Someone so important going unnamed shows the presence of two elements. One is that there likely was already a disciple of particular importance described in those verses and the other is that someone likely wanted to conceal their identity. So there were probably at least some Christians who were aware of a disciple who was of particular importance. Therefore, even if the designation of a beloved disciple is a later alteration, there was probably some disciple of particular importance and it may just be that particular importance that was the catalyst for this disciple going unnamed.

Despite certain theories that have floated around, it seems unlikely that the beloved disciple wouldn't be specifically mentioned when giving a list of people who were near the Cross during the Crucifixion. We're told that people were near the Cross; we're given a list of people who were near the Cross; and then we're told about communication between Christ, Mother Mary, and the beloved disciple near enough

to the Cross for that communication to have taken place during the Crucifixion. So presumably, the beloved disciple was near the Cross during the Crucifixion and near Mother Mary, who is one of the people specifically described as having been near the Cross during the Crucifixion.

It was important to keep the names of witnesses of the Crucifixion in verse 25, and the specific information in verses 26-27 likely gave way to the motivation to conceal the beloved disciple's identity in those verses. That is probably why there isn't a reference in verse 25 to a disciple being the beloved disciple while such a reference appears right after that. Given the willingness to leave someone unnamed in verses 26-27, the same would have probably been done in verse 25 if the beloved disciple was someone other than the four people mentioned in verse 25. The presence of the beloved disciple was not taken out of verses 26-27, they just go unnamed, and so the beloved disciple was probably not taken out of verse 25 either. So a reference to a disciple being the beloved disciple would probably appear in the list of names of people who were near the Cross during the Crucifixion if the beloved disciple was someone other than the four people who are listed in verse 25. None of those people are described as the beloved disciple in verse 25. If the beloved disciple was someone other than Mother Mary, Mother Mary's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, or Mary Magdalene, then there would probably be a reference in that list to a fifth person. Since there isn't, we can conclude that the beloved disciple is probably one of those four people.

One objection could be that the presence of the beloved disciple was only kept in verses 26-27 because there was more specific attention being given to them in those verses as opposed to verse 25 and so the presence of a fifth person could have been taken out of verse 25 while their presence remained in verses 26-27, which would mean that the beloved disciple is someone other than the four people mentioned in the current version of verse 25. However, if there was a fifth person mentioned in the original version of verse 25, the purpose of the potential removal of their presence in a later version of verse 25 would be defeated by the presence of the beloved disciple in verses 26-27. Hypothetically, if the presence of a fifth person was eliminated from verse 25, their presence would just reemerge in the very next verse, thereby defeating the impact of eliminating their presence in verse 25. So any potential motivation to eliminate the presence of a fifth person in verse 25 would not have the intended result it was supposed to have because the beloved disciple is still present in the narrative in verses 26-27. It simply wouldn't make sense to take someone's presence out of verse 25 if they are present in the very next verse. Additionally, if a fifth person representing the beloved disciple was present in the original version of verse 25 and a later version omitted their presence, that would then erroneously lead to the implication that the beloved disciple is one of the four remaining people in verse 25. The way the narrative goes is that there is a list of names of who was present during the Crucifixion and then there is the description of someone present during the Crucifixion being the beloved disciple. So the narrative naturally leads to the conclusion that the beloved disciple is someone named in verse 25, and therefore the removal of someone's name from verse 25 would simply lead to the implication that the beloved disciple is someone else named in verse 25. So not only would the removal of someone's name from verse 25 not have the intended result it was supposed to have, but there would also be an unintended implication that the beloved disciple is one of the other people named in verse 25. All factors considered, it's unrealistic to believe that there was ever a fifth person included in verse 25. Therefore, it appears that all of the names were preserved in verse 25 because it was important to show who was present during the Crucifixion, the fundamental information in verses 26-27 was preserved because it was important to describe true information about what Christ said during the Crucifixion, and there was motivation to conceal who exactly the beloved disciple is. That is why John 19:25-27 take the exact form that they do with a clear list in verse 25 and someone's identity



concealed in verses 26-27. In conclusion, it is obvious that the beloved disciple is one of the four people mentioned in John 19:25.

Mother Mary is described as having been involved in a conversation with the beloved disciple and so is unlikely to be the beloved disciple. It seems unlikely that Mother Mary's sister would get the title of beloved disciple instead of Mother Mary, and Mother Mary probably wouldn't have been described as the mother of her sister. Also, it is more likely the case that an unmarried woman rather than a married woman would be such a committed disciple that they would be viewed as the top disciple. So the probable scenario is that the beloved disciple was someone who is not Mother Mary, is not Mother Mary's sister, and is not a married woman. Mary Magdalene seems to meet all of those criteria and the other three people mentioned obviously appear not to. Mary Magdalene is described as a different person than Mother Mary and Mother Mary's sister, and she is never described in the New Testament as having been married.

In addition to having been near the Cross during the Crucifixion, Mary Magdalene is also described in the Gospel of John as having been the first person to have discovered the empty tomb and the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. It would make sense if the beloved disciple was near the Cross during the Crucifixion, was the first person to have discovered the empty tomb, and was the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. Why would there be one person who meets all of those criteria but there be someone else who is the beloved disciple? If there is only one person who meets all of those criteria, then that person is probably the beloved disciple. Mary Magdalene is one of only four people mentioned in the Gospel of John as having been near the Cross during the Crucifixion; and she is the only one of those four people who is not Mother Mary or Mother Mary's sister and is not described anywhere in the New Testament as having been married. Mary Magdalene is the only person mentioned in the Gospel of John as the first person to have discovered the empty tomb. Mary Magdalene is the only person mentioned in the Gospel of John as the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. These descriptions obviously show that Mary Magdalene is probably the beloved disciple.

If Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, then that would explain why the Gnostic Gospels describe her with so much importance. Our previous analysis of the Gnostic Gospels produced the conclusion that Mary Magdalene appears to be the beloved disciple; and independently from that, an analysis of the Gospel of John produced that same conclusion. So two independent sources show that Mary Magdalene appears to be the beloved disciple.

Two conclusions have been formed so far about Mary Magdalene. The first is that Mary Magdalene appears to be the beloved disciple. The second is that there seems to have been an effort to conceal information about Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple. Those two conclusions can be formed by simply analyzing verses 19:25-27 of the Gospel of John and those two conclusions can be further supported by analyzing the Gnostic Gospels. We will see those two conclusions challenged initially as we move to chapter 20 of the Gospel of John. A deeper analysis of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John will then show support for those two conclusions.

In chapter 20 of the Gospel of John, there are verses that refer to Mary Magdalene and the beloved disciple separately and so the beloved disciple is portrayed as someone other than Mary Magdalene. This assessment will require some challenging textual criticism to arrive at the right conclusion. If we look at John 20:2-13, which contain all of the instances in which the beloved disciple is presented as someone

other than Mary Magdalene, we can see what looks to be fraudulent information. The verses have been separated into different groups as they represent certain classifications of the information presented in these verses.

John 20:2-9

*So she came running to Simon Peter and the other disciple, the one Jesus loved, and said, "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb, and we don't know where they have put him!"*

*So Peter and the other disciple started for the tomb. Both were running, but the other disciple outran Peter and reached the tomb first. He bent over and looked in at the strips of linen lying there but did not go in. Then Simon Peter, who was behind him, arrived and went into the tomb. He saw the strips of linen lying there, as well as the burial cloth that had been around Jesus' head. The cloth was folded up by itself, separate from the linen. Finally the other disciple, who had reached the tomb first, also went inside. He saw and believed. They still did not understand from Scripture that Jesus had to rise from the dead.*

John 20:10-13

*Then the disciples went back to their homes, but Mary stood outside the tomb crying. As she wept, she bent over to look into the tomb and saw two angels in white, seated where Jesus' body had been, one at the head and the other at the foot.*

*They asked her, "Woman, why are you crying?"*

*"They have taken my Lord away", she said, "and I don't know where they have put him."*

This sequence is strange and confusing in multiple ways. First off, Mary Magdalene is described as having ran to Peter and another disciple, and is described as having said "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb, and we don't know where they have put him!" So it's being described that Mary Magdalene used the word "we" even though no one else is described as having been with her when she discovered the empty tomb. The use of the word "we" shows that something is amiss, although the use of the word "we" is not all that is strange.

It's also very strange that there seems to be an undue emphasis on who ran faster. The discovery of the empty tomb is being referred to and these verses seem to be focused on who ran faster. Who cares who ran faster? There's then an odd sequence in which the unnamed disciple reaches the tomb first but doesn't go in, then Peter catches up and goes in first, and then the unnamed disciple also enters the tomb and "believed". That sequence is so strange. Why do these details matter? What is going on?

Another important point to make about these verses is that there is again an unnamed disciple involved. Furthermore, the unnamed disciple is first called "the other disciple" as if we're supposed to know who that is. They are then secondarily referred to as "the one Jesus loved". If this disciple is going to go unnamed, it seems to make more sense to lead off with "the one Jesus loved" rather than "the other disciple". The reference to an "other disciple" before they're even introduced as the "the one Jesus loved" or in any other way shows that a general reference to a fictional character was fraudulently inserted into the text. The author was so careless that they didn't even care that they were referring to a character that hadn't even been introduced in the narrative yet. At the onset of a narrative, a reference to an "other disciple" leaves that character completely unidentified, even more so than describing someone as "the one Jesus loved", yet such a reference implies that the reader would know who they are. That's obviously the product of a later fraudulent attempt to insert false information into the text. If we take a look back at the

use of the word “we”, we can see that’s another example of carelessness by someone who was fraudulently altering the text of the narrative.

We can look to a verse in the Gospel of Luke for more evidence.

Luke 24:12

*Peter, however, got up and ran to the tomb. Bending over, he saw the strips of linen lying by themselves, and he went away, wondering to himself what had happened.*

We can see that how Peter is described in Luke 24:12 seems to include a combination of descriptions of Peter and the unnamed disciple in John 20:2-9. In both accounts, Peter ran to the tomb. In John, Peter and an unnamed disciple both ran to the tomb. In Luke, only Peter ran to the tomb. In John, the unnamed disciple is described as having bent over. In Luke, Peter is described as having bent over. In John, both Peter and the unnamed disciple are described as having seen strips of linen. In Luke, only Peter is described as having seen strips of linen. In John, it is the unnamed disciple who “believed”, and so Peter is not described as knowing what happened. In Luke, Peter was “wondering to himself what had happened”. In John, “the disciples went back to their homes”. In Luke, Peter “went away”. These accounts describe the same general sequence, but Luke 24:12 assigns the entire sequence to Peter while John 20:2-9 divides the sequence between Peter and a mysteriously unnamed disciple. That shows strong evidence that all of the mentions of an unnamed disciple in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John are fraudulent. It would therefore follow that all of the mentions of the beloved disciple as someone other than Mary Magdalene are fraudulent. That shows strong evidence that there was an effort to conceal information related to Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple, which provides further evidence that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple.

What if the Gospel of John is right by mentioning the other disciple as someone other than Mary Magdalene? That’s certainly possible. However, the Gospel of Luke would then be mysteriously missing the unnamed disciple, and then there would be an unnamed disciple in one Gospel and a missing disciple in another. This character is excluded from one version of the story and mysteriously unnamed in the other, their presence contradicts all of the evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, and their presence is in line with the evidence shown so far that there was an effort to conceal information about Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple. Therefore, all of the mentions of an unnamed disciple in John 20:2-9 appear to be fraudulent. Additionally, if that weren’t the case, all of the oddities in John 20:2-9 already presented would go unexplained, all of the evidence already presented that shows that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple would have to be rejected, we would be left without a good answer as to who the beloved disciple is or why they go unnamed, and the importance that the Gnostic Gospels describe Mary Magdalene as having would appear to be mysterious and confusing. A much more reasonable conclusion is that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, all of the mentions of an unnamed disciple in John 20:2-9 are fraudulent, such mentions were a part of an effort to fraudulently conceal Mary Magdalene’s importance, a desire to conceal Mary Magdalene’s importance is why the beloved disciple goes unnamed, and the Gnostic Gospels present Mary Magdalene as the top disciple of Christ because she really was.

If you’re still wondering why you should believe that there is a real beloved disciple at all, as previously explained, the mere presence of an unnamed beloved disciple is evidence that the beloved disciple is a real person. The mystery that arises through their presence in the Gospel of John shows that there likely

wouldn't be much motivation to include their presence unless they are a real person. There was motivation to conceal their identity, which shows that there would have been motivation to take their presence out of the Gospel of John completely unless their presence represented the reality of what actually happened. As previously explained, there wouldn't be much motivation to fraudulently make up the fundamental information in John 19:26-27. There particularly wouldn't be much motivation to fraudulently make up that information and then make up that an unnamed person was involved, especially since that person is presented as the beloved disciple. John 19:26-27 represent some of the most important information in the entire Bible, but only if that information is true. If that information weren't true, then there just wouldn't be much reason to include that information. The importance of those verses derives from them representing accurate information. If those verses were entirely false, then they wouldn't hold much importance if any at all, and so likely nobody would make them up. Furthermore, it would be so counterintuitive to make up a fictional character, place so much importance on them as is the case with the beloved disciple, and then leave them unnamed that it's unrealistic to believe that the presence of the beloved disciple ended up in the Gospel of John for any reason other than that there really is a person who is the beloved disciple. Those verses representing true information is the likely reason why they remained in the Gospel of John, and that reason combined with the evidence that shows that there was motivation to conceal the identity of a woman who is described in those verses as the top disciple of Christ provides the pathway for understanding why there is the presence of an unnamed beloved disciple in the Gospel of John.

In Chapter 19, important information about the Crucifixion was preserved in verses 26-27, and the concealment of the identity of the beloved disciple is a part of how those verses were kept. The diversion from knowing that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple is established in those verses. The second step of that diversion then occurs in chapter 20. Since John 19:26-27 represent such important information, those verses were only altered to conceal the identity of the beloved disciple. The effort is then continued in chapter 20 so that the beloved disciple is specifically presented as someone other than Mary Magdalene. It's a two-step approach over the course of chapters 19-20. In the end, we have evidence that shows that John 19:26-27 represent true information, that the beloved disciple is a real person, that the identity of the beloved disciple was fraudulently concealed in John 19:26-27, that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, and that all of the verses that present the beloved disciple as someone other than Mary Magdalene are fraudulent and were produced with the specific intent to falsely present the beloved disciple as someone other than Mary Magdalene.

We have evidence of two main waves of information spreading in the first century. The mainstream wave is consistent with the Bible and portrays Peter as the top disciple. The other wave portrays Mary Magdalene as the top disciple. The Bible tells us that Peter was the top disciple and was specially appointed with 11 other men. Peter couldn't have been the top disciple if Mary Magdalene was and the narratives about the appointing of "the Twelve" would obviously be fraudulent. Without any kind of special appointment like that, Mary Magdalene would inherently be recognized as more advanced than Peter and the other 11 men in terms of discipleship because she was present during the Crucifixion and they weren't. So realistically, one of those waves of information represents the truth in terms of who the top disciple was; and they oppose each other, so they can't both be true. Either Peter or Mary Magdalene was the top disciple of Christ.

During what became the most crucial time for their discipleship, “the Twelve” all threw away their discipleship and Mary Magdalene stayed faithful during and after the Crucifixion. Some argue that it was more dangerous for men to be present during the Crucifixion than for women. That’s not true and was fraudulently made up to try to defend Peter and the rest of “the Twelve”. First off, nobody should turn away from discipleship out of fear. Every disciple should remain in their discipleship even in danger. Additionally, if something was dangerous for any human being, it would have been even more dangerous for women, not men. It’s absolutely ridiculous to assert that these men weren’t present during the Crucifixion but women were only because it was dangerous for men but not women. The bottom line is that these men threw away their discipleship during such a crucial time while Mary Magdalene stayed faithful. Just with that alone, there would inherently be a distinction between Mary Magdalene and “the Twelve”, and that distinction would specifically be about Mary Magdalene being more advanced, more faithful, than all of “the Twelve”. Furthermore, the narratives about the appointing of “the Twelve” can be seen as ridiculous given that apparently one of them, Judas, betrayed Christ to the Jewish priests and the rest of them turned away from Christ afterwards; and meanwhile, Mary Magdalene remained faithful during and after the Crucifixion. What were they appointed for? Betrayal and throwing away their discipleship? Some argue that their supposed appointment was for them to be the leaders of spreading Christianity after the Resurrection. We will go into more detail on that later. For now, we can simply look to Paul for an example of someone who seems to have been far more successful at spreading Christianity and Paul wasn’t even around before the Resurrection. So someone who wasn’t even a disciple before the Resurrection and who wasn’t included in these supposed appointments seems to have been more successful than them in spreading Christianity. Therefore, “the Twelve” were all surpassed in discipleship by Mary Magdalene as well as by Paul. Furthermore, as shown earlier by Galatians 2:11-14, Peter was apparently trying to force people to follow customs that he didn’t even follow himself. That’s obviously not the actions of someone who should be considered the top disciple of Christ, and that information comes in addition to Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” disowning Christ and also being surpassed by Paul in spreading Christianity after the Resurrection. The results of what happened clearly show that there wasn’t any special appointing of these men. Those narratives were made up to put focus on a group of men instead of a woman. The unwarranted attention that is put on those men shows that those narratives aren’t accurate because Christianity isn’t about some special group of people apart from everyone else like that.

Peter disowned Christ and Mary Magdalene remained faithful during and after the Crucifixion. The Bible itself says that Peter disowned Christ and that Mary Magdalene remained faithful during and after the Crucifixion. So the mainstream wave of information that the Bible represents, which is supposed to favor Peter, actually ends up favoring Mary Magdalene. When we analyze the actions of discipleship, the Bible says that Peter threw away his discipleship and Mary Magdalene confirmed her commitment to discipleship during and after the Crucifixion. We are assessing who the top disciple of Christ was so we are assessing discipleship, and the Bible clearly shows that Mary Magdalene was a better disciple than Peter. In terms of discipleship, the person who confirmed their commitment to discipleship during and after the Crucifixion is more advanced than a person who threw away their discipleship. So since we have clear evidence that either Mary Magdalene or Peter was the top disciple of Christ, and Mary Magdalene was more advanced in discipleship than Peter, it therefore follows that Mary Magdalene is clearly the top disciple of Christ.

That conclusion can be further confirmed when we analyze who Christ first appeared to after the Resurrection. The exact names differ, but Mark, Matthew, and John all indicate that Peter was not present. The Gospels of John and Mark both state that Christ first appeared to Mary Magdalene alone, and more evidence will be shown later that the other women were not present. The Gospel of John seems to have fragments of information that are more representative of the wave that favored Mary Magdalene as the top disciple. The Gospel of Mark very explicitly places Peter in the top position and still explicitly states that Mary Magdalene was the first person to see Christ after the Resurrection. So we have two independent sources within the Bible that state that Christ first appeared to Mary Magdalene alone. Furthermore, that statement in the Gospel of Mark was a later addition, very possibly in the second century. That shows that probably over a century after the Resurrection, a Synoptic Gospel was being edited to show Mary Magdalene as the first person to see Christ after the Resurrection probably because the version in the Gospel of John was more popular than the versions in the Synoptic Gospels since there otherwise was an effort to conceal information about Mary Magdalene. Additionally, the Gospel of Matthew specifically names Mary Magdalene along with one other woman, which at least explicitly includes Mary Magdalene and excludes Peter. So generally speaking, the Bible supports the assertion that Christ first appeared to Mary Magdalene alone and not to Peter, and that likely wouldn't have been the case if that information was false because the Bible supports Peter. Mary Magdalene being the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection is a clear indication that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple of Christ and Peter wasn't.

Moving further, there are more pieces of evidence that show that the unnamed disciple mentioned in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John was fraudulently added to conceal Mary Magdalene's importance. The first piece of evidence is that Mary Magdalene is described as having said "we" even though she is the only person who is described as having discovered the empty tomb. That shows that verses 1 and 2 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John were probably each originally written by two different authors. The author of verse 1 described Mary Magdalene as having been alone and the author of verse 2 portrayed her as if someone else was with her. Verse 1 is unlike the Synoptic Gospels because the Synoptic Gospels describe Mary Magdalene as having been with someone else. Meanwhile, verse 2 aligns with the Synoptic Gospels with the use of the word "we" because that presents Mary Magdalene as if she was with someone else. That shows that the author of verse 2 was likely influenced by the Synoptic Gospels and then diverted from what was already written in the Gospel of John. Therefore, verse 2 is likely fraudulent.

Since there wasn't anybody else added to verse 1, the use of the word "we" may have actually been a simple mistake. Clearly, it doesn't make sense to use the word "we" when only one person is described, which shows that it may have been a simple mistake. Even if the use of the word "we" was a simple mistake, it still points to probable fraud because the use of the word "we" shows that verse 2 appears to have been written by a different author than verse 1, which shows that there was a later fraudulent alteration to an previously existing narrative. Furthermore, such a mistake would have likely resulted from the author having had knowledge of the description of multiple people in the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels. If the author of verse 2 didn't have knowledge of the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels, then verse 2 would have likely been based on the information in verse 1, in which case the word "we" likely wouldn't have been used. Instead, the word "we" was used, which shows that the Synoptic Gospels were probably an influence on the author of verse 2 regardless of whether the author intentionally used the word "we" or simply made a mistake. Since verse 2 sets the stage for what is described in verses

2-9, the evidence showing that verse 2 is fraudulent shows that all of John 20:2-9 appears to be fraudulent.

The second piece of further evidence is related to the part that describes Mary Magdalene staying at the tomb by herself crying. The reason why this is so telling is because we have this odd account of Peter and an unnamed disciple running to the tomb, there's no mention of Mary Magdalene going to the tomb with them, and then "the disciples" go home; but then Mary Magdalene stays at the tomb crying even though we have no description of her ever returning to the tomb. There are specific details about Peter and the unnamed disciple running to the tomb but no details about Mary Magdalene returning to the tomb. Obviously, there is something wrong, which shows the likely presence of fraudulent alteration somewhere.

The third piece of additional evidence can be found when we analyze the likely reasons why the sequence about Peter and the unnamed disciple running to the tomb was produced in such a strange way. There are three components that are built into this sequence that provide the likely explanation.

First, there was a Jewish law that expressed that there must be two witnesses to validate a testimony. The law itself is stated in the book of Deuteronomy in the Hebrew Bible (the Jewish book that the Old Testament is based on) and the Old Testament and refers specifically to court. The Gospel of Matthew shows an example of how that law influenced society even outside of court.

Deuteronomy 19:15

*One witness is not enough to convict a man accused of any crime or offense he may have committed. A matter must be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses.*

Matthew 18:16

*But if he will not listen, take one or two others along, so that every matter may be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses.*

All of the Synoptic Gospels present multiple women as witnesses to the empty tomb, which satisfies the desire to have at least two witnesses to validate a testimony. When we turn back to the Gospel of John, we see that only Mary Magdalene is described as having seen the empty tomb. That presents an issue in relation to the desire to have at least two witnesses.

Second, all of the Synoptic Gospels portray women as messengers and describe disbelief among "the disciples".

Mark 16:7

*"But go, tell his disciples and Peter, 'He is going ahead of you into Galilee. There you will see him, just as he told you.' "*

Mark 16:11-13

*When they heard that Jesus was alive and that she had seen him, they did not believe it. Afterward Jesus appeared in a different form to two of them while they were walking in the country. These returned and reported it to the rest; but they did not believe them either.*

Matthew 28:7-10

*“Then go quickly and tell his disciples: ‘He has risen from the dead and is going ahead of you into Galilee. There you will see him.’ ”*

*So the women hurried away from the tomb, afraid yet filled with joy, and ran to tell his disciples. Suddenly Jesus met them. “Greetings”, he said. They came to him, clasped his feet and worshiped him. Then Jesus said to them, “Do not be afraid. Go and tell my brothers to go to Galilee; there they will see me.”*

Matthew 28:17

*When they saw him, they worshiped him; but some doubted.*

Luke 24:9-11

*When they came back from the tomb, they told all these things to the Eleven and to all the others. It was Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, and the others with them who told this to the apostles. But they did not believe the women, because their words seemed to them like nonsense.*

These verses present the women as messengers and disciples as not believing. So we can see that Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” were presented in the Synoptic Gospels as having been in a different category than the women who were presented as messengers about the empty tomb. From that perspective, we can see that it seems to have been important to not categorize Peter as one of the initial witnesses of the empty tomb and to portray him as not believing Mary Magdalene’s claim that the tomb was empty. Instead, as we are about to see, the unnamed disciple takes on that role.

The unnamed disciple is described as reaching the tomb first but not going in the tomb, then Peter catches up and goes in first, and then the unnamed disciple also enters the tomb and “believed”. The unnamed disciple is described as reaching the tomb first, seeing the strips of linen, and then later is described as believing. The description of the unnamed disciple reaching the tomb first, seeing the strips of linen, and believing sets the unnamed disciple up as the second witness with Mary Magdalene presented as the first witness. Additionally, when the unnamed disciple is described as having believed, it is explained that “they still did not understand from Scripture that Jesus had to rise from the dead”. That explanation shows that the unnamed disciple’s supposed belief was not about the Resurrection of Christ but was about the tomb being empty, meaning that the unnamed disciple is described as believing that the tomb was empty. A person would have to first believe that the tomb was empty before being considered a witness of the empty tomb. So that supposed belief being attributed to the unnamed disciple and not to Peter puts the unnamed disciple as a witness to the empty tomb and leaves Peter out of that. The unnamed disciple is being specifically presented as a witness to the empty tomb. So it seems that the desire to have at least two witnesses and the desire to not present Peter as one of those initial witnesses or as having believed Mary Magdalene is apparently why the unnamed disciple is described as reaching the tomb first. In John 20:2-9, there are already two witnesses of the empty tomb before Peter arrives.

The third component revolves around the attention given to Peter. Not only is Peter specifically named in this sequence, but also Peter is the one described as going into the tomb first. That description puts Peter at center stage inside the empty tomb.

In conclusion, the strange sequence about the unnamed disciple reaching the tomb first but not going in and then Peter catching up and going in first seems to be best explained by the combination of a desire to present two witnesses, a desire to not present Peter as one of those initial witnesses or as having believed



Mary Magdalene, and a desire to place Peter as the first person inside the empty tomb. Seeing the apparent reasons why such a strange sequence appears in John 20:2-9 serves as evidence that such a sequence is fraudulent, and therefore that John 20:2-9 are fraudulent.

On the other hand, the societal influence to present at least two witnesses and the apparent desire in all of the Gospels to present multiple witnesses serve as evidence that John 20:1 is likely truthful, at least to some extent. That verse describes Mary Magdalene as the only disciple present. If that verse weren't truthful, then it would have likely been formed with multiple witnesses described. The lone presence of Mary Magdalene in John 20:1 despite the societal influence to present at least two witnesses and the apparent desire in all of the Gospels to present multiple witnesses shows that Mary Magdalene was probably really the only disciple present.

The fourth piece of further evidence that shows fraudulent alteration is the odd transition from verses 14 and 15 to verse 16.

John 20:14-15

*At this, she turned around and saw Jesus standing there, but she did not realize it was Jesus.*

*"Woman", he said, "why are you crying? Who is it you are looking for?"*

*Thinking he was the gardener, she said, "Sir, if you have carried him away, tell me where you have put him, and I will get him."*

John 20:16

*Jesus said to her, "Mary."*

*She turned toward him and cried out in Aramaic, "Rabboni!", which means Teacher.*

Why is Mary Magdalene described as having turned towards Christ in verse 16 after having been described in verses 14-15 as having already turned around and having already been in a conversation with Christ? Also, there isn't any description of the identity of Christ having been revealed to Mary Magdalene after she is described as having not recognized Christ. In verse 14, she is described as both having turned around and having not recognized Christ. She is then described in verse 15 as having conversed with Christ but not having known that she was talking to Christ. Then in verse 16, Mary Magdalene is described as having turned towards Christ even though she was previously described as having already turned around and having already been in a conversation with Christ, and is described as suddenly having recognized Christ even though she was previously described as having not recognized Christ and there is no description afterward of the identity of Christ having been revealed to her. The way that verses 14 and 15 transition to verse 16 shows that it is probable that verses 14 and 15 came from a different author than verse 16, which means that they are likely fraudulent additions. Furthermore, verses 14-15 refer to Mary Magdalene as crying similar to verses 10-11, which have already been shown to be likely fraudulent. So the reference to Mary Magdalene crying in verses 14-15 is another indication that those verses are likely fraudulent. The probable scenario is that verse 16 is authentic, meaning that the original source of the information is Mary Magdalene, and verses 14 and 15 were fraudulently added later on to support the effort to portray Mary Magdalene as if she didn't expect the Resurrection. As we will see later, contrary to popular belief, she probably did expect the Resurrection and that is probably why she was at the tomb on that day.

Verse 17 gives us the fifth piece of additional evidence that shows the presence of fraudulent text. Verse 17 describes Mary Magdalene as having been prohibited from touching Christ. However, that is not described in any other Gospel and verse 27 shows Thomas as having been allowed to touch Christ.

John 20:17

*Jesus said, "Do not hold on to me, for I have not yet returned to the Father. Go instead to my brothers and tell them, 'I am returning to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.' "*

John 20:27

*Then he said to Thomas, "Put your finger here; see my hands. Reach out your hand and put it into my side. Stop doubting and believe."*

Why isn't Mary Magdalene allowed to touch Christ but Thomas is? It seems obvious that verse 17 appears to be a fraudulent addition. Such a fraudulent addition was likely an attempt to suppress information about Christ's relationship with Mary Magdalene. We will go into more detail about their relationship later. As will also be shown later, verse 27 appears to be fraudulent as well. But it's not just the contrast with verse 27 that shows that verse 17 is fraudulent, it's also the contrast with every other Gospel. Verse 17 is the only reference in any of the Gospels to anyone having been prohibited from touching Christ. Furthermore, Christ is described as having referred to God as "my God and your God" as if Christ is not God. That interpretation opposes the verses in the Gospel of John that describe Christ as God. That is further evidence that John 20:17 is a later fraudulent addition.

The misplaced use of the word "we", the multiple descriptions of an unnamed disciple, the strange description of who ran faster, the similarities and differences between John 20:2-9 and Luke 24:12, the description of Mary Magdalene having stayed at the tomb even though she isn't ever described as having returned to the tomb, the confusing transition from John 20:14-15 to John 20:16, the contrast between John 20:17 and the rest of the New Testament, and the interpretation that John 20:17 describes Christ as if Christ is not God all combine to show strong evidence that most of the first 17 verses of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John appear to be fraudulent. In conclusion, it is justified to believe that all of the verses that contradict the belief that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple are fraudulent and were added to conceal information related to Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple. The evidence that shows that there was concealment of information related to Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple is further evidence that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple.

Again, the mere presence of an unnamed beloved disciple is evidence that the beloved disciple is a real person. The mystery that arises through their presence in the Gospel of John shows that there likely wouldn't be much motivation to include their presence unless they are a real person. There was motivation to conceal their identity, which shows that there would have been motivation to take their presence out of the Gospel of John completely unless their presence represented the reality of what actually happened. As previously explained, there wouldn't be much motivation to fraudulently make up the fundamental information in John 19:26-27. There particularly wouldn't be much motivation to fraudulently make up that information and then make up that an unnamed person was involved, especially since that person is presented as the beloved disciple. John 19:26-27 represent some of the most important information in the entire Bible, but only if that information is true. If that information weren't true, then there just wouldn't be much reason to include that information. The importance of those verses derives from them representing accurate information. If those verses were entirely false, then they wouldn't hold

much importance if any at all, and so likely nobody would make them up. Furthermore, it would be so counterintuitive to make up a fictional character, place so much importance on them as is the case with the beloved disciple, and then leave them unnamed that it's unrealistic to believe that the presence of the beloved disciple ended up in the Gospel of John for any reason other than that there really is a person who is the beloved disciple. Those verses representing true information is the likely reason why they remained in the Gospel of John, and that reason combined with the evidence that shows that there was motivation to conceal the identity of a woman who is described in those verses as the top disciple of Christ provides the pathway for understanding why there is the presence of an unnamed beloved disciple in the Gospel of John.

In Chapter 19, important information about the Crucifixion was preserved in verses 26-27, and the concealment of the identity of the beloved disciple is a part of how those verses were kept. The diversion from knowing that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple is established in those verses. The second step of that diversion then occurs in chapter 20. Since John 19:26-27 represent such important information, those verses were only altered to conceal the identity of the beloved disciple. The effort is then continued in chapter 20 so that the beloved disciple is specifically presented as someone other than Mary Magdalene. It's a two-step approach over the course of chapters 19-20. In the end, we have evidence that shows that John 19:26-27 represent true information, that the beloved disciple is a real person, that the identity of the beloved disciple was fraudulently concealed in John 19:26-27, that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, and that all of the verses that present the beloved disciple as someone other than Mary Magdalene are fraudulent and were produced with the specific intent to falsely present the beloved disciple as someone other than Mary Magdalene.

The simple fact that the identity of the beloved disciple is not revealed a single time in the entire Gospel of John or anywhere else in the New Testament is incredibly obvious evidence that the beloved disciple's identity was fraudulently concealed. John 19:26-27 describe Christ as having communicated with the beloved disciple during the Crucifixion. The description of that communication is some of the most important information in the entire Bible. We should know who this person is, and the fact that the text doesn't tell us shows that their identity seems to have been fraudulently concealed. From that perspective, it's very easy to see that there seems to be someone who was the top disciple of Christ who the "orthodox church" didn't want us to know about. The concealment in 2 Corinthians of the identity of someone who apparently received praise in the gospel through all of the churches is further evidence of that. That person is probably the beloved disciple given that they are described as having received praise in the gospel through all of the churches and they go unnamed in 2 Corinthians just as the beloved disciple goes unnamed in the Gospel of John. There is also the concealment in the second letter attributed to the name "John" of the identity of someone who is referred to as "the elder" and as a "chosen sister". The writings previously shown from Origen show that there seems to have been female Christian leadership and that the "orthodox church" seems to have been opposed to that. It seems obvious that the "orthodox church" wanted to suppress female leadership and that they fraudulently concealed the identity of the beloved disciple. That is further evidence that the mentions of an unnamed disciple in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John are fraudulent, and so that is also further evidence that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple and that there was an effort to fraudulently conceal information related to Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple.

Additionally, chapter 21 of the Gospel of John shows further evidence in support of the assertion that information about Mary Magdalene was fraudulently concealed.

John 21:14

*This was now the third time Jesus appeared to his disciples after he was raised from the dead.*

John 21:14 alleges that it is describing the third appearance of Christ after the Resurrection; however, it comes after three other appearances are described. There was the account of Christ having appeared to Mary Magdalene first and then there are two other appearances described in chapter 20. So the one described in chapter 21 should have been considered the fourth appearance according to the narratives in the Gospel of John. However, the probable scenario is that the first appearance described was not included in the count contained in verse 21:14 because it was a description that described Mary Magdalene as the only disciple involved and the author of John 21:14 didn't consider Mary Magdalene to have been a disciple. So that is not only further evidence that there seems to have been information that was concealed about a disciple, but also further evidence that there seems to have been information concealed specifically about Mary Magdalene. Furthermore, John 20:10-11 also refer to Mary Magdalene as separate from "the disciples" when those verses describe "the disciples" going back to their homes but describe Mary Magdalene as staying at the tomb crying. So John 20:10-11 and John 21:14 combine to present two different instances of Mary Magdalene being referred to as separate from "the disciples", which shows that there was an effort to present Mary Magdalene as if she wasn't a disciple at all even though she seems to have been the top disciple.

An analysis of the end of the Gospel of Mark can provide further evidence. The first point to recognize is that it is widely believed that verses 9-20 of chapter 16 of the Gospel of Mark are a later addition that were not in the original version of the Gospel of Mark. Many modern Bibles mention that the earliest manuscripts and some other ancient sources do not include those verses. So it is well evidenced that Mark 16:9-20 appear to be a later addition and appear to not have been a part of the original version of the Gospel of Mark. Additionally, those verses seem to be an attempt to harmonize the Gospel of Mark with the other three Gospels and with Acts. Verse 9 is similar to John, verse 12 is similar to Luke, verse 15 is similar to Matthew and Luke, and verses 17 and 18 are similar to information found in Acts. Mark 16:9-20 seem to combine contradicting accounts from the other three Gospels, which shows that whoever wrote those verses probably copied information from the other Gospels. Mark 16:9-20 also seem to contain information from Acts about disciples speaking in different tongues and Paul being bitten by a snake, which shows that whoever wrote those verses probably had knowledge of what was written in Acts and that shows that whoever wrote those verses probably copied information from Acts. Also, Mark describes someone being with Mary Magdalene when she is described as having gone to the tomb but then only describes Mary Magdalene as having first seen Christ after the Resurrection. That shows that verse 16:9 was probably written by a different author than verse 16:8 and that is further evidence that the Gospel of Mark appears to have been altered from its original version to include verses 16:9-20. Therefore, it seems that the original version of the Gospel of Mark probably ended with Mark 16:8. That shows that the original version of the Gospel of Mark seems to have not included a single description of Christ having appeared to anyone after the Resurrection. Mark instead describes "the women" as having "fled from the tomb" after having seen "a young man dressed in a white robe" who was not Christ, and describes them as having "said nothing to anyone because they were afraid". That's it. That seems to be

how the original version of the Gospel of Mark ended. So the original version of the Gospel of Mark doesn't seem to include any description of Christ having appeared to anyone.

It is believed by some that this later addition was added in the second century. That is a very plausible theory considering that it appears that a biblical canon that included the four Gospels was likely put together in the second century. There is a good possibility that those verses were added to the Gospel of Mark while that biblical canon was being put together so that the Gospel of Mark harmonized better with the other Gospels and with Acts.

The fact that the Gospel of Mark through verse 16:8 doesn't describe a single appearance of Christ after the Resurrection is further evidence that information about Mary Magdalene was concealed. How can a Gospel be written without a single description of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection? The sudden end shows that the author seems to have struggled with what to write and probably didn't want to describe what had actually happened. Additionally, the fact that Mark 16:9 describes Mary Magdalene as having been the only person who Christ first appeared to after the Resurrection is evidence that the most popular belief was that Mary Magdalene was alone when she was at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection before she saw Christ and that she was probably the only disciple to have first seen Christ after the Resurrection.

Not only does the sudden end to the original version of the Gospel of Mark show evidence that information about Mary Magdalene was concealed but so do the contradictions among all of the Gospels. The later addition to Mark only names Mary Magdalene as having been the first to have seen Christ after the Resurrection; John also only names Mary Magdalene; Matthew names Mary Magdalene and "the other Mary"; and Luke first refers to two men, one of whom goes unnamed while the other is named Cleopas, and then presents Peter ("Simon") as the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. Excluding Mark 16:9-20, none of the Gospels agree about who Christ first appeared to after the Resurrection. Furthermore, even if Mark 16:9-20 are included, only Mark and John would agree with each other.

Why do the Gospels give contradicting accounts about the discovery of the empty tomb and the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection?

The fact that all four Gospels disagree with each other regarding the discovery of the empty tomb and the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection is an indication that a lot of what is contained in those narratives is fraudulent. The presence of fraud in those narratives is evidence that information was changed. As we will go into more detail on later, the narratives about the discovery of the empty tomb and the Resurrection were changed to put less focus on Mary Magdalene. There was desire to present her with other women so that she wasn't singled out and to present her as a messenger to Peter and the others so that focus is put on them. We will unravel all of these narratives to see exactly what is going on with them. For now, we can see that the Gospels disagreeing about the discovery of the empty tomb and the Resurrection shows that people were changing information, and therefore that a lot of what is contained in those narratives is fraudulent and conceals truth about what really happened on the day of the Resurrection. There is one crucial detail, however, that is found in all four Gospels: Mary Magdalene was at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection before it was discovered that the tomb was empty. She is the only person who is consistently named in all four Gospels as having been at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection before it was discovered that the tomb was empty. That is further evidence that Mary

Magdalene was the only disciple to have first seen Christ after the Resurrection. That shows evidence that the Synoptic Gospels are fraudulent in regard to describing any other person as having been with Mary Magdalene when she was at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection.

So far, it appears that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, the Gospel of John was fraudulently altered to describe Mary Magdalene as separate from the beloved disciple, all of the Synoptic Gospels avoid mentioning that there was a beloved disciple, all of the Synoptic Gospels describe Mary Magdalene as having been with at least one other person when she is described as having been at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection and they are all fraudulent in doing so, the original version of the Gospel of Mark didn't include a single description of any appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, and the Gospel of Mark was later altered to better harmonize with the other Gospels and with Acts.

More evidence can be found when an assessment is done on why anyone was at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection. Each of the Synoptic Gospels provides a reason for why the people mentioned in each went to the tomb while the Gospel of John does not provide such an explanation. In Mark and Luke, women are described as having gone to the tomb to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ. In Matthew, women are described as having gone to the tomb to simply look at the tomb.

It seems very unlikely that anyone would go into a tomb after a body had been in there for multiple days for the purpose of anointing a body. The Gospel of John shows evidence of how unlikely that is.

John 11:38-39

*Jesus, once more deeply moved, came to the tomb. It was a cave with a stone laid across the entrance. "Take away the stone", he said.*

*"But Lord", said Martha, the sister of the dead man, "by this time there is a bad odor, for he has been there four days."*

The period of time described in those verses can be compared to how long after the Crucifixion people are described as having gone to the tomb. It seems very unrealistic to believe that people went to the tomb multiple days after the Crucifixion expecting to go in to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ, and John 11:38-39 are indicative of that. Additionally, according to Jewish tradition, a body should be anointed before the burial is completed.

What if people went to the tomb to simply look at the tomb as described in the Gospel of Matthew but they were planning on looking at the tomb from the outside? That's certainly possible but seems to be quite a stretch because it doesn't provide much of an explanation for having gone to the tomb, there doesn't seem to be much reason to go to a tomb to look at the outside of a tomb, and it still wouldn't explain the accounts in Mark and Luke because those accounts specifically reference anointing.

It doesn't seem to make much sense to anoint someone's body after their burial is already completed, especially if it's multiple days later, and Jewish tradition calls for a body to be anointed before a burial is completed. Some people argue that they had to wait until after the Sabbath. However, that does not explain why the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ was not anointed during the burial. Jewish tradition called for a body to be anointed during a burial, so any description of an anointing happening multiple days after the burial shows probable fraud. Some argue against that by asserting that there wasn't enough time before the beginning of the Sabbath. However, chapter 19 of the Gospel of John

describes the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ having been anointed during the burial and the Synoptic Gospels don't provide any description of there not having been enough time to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. The explanation that there wasn't enough time to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ doesn't appear anywhere in the New Testament and seems to just be a legend that was made up to explain the description of an anointing happening multiple days after the burial. Again, Jewish tradition calls for a body to be anointed during a burial. That alone shows that the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ would have probably been anointed during the burial rather than multiple days later. Furthermore, the Synoptic Gospels describe some of the same people who they describe as having discovered the empty tomb as also having been present during the burial. So in order for those accounts to make sense, the people who are described as having discovered the empty tomb would have had to have known that the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ had already been anointed if the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ was, in which case they likely wouldn't have gone to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ because the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ would have likely already been anointed during the burial.

This assessment shows probable fraud in all of the Synoptic Gospels in relation to the discovery of the empty tomb. The reasons given in the Synoptic Gospels for why anyone went to the tomb appear to be fraudulent. The anointing of the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ as described in the Gospel of John seems much more realistic than the descriptions in Mark and Luke of people going to the tomb multiple days later to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ because it is described in John as having happened before the burial was completed, which is more typical of Jewish customs as mentioned in the Gospel of John. It is specifically stated in the Gospel of John that the anointing during the burial was in accordance with Jewish customs. So we can see that the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ was probably anointed during the burial.

As previously mentioned, the Gospel of John differs from the Synoptic Gospels by not explaining why Mary Magdalene was at the tomb. It wasn't likely to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ because the Gospel of John describes the anointing of the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ in chapter 19, and also it would be unlikely that someone would anoint a body after a burial is completed, especially if there were stones or a large stone covering the tomb. It appears that Mary Magdalene was not at the tomb to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ. Why was Mary Magdalene at the tomb then? Did she expect the Resurrection?

The fact that the Gospel of John excludes an explanation for why Mary Magdalene was at the tomb is evidence that Mary Magdalene probably expected the Resurrection. Additionally, there doesn't seem to be any obvious motivation for Mary Magdalene to have been at the tomb on that day unless she expected the Resurrection given that the burial was already completed, it was a different day than the day of the burial, there were likely stones or a large stone covering the tomb, and she probably wasn't there to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ. Another aspect that should show that Mary Magdalene probably expected the Resurrection is that she is described as having been at the tomb "while it was still dark". Why was she at the tomb so early? Why was she at the tomb before daylight appeared? Probably because she expected the Resurrection on that day. Furthermore, the distinction that it was still dark out rather than simply describing that it was very early is only contained in the Gospel of John and is probably an indication of truthful eyewitness testimony. That gives credibility to that portion of John

20:1. So she was likely at the tomb very early on the day that she expected the Resurrection because of that expectation.

A more extensive analysis will be presented later that shows even more substantial evidence that Mary Magdalene expected the Resurrection. The evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene expected the Resurrection shows that there seems to have been fraudulent concealment of information about that expectation. That not only shows that the Synoptic Gospels are probably fraudulent, but also shows further evidence that chapter 20 of the Gospel of John is probably fraudulent when describing Mary Magdalene as surprised and troubled by the tomb being empty, which shows further evidence that verses 2-15 and 17 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John appear to be fraudulent.

There is plenty of evidence just within the Gospel of John alone to show that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, and the verses previously stated from the Gnostic Gospels add even further evidence for that conclusion and do so very specifically and extensively. Not only is a woman named Mary being shown as a leader, but she is specifically referred to as someone who would likely be the beloved disciple. “Mary” is described in the Gospel of Mary as someone who taught the other disciples, including Peter. She is even described as knowing certain teachings of Christ that were not known by Peter and the others, which specifically portrays her as the top disciple by portraying her as knowing more about Christ’s teachings than others. The Gospel of Philip states “Why do you love her more than all of us?”, which specifically presents Mary Magdalene as someone who would likely be the beloved disciple. Additionally, the name “Mary of Magdala” is used in the Gospel of Philip and is used to describe someone who is one of three people who “always walked with the Master”, the other two people being Mother Mary and Mother Mary’s sister. So “Mary of Magdala”, obviously presumably Mary Magdalene, is described as being in an exclusive group of three that includes Mother Mary and Mother Mary’s sister. Even if none of that information is true of Mary Magdalene, it’s still incredibly striking that any of it was written at all. The popular account is that Mary Magdalene was a sinful prostitute, but there are documents that seem to describe her as being a teacher to the other disciples, as being loved by Christ more than any other disciple, and as being in an exclusive group of three that includes Mother Mary and Mother Mary’s sister. So again, regardless of whether any of that information is true, the fact that it was written at all shows that there is much more to the story of Mary Magdalene, although we could already see that just by studying the Gospel of John. The Gnostic Gospels provide additional support to show that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, but they are not needed to justifiably make such an assertion. There is a sufficient amount of evidence just within the Gospel of John to very justifiably show that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple.

The evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple is further evidence that verses 2-15 and verse 17 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John are fraudulent alterations to suppress information about Mary Magdalene. From verse 2 through verse 17 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John, there is likely only one truthful verse: John 20:16.

John 20:16

*Jesus said to her, “Mary.”*

*She turned toward him and cried out in Aramaic, “Rabboni!”, which means Teacher.*

Given all of the evidence that verses 2-15 and 17 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John are fraudulent, you might be wondering why you should trust John 20:16. An extensive examination of John 20:16 as well as



some other verses in the Gospel of John is forthcoming later here in Part 2. For now, it should be recognized that the presence of fraud seems to center around concealing information about Mary Magdalene, not exalting her. John 20:16 describes Mary Magdalene as the only disciple present during the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. Such a description opposes the apparent fraudulent nature of verses 2-15 and 17, which seem to serve the purpose of concealing information about Mary Magdalene. That alone shows that John 20:16 is probably truthful eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene. Additionally, the presence of Mary Magdalene as the only disciple described also opposes the societal influence to present at least two witnesses to validate a testimony and the apparent desire in all of the Gospels to present multiple witnesses. That also serves as evidence that John 20:16 is likely truthful. If John 20:16 were fraudulent, then there would likely be at least two people described. Instead, only Mary Magdalene is described. Also, not only would it have been unlikely that a fraudulent verse would only include one witness, but that witness was a woman. It would have been highly unlikely to fraudulently describe only one witness, especially if that witness was a woman. Another piece of evidence is the evidence that shows that verses 14-15 of chapter 20 were written by a different author than verse 20:16. Verses 14-15 appear to be fraudulent and verse 20:16 appears to have been written by a different author. The assertion that verse 20:16 was written by a different author than a fraudulent author supports the conclusion that verse 20:16 is authentic.

The fraudulent alterations to the Gospel of John seem to try to downplay the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection and focus attention on the other Resurrection narratives. The authors of the Synoptic Gospels wanted to present someone else as having been with Mary Magdalene; but the authors of the fraudulent alterations to the Gospel of John don't seem to have cared as much about that, and even go as far as to exclude the account about Mary Magdalene from the count of appearances of Christ after the Resurrection as has been shown by John 21:14. Less importance seems to have been placed on John 20:16; and as a result, it seems that real eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene about the Resurrection of Christ has been fairly preserved and remains within John 20:16. As previously mentioned, an extensive examination that shows further evidence of the likely authenticity of John 20:16 as well as some other verses is forthcoming later here in Part 2; but for now, we can already see that John 20:16 is likely real eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene about the Resurrection of Christ.

So far, evidence has been shown that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, there was fraudulent concealment of information related to Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple, Mary Magdalene expected the Resurrection, and there was fraudulent concealment of information related to Mary Magdalene having expected the Resurrection. As we turn back to the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the discovery of the empty tomb and the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, we can see that the Synoptic Gospels seem to be fraudulent by downplaying Mary Magdalene's importance and presenting her as a messenger along with at least one other woman. Therefore, it seems that all four Gospels contain attempts to conceal information about Mary Magdalene. However, it seems that the Synoptic Gospels take a different route to such concealment than the Gospel of John does. The fundamental structure of the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels downplay Mary Magdalene's importance, which shows that such narratives were probably fraudulent upon their original production. The Gospel of John, on the other hand, shows that there seems to have been contributions from multiple authors, which shows that there seems to have been fraudulent alterations made to a previously existing version of the Gospel of John. If that wasn't the case, then there probably wouldn't have been an unnamed beloved disciple described in the Gospel of John.

The apparent presence of multiple authors in the Gospel of John shows the presence of two different forces. On one hand, there seems to have been information circulating about Mary Magdalene being the top disciple during Christ's Ministry. On the other hand, there seems to have been an effort to conceal information related to Mary Magdalene's importance. The Gnostic Gospels are an example of the force that shows that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple. The Synoptic Gospels are examples of the force that concealed information about Mary Magdalene. The Gospel of John contains both forces. There seems to have been a previously existing version of the Gospel of John that portrayed Mary Magdalene as someone who could be viewed as the beloved disciple and the modern version of the Gospel of John seems to contain fraudulent alterations that conceal information about Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple.

There seems to have been one party that believed that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple and there seems to have been another party that wanted to conceal information about Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple. Meanwhile, the Synoptic Gospels place plenty of importance on Peter and the rest of "the Twelve". So it seems that the party that wanted to conceal information about Mary Magdalene favored Peter and the rest of "the Twelve". For example, the Gospel of Luke exalts Peter to a ridiculous extent and also claims that Mary Magdalene had seven demons come out of her. That is a very explicit example of the division that existed between these two parties.

All three Synoptic Gospels give particular attention to Peter. The Gospel of Matthew goes really far in declaring Peter in a top spot.

Matthew 16:17-19

*Jesus replied, "Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for this was not revealed to you by man, but by my Father in heaven. And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven."*

The Synoptic Gospels give attention to Peter over and over again and the Gospel of Matthew presents a narrative that describes Christ as having said that Christ's Church will be built on a rock with that rock being Peter. Again, the name "Peter" as it relates to Peter in the Gospels comes from the Greek word "pitros", which means rock. So when Matthew 16:17-19 states "you are Peter", that really means "you are rock". So then, when Matthew 16:17-19 says "on this rock I will build my church", "this rock" refers to Peter.

"The Twelve" are also proudly proclaimed in the Synoptic Gospels. There is a narrative in all of the Synoptic Gospels describing the supposed appointing of "the Twelve" and lists each of them by name. These are narratives that claim that there was an official appointing of these men by Christ. Additionally, Matthew and Luke both include narratives that really take an extreme view on the importance of "the Twelve".

Matthew 19:28

*Jesus said to them, "I tell you the truth, at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man sits on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."*

Luke 22:28-30

*“You are those who have stood by me in my trials. And I confer on you a kingdom, just as my Father conferred one on me, so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.”*

Here we see Luke describing “the Twelve” as being people who a kingdom will be conferred to just as a kingdom was conferred to Christ. That sounds like “the Twelve” are being portrayed as having the ability to be like Christ in that way, and so those verses obviously appear to be fraudulent. Furthermore, both Matthew and Luke claim that “the Twelve” will sit on thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. These verses are really extreme. These verses obviously appear to be fraudulent. The Gospel of John, on the other hand, does not include any such claims or any narrative that describes the supposed appointing of “the Twelve”.

Peter couldn't have been the top disciple if Mary Magdalene was, and “the Twelve” couldn't have been the top twelve disciples if they didn't include the top disciple. From that perspective, we can see that any text in the Bible that exalts Peter or “the Twelve” in such a way appears to be fraudulent and appears to be a part of an effort to conceal information about Mary Magdalene's importance and to fraudulently exalt other people.

Given the evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple and that there were specific efforts to conceal information about Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple, we can see that Peter doesn't seem to have been the top disciple and that “the Twelve” don't seem to have been the top twelve disciples. That in turn shows that Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” seem to have been fraudulently exalted in coordination with specific efforts to conceal information about Mary Magdalene's importance. Again, Peter couldn't have been the top disciple if Mary Magdalene was, and “the Twelve” couldn't have been the top twelve disciples if they didn't include the top disciple. Therefore, the narratives that exalt Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” appear to be fraudulent. More specifically, the narratives about the supposed appointing of “the Twelve” appear to be fraudulent. We can come to that conclusion just based on the evidence that shows that “the Twelve” seem to have excluded the top disciple. Given that “the Twelve” appear to have been a group of men who excluded the top disciple, “the Twelve” don't appear to have been appointed in the way that the Synoptic Gospels describe. Additionally, John 1:11-12 provide further evidence.

John 1:11-12

*He came to that which was his own, but his own did not receive him. Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to be children of God.*

John 1:11-12 show that discipleship is a choice. Being a disciple means choosing to be a disciple. We can come to that conclusion even without John 1:11-12. A true disciple commits themselves to discipleship and commitment must be a choice. So a person can't really commit to discipleship without choosing to. If one chooses to be a disciple, then they are a disciple. If one chooses to not be a disciple, then they are not a disciple. Based on that teaching, we can see that discipleship is an individual choice, and so it appears that “the Twelve” were never appointed in the way that the Synoptic Gospels describe. Therefore, the narratives that describe the supposed appointing of “the Twelve” all appear to be fraudulent. Additionally, as we will go into more detail on shortly, the apparent fraudulent nature of the attention that Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” receive in the Gospels as well as “the Twelve” apparently having chosen to turn

away from Christ are both indications that the Resurrection narratives that focus on Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” are fraudulent as well.

Further evidence that “the Twelve” were not specially appointed in the way that the Bible describes can be found in Paul’s letter to the Galatians.

Galatians 2:11-14

*When Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he was clearly in the wrong. Before certain men came from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they arrived, he began to draw back and separate himself from the Gentiles because he was afraid of those who belong to the circumcision group. The other Jews joined him in his hypocrisy, so that by their hypocrisy even Barnabas was led astray. When I saw that they were not acting in line with the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter in front of them all, “You are a Jew, yet you live like a Gentile and not like a Jew. How is it, then, that you force Gentiles to follow Jewish customs?”*

These verses describe Peter and some others as hypocrites and states “they were not acting in line with the truth of the gospel”. Paul accused Peter of being a Jew who lives like a gentile while forcing gentiles to follow Jewish customs. These descriptions of Peter present him as a hypocrite who tried to control other people by forcing them to follow customs that he didn’t even follow himself. The Gospels describe Peter as someone who disowned Christ and Galatians describes Peter as a hypocrite who tried to control other people by forcing them to follow customs that he didn’t even follow himself. This portrayal of Peter is further evidence that he was not the top disciple, and therefore that his exaltation as the top disciple in the Gospels is fraudulent. If Peter was not the top disciple, then “the eleven” (“the Twelve” without Judas Iscariot) weren’t the frontrunners of spreading Christianity. Instead, Mary Magdalene was the top disciple and the frontrunner of spreading Christianity.

The mere presence of Paul in the history of early Christianity shows that Peter and the rest of “the eleven” don’t seem to have been relatively very successful. The Bible omits a lot of information about female Christian leadership; but information about male leadership, on the other hand, is in abundance in the Bible. So the Bible is more useful in assessing male leadership than it is in assessing female leadership. Among the men, Paul seems to have had more of a presence than Peter. Paul is believed by many to have been the eventual frontrunner of spreading Christianity. Peter and the rest of “the eleven” are believed to have been frontrunners in the very early days and Paul is believed to have eventually been the most productive in spreading Christianity. Those beliefs of course omit the leadership of Mary Magdalene, which we will go into more detail on in Part 6, but those beliefs can still give us insight into the dynamics among the men. Just among the men, Peter still seems to have lost out on achieving the top spot. Paul seems to have taken on that role. Therefore, Paul’s presence in the history of early Christianity shows further that Peter and the rest of “the eleven” were not the top frontrunners of spreading Christianity because Paul’s presence shows that they weren’t even the top frontrunners among the men.

Paul apparently wasn’t even a disciple during Christ’s Ministry. He seems to have entered into the mix afterwards. So even someone who wasn’t a disciple during Christ’s Ministry surpassed Peter and the rest of “the eleven”. The evidence that shows that Peter and the rest of “the eleven” were surpassed by a man who wasn’t even a disciple during Christ’s Ministry is further evidence that Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” were not specially appointed and were not the top disciples during Christ’s Ministry, which in turn shows further evidence that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple.

Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” seem to have been a group of men who disowned Christ while the top disciple, Mary Magdalene, stayed faithful and who were also surpassed by Paul. They don’t seem to have ever been specially appointed, they seem to have been an exclusive group that excluded the top disciple, they apparently disowned Christ, and they seem to have also been surpassed by Paul in addition to Mary Magdalene. In conclusion, Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” should not be given the benefit of the doubt over all of the overwhelming evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple.

### **The Empty Tomb and the Resurrection**

Regarding the discovery of the empty tomb and the Resurrection, we should analyze the narratives in three groups: narratives about the discovery of the empty tomb, narratives about the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, and all other Resurrection narratives. Each of the Gospels describe Mary Magdalene, either alone or as a part of a group of women, as having discovered the empty tomb. The Gospel of John describes Mary Magdalene as having been alone at the tomb and the Synoptic Gospels all describe her as having been with at least one other woman. The Gospel of John describes Mary Magdalene as having been the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection, the Gospel of Mark through verse 16:8 doesn’t describe a single appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, the Gospel of Matthew describes Mary Magdalene and “the other Mary” as having been the first two people to have seen Christ after the Resurrection, and the Gospel of Luke takes a different direction by avoiding describing Mary Magdalene or any other woman as having seen Christ after the Resurrection and instead describes Peter and two other men as having first seen Christ after the Resurrection. All of the Gospels then include narratives about “the eleven”.

We have already seen that the Synoptic Gospels are probably fraudulent in describing any other woman as having been with Mary Magdalene when she was at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection. The Gospel of Mark through verse 16:8 doesn’t include a single description of any appearance of Christ after the Resurrection and so the Gospel of Mark should not be trusted regarding information about the Resurrection. As with the discovery of the empty tomb, the Gospel of Matthew is probably fraudulent in describing any other woman as having been with Mary Magdalene when Christ appeared to her after the Resurrection. The narrative in the Gospel of Luke about the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection can already be seen as probably fraudulent just based on the fact that it takes a different direction than the other Gospels by describing Peter and two other men as the first people to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. It was previously shown that any narrative that exalts Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” is probably fraudulent and so all of the narratives that describe Christ as having appeared to the “the eleven” are probably fraudulent. Additionally, as previously shown, discipleship is a choice, and so if “the eleven” chose to not be disciples, then they would appear to not have been disciples on the day of the Resurrection. If “the eleven” were no longer disciples, then they probably didn’t see Christ after the Resurrection. Hypothetically, if Christ appeared to anyone who was a disciple on the day of the Resurrection but not to anyone who wasn’t a disciple, and “the eleven” chose to not be disciples, then they would not have been disciples and so would not have seen Christ after the Resurrection. If Christ appeared to anyone who was a disciple but not to anyone who wasn’t a disciple, and “the eleven” disowned Christ, then “the eleven” would not have seen Christ after the Resurrection. So just based on the information presented so far, we can already see that John 20:16 is probably the only reliable description

of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection; and that conclusion will be further supported as we go into more detail about the Resurrection narratives.

As previously mentioned, the first description in the Gospel of Luke of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection is in a narrative that doesn't exist in any other Gospel.

Luke 24:13-16

*Now that same day two of them were going to a village called Emmaus, about seven miles from Jerusalem. They were talking with each other about everything that had happened. As they talked and discussed these things with each other, Jesus himself came up and walked along with them; but they were kept from recognizing him.*

Luke 24:19

*"What things?" he asked.*

*"About Jesus of Nazareth", they replied. "He was a prophet, powerful in word and deed before God and all the people."*

Luke 24:25-35

*He said to them, "How foolish you are, and how slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Did not the Christ have to suffer these things and then enter his glory?" And beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he explained to them what was said in all the Scriptures concerning himself. As they approached the village to which they were going, Jesus acted as if he were going farther. But they urged him strongly, "Stay with us, for it is nearly evening; the day is almost over." So he went in to stay with them.*

*When he was at the table with them, he took bread, gave thanks, broke it and began to give it to them. Then their eyes were opened and they recognized him, and he disappeared from their sight. They asked each other, "Were not our hearts burning within us while he talked with us on the road and opened the Scriptures to us?"*

*They got up and returned at once to Jerusalem. There they found the Eleven and those with them, assembled together and saying, "It is true! The Lord has risen and has appeared to Simon." Then the two told what had happened on the way, and how Jesus was recognized by them when he broke the bread.*

There are seven points to make about these verses. The first is that this narrative is not in any other Gospel. If this narrative really described an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, then it likely wouldn't only be in the Gospel of Luke. The fact that this narrative is only in the Gospel of Luke is evidence that this narrative is probably fraudulent. The second point is that the Gospel of Luke doesn't describe Christ as having appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection. Mark, Matthew, and John all describe Christ as having appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection. The Gospel of Luke instead describes women as only discovering the empty tomb and avoids any mention of Christ having appeared to Mary Magdalene. So a narrative that isn't in any other Gospel is used to represent the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, and meanwhile, there isn't a single mention in the Gospel of Luke of Christ having appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection. It seems obvious that this narrative is probably fraudulent and was probably produced to shift attention away from Mary Magdalene. The third point is that the Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that describes the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection to have been to Peter alone. The Gospel of Luke doesn't

actually include any narrative that describes such an appearance, but simply refers to it. We can revisit Luke 24:33-35 to break down how to see this.

Luke 24:33-35

*They got up and returned at once to Jerusalem. There they found the Eleven, and those with them, assembled together and saying, "It is true! The Lord has risen and has appeared to Simon." Then the two told what had happened on the way, and how Jesus was recognized by them when he broke the bread.*

Those verses describe that Christ appeared to "Simon". There were two people involved in the narrative prior to that. So it wouldn't make sense to only name one person if the same supposed appearance was being described. Therefore, this supposed appearance to "Simon" refers to someone who is not one of those two people, which means Luke 24:33-35 are referring to a supposed appearance that is not described in the narrative. A simple reference to "Simon" without any other specific identifying information would obviously be a reference to Peter who was originally named "Simon" before being later called "Peter". Additionally, the sentence that refers to a supposed appearance to Peter starts off by describing "the eleven and those with them" being assembled together and the sentence is describing this group of people as speaking about the supposed appearance to Simon, which is another indication that this supposed appearance is not about the two people described throughout the narrative. The Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that includes this narrative, the Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that doesn't describe Christ as having appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection, and the Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that claims that Christ first appeared to Peter alone. These first three points already make it very obvious that this narrative is probably fraudulent. The fourth point is that these two people are described as having not recognized Christ, which is similar to fraudulent verses in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John that describe Mary Magdalene as not having recognized Christ. The fifth point is that verse 24:19 refers to Christ as a "prophet" who was "powerful in word and deed before God and all the people". So Christ is described as having been a prophet rather than being God, similar to Islamic beliefs, as was shown in Part 1. Additionally, Christ is described separately from God as having been "before God and all the people". As shown in Part 1, this verse seems to describe Christ as if Christ is not God. Describing Christ as a prophet instead of as God opposes Christianity and supports Islam. So that verse opposes Christianity and supports Islam. This is a pattern that we will go into more detail on later. For now, it is easy to see that verse 24:19 appears to be fraudulent. The sixth point is that Christ is described as having explained to the two people "what was said in all the Scriptures" about Christ, but immediately after that, the narrative goes in a different direction instead of describing the two people as having responded to what Christ is described as having said. That odd transition is representative of an incoherent storyline, which shows probable fraud. The seventh point is that after Christ is described as having disappeared from them, the two people are then described as having recognized what Christ had previously said about the Scriptures. So there was no initial response provided after the description of Christ having spoken about the Scriptures but then there's a later reference to such a response. This again points to probable fraud. The author's inability to put together important pieces of the story shows that the missing gaps are probably a product of the entire narrative being fraudulent. For these reasons, it is justified to believe that this account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection is fraudulent.

So the Gospel of Luke includes multiple women along with Mary Magdalene when describing the discovery of the empty tomb; includes more women along with Mary Magdalene than any other Synoptic Gospel; entirely avoids describing Christ as having appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection;

claims that Christ first appeared after the Resurrection to Peter alone; and describes the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection in an apparently fraudulent narrative that isn't in any other Gospel, seems incoherent, opposes Christianity, and supports Islam. The probable scenario is that there was an effort to conceal information about Christ having appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection and, as a part of that effort, a fraudulent narrative that isn't in any other Gospel was added to falsely represent the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection.

Now we can turn to the parts in Matthew and Luke that primarily focus on "the eleven" ("the Twelve" without Judas Iscariot). The narrative in Matthew is commonly referred to as "The Great Commission" and the narrative in Luke is very similar in certain ways and a part of it could also be referred to as "The Great Commission". First and foremost, given that these narratives focus on a group of men that seems to exclude the top disciple of Christ, Mary Magdalene, these narratives already appear to be entirely fraudulent.

Matthew 28:16-20

*Then the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain where Jesus had told them to go. When they saw him, they worshipped him; but some doubted. Then Jesus came to them and said, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age."*

Luke 24:33-53

*They got up and returned at once to Jerusalem. There they found the Eleven and those with them, assembled together and saying, "It is true! The Lord has risen and has appeared to Simon." Then the two told what had happened on the way, and how Jesus was recognized by them when he broke the bread. While they were still talking about this, Jesus himself stood among them and said to them, "Peace be with you."*

*They were startled and frightened thinking they saw a ghost. He said to them, "Why are you troubled, and why do doubts rise in your minds? Look at my hands and my feet. It is myself! Touch me and see; a ghost does not have flesh and bones, as you see I have."*

*When he had said this, he showed them his hands and feet. And while they still did not believe it because of joy and amazement, he asked them, "Do you have anything to eat?" They gave him a piece of broiled fish, and he took it and ate it in their presence.*

*He said to them, "This is what I told you while I was still with you: Everything must be fulfilled that is written about me in the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms."*

*Then he opened their minds so they could understand the Scriptures. He told them, "This is what is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and repentance and forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things. I am going to send you what my Father has promised; but stay in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high."*

*When he had led them out to the vicinity of Bethany, he lifted up his hands and blessed them. While he was blessing them, he left them and was taken up into heaven. Then they worshiped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy. And they stayed continually at the temple, praising God.*



The Gospel of Matthew describes this grand scene of Christ having given instructions to the people who abandoned Christ and were afraid to continue to follow Christ after everything that Christ had taught them. It doesn't make much sense for these people to have been entrusted with spreading Christianity when they had such a lack of an understanding that they abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified. The narrative states "teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you". The people who abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified and didn't understand a lot of what was taught to them by Christ were supposed to teach the world everything that Christ had taught them? That doesn't seem to make much sense. This narrative even explicitly states that "some doubted". So not only did these men abandon Christ while Christ was crucified and didn't understand a lot of what was taught to them by Christ, but some of them are also described as having still doubted even after the Resurrection. Despite all of that, this narrative proposes that these men were entrusted with spreading Christianity to the world. Additionally, this narrative describes a group of men that seems to exclude the top disciple of Christ, Mary Magdalene, as being entrusted with spreading Christianity to the world. So it seems that according to this narrative, the top disciple of Christ was not entrusted with spreading Christianity to the world; but instead, spreading Christianity to the world was entrusted to a group of men who abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified and didn't understand a lot of what was taught to them by Christ, and some of them supposedly still doubted even after the Resurrection. This narrative obviously appears to be entirely fraudulent.

As for the Gospel of Luke, there are six points to make. The first is one of the points made for the Gospel of Matthew: it is unlikely that the people who abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified and didn't understand a lot of what was taught to them by Christ would be entrusted with teaching the world about what was taught to them by Christ. The second is another one of the points made for the Gospel of Matthew: focus on a group of men that excluded the top disciple of Christ, Mary Magdalene, shows that the entire narrative appears to be entirely fraudulent. The third is that there is this strange part about Christ eating. Christ was crucified, these men abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified, and they are described in this narrative as having still had doubts. Despite all of that, this narrative goes on to describe Christ as having asked for food and having eaten. That's such an odd sequence that is obviously apparently fraudulent. That information was probably influenced by an ancient literary style. The description of eating can be used to express that a character is not a ghost. In other words, it is thought that only a physical being could eat, so any being who can eat is not a ghost. That literary style probably influenced the description in those verses of Christ eating and the use of that literary style shows further that those verses are fraudulent. The fourth point is that these men are described as having obtained an understanding of Scriptures. Why do they need to understand the Scriptures to see that Christ had risen? If they could see Christ, then what else do they need to understand that Christ had risen? It is described that an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection was not enough for them to believe but an understanding of Scriptures may have been. That shows further evidence that this entire narrative is fraudulent. The fifth point is that this narrative actually refers to "power". Christianity is not about receiving power. Yet this narrative describes that power was supposed to be given to people who abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified and didn't understand a lot of what was taught to them by Christ. The sixth point is that this narrative states "they stayed continually at the temple". What about spreading Christianity throughout the world? Isn't that more important than staying at the temple? It seems that this narrative describes a step backwards. Jewish priests of the temple wanted Christ crucified and this narrative describes Christ's supposed disciples as having stayed continually at the temple rather than traveling to spread Christianity.

This narrative describes “the eleven” as having stayed continually at the place that was controlled by people who wanted Christ crucified instead of traveling to spread Christianity. That represents a major fundamental misunderstanding of Christianity. In fact, this narrative contains multiple fundamental misunderstandings of Christianity. This narrative is obviously apparently fraudulent.

So far, evidence has been shown that this is the real scenario: Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, expected the Resurrection, and was at the tomb by herself on the day of the Resurrection; there was an effort to conceal information about Mary Magdalene; there was an effort to fraudulently exalt Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” (or “the eleven”); every Resurrection narrative in the Synoptic Gospels is fraudulent; verses 2-15 and 17 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John are fraudulent; and verse 16 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John is truthful.

As for the rest of the Gospel of John, we should first compare certain verses from chapter 19 with the last two verses of chapter 20.

John 19:31-35

*Now it was the day of Preparation, and the next day was to be a special Sabbath. Because the Jews did not want the bodies left on the crosses during the Sabbath, they asked Pilate to have the legs broken and the bodies taken down. The soldiers therefore came and broke the legs of the first man who had been crucified with Jesus, and then those of the other. But when they came to Jesus and found that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. Instead, one of the soldiers pierced Jesus' side with a spear, bringing a sudden flow of blood and water. The man who saw it has given testimony, and his testimony is true. He knows that he tells the truth, and he testifies so that you also may believe.*

John 20:30-31

*Jesus did many other miraculous signs in the presence of his disciples, which are not recorded in this book. But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name.*

John 19:31-35 explain that an eyewitness testified to what happened after the Crucifixion was completed. Eyewitness testimonies about the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of Christ are the two most important kinds of eyewitness testimony in relation to showing evidence for the Resurrection of Christ. So John 19:31-35 represent one of the two most important kinds of eyewitness testimony in relation to showing evidence for the Resurrection of Christ. That is why that testimony is so important to other people. That testimony provides reason to believe in the Resurrection of Christ. In contrast, chapter 20 provides a different approach to trying to convince people to believe in Christianity. As discussed, verse 20:16 appears to be the only truthful verse in verses 2-17 of chapter 20. The rest of chapter 20 describes Christ as having appeared to the so-called “disciples” and having performed multiple miracles, and concludes by claiming that multiple miracles were performed by Christ so that we “may believe that Jesus is the Christ”. There is a fundamental misunderstanding of Christianity represented by John 20:30-31. There is a difference between those who saw Christ in the first century and people who walk the Earth today. Those who saw Christ in the first century may have been given miracles, which may have helped in their belief. Any miracles that were performed in the first century that were not the Resurrection wouldn't have been mainly for us. They would have been mainly for those who saw Christ in the first century. For example, if water was really turned into wine, that would have had an immediate impact on those who would have witnessed it, but that is not the main reason or even one of the main reasons why we should believe in

Christianity. Believing in Christianity is not based on water turning into wine. But for someone who lived in the first century, they could have become a disciple during Christ's Ministry. For us, we should not believe in Christianity because of water potentially having turned into wine. We should not believe in Christianity because of John 20:30-31. There are many other reasons to believe in Christianity. Your faith should not be dependent on miracles that may have been performed in the first century that were not the Resurrection. Your faith should not follow the outline laid out in John 20:30-31. Instead, your faith should be supported by John 19:31-35. The testimony in John 19:31-35 is for everybody. Miracles that may have been performed in the first century that were not the Resurrection were mainly for people who would have witnessed them. So John 20:30-31 represent a fundamental misunderstanding of Christianity and are therefore apparently fraudulent. John 20:30-31 appear to have been written by someone who didn't really understand Christianity and so those verses appear to be fraudulent.

With just the recognition that John 20:30-31 are apparently fraudulent, there is already good reason to believe that most of the rest of chapter 20 is fraudulent. We will begin with verses 21-23 and eventually cover the rest of chapter 20.

John 20:21-23

*Again Jesus said, "Peace be with you! As the Father has sent me, I am sending you." And with that he breathed on them and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive anyone his sins, they are forgiven; if you do not forgive them, they are not forgiven."*

These verses show three fundamental misunderstandings about Christianity. One is in relation to the description of Christ expressing that Christ will send the so-called "disciples" as "the Father" sent Christ. That portrays Christ as separate from God, which contradicts other theology in the Gospel of John that describes Christ as God. The second is in relation to the description of Christ giving the Holy Spirit to people by breathing on them. The description of the physical passing on of the Holy Spirit does not align with true Christianity. Receiving the Spirit of God is about recognizing the presence of God. You do not need to be physically breathed on to receive the Spirit of God. The third is that it is described that if one of those people doesn't forgive someone then that someone is not forgiven. That does not represent true Christianity. These verses are intended to give an extravagant tale about certain people being special by supposedly having been breathed on by Christ and having been able to choose who is forgiven. That's not true Christianity. John 20:21-23 appear to be fraudulent.

Verse 24 of chapter 20 contains one of only three references to "the Twelve" throughout the entire Gospel of John. The other two are in John 6:66-71.

John 6:66-71

*From this time many of his disciples turned back and no longer followed him.*

*"You do not want to leave too, do you?" Jesus asked the Twelve.*

*Simon Peter answered him, "Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life. We believe and know that you are the Holy One of God."*

*Then Jesus replied, "Have I not chosen you, the Twelve? Yet one of you is a devil". (He meant Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot, who, though one of the Twelve, was later to betray him.)*

John 20:24

*Now Thomas (called Didymus), one of the Twelve, was not with the disciples when Jesus came.*

The Synoptic Gospels describe the appointing of “the Twelve”, name each of them, give them special status, and describe promises having been made to them. The Gospel of John, on the other hand, does not include any narrative that describes the appointing of “the Twelve” or any such claims of special status or promises. The fact that the Gospel of John never introduces “the Twelve” is strong evidence that every mention of “the Twelve” in the Gospel of John is fraudulent. There isn’t any information in the Gospel of John that introduces who those twelve men are. The only two men who are ever specifically described as one of “the Twelve” are Judas and Thomas. None of the other ten men are ever specifically identified in the Gospel of John as one of “the Twelve”, not even Peter. Peter is described in John 6:66-71 along with two mentions of “the Twelve”, but Peter is never specifically identified as one of “the Twelve”. Even if John 6:66-71 seem to imply that Peter is one of “the Twelve”, that is never explicitly stated in the Gospel of John. Since there isn’t any introduction of “the Twelve” like there is in all of the Synoptic Gospels, all three mentions of “the Twelve” in the Gospel of John appear to be fraudulent. Additionally, as previously shown, the general exaltation of “the Twelve” appears to be fraudulent and so that is further evidence that all three mentions of “the Twelve” in the Gospel of John are fraudulent. Therefore, John 20:24 is apparently fraudulent.

Verses 18 and 25 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John are very similar to each other.

John 20:18

*Mary Magdalene went to the disciples with the news: “I have seen the Lord!” And she told them that she had said these things to her.*

John 20:25

*So the other disciples told him, “We have seen the Lord!”*

*But he said to them, “Unless I see the nail marks in his hands and put my finger where the nails were, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe it.”*

Verse 18 describes Mary Magdalene as having said “I have seen the Lord!” and verse 25 describes some so-called “disciples” as having said “We have seen the Lord!” There are a few reasons to believe that both of these verses are fraudulent. First, the use of nearly identical statements shows the likely fraudulent nature of both because the use of nearly identical statements appears to be representative of the author’s writing style rather than of what actually happened. Both statements appear to just be products of the author’s storytelling. Second, the contrast between the description in verse 16 of Mary Magdalene having called Christ “Rabboni” and the description in verse 18 of Mary Magdalene having referred to Christ as “the Lord” shows the likelihood that verses 16 and 18 were written by different authors from each other. It’s certainly not impossible for someone to use two different words to refer to Christ. People do that. Many people today say both “God” and “Lord”. So the use of two different words to refer to Christ doesn’t prove that verses 16 and 18 were written by different authors from each other. Nevertheless, it is still significant that two different words are used. If Mary Magdalene called Christ “Rabboni” when she saw Christ after the Resurrection, then it seems likely that she typically called Christ “Rabboni” instead of “the Lord”. That of course is not necessarily the case; however, it does seem likely. Third, the Greek word that gets translated to “Lord” in verse 18 is translated from the Greek word Κύριον (“Kyrion”), and the other two verses in chapter 20 that describe Mary Magdalene as having used that word have already been shown to appear to be fraudulent. Those verses are verses 2 and 13. Verse 2 describes Mary Magdalene as having said “They have taken the Lord out of the tomb, and we don’t know where they have put him!”

Verse 13 describes Mary Magdalene as having said “They have taken my Lord away” and “I don’t know where they have put him.” Both verses 2 and 13 use the Greek word “Kyriion” as does verse 18. So there are four verses that describe Mary Magdalene as having spoken: verses 2, 13, 16, and 18. Verse 16 describes Mary Magdalene as having called Christ “Rabboni” while the other three verses describe Mary Magdalene as having referred to Christ as “Lord”. Two of those three verses that use the word “Lord” have been shown to appear to be fraudulent. So it is then likely that the only other verse that describes Mary Magdalene as having referred to Christ as “Lord”, verse 18, is fraudulent as well. Since verse 25 was likely written by the same author as verse 18, that would show that verse 25 is also likely fraudulent. Fourth, it seems unlikely that a truthful verse about the first proclamation that Christ had risen would be so simple. Verse 18 simply describes Mary Magdalene as having said “I have seen the Lord” and then states “And she told them that he had said these things to her”. The simplicity of a verse that describes such important information is probably a product of fraudulent writing. A truthful verse about the first proclamation that Christ had risen would likely be more informative. Since verse 25 was likely written by the same author as verse 18, that would show that verse 25 is also likely fraudulent. Fifth, the comparison of verse 18 to verse 25 shows another attempt to separate Mary Magdalene from “the disciples”. Verse 18 states “Mary Magdalene went to the disciples” and verse 25 states “the other disciples told him”. Verse 25 uses the word “other” before the word “disciples” and refers to Thomas. The word “other” is translated from the Greek word ἄλλοι (“alloi”) and is properly translated as the word “other”. That word is not in verse 18. The use of that word in verse 25 shows that Thomas is being portrayed as a disciple. The absence of that word in verse 18 shows that Mary Magdalene is being portrayed as separate from “the disciples”, which shows that there was an effort to present Mary Magdalene as if she wasn’t a disciple at all even though she was the top disciple. That shows further evidence that both verses 18 and 25 are fraudulent.

John 20:20 is the only other verse in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John that uses the Greek word “Kyriion”. Verse 28 uses the Greek word “Kyrios”, which is slightly different but equivalent; and it will be shown shortly that verse 28 appears to be fraudulent.

John 20:20

*After he said this, he showed them his hands and side. The disciples were overjoyed when they saw the Lord.*

The use of the Greek word “Kyriion” to refer to God doesn’t necessarily show probable fraudulent writing. However, it has been shown that the other four uses of that word within chapter 20 appear to be fraudulent. That shows that someone who used the Greek word “Kyriion” to refer to Christ seems to have fraudulently altered chapter 20. Meanwhile, verse 16, the only verse in chapter 20 after verse 1 that has so far been shown to seem to be authentic, refers to Christ as “Rabboni”. Therefore, it is likely the case that the only other use of the Greek word “Kyriion” in chapter 20 is fraudulent.

Verses 20-25 of chapter 20 have been shown to appear to be fraudulent. So the verse that serves as an introduction to those verses, verse 19, is probably fraudulent as well, which means that verses 19-25 of chapter 20 all appear to be fraudulent.

The account about Mary Magdalene in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John ends with verse 18. Verses 19-31 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John represent narratives that describe Christ as having appeared to “the disciples”. It has been shown that verses 19-25 are all appear to be fraudulent. Also, it has already been

shown that verses 30-31 also appear to be fraudulent. Just based on that, it is then easy to derive the belief that verses 26-29 are also likely fraudulent. Additionally, verses 26-29 not only show a fundamental misunderstanding of Christianity by focusing on the physicality of the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ as a reason for Thomas to believe, but those verses are also some of the most outrageous verses in the entire Bible. They describe Christ as having appeared in a form that shows the wounds of the Crucifixion. That seems to be a product of faulty human thinking. The wounds of the Crucifixion led to the burial and the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ resurrected. There are two parts to that statement that each deserves independent recognition. The first is that the wounds of the Crucifixion led to the burial, and the second is that the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ resurrected. If the wounds of the Crucifixion led to the burial and the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ resurrected, then it is justified to believe that the wounds of the Crucifixion would no longer be present. These verses leave off with “Because you have seen me, you have believed; blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed”. That conclusion shows the likely motivation for adding these verses. These verses were probably a fraudulent attempt to convince people to believe in Christianity, which is on par with verses 30-31. Verses 30-31 reference miracles that were not the Resurrection as reasons for all people to believe in Christianity, which has been shown to have probably been a fraudulent attempt to convince people to believe.

The rest of chapter 20 after verse 16 describes the top disciple of Christ, Mary Magdalene, as if she wasn't a disciple at all; and includes descriptions of people receiving the Spirit of God by being breathed on, descriptions of people being able to decide who is forgiven, one of only three references in the Gospel of John to “the Twelve”, descriptions of wounds of the Crucifixion still having been on the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, and the explanation that miracles in the first century that were not the Resurrection are for us to believe in Christianity. It is justified to believe that the rest of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John after verse 16 is all fraudulent. It is justified to believe that verses 1 and 16 are the only truthful verses through all of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John.

As we move into chapter 21 of the Gospel of John, we should reexamine the last two verses of chapter 20 while we take a look at the first four verses of chapter 21.

John 20:30-31

*Jesus did many other miraculous signs in the presence of his disciples, which are not recorded in this book. But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name.*

John 21:1-4

*Afterward Jesus appeared again to his disciples, by the Sea of Tiberias. It happened this way: Simon Peter, Thomas (called Didymus), the sons of Zebedee, and two other disciples were together.*

*“I'm going out to fish,” Simon Peter told them.*

*And they said, “We'll go with you.” So they went out and got into the boat, but that night they caught nothing. Early in the morning, Jesus stood on the shore, but the disciples did not realize that it was Jesus.*

There are three points to make about the information that spans over the last two verses of chapter 20 and the first four verses of chapter 21. The first is that there is what appears to be a clear conclusion to the Gospel of John in chapter 20 and it's strange for there to be anything after that, which shows that all of chapter 21 appears to be a later fraudulent addition. The second is that Peter takes center stage among the

so-called “disciples” in chapter 21, which, as has been shown, appears to be a product of fraudulent exaltation. The third is that there is a description that “the disciples” didn’t recognize Christ when they first saw Christ, which is characteristic of some of the fraudulent verses in chapter 20. So there is a style that seems to be common among the fraudulent verses in chapter 20 and what also looks like fraudulent verses in John 21:1-4. That common style is that of describing that there were disciples who saw Christ but did not recognize Christ. The only other instance of that happening throughout the rest of the entire New Testament is in the Gospel of Luke and that narrative has been shown to appear to be fraudulent. We should be able to see that it appears that the descriptions of anyone having seen Christ but not having recognized Christ are all fraudulent. The conclusion to chapter 20 is enough to show that all of chapter 21 appears to be a later fraudulent addition. On top of that, Peter takes center stage in chapter 21, which has been shown to appear to be fraudulent; and there are descriptions of people not recognizing Christ, which has also been shown to appear to be fraudulent.

John 21:14, a verse that has already been shown to appear to be fraudulent, is another verse that shows that chapter 21 is a later fraudulent addition.

John 21:14

*This was now the third time Jesus appeared to his disciples after he was raised from the dead.*

There was the account of Christ having appeared to Mary Magdalene first and then there were two other appearances described in chapter 20. So the one described in chapter 21 should be considered the fourth appearance according to the narratives in the Gospel of John. However, it appears that the first appearance described was not included in the count contained in verse 14 because it was a description that described Mary Magdalene as the only disciple involved and the author of John 21:14 didn’t consider Mary Magdalene to be a disciple. So that is not only further evidence that chapter 21 is fraudulent, but also further evidence that there was an effort to conceal information about Mary Magdalene.

The last two verses of chapter 21 also show that chapter 21 is a later fraudulent addition.

John 21:24-25

*This is the disciple who testifies to these things and who wrote them down. We know that his testimony is true. Jesus did many other things as well. If every one of them were written down, I suppose that even the whole world would not have room for the books that would be written.*

The last two verses of chapter 21, like the last two verses of chapter 20, focus on miracles that were not the Resurrection. So just like the conclusion of chapter 20, the conclusion of chapter 21 appears to be fraudulent as well. It’s easy to view all of chapter 21 as a later fraudulent addition to the Gospel of John.

So far, among all of the accounts through all four of the Gospels of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, only verse 16 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John seems to be truthful. That means that apparently there is only one truthful account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection through all four of the Gospels, the account in the Gospel of John of the appearance to Mary Magdalene alone.

Now that we have seen that the account in the Gospel of John of Christ having appeared after the Resurrection to Mary Magdalene alone appears to be the only reliable account in the Gospels of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, we should now examine certain other verses in the Gospel of John to better understand what may have happened after the Resurrection. As we proceed, we should keep

in mind that it has already been explained that it appears that none of “the eleven” saw Christ after the Resurrection. The descriptions of their supposed appointing and their exaltation has all been shown to be fraudulent, and they all threw away their discipleship and were not disciples on the day of the Resurrection. In addition to all of that, all of the narratives that describe appearances of Christ after the Resurrection to them are fraudulent. So we can already see that Mary Magdalene appears to have been the only disciple who saw Christ after the Resurrection, and that conclusion will be furthered by the following analysis.

John 1:4

*In him was life, and that life was the light of men.*

John 3:6

*“Flesh gives birth to flesh, but the Spirit gives birth to spirit.”*

John 6:63

*“The Spirit gives life; the flesh counts for nothing. The words I have spoken to you are spirit and they are life.”*

John 15:4-5

*“Remain in me, and I will remain in you. No branch can bear fruit by itself; it must remain in the vine. Neither can you bear fruit unless you remain in me. I am the vine; you are the branches. If a man remains in me and I in him, he will bear much fruit; apart from me you can do nothing.”*

John 1:4 shows that life is in God. Therefore, our lives are in God. John 3:6 differentiates between spirit and flesh, which is to differentiate between spirit and the physical world. John 3:6 emphasizes the Spirit and deemphasizes the physical world. John 6:63 is similar to John 3:6 in that it emphasizes the Spirit and deemphasizes the physical world. John 6:63 specifically states that “the Spirit gives life”, which of course emphasizes the Spirit, and then specifically states “the flesh counts for nothing”, which obviously deemphasizes the physical world. Both John 3:6 and John 6:63 indicate that we should focus on the Spirit rather than the physical world. That also means that we should focus on our own spirit rather than the physical world. In other words, spirit matters more than flesh. Furthermore, John 6:63 emphasizes teachings by stating “the words I have spoken to you are spirit and they are life”. John 6:63 emphasizes the Spirit and teachings, and deemphasizes “the flesh”. Verses 15:4-5 refer to Christ remaining in disciples and disciples remaining in Christ. A person is a disciple if they remain in Christ and bear fruit (spread Christianity). Disciples should remain in Christ and Christ will remain in them. So a disciple will remain in Christ, and Christ will remain in them. Remaining in Christ means recognizing the presence of God and practicing teachings of God. That is what it means to be a disciple. A disciple should recognize the presence of God and practice teachings of God, and they will then remain in Christ.

There are some verses in the Gospel of John that seem to oppose those verses.

John 7:33-34

*Jesus said, “I am with you for only a short time, and then I go to the one who sent me. You will look for me, but you will not find me; and where I am, you cannot come.”*

John 8:21



*“Once more Jesus said to them, “I am going away, and you will look for me, and you will die in your sin. Where I go, you cannot come.”*

John 13:33

*“My children, I will be with you only a little longer. You will look for me and just as I told the Jews, so I tell you now: Where I am going, you cannot come.”*

John 13:36

*Simon Peter asked him, “Lord, where are you going?”*

*Jesus replied, “Where I am going, you cannot follow now, but you will follow later.”*

John 14:2-4

*“In my Father’s house are many rooms; if it were not so, I would have told you. I am going there to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come back and take you to be with me that you also may be where I am. You know the way to the place where I am going.”*

John 14:18

*“I will not leave you as orphans; I will come to you.”*

John 14:28

*“You heard me say, ‘I am going away and I am coming back to you.’ If you loved me, you would be glad that I am going to the Father, for the Father is greater than I.”*

John 16:16

*“In a little while you will see me no more, and then after a little while you will see me.”*

Verses 7:33-34, 8:21, 13:33, and 13:36 describe Christ as having expressed to people that Christ was leaving them. Verses 7:33-34, 8:21, and 13:33 all describe Christ as having taught that Christ was going away, that people would look for Christ, and that they would not be able to go along with Christ. Verse 13:36 also describes Christ as having taught that people would not be able to go along with Christ, and specifically states “you will follow later”. Verses 14:2-3, 14:18, 14:28, and 16:16 describe Christ as having taught that Christ would return. This second set of verses, in contrast to the first set of verses, describes Christ as having taught that Christ was going away, that people could not go with Christ, and that Christ would come back to “the disciples”. These verses contradict the first set of verses. One set of verses teaches that Christ is always with disciples of Christ; and the other set of verses teaches that Christ was going away, that people could not go with Christ, and that Christ would return to take people with Christ.

The main difference between these two sets of verses that we should examine is that the first set of verses focuses on the presence of the Spirit and the second set of verses focuses on the physical world. The first set of verses teaches that Christ is always with disciples and that we should recognize the presence of the Spirit. The second set of verses focuses on disciples seeing the physical appearance of Christ and that disciples would not be with Christ if the physical appearance of Christ goes away. The first set of verses focuses on Christ’s Spirit and teachings, and the second set focuses on the physical appearance of Christ.

The first set of verses includes the phrase “the Spirit gives life; the flesh counts for nothing”. That obviously revolves around Christ’s Spirit and deemphasizes the flesh of the physical appearance of

Christ. The first set of verses also instructs disciples that if they remain in Christ then Christ will remain in them. That shows that disciples can choose to remain in Christ. Such a choice is not dependent on the physical appearance of Christ. That choice is dependent on a disciple recognizing the presence of God and practicing teachings of God.

The second set of verses specifically states “I am going away and I am coming back to you”, “I am with you for only a short time”, “you will look for me, but you will not find me”, “where I am, you cannot come”, “I will come back and take you to be with me that you also may be where I am”, “I will come to you”, and “in a little while you will see me no more, and then after a little while you will see me”. All of those phrases focus on the physical appearance of Christ rather than Christ’s Spirit or Christ’s teachings. The second set of verses even alleges that Christ will take disciples with Christ so that disciples can be with Christ. If that teaching was a true teaching, then that would mean that people would have to be physically taken away to be with Christ. That is obviously not compatible with the teaching derived from the first set of verses that shows that disciples are able to always be in Christ by recognizing the presence of God and practicing teachings of God. The first set of verses teaches that disciples are always in Christ and the second set says “you will look for me, but you will not find me” and “where I am, you cannot come”.

The second set of verses obviously contradicts the first set of verses. The first set of verses focuses on the Spirit and teachings of Christ, and the second set focuses on the physical world, much like the Synoptic Gospels do. That difference shows that each set of verses seem to have been produced by different authors. As previously shown, a lot of the Gospel of John focuses on the Spirit and the Synoptic Gospels focus on the physical world, which shows that the first set of verses appears to represent accurate theology and that the verses in the second set appear to be fraudulent.

These two sets of verses cannot be reconciled with each other. These two sets of verses show competing theology with each other. That shows that each set of verses appear to have derived from different authors from each other and that only one set of verses can represent accurate theology. The first set of verses has already shown to represent accurate theology and the verses in the second set have already shown to be fraudulent, and there is more information that furthers that conclusion.

The differences between the accounts in the Gospel of John that describe appearances of Christ after the Resurrection can shed some light. The only account that seems to be reliable in the Gospel of John shows Mary Magdalene as having been at the tomb, where Christ was near. So that is an example of Mary Magdalene following Christ’s teachings, and therefore is an example of Mary Magdalene remaining in Christ and Christ remaining in her. The other accounts, which all appear to be fraudulent, describe Christ as having gone to where the so-called “disciples” were. The only apparently reliable account describes Mary Magdalene as having gone to where Christ was, and the apparently fraudulent accounts describe Christ as having gone to where the so-called “disciples” were and none of them as having gone to where Christ was. Also, Mary Magdalene was present during the Crucifixion while the so-called “disciples” had abandoned Christ and had chosen to not follow Christ’s teachings. So both with the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, Mary Magdalene chose to be where Christ was and the so-called “disciples” did not. According to the first set of verses, if a person follows Christ’s teachings, then they are in Christ and Christ is in them. The only apparently reliable account in the Gospel of John of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection shows Mary Magdalene as having chosen to be where Christ was and having been

with Christ. The so-called “disciples” did not follow Christ’s teachings, they abandoned Christ. Meanwhile, the only narratives in the Gospel of John that describe any of them seeing Christ after the Resurrection appear to be fraudulent. Chapters 20 and 21 describe Christ as having appeared to the so-called “disciples” after they chose to abandon Christ and not follow Christ’s teachings, and those narratives appear to be fraudulent.

The only apparently reliable account shows Mary Magdalene as having chosen to be where Christ was and having been with Christ; and the likely fraudulent accounts show people not following Christ’s teachings and describe Christ going to them. The first set of verses matches up with the only apparently reliable account and the verses in the second set match up with the apparently fraudulent accounts. That shows further evidence that the first set of verses appears to represent accurate theology and that the verses in the second set appear to be fraudulent.

Given that the first set of verses appears to represent accurate theology and that the verses in the second set appear to be fraudulent, it is further justified to believe that Mary Magdalene was the only disciple who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection because she is the only disciple described in the Gospel of John as having been present during the Crucifixion and having been at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection before it was discovered that the tomb was empty. Mary Magdalene is described in the Gospel of John as having been present during the Crucifixion and as being the only disciple who was at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection before it was discovered that the tomb was empty. She remained faithful. She remained a disciple. She remained in Christ.

According to the teachings in John 15:4-5, a disciple remains in Christ. If Mary Magdalene was the only disciple to have remained in Christ, then it seems that she was the only disciple left. All of the other disciples had fallen away and were no longer disciples. That shows evidence that any description of Christ having appeared to any “disciple” who is not Mary Magdalene is apparently fraudulent. It appears that Mary Magdalene remained in Christ and that the so-called “disciples” did not, so Mary Magdalene appears to have been the only disciple left. That is evidence that Mary Magdalene was the only disciple who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection.

Being a disciple means choosing to be a disciple. If one chooses to remain in Christ, then they are a disciple of Christ. If one chooses to not remain in Christ, then they are not a disciple of Christ. Mary Magdalene chose to remain in Christ and “the Twelve” chose to no longer be disciples. Further evidence of that can be seen by taking another look at John 1:11-12.

John 1:11-12

*He came to that which was his own, but his own did not receive him. Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to be children of God.*

As presented earlier, John 1:11-12 show that being a disciple means choosing to be a disciple; and it was also shown that we can come to that conclusion even without John 1:11-12 because discipleship requires commitment and true commitment must be a choice. Mary Magdalene chose to remain in Christ and “the Twelve” chose to no longer be disciples. So Mary Magdalene appears to have been the only disciple left when Christ appeared to her after the Resurrection. If Mary Magdalene was the only disciple on the day of the Resurrection, then it appears that she would have been the only disciple who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection. Meanwhile, the only apparently reliable account of an appearance of Christ after

the Resurrection through all four Gospels describes Mary Magdalene as the only disciple present. That is further evidence that Mary Magdalene is the only disciple who saw Christ after the Resurrection.

So far, we have seen that there appears to be only one reliable account throughout all four Gospels of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection and that account describes Christ as having appeared to Mary Magdalene alone; there isn't any account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection described in the Gospel of Mark before the later fraudulent addition; all of the accounts in Matthew and Luke of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection appear to be fraudulent; there are teachings in the Gospel of John that teach that Christ remains in disciples who remain in Christ, which shows evidence that Christ only appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection because she is the only disciple who is described in the Gospel of John as having been present during the Crucifixion and having been at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection before it was discovered that the tomb was empty; and there are teachings in the Gospel of John that teach that discipleship is a choice, which also shows evidence that Christ only appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection because Mary Magdalene appears to have been the only disciple on the day of the Resurrection. Therefore, we can conclude that there is only one reliable account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection throughout all four of the Gospels, and that Mary Magdalene was the only disciple who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection.

The fact that all four Gospels disagree with each other regarding the Resurrection narratives is an indication that a lot of what is contained in those narratives is fraudulent. If Christ did appear to "the eleven", then the Gospels would likely be more in agreement with each other regarding the Resurrection narratives. There is one crucial detail, however, that is found in all four of the Gospels: Mary Magdalene was at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection before it was discovered that the tomb was empty. She is the only person who is consistently named in all four Gospels as having been at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection before it was discovered that the tomb was empty. That is further evidence that Mary Magdalene was the only disciple to have seen Christ after the Resurrection.

The popular storyline is that Peter and the rest of "the Twelve" were specially appointed as the top group of disciples; and eleven of them, despite their disownment of Christ, were chosen to be the frontrunners of spreading Christianity to the world. That story is about "the eleven" doubting, but being forgiven and being committed to discipleship after seeing Christ after the Resurrection. That story is dependent on the claim that these men were specially appointed as the top disciples. As previously shown, this group of men apparently didn't include the top disciple and so their exaltation as the top group of disciples obviously appears to be fraudulent. Additionally, given that this group of men apparently didn't include the top disciple, their exaltation as the frontrunners of spreading Christianity to the world obviously appears to be fraudulent. So given that this group of men apparently didn't include the top disciple, "the Twelve" apparently were not specially appointed as the top group of disciples and "the eleven" apparently were not specially chosen to be the frontrunners of spreading Christianity to the world. If "the eleven" were not specially appointed and they all disowned Christ, then "the eleven" were not disciples when Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection. Peter and the rest of "the Twelve" are men who seem to have followed Christ for a while and eventually disowned Christ while the top disciple, Mary Magdalene, continued to follow Christ.

As shown before, further evidence that "the eleven" were not the frontrunners of spreading Christianity can be found in Paul's letter to the Galatians.

Galatians 2:11-14

*When Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he was clearly in the wrong. Before certain men came from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they arrived, he began to draw back and separate himself from the Gentiles because he was afraid of those who belong to the circumcision group. The other Jews joined him in his hypocrisy, so that by their hypocrisy even Barnabas was led astray. When I saw that they were not acting in line with the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter in front of them all, "You are a Jew, yet you live like a Gentile and not like a Jew. How is it, then, that you force Gentiles to follow Jewish customs?"*

We went through these verses before, but now that it has been shown that Mary Magdalene appears to have been the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection, these verses should be examined again. These verses describe Peter and some others as hypocrites and states "they were not acting in line with the truth of the gospel". Paul accused Peter of being a Jew who lives like a gentile while forcing gentiles to follow Jewish customs. These descriptions of Peter present him as a hypocrite who tried to control other people by forcing them to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself. The Gospels describe Peter as someone who disowned Christ and Galatians describes Peter as a hypocrite who tried to control other people by forcing them to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself. This portrayal of Peter is further evidence that he was not the top disciple, and therefore that his exaltation as the top disciple in the Gospels is fraudulent. If Peter was not the top disciple, then "the eleven" obviously weren't the frontrunners of spreading Christianity. Instead, Mary Magdalene appears to have been the top disciple and the frontrunner of spreading Christianity. As a result, these verses show further evidence that Peter and the rest of "the eleven" did not see Christ after the Resurrection.

As also shown before, the mere presence of Paul in the history of early Christianity shows that Peter and the rest of "the eleven" don't seem to have been relatively very successful. That shows further evidence that they did not see Christ after the Resurrection. Among the men, Paul seems to have had more of a presence than Peter. So just among the men, Peter still seems to have lost out on achieving the top spot. Paul seems to have taken on that role. Therefore, Paul's presence in the history of early Christianity shows that Peter and the rest of "the eleven" don't seem to have been the top frontrunners of spreading Christianity because they don't even seem to have been the top frontrunners among the men, and that shows further evidence that they did not see Christ after the Resurrection.

Paul apparently wasn't even a disciple during Christ's Ministry. He seems to have entered into the mix afterwards. So even someone who wasn't a disciple during Christ's Ministry seems to have surpassed Peter and the rest of "the eleven". The evidence that shows that Peter and the rest of "the eleven" were surpassed by a man who wasn't even a disciple during Christ's Ministry is further evidence that Peter and the rest of "the eleven" were not specially appointed and were not the top disciples during Christ's Ministry, which in turn shows further evidence that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple and that Peter and the rest of "the eleven" did not see Christ after the Resurrection.

Peter and the rest of "the eleven" seem to have been a group of men who disowned Christ while the top disciple, Mary Magdalene, stayed faithful and who were also surpassed by Paul. They don't seem to have ever been specially appointed, they seem to have been an exclusive group that excluded the top disciple, they apparently disowned Christ, and they seem to have also been surpassed by Paul in addition to Mary Magdalene. In conclusion, Peter and the rest of "the eleven" should not be given the benefit of the doubt

over all of the overwhelming evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple and was the only disciple who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection.

The main piece of evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene was the only disciple who saw Christ after the Resurrection is the teaching that expresses that discipleship is a choice. If you choose to be a disciple, then you are a disciple. If you choose to not be a disciple, then you are not a disciple. The choice is yours. From that perspective, we can see how unrealistic it is that “the Twelve” were specially appointed given that discipleship is a choice, and how unlikely it is that “the eleven” saw Christ after the Resurrection given that they chose to disown Christ. Discipleship is a choice, so they were likely never appointed in the way that the Bible describes. Discipleship is a choice, so their choice to disown Christ was a choice to not be a disciple. If Peter and the rest of “the eleven” disowned Christ, then they chose to not be disciples. Therefore, Mary Magdalene appears to have been the only disciple when she saw Christ after the Resurrection, and so she appears to have been the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection.

The popular storyline is that Peter and the rest of “the eleven” believed in the Resurrection of Christ after seeing the physical appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. Hypothetically, if Christ appeared to anyone who was a disciple on the day of the Resurrection but not to anyone who wasn’t a disciple, and “the eleven” chose to not be disciples, then they would not have been disciples and so would not have seen Christ after the Resurrection. If Christ appeared to anyone who was a disciple but not to anyone who wasn’t a disciple, and “the eleven” disowned Christ, then “the eleven” would not have seen Christ after the Resurrection. Instead, they probably learned about the Resurrection of Christ from the top disciple and apparently the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection, Mary Magdalene.

All of the narratives that describe “the eleven” as having seen Christ after the Resurrection describe Christ as having gone to “the eleven” rather than “the eleven” having gone to Christ. So hypothetically, if Christ did appear after the Resurrection to “the eleven” and “the eleven” came to believe in the Resurrection of Christ because they saw Christ after the Resurrection, then that would oppose the teaching that discipleship is a choice. In that hypothetical scenario, “the eleven” chose to not be disciples and would have been specially chosen to be disciples despite them having chosen to not be disciples. That supposed special appointing of “the eleven” would oppose their own apparent personal choice to not be disciples. The fact that all of the narratives that describe Christ appearing after the Resurrection to “the eleven” specifically portray Christ as having gone to “the eleven” rather than “the eleven” having gone to Christ provides enough evidence by itself to show that “the eleven” did not see Christ after the Resurrection. They chose to not be disciples and those narratives present “the eleven” as a special group of people who were appointed to be disciples even though they made a personal decision for themselves to not be disciples. Conversely, the only reliable account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection presents Mary Magdalene as having chosen to go to where Christ was. So again, “the eleven” probably learned about the Resurrection of Christ from the top disciple and apparently the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection, Mary Magdalene.

There are certain parts of the Gospel of Mary, one of the Gnostic Gospels, that can help explain the probable scenario after Mary Magdalene’s proclamation that she had seen Christ after the Resurrection. Although the Gospel of Mary can’t be relied upon as a whole as there are some very strange and illegitimate parts, the verses below can still be looked at as fairly reasonable information to examine to try to understand certain probable circumstances after the Resurrection.

### The Gospel of Mary

*Then Mary stood up. She greeted them all, addressing her brothers and sisters, “Do not weep and be distressed nor let your hearts be irresolute. For his grace will be with you all and will shelter you. Rather, we should praise his greatness, for he has prepared us and made us human beings.” When Mary said these things, she turned their heart toward the Good, and they began to debate about the words of [the Savior].*

### The Gospel of Mary

*Peter said to Mary, “Sister we know that the Savior loved you more than all other women. Tell us the words of the Savior that you remember, the things you know that we don’t because we haven’t heard them.”*

### The Gospel of Mary

*Peter responded, bringing up similar concerns. He questioned them about the Savior, “Did he then speak with a woman in private without our knowing about it? Are we to turn around and listen to her? Did he choose her over us?”*

*Then Mary wept and said to Peter, “My brother Peter, what are you imagining? Do you think that I have thought up these things by myself in my heart or that I am telling lies about the Savior?”*

*Levi answered, speaking to Peter, “Peter, you have always been a wrathful person. Now I see you contending against a woman like the adversaries. For if the Savior made her worthy, who are you then for your part to reject her? Assuredly the Savior’s knowledge of her is completely reliable. That is why he loved her more than us. Rather, we should be ashamed. We should clothe ourselves with the perfect human, acquire it for ourselves as he commanded us, and announce the good news, not laying down any other rule or law that differs from what the Savior said.”*

*After [he said these] things, they started going out [to] teach and to preach.*

The Gospel of Mary describes male “disciples”, specifically Peter, as wanting Mary Magdalene to teach them what Christ had told her that Christ had not told anyone else. So Mary Magdalene likely taught Peter and the others after the Resurrection. She probably taught them about what Christ had said. They probably believed after Mary Magdalene explained all of that to them. So not only was Mary Magdalene probably the only disciple who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection, but she also probably taught Peter and the others to have faith after the Resurrection. That would mean that the entire Christian community among the human race appears to have come from one person, Mary Magdalene. It is justified to believe that Mary Magdalene was chosen by God to be the human leader of Christianity in the first century after the Resurrection. It is justified to believe that Christ gave Christianity to Mary Magdalene, and that Mary Magdalene in turn gave Christianity to the rest of the world.

So there were at least two views that were spreading in the first century about the Resurrection. One view is that Mary Magdalene was the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. Another view is that Mary Magdalene as well as “the eleven” and maybe some others saw Christ after the Resurrection. So first, Mary Magdalene saw Christ after the Resurrection and told others, and then at some point, people began spreading fraudulent narratives about “the eleven” supposedly seeing Christ after the Resurrection.

We can turn to the Gospel of John to see an example of the development of the effort to exalt Peter. As we will go into more detail on in Part 5, the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have not

exalted Peter as later additions seem to have done, which can be shown by a comparison of John 1:38-39 and John 1:40-42.

John 1:38-39

*Turning around, Jesus saw them following and asked, "What do you want?"*

*They said, "Rabbi", which means Teacher, "where are you staying?"*

*"Come", he replied, "and you will see."*

*So they went and saw where he was staying, and spent that day with him. It was about the tenth hour.*

John 1:40-42

*Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, was one of the two who heard what John had said and who had followed Jesus. The first thing Andrew did was to find his brother Simon and tell him, "We have found the Messiah" (that is, the Christ). And he brought him to Jesus."*

*Jesus looked at him and said, "You are Simon son of John. You will be called Cephas" (which, when translated, is Peter).*

John 1:38-39 present two unnamed disciples. Immediately after that, Andrew is named and is presented as one of those unnamed disciples. It's incredibly strange for the first two disciples to go unnamed. That shows evidence that someone's identity was concealed. However, Andrew is then identified as one of them. For Andrew to be presented as one of the unnamed disciples and to go unnamed before being named shows that Andrew was probably not one of the first two disciples as described in John 1:38-39. That in turn shows evidence that John 1:40-42 were produced after John 1:38-39 was already a part of an earlier version of the Gospel of John. Additionally, a Gospel is unlikely to include a narrative about people becoming disciples if those people are going to go unnamed. So the concealment of their identity is evidence that such concealment is a part of a later fraudulent alteration. So some form of John 1:38-39 was probably in the original version of the Gospel of John, and then someone's identity was later concealed in those verses and John 1:40-42 were added with Andrew being presented as one of those unnamed people. Furthermore, it appears that Andrew was used to put Peter at center stage. Andrew is immediately identified as Peter's brother before Peter even enters the scene, which shows that Andrew was being used to introduce Peter. Additionally, Andrew serves as a bridge from John 1:38-39 to John 1:40-42, and so provides a bridge from the account about two unnamed people to the account about Peter. That shows that later fraudulent additions appear to be associated with the exaltation of Peter in the Gospel of John. Therefore, Peter was probably not exalted in the original version of the Gospel of John and it was a pro-Peter group that later fraudulently altered the Gospel of John.

This pro-Peter group probably wouldn't have felt the need to alter the Gospel of John if the Gospel of John wasn't already widely circulated. If nobody was reading the Gospel of John, then there wouldn't be much reason to use the Gospel of John at all, much less fraudulently alter it. So the evidence that there were later fraudulent additions is evidence that the Gospel of John was widely circulated. It's that apparent wide circulation that likely influenced them to want to use an altered version. Otherwise, one of the Synoptic Gospels would have sufficed. As shown several times, the Synoptic Gospels seem to have been produced by a pro-Peter group. So on one hand, a pro-Peter group decided to fraudulently alter the Gospel of John; and on the other hand, a pro-Peter group produced or at least influenced each of the Synoptic Gospels. As we will go into more detail on in Part 5, there was division among different pro-



Peter groups, which gave rise to a fraudulently altered version of the Gospel of John as well as the Synoptic Gospels.

The Synoptic Gospels are fundamentally pro-Peter Gospels as opposed to the Gospel of John that seems to only be pro-Peter in certain parts that appear to have been added later on. The later fraudulent alterations to the Gospel of John as well as the ignorance and criticism towards Mary Magdalene in the Synoptic Gospels show that there were efforts to suppress the Revolution that Mary Magdalene was spreading. The Gospels show remnants of the Revolution that she led. The Gospels also show that there was a different revolution that sought to suppress the Revolution that Mary Magdalene was spreading. There were at least two waves of information spreading in the Roman Empire in the first century. One was the Revolution that Mary Magdalene was spreading; and another was a pro-Peter force that sought to suppress the Revolution that Mary Magdalene was spreading and to exalt Peter and the rest of “the Twelve”.

With the recognition of this conflict and the two waves of information involved in this conflict, we can now move forward with analyzing why the ending of the Gospel of Mark through verse 16:8 was produced the way that it was.

Mark 16:5-8

*As they entered the tomb, they saw a young man dressed in a white robe sitting on the right side, and they were alarmed.*

*“Don’t be alarmed”, he said. “You are looking for Jesus the Nazarene, who was crucified. He has risen! He is not here. See the place where they laid him. But go, tell his disciples and Peter, ‘He is going ahead of you into Galilee. There you will see him, just as he told you.’”*

*Trembling and bewildered, the women went out and fled from the tomb. They said nothing to anyone, because they were afraid.*

Mark 16:5-8 allude to an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection but don’t actually describe an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. The Resurrection is the climax of the entire Gospel but the original version of the Gospel of Mark seems to have avoided describing any appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. The original version of the Gospel of Mark seems to have stopped just shy of reaching the actual climax of the story that it is telling. A story that abruptly stops short of the climax obviously shows signs of hiding something. It seems that the climax was never written into the story. So there was something about the climax that they apparently wanted to hide. Given the conflict that the pro-Peter group had with the Revolution that Mary Magdalene was spreading, we can better understand what was being hidden by the absence of a climax in the original version of the Gospel of Mark.

There are two views that have been presented so far in relation to the Resurrection. One is that Mary Magdalene was the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection and the other included the belief that “the eleven” saw Christ after the Resurrection. The pro-Peter group obviously chose the second view. However, they did not represent that view very strongly in the original version of the Gospel of Mark. They instead passively imply that Peter and the rest of “the eleven” saw Christ after the Resurrection. Stopping short like that shows that the author was confronting a problem with what exactly to write. They opposed the truthful view that Mary Magdalene was the only disciple who saw Christ after the Resurrection and they wanted to rewrite history, but they stopped short of describing what happened. They ended up just passively implying that “the eleven” saw Christ in Galilee. Such a lack of detail shows

evidence that the author was not drawing on the truth but was instead forming a fraudulent narrative. If “the eleven” had seen Christ after the Resurrection, then the author of the original version of the Gospel of Mark could have drawn on the truth for a more detailed account, and so the unwillingness to provide more details to such an important narrative shows evidence that “the eleven” did not see Christ after the Resurrection.

The very particular form that the Gospel of Mark takes shows us that Mary Magdalene was well-known and involved with the Resurrection in some way, that Peter disowned Christ, that none of “the eleven” saw Christ after the Resurrection, and that there was a campaign to suppress information about Mary Magdalene and to exalt Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” in an effort to rewrite history.

The campaign to suppress information about Mary Magdalene and to exalt Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” can be seen by the Gospel of Mark as well as the fraudulent alterations in the Gospel of John. The Gospels of Matthew and Luke take this campaign even further. Those two Gospels describe the so-called “Great Commission”, which was supposedly the big scene after the Resurrection involving “the eleven”. The author of the Gospel of Mark seems to have been at a loss for what to write in relation to the Resurrection. The author of the Gospel of Matthew and the author of the Gospel of Luke seem to have not been held up in the same way. Those authors let loose and went all the way. That shows that Resurrection narratives were developing over time. This can also be seen by the fraudulent alterations in the Gospel of John. The development of Resurrection narratives can be seen within the Gospel of John alone as well as with the transition from the Gospel of Mark to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. The development of these Resurrection narratives shows that there was first information circulating about Mary Magdalene being the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection, then there was vague information that opposed that view and asserted that “the eleven” saw Christ after the Resurrection, and then there were more specific narratives going into details about “the eleven” allegedly having seen Christ after the Resurrection.

The Gospels of Matthew and Luke can provide further details about what happened after the Resurrection and show that the Resurrection narratives were formed based on certain fraudulent information that was circulating at the time.

Matthew 28:17

*When they saw him, they worshiped him; but some doubted.*

Luke 24:45-46

*Then he opened their minds so they could understand the Scriptures. He told them, “This is what is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day.”*

Matthew 28:17 refers to some of the so-called “disciples” as having doubted even after supposedly seeing Christ after the Resurrection. Supposedly, it was seeing Christ after the Resurrection that led to “the eleven” having believed after having disowned Christ. Matthew 28:17 asserts that some still doubted even after supposedly seeing Christ after the Resurrection. It’s obviously extremely unlikely that there would be doubters among a group that saw Christ after the Resurrection. Matthew 28:17 shows that the author was responding to real information that was circulating about some of “the eleven” having doubted even after the Resurrection. However, there probably wouldn’t have been any doubters among “the eleven” if they really had seen Christ after the Resurrection. So Matthew 28:17 not only shows evidence that the

author was responding to information about doubting among “the eleven”, but it also shows evidence that “the eleven” didn’t see Christ after the Resurrection.

Luke 24:45-46 refer to knowledge about past writing having influenced “the disciples” to believe. Luke 24:45-46 portray “the disciples” as having believed after their minds were opened and after they understood “the Scriptures”. If “the eleven” saw Christ after the Resurrection, then they wouldn’t need to have their minds opened in that way or need to understand “the Scriptures” to recognize that Christ had risen. If they could see Christ, then they could have recognized that Christ had risen. Instead, this narrative describes “the disciples” as believing after they understood “the Scriptures”. Luke 24:45-46 portray “the disciples” as having believed because of previously known information, which probably wouldn’t be the case had “the eleven” actually seen Christ after the Resurrection. Additionally, Luke 24:45-46, like Matthew 28:17, allude to doubting after the Resurrection. The narrative that Luke 24:45-46 are a part of describes Christ as appearing to “the eleven”, yet the narrative describes “the eleven” as needing more understanding before believing. That is evidence that they didn’t see Christ after the Resurrection and instead were told about the Resurrection, had doubts at first, and then believed after more was explained to them.

The combination of John 20:16, Matthew 28:17, and Luke 24:45-46 outlines the fundamental information contained in the verses previously shown from the Gospel of Mary about the Resurrection. In those verses, Mary Magdalene seems to be portrayed as the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection and as having explained the Resurrection to the male “disciples” while some of them doubted and some were gaining an understanding. In John 20:16 and the Gospel of Mary, Mary Magdalene seems to be the only person who saw Christ after the Resurrection. In Luke 24:45-46 and the Gospel of Mary, the male “disciples” seem to have required additional information before developing an understanding of the Resurrection rather than immediately understanding that Christ had risen. In Matthew 28:17 and the Gospel of Mary, some of the male “disciples” seem to have doubted whether the Resurrection had actually occurred. This shows that certain components of the Gospel of John, the Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel of Luke, and the Gospel of Mary are similar to each other. Those similarities show that the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Mary seem to represent some of what actually happened while the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, like Mark, seem to be responding to information that was widely circulating about “the eleven” doubting the Resurrection, not understanding the Resurrection, and needing additional information to finally come to believe in the Resurrection. All of that is representative of a scenario in which Mary Magdalene was the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection and “the eleven” learned about the Resurrection from Mary Magdalene rather than seeing Christ themselves after the Resurrection while they doubted and didn’t really understand the Resurrection.

The later addition to the Gospel of Mark continues this pattern.

Mark 16:9-14

*When Jesus rose early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had driven seven demons. She went and told those who had been with him and who were mourning and weeping. When they heard that Jesus was alive and that she had seen him, they did not believe. Afterward Jesus appeared in a different form to two of them while they were walking in the country. These returned and reported it to the rest; but they did not believe them either.*

*Later Jesus appeared to the Eleven as they were eating; he rebuked them for their lack of faith and their stubborn refusal to believe those who had seen him after he had risen.*

Mark 16:9-14, which appear to have been produced after the original production of all four Gospels, tells a story that involves the following components: Christ first appeared to Mary Magdalene, “the eleven” doubted whether the Resurrection had actually occurred, and “the eleven” stubbornly refused to believe that Christ had risen. Those components are very similar to the components previously discussed from John 20:16, Matthew 28:17, Luke 24:45-46, and the Gospel of Mary. The same storyline is appearing over and over again through the Gospel of John, the Gospel of Mark after verse 16:8, the Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel of Luke, and the Gospel of Mary. That storyline is one that involves “the eleven” not believing in the Resurrection even after learning about the Resurrection. That shows that “the eleven” seem to have not seen Christ after the Resurrection. There was obviously a struggle for them to believe, and that realistically would not have been the case if they had seen Christ after the Resurrection. Instead, such a struggle seems to be representative of them not having seen Christ after the Resurrection and simply having been told about the Resurrection.

What we’ve seen from the Gospel of John, the Gospel of Mark through verse 16:8, the Gospel of Mark after verse 16:8, the Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel of Luke, and the Gospel of Mary is that none of these pieces of writing would have taken on the particular form that they did if it weren’t true that Mary Magdalene was the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection and that “the eleven” doubted her Testimony. All of those pieces of writing show evidence that they were shaped around the sequence of Mary Magdalene being the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection and “the eleven” doubting her Testimony.

### **The Anointing of Christ**

Further evidence can be found when we analyze the narratives about the anointing of Christ in Bethany.

Mark 14:3

*While he was in Bethany, reclining at the table in the home of a man known as Simon the Leper, a woman came with an alabaster jar of very expensive perfume, made of pure nard. She broke the jar and poured the perfume on his head.*

Matthew 26:6-7

*While he was in Bethany in the home of a man known as Simon the Leper, a woman came to him with an alabaster jar of very expensive perfume, which she poured on his head as he was reclining at the table.*

Luke 7:36-38

*Now one of the Pharisees invited Jesus to have dinner with him, so he went to the Pharisee’s house and reclined at the table. When a woman who had lived a sinful life in that town learned that Jesus was eating at the Pharisee’s house, she brought an alabaster jar of perfume, and as she stood behind him at his feet weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears. Then she wiped them with her hair, kissed them, and poured perfume on them.*

John 12:1-3

*Six days before the Passover, Jesus arrived at Bethany, where Lazarus lived, whom Jesus had raised from the dead. Here a dinner was given in Jesus' honor. Martha served, while Lazarus was among those reclining at the table with him. Then Mary took about a pint of pure nard, an expensive perfume; she poured it on Jesus' feet and wiped his feet with her hair. And the house was filled with fragrance of the perfume.*

All four of the Gospels describe a woman anointing Christ. All of the Synoptic Gospels leave the woman who anointed Christ unnamed. Luke goes further by describing this woman as a sinner. The Gospel of John, however, describes this woman as having been named "Mary". Mark, Matthew, and John describe this anointing as having taken place in Bethany while Luke doesn't. Mark and Matthew place this narrative in the home of "Simon the Leper", Luke places this narrative in the home of "one of the Pharisees", and John places this narrative in the home of Lazarus and his sisters Mary and Martha.

The Gospels differ in their accounts, but they all have one common theme: a woman anointed Christ. There is a reason why they all share that common theme and there is a reason why there are such extensive differences between them. Mark and Matthew are mostly similar. John is similar to them in describing the anointing as having taken place in Bethany. Luke is separate from the other three by not describing Bethany, by describing the anointing as having taken place in a Pharisee's house, and by describing the woman as a sinner. So immediately, we can separate Luke from the other three Gospels in relation to these narratives. Luke seems to take the most extreme view on certain matters pertaining to women. Luke is the only Gospel that describes women who followed Christ as having been cured of diseases and evil spirits. More specifically, excluding Mark 16:9-20, Luke is the only Gospel that describes Mary Magdalene as having seven demons come out of her. Additionally, Luke is the only Gospel that doesn't name anyone specific among the women who witnessed the Crucifixion and Luke is the only Gospel that names Joanna as having been involved with the discovery of the empty tomb. Luke is very obviously the most rogue Gospel with certain narratives about women. As a result, our analysis of the anointing of Christ in Bethany should mainly focus on the narratives in Mark, Matthew, and John.

As previously stated, Mark and Matthew are mostly similar. John provides a sharp contrast by describing the anointing as having taken place in the home of Lazarus, Martha, and Mary of Bethany, and by naming the woman who anointed Christ. The narrative in John is a much more personal narrative than the ones found in Mark and Matthew. The specific details found in John combined with the general details found in Mark and Matthew can provide a pathway for understanding what really happened.

Chapter 11 of the Gospel of John describes the raising of Lazarus and interactions involving Lazarus' sisters Mary and Martha. So naturally, in the very next chapter, when someone is called "Mary" and not specifically "Mary Magdalene", it's easy to view that person as Mary of Bethany instead of Mary Magdalene. In fact, Mary of Bethany is actually identified in chapter 11 as the person who anointed Christ.

John 11:1-2

*Now a man named Lazarus was sick. He was from Bethany, the village of Mary and her sister Martha. This Mary, whose brother Lazarus now lay sick, was the same one who poured perfume on the Lord and wiped his feet with her hair.*

It's incredibly strange that chapter 11 alleges that Mary of Bethany is the person who supposedly poured perfume on Christ and wiped Christ's feet with her hair. That's incredibly strange because the narrative about someone named "Mary" having done that is in the next chapter. Chapter 11 represents a time-period that is chronologically before the time-period described in chapter 12. So why is something that is described as having happened in chapter 12 clarified in the preceding chapter? Such clarification does nothing to separate her from any other Mary in chapter 11, so it does nothing for her identification in chapter 11. Regardless of whether or not she poured perfume on Christ and wiped Christ's feet with her hair, she is Mary of Bethany who is Lazarus' and Martha's sister. So such clarification does nothing for someone's understanding of chapter 11. It only contributes to chapter 12. Furthermore, in reading the Gospel of John, a person would not have obtained any information about the anointing of Christ in Bethany through chapters 1-11, so such a reference wouldn't make sense. Therefore, there seems to be some overcompensation for what someone wanted readers to believe. The fact that information about chapter 12 is contained in chapter 11 is an indication that someone seems to have added that text to influence readers and that they probably wanted to influence readers because there were some people who believed that someone other than Mary of Bethany anointed Christ and wiped Christ's feet with their hair. With that assertion, we can conclude that such information appears to be fraudulent, which means that Mary of Bethany probably wasn't the person who anointed Christ in Bethany. Who was it then? Well, we've seen plenty of evidence that information about Mary Magdalene has been concealed and she shares the same first name as Mary of Bethany, so it seems obvious that it was probably Mary Magdalene who anointed Christ in Bethany. Furthermore, it would make much more sense if the top disciple was the one who anointed Christ.

It's also incredibly strange that one sister is described as serving while the other sister is described as anointing Christ. There are three siblings among Lazarus, Martha, and Mary of Bethany; but only one of them supposedly honors Christ by anointing Christ. Alternatively, if Mary Magdalene was the one who anointed Christ in Bethany, then there is no longer that issue. The separation of descriptions of the sisters is evidence that neither sister anointed Christ and that Mary Magdalene was the one who anointed Christ.

As we move further along in the narrative in the Gospel of John, we can begin to see what this anointing was about.

John 12:7

*"Leave her alone", Jesus replied. "It was intended that she should save this perfume for the day of my burial."*

John 12:7 proposes that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany was supposed to save the perfume that they used so that it could be used on the day of the burial. If the person who anointed Christ in Bethany was supposed to save the perfume for the day of the burial, then that person would seem to have known that the burial was going to take place, in which case they would seem to have known that the Crucifixion was going to take place. If this person knew that the Crucifixion was going to take place, then it seems that they would have expected the Resurrection. As previously asserted, Mary Magdalene seems to have expected the Resurrection. The evidence for that assertion combined with the evidence that shows that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany would have expected the Resurrection is evidence that Mary Magdalene is the person who anointed Christ in Bethany. Mary Magdalene seems to have expected the

Resurrection and the person who anointed Christ in Bethany seems to have expected the Resurrection, so Mary Magdalene is probably the person who anointed Christ in Bethany.

Given the evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene expected the Crucifixion and the Resurrection to happen, there is now another point that shows that Mary of Bethany was probably not the one who anointed Christ in Bethany.

John 11:32

*When Mary reached the place where Jesus was and saw him, she fell at his feet and said, "Lord, if you had been here, my brother would not have died."*

Verse 11:32 shows that Mary of Bethany did not yet believe that Christ could raise someone from the dead, which indicates that she is not realistically someone who would have expected the Crucifixion and the Resurrection to happen and therefore she probably wasn't the person who anointed Christ in Bethany.

The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes anointing during the burial and the Gospel of John also connects the anointing in Bethany with the anointing during the burial. The Gospel of John implies that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany is also the person who anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. However, the Gospel of John describes two different people as having carried out each anointing. Mary of Bethany is described as anointing Christ in Bethany and Nicodemus is described as anointing the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. It has already been shown that Mary of Bethany probably didn't anoint Christ in Bethany and that Mary Magdalene probably did. So immediately, we can conclude that it is probable that Nicodemus didn't anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial but that Mary Magdalene did instead. A closer examination of these narratives will provide even further evidence of that.

All four Gospels describe Joseph of Arimathea as having been present during the burial. As for the Synoptic Gospels specifically, both Mark and Matthew name Mary Magdalene, Mark names Mary the mother of Joses while Matthew names "the other Mary", and Luke generally refers to "the women who had come with Jesus from Galilee". Mary the mother of Joses is probably "the other Mary", in which case Mark and Matthew would agree with each other. Luke does not name anyone specific among women and so neither agrees nor disagrees with Mark or Matthew. John, on the other hand, goes in a different direction. The only other person that the Gospel of John names besides Joseph of Arimathea is Nicodemus, who is not named at all in any other Gospel.

The pattern among all of the Gospels is that information about Mary Magdalene has been concealed. That pattern is that her name appears less than it should, not more. So typically, when her name is mentioned in a way that shows that she was present, such a mentioning is probably truthful. There are then times when her name should be mentioned and it is not. With that analysis having been presented, the mentioning of her name in Mark and Matthew is probably truthful. Meanwhile, the absence of her name in the Gospel of John seems to follow the pattern already shown in the Gospel of John that her name has been excluded when it shouldn't be. So Mary Magdalene being mentioned in Mark and Matthew combined with the pattern already shown in the Gospel of John that her name has been excluded when it shouldn't be leads to the conclusion that Mary Magdalene was probably described as having been present during the burial in the original version of the Gospel of John. Furthermore, the Gospel of John describes Mary Magdalene

as having been present during the Crucifixion and having been the first person who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection, so it's almost a forgone conclusion that the original version of the Gospel of John described Mary Magdalene as having been present during the burial.

Nicodemus is only mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament in chapters 3 and 7 of the Gospel of John, so that is probably where his name came from. He was a man so it's justified to believe that if he was present during the burial then he would have been mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels alongside Joseph of Arimathea. All of the Gospels describe Joseph of Arimathea as having been present during the burial but only the Gospel of John names Nicodemus anywhere. Therefore, the presence of a reference to Nicodemus in the burial narrative is further evidence that Mary Magdalene's name was fraudulently removed.

Even more specific evidence can be found when analyzing the reference to Nicodemus along with the verses that surround it.

John 19:38

*Later, Joseph of Arimathea asked Pilate for the body of Jesus. Now Joseph was a disciple of Jesus, but secretly because he feared the Jews. With Pilate's permission, he came and took the body away.*

John 19:39

*He was accompanied by Nicodemus, the man who earlier had visited Jesus at night. Nicodemus brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about seventy-five pounds.*

John 19:40

*Taking Jesus' body, the two of them wrapped it, with the spices, in strips of linen. This was in accordance with Jewish burial customs.*

As we will go into further detail on in Part 5, the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have been mainly intended for a gentile audience and that can be seen by the consistent use of the phrase "the Jews" as if the Jewish population was outside of the target audience. It's not just any use of the phrase "the Jews" that indicates that. The Synoptic Gospels sometimes use that phrase. It's the consistent attitude that "the Jews" were not a population that the Gospel of John was intended for. Later additions to the Gospel of John seem to have been added by Jewish authors and they seem to have supported Judaism. So there is a mix of writing that presents "the Jews" as a foreign population and writing that is specifically in favor of Judaism. This will be shown in more detail in Part 5. For now, we can see that verses 38 and 40 of chapter 19 of the Gospel of John seem to be a part of the original version of the Gospel of John because verse 38 says "the Jews" and verse 40 says "in accordance with Jewish burial customs", which both present the Jewish population as if they are not the target audience, which is characteristic of the original version and not characteristic of later layers. Meanwhile, verse 39 seems to be a later fraudulent addition. First, as already shown, simply the presence of Nicodemus shows the fraudulent nature of the verse. Additionally, verse 39 uses the words "myrrh", which comes from the Greek word *σμύρνης* ("smyrnēs"), and "aloes", which comes from the Greek word *ἀλόης* ("aloēs"); and verse 40 uses the word "spices", which comes from the Greek word *ἀρωμάτων* ("arōmatōn"). Verse 39 using the words "smyrnēs" and "aloēs" when the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have used the word "arōmatōn" shows that verse 39 seems to have been written by a different author than verse 40, and therefore is a later fraudulent alteration. So verses 38 and 40 seem to have been a part of the original version of the Gospel



of John and verse 39 seems to have been a later fraudulent addition that was wedged in between verses 38 and 40 to replace information that named Mary Magdalene. Meanwhile, verse 40 says “the two of them”, which shows the presence of a second person who we can now see doesn’t seem to have been Nicodemus. Obviously that person seems to have been Mary Magdalene.

In addition to all of that, verse 39 says “the man who earlier had visited Jesus at night”. Such a description of Nicodemus shows a different writing style than that of chapter 3 that describes him as “a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus, a member of the Jewish ruling council”. Chapter 3 shows a certain familiarity with Nicodemus while verse 39 of chapter 19 shows a certain distance with Nicodemus. That shows that the beginning of chapter 3 was written by a different author, and since verse 39 of chapter 19 references chapter 3, verse 39 of chapter 19 appears to have been added after the introduction of Nicodemus in chapter 3 was already a part of the Gospel of John, which shows that the reference to Nicodemus in chapter 19 is a later fraudulent alteration.

In conclusion, Mary Magdalene appears to have anointed Christ in Bethany and appears to have anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial; and the motivation behind concealing Mary Magdalene’s name in the burial narrative in the Gospel of John was probably an attempt to divert from the implication in the Gospel of John that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany was also the person who anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial.

Evidence has been shown that Mary of Bethany probably didn’t anoint Christ in Bethany, that Nicodemus probably didn’t anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial, and that the same person probably did both. So the evidence points to the conclusion that someone other than Mary of Bethany and Nicodemus anointed Christ in Bethany and anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. It has also been shown that this person seems to have expected the Resurrection. Mary Magdalene is the only person who has been shown to meet all of that criteria. She is not Mary of Bethany or Nicodemus, she seems to have expected the Resurrection, and she seems to have been present during the burial.

On the night that Christ was anointed in Bethany, Mary Magdalene appears to have expected the Crucifixion and the Resurrection to occur; and the anointing of Christ in Bethany appears to have been her proclamation of those expectations. Mary Magdalene seems to have anointed Christ in Bethany and then anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. Mary Magdalene seems to have used the same perfume twice for the purpose of anointing: once in Bethany before the Crucifixion and once after the Crucifixion for the burial. Mary Magdalene then seems to have gone on to be the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection.

Further evidence that the same person who anointed Christ in Bethany also anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial can be found when we examine the narratives in Mark and Matthew.

Mark 14:8

*“She did what she could. She poured perfume on my body beforehand to prepare for my burial.”*

Matthew 26:12

*“When she poured this perfume on my body, she did it to prepare me for burial.”*

Similar to John, Mark and Matthew both imply that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany knew that the burial would take place, however, in a different way. John expresses that the perfume was to be saved for the burial while Mark and Matthew express that the anointing of Christ in Bethany was in preparation for the burial. Although John mentions the saving of perfume for the burial while Mark and Matthew mention the anointing of Christ in Bethany as preparation for the burial, all three of those Gospels nevertheless relate the anointing of Christ in Bethany to the burial. Hypothetically, even if the anointing in Bethany was in preparation for the burial, it would still seem to be the case that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany would have known that the burial would take place. Otherwise, the anointing in Bethany would not seem to be in preparation for the burial.

More evidence can be found when we analyze why Mark and Matthew would imply that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany was aware that the burial would take place. Mark, Matthew, and John all seem to imply that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany was aware that the burial would take place and so seem to imply that this person knew that the Crucifixion would take place. However, none of these Gospels expand on that part of the narrative. It's incredible that these Gospels briefly touch on that matter and then don't express any more information about it. The Gospel of John seems to have been fraudulently altered many times over the course of many centuries, so it's easy to see why there might not be more information found in the Gospel of John about the expectation of the Resurrection. However, Mark and Matthew don't seem to have the same level of revision. So why don't they contain more information about this?

A general theme in Mark and Matthew is that nobody understood Christ's supposed warnings about the Crucifixion. These Gospels over and over again describe Christ as having warned that the Crucifixion would happen and describe the so-called "disciples" as not having received that message correctly. Given that Mark and Matthew demonstrate this theme, it does not seem as though either of them are trying to convey that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany knew that the Crucifixion would take place, and therefore that the burial would take place. If these narratives don't intend to convey that this person knew that the burial would take place, then there is some other reason why the burial is related to the explanation for why this person anointed Christ.

Mark 14:9

*"I tell you the truth, wherever the gospel is preached throughout the world, what she has done will also be told, in memory of her."*

Matthew 26:13

*"I tell you the truth, wherever this gospel is preached throughout the world, what she has done will also be told, in memory of her."*

Both of these verses express that the anointing of Christ in Bethany will be described in the Gospel throughout the world in memory of the person who anointed Christ. Regardless of why exactly this person would be talked about wherever the Gospel is preached, the authors of Mark and Matthew were clearly expressing that this anointing was so important that it would be attached to the Gospel as it is preached throughout the world. So much like examples already shown that the Synoptic Gospels were responding to societal circumstances, it seems that Mark and Matthew were doing that with the anointing of Christ in Bethany. Mark and Matthew avoid naming the person who anointed Christ in Bethany and avoid any mention of an anointing during the burial. The authors of Mark and Matthew don't seem to

have wanted to write about the anointing in Bethany or the anointing during the burial, yet they still described one of them in limited detail. The apparent reluctance to describe the anointing combined with the presence of some level of information about the anointing shows evidence that the authors were pressured to say something about the anointing of Christ in Bethany.

Mark 14:9 and Matthew 26:13 show where that likely pressure probably came from. Mark 16:9 and Matthew 26:13 both express that the anointing of Christ in Bethany would be told of wherever the Gospel is preached throughout the world. It seems that those verses reflect some of the reality in society during that time-period. It seems that information about the anointing of Christ in Bethany was widely circulated and it seems that's why the authors of Mark and Matthew felt pressured to address the matter. They seem to have faced the widely circulated information about Mary Magdalene having anointed Christ in Bethany and they chose to address it in a way that described an anonymous person as having anointed Christ in Bethany. Meanwhile, neither Mark nor Matthew describes any anointing during the burial.

So it seems that the authors of Mark and Matthew were reluctant to include information about the anointing of Christ in Bethany. However, they nevertheless still imply that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany knew that the burial would take place. Such a bold concept goes mostly unattended to in Mark and Matthew. These Gospels briefly mention such a concept and then move on. That shows that the authors of Mark and Matthew may not have realized what they were implying. Had they, they probably wouldn't have included such an implication or they probably would have expanded on it. It seems that they may have taken the verse from the Gospel of John and then edited it so to not connect it to the anointing during the burial. As shown, John expresses that the perfume should be saved for the burial while Mark and Matthew don't describe any anointing during the burial and instead express that the anointing in Bethany was in preparation for the burial. So the versions in Mark and Matthew seem to have taken the version in John and modified it to exclude any implication of an anointing during the burial. That then disconnects the anointing in Bethany with anyone who is mentioned in the burial narrative. Meanwhile, Mary Magdalene is described in both Mark and Matthew as having been present during the burial.

A fraudulently altered version of the Gospel of John describes Nicodemus as having anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial while Mark and Matthew avoid describing any anointing during the burial and disconnect the anointing in Bethany from anyone who is mentioned in the burial narrative. It seems that all three of those Gospels are written in a way to exclude Mary Magdalene from any anointing, but Mark and Matthew take a different route in doing so than John does. It seems that the original version of the Gospel of John described Mary Magdalene as having anointed Christ in Bethany and having anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. The Gospel of John seems to have then been fraudulently altered to describe Mary of Bethany as anointing Christ in Bethany and Nicodemus as anointing the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. Meanwhile, Mark and Matthew were produced in a way that describes an unnamed woman as anointing Christ in Bethany, avoids describing the saving of the perfume for the burial, and avoids describing any anointing during the burial. Mark and Matthew take a different route than John, but all three seem to contain deliberate attempts to conceal information about Mary Magdalene having anointed Christ in Bethany and having anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial.

Rather than trying to exalt the unnamed woman who is described in Mark and Matthew as anointing Christ in Bethany, it seems that those Gospels are responding to information contained in the Gospel of John. That seems to be the reason why Mark and Matthew would imply that this person expected the burial to take place. Just as the authors seem to have been responding to societal circumstances, they also seem to have implied that an unnamed person expected the burial to take place because they were responding to information contained in the Gospel of John about this person saving the perfume for the burial. In an attempt to avoid describing this person as saving the perfume for the burial, Mark and Matthew ended up implying something that was detrimental to a general theme in those Gospels: that nobody expected the Crucifixion or the Resurrection. From that perspective, we can see that the implication in Mark and Matthew that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany expected the burial to take place may have been accidental. Regardless, we can rely on the base story that seems to have been a part of the original version of the Gospel of John: Mary Magdalene anointed Christ in Bethany, saved some of the perfume for the burial because she expected the burial to take place, and then anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial.

Mark 14:9 and Matthew 26:13 show further evidence of the Revolution that Mary Magdalene led. Not only did her Revolution spread information about the Resurrection, but it also spread information about Mary Magdalene having expected the Resurrection.

Also in relation to the anointing in Bethany and the anointing during the burial, we should now examine the meaning of the word “messiah”. The word “Christ” comes from the Greek word Χριστός “Christos”, which means “anointed”, and corresponds to the Hebrew word מָשִׁיחַ (“mashiakh”), which also means “anointed”. The name “messiah” comes from the meaning of “the anointed One”. So the name “Christ” derives from the meaning of “the anointed One”.

Many people skip over the literal meaning of “messiah” and assume a more figurative or spiritual anointing rather than an anointing with a physical substance such as oil or perfume. Many people view Christ as the Messiah without thinking about an actual anointing. In this way, the Messiah is viewed as inherently the anointed One and so there isn't focus on an actual anointing, there is just the recognition that Christ is the anointed One. However, the concept of a messiah as laid out in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament comes from the tradition of a king being anointed by a Jewish priest with a physical substance such as oil. Kings were viewed as anointed and were actually anointed with a physical substance.

The Hebrew word that gets translated to “messiah” refers to an actual anointing with a physical substance. Because of this, we should place importance on the anointing in Bethany and the anointing during the burial. Mary Magdalene seems to have been the one who anointed Christ in Bethany and anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. That would elevate Mary Magdalene to a status not reached by any other human being. That shows further evidence that Mary Magdalene was the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection.

Earlier here in Part 2, it was asserted that Mary Magdalene seems to have expected the Resurrection because there doesn't seem to be any other explanation that seems as reasonable as to why she was at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection before it was discovered that the tomb was empty. The assertion that Mary Magdalene expected the Resurrection was then later supported by the evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene anointed Christ in Bethany and then purposely saved some of the perfume for the burial,

which shows that she seems to have expected the burial to take place and therefore seems to have expected the Resurrection. Having anointed Christ elevates Mary Magdalene to a status not reached by any other human being. Additionally, having expected the Resurrection also elevates Mary Magdalene to a status not reached by any other human being. That shows further evidence that Mary Magdalene was the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection.

If we analyze Mary Magdalene's status in relation to that of "the Twelve" both before the Crucifixion and after the Resurrection, we can see even further that Mary Magdalene appears to have been the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. She seems to have been the only person who anointed Christ and the only person who expected the Resurrection. That elevates her to a status not reached by any other human being, let alone "the Twelve". So before the Crucifixion, Mary Magdalene was elevated to a status that hadn't been reached by another human being. For "the Twelve" to have seen Christ after the Resurrection, they would have then been elevated to a similar status as that of Mary Magdalene. So there would then be a shift in the relationship between the statuses of Mary Magdalene and "the Twelve". Such a shift would be quite mysterious and seems very unrealistic. As a result, it is probable that such a shift did not happen. That shows further evidence that Mary Magdalene was the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection.

John 20:16 likely represents the only truthful account in the Gospels of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection.

John 20:16

*Jesus said to her, "Mary."*

*She turned toward him and cried out in Aramaic, "Rabboni!", which means Teacher.*

That is what we are left with. This verse seems to represent real eyewitness testimony in the Bible of the first and probably only appearance of Christ after the Resurrection.

The following verses from the Gospel of Mary likely provide a somewhat accurate account of what happened afterwards.

The Gospel of Mary

*Then Mary stood up. She greeted them all, addressing her brothers and sisters, "Do not weep and be distressed nor let your hearts be irresolute. For his grace will be with you all and will shelter you. Rather, we should praise his greatness, for he has prepared us and made us human beings." When Mary said these things, she turned their heart toward the Good, and they began to debate about the words of [the Savior].*

The Gospel of Mary

*Peter said to Mary, "Sister we know that the Savior loved you more than all other women. Tell us the words of the Savior that you remember, the things you know that we don't because we haven't heard them."*

The Gospel of Mary

*Peter responded, bringing up similar concerns. He questioned them about the Savior, “Did he then speak with a woman in private without our knowing about it? Are we to turn around and listen to her? Did he choose her over us?”*

*Then Mary wept and said to Peter, “My brother Peter, what are you imagining? Do you think that I have thought up these things by myself in my heart or that I am telling lies about the Savior?”*

*Levi answered, speaking to Peter, “Peter, you have always been a wrathful person. Now I see you contending against a woman like the adversaries. For if the Savior made her worthy, who are you then for your part to reject her? Assuredly the Savior’s knowledge of her is completely reliable. That is why he loved her more than us. Rather, we should be ashamed. We should clothe ourselves with the perfect human, acquire it for ourselves as he commanded us, and announce the good news, not laying down any other rule or law that differs from what the Savior said.”*

*After [he said these] things, they started going out [to] teach and to preach.*

John 20:16 is probably the only reliable account in the Bible of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. The Gospel of Mary describes Mary Magdalene proclaiming the Resurrection to others. The combination of John 20:16 and those verses from the Gospel of Mary gives us a good background understanding of what likely happened after the Resurrection. From then on, Mary Magdalene spread the true Christian Revolution.

### **The Case for the First Century Christian Revolution**

The evidence in the Gospels of the Revolution that Mary Magdalene spread can also show evidence for the Resurrection, and therefore that Christianity is the true religion. The evidence that shows the concealment of information about the Revolution shows that the Revolution really was spreading. Not only that, it also shows that the Revolution was spreading information about Mary Magdalene being the top disciple and having anointed Christ, and that the Revolution was so widely spread that those who opposed it had to address it. They weren’t able to ignore it. So the Gospels show evidence that the Revolution was spreading, that it had been widely spread, and that it spread information about Mary Magdalene being the top disciple and having anointed Christ. Evidence of the Revolution can also be found in the Gnostic Gospels, which show evidence that the Revolution spread information about Mary Magdalene being the top disciple into the second century and maybe into the third and fourth centuries and so on. In the sixth century, Pope Gregory labeled Mary Magdalene as a prostitute. Such a disgusting attack is evidence that the pope felt the need to combat the fame of Mary Magdalene. Therefore, it appears that the Revolution spread information about Mary Magdalene being the top disciple into the sixth century. That shows that the Revolution appears to have spread information about Mary Magdalene being the top disciple for over half a millennium.

The Revolution that Mary Magdalene began spreading in the first century seems to have still been spreading information about her over 500 years after the Resurrection. But to see how this shows evidence of the Resurrection, we must analyze how the Revolution began.

First and foremost, the fact that Christianity is about Christ shows evidence that Christ is the Teacher of someone. If Christ wasn’t the Teacher of someone, then it is incredibly unlikely that Christianity would

have been formed around Christ. Furthermore, the presence of the Crucifixion narratives serves as evidence that the Crucifixion really did happen. Anyone forming a false religion would have been unlikely to falsely describe a crucifixion of the leader of that religion if that leader wasn't really crucified. So there is evidence that shows that Christ really was the Teacher of someone, that Christ really was crucified, and that a woman spread the Revolution about the Teacher.

If money, power, politics, or violence is a part of a revolution, then there is a good possibility that such a revolution is fraudulent. This can be seen with the early spread of Islam. Islam is a religion that has a history that places a battle very early on in the formation of Islam. From the beginning of the history of Islam, there seems to have been money, power, politics, and violence. But that doesn't seem to be the case with the Revolution that Mary Magdalene spread. As we will go into more detail on in Part 4 and Part 6, her Revolution seems to have been spread mostly among the lower class. There doesn't seem to have been any ruling power gained from the Revolution. Instead, it seems that those who tried to conceal information about her Revolution were seeking power, and that in turn involves politics. There also doesn't seem to have been any violence initiated by the spread of true Christianity in the first century.

Aside from money, power, politics, and violence, a person could want to spread a false religion if they are the main focus of the religion. In Islam, Muhammad is a main focus and he may have been a king who formed a false religion to gain power and to conquer. In Mormonism, Joseph Smith has been labeled as a prophet who had visions. Even though Mormonism was developed to appear to be a Christian religion, there is still incredible focus on Joseph Smith as a prophet. Both Muhammad and Joseph Smith take center stage with these false religions. Although Mary Magdalene has been known as the top disciple of Christ, true Christianity is really about Christ and the mentioning of a top disciple really only refers to them as a student of Christ. Mary Magdalene is not center stage. She is a student of the Teacher who is Christ. The claims made about Muhammed and Joseph Smith are very different. Islam focuses on Muhammad as a prophet and Mormonism focuses on Joseph Smith as a prophet while true Christianity focuses on Christ. The Revolution that Mary Magdalene spread appears to have included information about her being the top disciple, but ultimately, the Revolution that she spread is about Christ.

So there doesn't seem to be money, power, politics, violence, or a pursuit of fame associated with the origin of the Revolution that Mary Magdalene spread. With that conclusion having been presented, it seems that the probable reason remaining for why the Revolution spread so widely is because of the message of the Revolution, in other words, the teachings. That means that Christ's teachings seem to be the reason why the Revolution spread so widely. It was the knowledge that people were given. On a fundamental level, Christianity can be shown to be the true religion through the logic of Christ's teachings. That is probably how Mary Magdalene was so successful in spreading true Christianity. If money, power, politics, violence, and a pursuit of fame aren't involved, then we're left with the teachings. Mary Magdalene seems to have been able to reach a large portion of the population simply by spreading the truth of Christ's teachings.

Since it seems to have been Christ's teachings that allowed Mary Magdalene to be so successful, then it seems that a man could have done the same. Mary Magdalene was at a disadvantage in the first century because she was a woman. Additionally, she was likely poor. A man would have been at a much greater advantage than a woman in the process of spreading a false religion. Since Christ's teachings appear to have been the catalyst for the successful spread of Christianity, then it seems that a man could have been

successful at spreading the teachings. Hypothetically, if Christ was merely a man, in other words, if Christianity was a false religion, Christianity could have still been successful just based on the evidence that shows that the teachings were the catalyst for the successful spread of Christianity. If Christ was merely a man and Christianity was a false religion, then it wouldn't seem to make much sense that the spreading of the religion was so successful after the Crucifixion rather than before the Crucifixion. One objection to that is that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection convinced people to believe in Christianity. However, there were plenty of religions in ancient times that involved a description of a death and a resurrection. One example is the ancient Egyptian myth of Isis and Osiris about the death and resurrection of Osiris. There also seems to have been a group of people who spread information about Simon of Peraea, who seems to have been a man who was crucified who this group claimed was the Messiah, but that group wasn't very successful. So it wasn't simply expressing that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection occurred that allowed Mary Magdalene to be so successful. It was more specifically the teachings of Christ. As a result, it seems that Christianity could have been successfully spread before the Crucifixion; but there seems to have been a shift after Mary Magdalene began spreading Christianity.

So it seems that Christianity could have been spread as successfully before the Crucifixion as afterwards, but that success was instead delayed until afterwards. That shows evidence that Christ deliberately chose to pass Christianity to Mary Magdalene so that she could lead the Revolution. That in turn shows evidence of the Foreknowledge of Christ. That evidence of the Foreknowledge of Christ in turn shows evidence that Christ is God.

One objection could be that the reason why the Revolution spread to less people before the Crucifixion was because there wasn't as much time from the beginning of Christ's Ministry until the Crucifixion as there was for Mary Magdalene after the Crucifixion. In other words, more time led to a larger spread. So it could be argued that the Revolution wasn't deliberately given to Mary Magdalene but was instead simply left for her taking after the Teacher was crucified, and she had more time that led to more success. However, the different results of Christ having been crucified versus Mary Magdalene leading the Revolution combined with Mary Magdalene having been taught by Christ shows that Mary Magdalene was taught to take a certain path that would lead to a different result. As previously shown, Mary Magdalene's success can be attributed to the teachings of Christ. If Christ was able to teach Mary Magdalene in a way that led to such success, then Christ knew how to be that successful, and yet Christ was crucified while someone who Christ taught led the Revolution. A student follows the example of their teacher, and Mary Magdalene took a different path than Christ, which shows that she was taught to take a different path. That shows evidence that Christ deliberately took a path that led to the Crucifixion and deliberately gave Christianity to Mary Magdalene for her to lead the Revolution.

Now that we've gone through that assessment, we can see that the spreading of Christianity by Mary Magdalene can be instrumental in showing that Christianity is the true religion. More evidence and analysis will be shown in Part 4, but for now, we can see that the evidence of the Revolution that Mary Magdalene spread provides evidence that Christianity is the true religion. We can justifiably believe in the Resurrection of Christ and we can show justification for that belief through the evidence of the Revolution that Mary Magdalene spread. Christ gave Christianity to Mary Magdalene and she in turn gave Christianity to the rest of the world.



## **Eyewitness Testimony**

We should now return to chapter 21 of the Gospel of John to begin an assessment of whose testimony the Gospel of John possesses.

John 21:24

*This is the disciple who testifies to these things and who wrote them down. We know that his testimony is true.*

Since there is evidence that all of chapter 21 is fraudulent, one may suspect that John 21:24 is as well. However, it does not seem like a good strategy to base an entire Gospel on the testimony of an unnamed disciple. While chapter 21 appears to be a fraudulent addition as a whole, there might still be some truth contained within verse 24.

The only reliable account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection only names Mary Magdalene as having been present. She would have been the only human being who would have been able to give that testimony. Additionally, there seems to have been an issue for the “orthodox church” with Mary Magdalene being presented in such an important role. That presentation didn’t happen overnight. The concealment of information about Mary Magdalene shows that there were a lot of people who thought very highly of her and that there were a lot of other people who didn’t like that. That shows reason to believe that the Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene and that the Gospel of John was fraudulently altered to seem as though it is based on the testimony of an unnamed disciple who is not Mary Magdalene. Again, it does not seem like a good strategy to base an entire Gospel on the testimony of an unnamed disciple. However, that may have been an attractive alternative if there were Christians who believed that the Gospel of John possessed fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene. So the fact that the modern version of the Gospel of John claims to be based on the testimony of an unnamed disciple is strong evidence that the Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene and that there was an effort made to conceal that information by claiming that the Gospel of John is based on the testimony of an unnamed disciple.

It does not seem like a good strategy to base an entire Gospel on the testimony of an unnamed disciple, Mary Magdalene is the only human being who could have given eyewitness testimony about the only reliable account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, and the “orthodox church” seems to have wanted to conceal information about Mary Magdalene. So while John 21:24 appears to have a fraudulent origin given that all of chapter 21 appears to be a later fraudulent addition, it can still provide us with incredible evidence of what may have happened with eyewitness testimony from the first century.

There are other verses that we have already seen that we should look at again that refer to someone’s testimony.

John 19:31-35

*Now it was the day of Preparation, and the next day was to be a special Sabbath. Because the Jews did not want the bodies left on the crosses during the Sabbath, they asked Pilate to have the legs broken and the bodies taken down. The soldiers therefore came and broke the legs of the first man who had been crucified with Jesus, and then those of the other. But when they came to Jesus and found that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. Instead, one of the soldiers pierced Jesus’ side with a spear,*

*bringing a sudden flow of blood and water. The man who saw it has given testimony, and his testimony is true. He knows that he tells the truth, and he testifies so that you also may believe.*

Who is this person who gave testimony about the completion of the Crucifixion? Did Mother Mary, Mother Mary's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene all leave before this happened, and then someone else gave testimony of this? That seems farfetched. Furthermore, the person who gave such a testimony goes unnamed. Eyewitness testimonies about the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of Christ are the two most important kinds of eyewitness testimony in relation to showing evidence for the Resurrection of Christ. This testimony is one of the two most important kinds of eyewitness testimony about Christ in relation to showing evidence for the Resurrection of Christ and it is attributed to an anonymous "man". Additionally, John 19:25 is the verse that shows who the Gospel of John portrays as having been present during the Crucifixion. So naturally, real eyewitness testimony about the Crucifixion in the Gospel of John should be believed to have come from one of the four people described in John 19:25, all of whom are women, which shows that the mentioning of an anonymous man appears to be a later fraudulent alteration. Furthermore, apparently only one person gave a testimony about the completion of the Crucifixion. This unnamed "man" apparently provided the only testimony about the completion of the Crucifixion. It should be obvious that such a person should not go unnamed and that such a person going unnamed indicates that this person's identity was fraudulently concealed. With that alone, we can easily derive the belief that this person is Mary Magdalene. Additionally, Mary Magdalene was already named as having been present during the Crucifixion and there has already been evidence shown that the Gospel of John seems to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene. So it would make sense if this testimony is that of Mary Magdalene's. That would also explain why this testimony is attributed to an anonymous "man". Furthermore, given the societal influence to present at least two witnesses to validate a testimony and the apparent desire in all of the Gospels to present multiple witnesses, it is very unlikely that these verses would have been fraudulently produced to only describe one person as having given this testimony. The presence of only one person testifying to what is described in these verses is evidence that the original form of this information is probably true testimony. These verses were unlikely to have been originally produced with only one person involved in the testimony unless the original testimony is true testimony. There being only one person described serves as evidence that the basic information in these verses is probably truthful. None of the Synoptic Gospels describe the information contained in these verses and the people who committed fraud in the Gospel of John apparently didn't care enough to add a second person. We previously saw a similar situation with John 20:16, which describes Mary Magdalene as the only disciple present. Less importance seems to have been placed on John 20:16 because of the other Resurrection narratives in the Gospel of John, and so there seems to have not been a desire to add another person to John 20:16. Similarly, the information contained in John 19:31-35 isn't in any of the Synoptic Gospels and so it seems that less importance was placed on this testimony. As a result, it is likely that the desire to change information in those verses centered around concealing whose testimony it was, and therefore the societal influence to present at least two witnesses to validate a testimony didn't come into play. These verses were unlikely to have been originally produced with only one person involved in the testimony unless the original testimony is true testimony, and these verses were unlikely to have been originally produced with that lone person being anonymous. There being only one person described as well as that person being anonymous both serve as evidence that the basic information in these verses is truthful.

The text states “The man who saw it has given testimony, and his testimony is true. He knows that he tells the truth, and he testifies so that you also may believe.” There is special emphasis placed on this testimony. This testimony was given so that we may believe. This is obviously very important testimony that is for people to believe in the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of Christ. Why would Mother Mary, Mother Mary’s sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene all leave and have someone else give such an important testimony? It seems probable that this testimony is that of Mary Magdalene’s and we have yet another instance of her going unnamed.

So there has been some evidence shown that the Gospel of John appears to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene. There are several verses that we should now analyze that show further evidence of that assertion and/or that can be supportive in showing probable truthfulness in some of the testimony that is provided in the Gospel of John. First, we’ll go back to verse 25 of chapter 19, and then we’ll move on to other verses that show evidence that the Gospel of John appears to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene and/or that the Gospel of John probably contains truthful eyewitness testimony.

John 19:25

*Near the cross of Jesus stood his mother, his mother’s sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene.*

The order of the people in this list of who was near the Cross shows evidence that the Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene and that her Testimony is truthful. John 19:25 is the only instance in all four of the Gospels that describes a group of women and has Mary Magdalene named last. In fact, Mary Magdalene is named first in all other instances that describe a group of women and include the name Mary Magdalene (Mark 15:40, Mark 15:47, Mark 16:1, Matthew 27:56, Matthew 27:61, Matthew 28:1, Luke 8:2-3, Luke 24:10). So there are nine instances in the Gospels that describe a group of women and include the name Mary Magdalene, eight of which name Mary Magdalene first and one of which, the one in the Gospel of John, names Mary Magdalene last. Mary Magdalene being named first in the eight instances within the Synoptic Gospels shows her importance as the authors of the Synoptic Gospels naturally placed her first among a group of women. Naming Mary Magdalene first among a group of women probably didn’t seem like much of a risk to those who originally did that because they probably didn’t place much importance on these lists of women. So without them assessing a high level of risk, they probably naturally named Mary Magdalene first because of who she really is. Mary Magdalene being named last in the one instance that she is, contrasted with the eight instances that name her first, shows that Mary Magdalene is probably the person who provided the original list as she probably naturally listed herself last. Even if someone other than Mary Magdalene would have placed Mother Mary and Mother Mary’s sister before Mary Magdalene, Mary the wife of Clopas would still likely not have been placed before Mary Magdalene unless Mary Magdalene was the person who provided that list of people. The authors of the Synoptic Gospels named her first while she probably named herself last. That’s not to say that Mary Magdalene necessarily wrote John 19:25 as it appears in the Bible today, it’s simply to say that she is likely the original source of the fundamental information contained in the verse. For example, it’s not necessarily the case that Mary Magdalene wrote or even said “Jesus’ Mother”, “his mother’s sister”, or “Mary the wife of Clopas”. Those specific labels are ultimately how the author of John 19:25 chose to identify those people. Nevertheless, the original list that identified the four people described in John 19:25 likely came from Mary Magdalene, and therefore, the order of

those four people in that list likely originally came from her. John 19:25 shows incredible evidence of probable eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene as she probably listed herself last.

As we move to John 19:26-27, we can see more evidence that the Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene and that her Testimony is reliable.

John 19:26-27

*When Jesus saw his mother there, and the disciple whom he loved standing nearby, he said to his mother, "Dear woman, here is your son", and to the disciple, "Here is your mother." From that time on, this disciple took her into his home.*

The apparent fraudulent removal of Mary Magdalene's name actually provides evidence for the authenticity of the fundamental aspects of the description of that communication. If the entire narrative was false, then there probably wouldn't be an unnamed disciple. There being an unnamed disciple shows that the fundamental aspects of the description of that communication are probably truthful. The presence of an unnamed disciple shows that the true identity of the beloved disciple was probably first concealed sometime after the original production of those verses. Otherwise, someone's name would probably be there or those verses probably wouldn't have been produced in the first place. It's highly unlikely that those verses were originally produced with the beloved disciple's identity concealed. Therefore, there were likely verses circulating that showed the name of the beloved disciple. If John 19:26-27 were fraudulent to begin with and the "orthodox church" wanted to conceal the identity of the beloved disciple, then they probably wouldn't have used John 19:26-27 at all. The original inclusion of John 19:26-27 likely derived from those verses representing real eyewitness testimony of the Crucifixion. Otherwise, those verses would have likely never ended up in the New Testament. There doesn't seem to be any obvious motivation for someone to have added those verses unless the fundamental information in those verses came from real eyewitness testimony. So despite the apparent presence of fraudulent alterations, the fundamental information in John 19:26-27 is likely truthful. The fundamental information in John 19:26-27 likely represents real eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene of communication between Christ, Mother Mary, and Mary Magdalene during the Crucifixion. That assessment provides evidence that Mary Magdalene seems to have taken Mother Mary into her home after the Crucifixion.

John 1:38-39

*Turning around, Jesus saw them following and asked, "What do you want?"*

*They said, "Rabbi", which means Teacher, "where are you staying?"*

*"Come", he replied, "and you will see."*

*So they went and saw where he was staying, and spent that day with him. It was about the tenth hour.*

The presence of an unnamed disciple in this narrative represents the first instance of an unnamed disciple in the Gospel of John. There has been evidence shown that the Gospel of John seems to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene and there has been evidence shown that Mary Magdalene's name seems to have been fraudulently concealed. Just based on that, we can see that there is already a good possibility that Mary Magdalene is the source of the original testimony contained in these verses, although that doesn't necessarily mean that every mention of an unnamed person is a reference to Mary Magdalene. We've already seen that the mentions of an unnamed disciple in chapter 20 appear to be fraudulent and that a seemingly fictional character is presented as someone who is not Mary Magdalene. So someone going unnamed in the Gospel of John is not necessarily an indication that Mary Magdalene's

name was concealed. However, as we will continue to go into more detail on, in the case of John 1:38-39, it does appear that Mary Magdalene is probably the source of the original testimony represented in those verses.

When there is an unnamed disciple, there are two main possibilities. One of course is that someone's identity was originally presented and then was later concealed. The second is that a fictional character was inserted into the text for whatever reason. The beloved disciple going unnamed in chapter 19 of the Gospel of John seems to be in line with the first main possibility, and the presence of an unnamed disciple in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John seems to be in line with the second main possibility. Mary Magdalene's identity seems to be concealed in John 19:26-27, and the presence of an unnamed disciple in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John seems to represent a fictional character. In the case of John 1:38-39, we need to assess which of these two main possibilities those verses seem to be in line with.

In John 1:38-39, there isn't any theological agenda that seems to be present, there aren't any teachings from Christ that are described, and there isn't any extra description about the disciples involved. To the average reader of the New Testament, there doesn't appear to be any serious claims being made. There doesn't seem to be much reason to fraudulently add these verses. All of the other narratives about people becoming disciples throughout all four Gospels, on the other hand, take a different route. There's a very distinct pattern across all of the Synoptic Gospels and we'll see that pattern extend to the Gospel of John through what appears to be later fraudulent additions to the Gospel of John.

Mark 1:16-20

*As Jesus walked beside the Sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and his brother Andrew casting a net into the lake, for they were fishermen. "Come, follow me", Jesus said, "and I will make you fishers of men." At once they left their nets and followed him.*

*When he had gone a little farther, he saw James son of Zebedee and his brother John in a boat, preparing their nets. Without delay he called them, and they left their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired men and followed him.*

Matthew 4:18-22

*As Jesus was walking beside the Sea of Galilee, he saw two brothers, Simon called Peter and his brother Andrew. They were casting a net into the lake, for they were fishermen. "Come, follow me", Jesus said, "and I will make you fishers of men." At once they left their nets and followed him.*

*Going on from there, he saw two brothers James son of Zebedee and his brother John. They were in a boat with their father Zebedee, preparing their nets. Jesus called them, and immediately they left the boat and their father and followed him.*

Luke 5:1-11

*One day as Jesus was standing by the Lake of Gennesaret, with the people crowding around him and listening to the word of God, he saw at the water's edge two boats, left there by the fishermen, who were washing their nets. He got into one of the boats, the one belonging to Simon, and asked him to put out a little from shore. Then he sat down and taught the people from the boat.*

*When he had finished speaking, he said to Simon, "Put out into deep water, and let down the nets for a catch."*

*Simon answered, "Master, we've worked hard all night and haven't caught anything. But because you say so, I will let down the nets."*

*When they had done so, they caught such a large number of fish that their nets began to break. So they began to sink.*

*When Simon Peter saw this, he fell at Jesus' knees and said, "Go away from me, Lord; I am a sinful man!" For he and all his companions were astonished at the catch of fish they had taken, and so were James and John, the sons of Zebedee, Simon's partners.*

*Then Jesus said to Simon, "Don't be afraid, from now on you will catch men." So they pulled their boats up on shore, left everything, and followed him.*

The narratives from the Gospels of Mark and Matthew focus on Peter, Andrew, James, and John; and the narrative from the Gospel of Luke focuses on the same group except without Andrew. All of these narratives give more details about the people involved than what we've seen from John 1:38-39. We are told that Peter, Andrew, James, and John are all fishermen; Peter and Andrew are brothers; James and John are brothers; the father of James and John is named Zebedee; James and John fish with their father; Peter has the two names "Simon" and "Peter"; Peter and Andrew are told that they will be "fishers of men"; and Peter, James, and John are told that they will "catch men". In stark contrast, we're not even given a single name of any disciple in John 1:38-39.

Not only are there plenty of specific details about disciples in the Synoptic Gospels as opposed to John 1:38-39, but there is also a distinct level of exaltation particularly for Peter. He is listed first before any other disciple in all of the Synoptic Gospels, and the Gospel of Luke goes the furthest to put Peter at center stage. The Gospel of Luke describes Christ as teaching from Peter's boat and describes Peter as engaging in conversation with Christ, catching a miraculous amount of fish, falling "at Jesus' knees", saying to Christ "go away from me Lord", and calling himself a "sinful man". Additionally, Andrew doesn't appear in this narrative, and James and John are only briefly introduced towards the end after most of the action of the narrative has already taken place and they are immediately identified as Peter's partners. The Gospel of Luke goes further than any other Gospel in making Peter the star of the disciples, and Mark and Matthew have their fair share of exaltation of Peter as well. When it comes to the disciples, all of the Synoptic Gospels are very clear in presenting Peter in the top spot and that exaltation begins in each of the Synoptic Gospels with naming him first before any other disciple. In the Gospel of John, however, Peter doesn't even make it into the first group of disciples. Instead, someone whose identity has been concealed is described as having been a disciple and spending a day with Christ before Peter is even introduced.

As we move to narratives about the calling of a tax collector, we can again see a relatively high level of attention and detail placed on a single disciple.

Mark 2:13-17

*Once again Jesus went out beside the lake. A large crowd came to him, and he began to teach them. As he walked along, he saw Levi son of Alphaeus sitting at the tax collector's booth. "Follow me", Jesus told him, and Levi got up and followed him.*

*While Jesus was having dinner at Levi's house, many tax collectors and "sinners" were eating with him and his disciples, for there were many who followed him. When the teachers of the law who were Pharisees saw him eating with the "sinners" and tax collectors, they asked his disciples: "Why does he eat with tax collectors and 'sinners'?"*

*On hearing this, Jesus said to them, “It is not the healthy who need a doctor, but the sick. I have not come to call the righteous, but the sinners.”*

Matthew 9:9-13

*As Jesus went on from there, he saw a man named Matthew sitting at the tax collector’s booth. “Follow me”, he told him, and Matthew got up and followed him.*

*While Jesus was having dinner at Matthew’s house, many tax collectors and “sinners” were eating with him and his disciples, for there were many who followed him. When the teachers of the law who were Pharisees saw him eating with the “sinners” and tax collectors, they asked his disciples: “Why does he eat with tax collectors and ‘sinners’?”*

*On hearing this, Jesus said “It is not the healthy who need a doctor, but the sick. But go and learn what this means: ‘I desire mercy, not sacrifice. For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners.’ ”*

Luke 5:27-32

*After this, Jesus went out and saw a tax collector by the name of Levi. “Follow me”, Jesus said to him, and Levi got up, left everything, and followed him.*

*Then Levi had a great banquet for Jesus at his house, and a large crowd of tax collectors and others were eating with them. But the Pharisees and the teachers of the law who belonged to their sect complained to his disciples. “Why do you eat and drink with tax collectors and ‘sinners’?”*

*Jesus answered them, “It is not the healthy who need a doctor, but the sick. I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.”*

These narratives describe the profession of the person described, which is similar to the previous narratives that described Peter and the rest as fishermen, and go on to include a scene that involves a dinner at this person’s house. These narratives are on par with the narrative from the Gospel of Luke that describes the supposed calling of Peter. Even the tax collector described in the Synoptic Gospels gets more attention than the first disciple described in the Gospel of John.

As we turn back to the Gospel of John and take a look at the narratives after John 1:38-39, we see a similar style as that of the Synoptic Gospels.

John 1:40-42

*Andrew, Simon Peter’s brother, was one of the two who heard what John had said and who had followed Jesus. The first thing Andrew did was to find his brother Simon and tell him, “We have found the Messiah” (that is, the Christ). And he brought him to Jesus.”*

*Jesus looked at him and said, “You are Simon son of John. You will be called Cephas” (which, when translated, is Peter).*

John 1:43-44

*The next day Jesus decided to leave for Galilee. Finding Philip, he said to him, “Follow me.”*

*Philip, like Andrew and Peter, was from the town of Bethsaida.*

*Philip found Nathanael and told him, “We have found the one Moses wrote about in the Law, and about whom the prophets also wrote – Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.”*

*“Nazareth! Can anything good come from there?” Nathanael asked*

*“Come and see”, said Philip.*

*When Jesus saw Nathanael approaching, he said of him, "Here is a true Israelite, in whom there is nothing false."*

*"How do you know me?" Nathanael asked.*

*Jesus answered, "I saw you while you were still under the fig tree before Philip called you."*

*Then Nathanael declared, "Rabbi, you are the Son of God; you are the King of Israel."*

*Jesus said, "You believe because I told you I saw you under the fig tree. You shall see greater things than that." He then added, "I tell you the truth, you shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man."*

With these narratives we again see a relatively high level of attention and detail placed on certain disciples. These narratives, unlike John 1:38-39, seem to fall in line with the style seen in the Synoptic Gospels. That sets John 1:38-39 apart from all of the other narratives about people becoming disciples, even the other ones in the Gospel of John.

All of the narratives in the Gospels about the calling of disciples except for John 1:38-39 describe those disciples as being verbally called to follow Christ rather than choosing on their own to be a disciple without being verbally called. John 1:38-39, on the other hand, describe two disciples as making the decision on their own to follow Christ. The Gospel of John even describes Christ as having asked what the disciples wanted. That is in major contrast to the other narratives. We previously examined this kind of difference with the Resurrection narratives. The only reliable account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection describes Mary Magdalene as having decided to have been at the tomb while all of the other Resurrection narratives throughout all four Gospels describe Christ as going to where the so-called "disciples" were and those narratives all appear to be fraudulent. Similarly, the presence in the Gospel of John of a disciple choosing on their own to follow Christ rather than being verbally told to follow Christ is different than all of the other narratives throughout all four Gospels of people described as becoming disciples. With the narratives about a first disciple and the narratives about the Resurrection, we see one account about a disciple making a choice for themselves to be with Christ and all of the other narratives either describe a disciple as being verbally called to be a disciple or describe Christ physically appearing to a disciple who chose to disown Christ. There are two narratives in the Gospel of John that describe someone as having chosen to be with Christ: one is about a first disciple and the other is the only reliable account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. That shows evidence that John 1:38-39 possess true testimony. Furthermore, since the only reliable account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection only names Mary Magdalene as having seen Christ and since the only disciple who could have given that testimony is Mary Magdalene, there is obviously an even greater possibility that John 1:38-39 possess fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene.

As previously stated, the Gospel of John is the only Gospel that doesn't include Peter in the first group of disciples. That is a major diversion from the Synoptic Gospels. Such a diversion would likely have only happened if John 1:38-39 hold a certain level of importance. As previously shown, those verses don't give much information about the disciples described. What is so important about those verses that they would be written as the account of the first disciples while Peter gets left out? The importance of John 1:38-39 is probably that they possess fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene.

Moving further, in relation to the reference to the tenth hour in John 1:38-39, there are 17 instances throughout the Gospels that name a specific time. Of those 17 instances, 14 of them name the third, sixth,



or ninth hour. That statistic shows that it was common to use a time that marked a quarter of a half of a day.

The accounting of a day in ancient times was in accordance with sunrise and sunset. So the beginning and end of a day could vary depending on the time of year and the particular day. 12 hours were assigned to each period of daylight and 12 hours to each night, but the hours were not necessarily 60 minutes as we count today. The concept of a relative hour was used. A relative hour does not have a fixed length but is determined based on the sun. During the summer, a period of daylight is longer and so each relative hour would be longer. During the winter, a period of daylight is shorter and so each relative hour would be shorter. Regardless of how long a period of daylight was, it was considered to be 12 hours. So a relative hour refers to a certain portion of the day as indicated by the position of the sun in relation to the observer. Hypothetically, if the sun rose at 6:00 am and set at 6:00pm, then the period of daylight would be equal to 12 60-minute hours and so a relative hour would then be 60 minutes and the first hour would be 6:00 am to 7:00 am. So from that perspective, the third, sixth, and ninth hours would approximately refer to 8:00 am to 9:00 am, 11:00 am to 12:00 pm, and 2:00 pm to 3:00 pm, respectively.

Regardless of the exact accounting of a day, it seems to have been common to describe events as having occurred at the third, sixth, or ninth hour. The Gospel of Mark uses all three in relation to the Crucifixion.

Mark 15:25

*It was the third hour when they crucified him.*

Mark 15:33-34

*At the sixth hour darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour. And at the ninth hour Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eloi, Eloi, llama sabachthani?", which means, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"*

The Gospel of Mark is claiming that the Crucifixion began at the third hour, that darkness came over the land from the sixth hour until the ninth hour, and that Christ cried out at the ninth hour. Matthew and Luke both describe darkness coming over the land from the sixth hour until the ninth hour, and Matthew describes Christ crying out at the ninth hour. The Gospel of John only describes the sixth hour and does so in relation to Pontius Pilate sitting on the "judge's seat".

In summary, it seems to have been common to describe events as having occurred at the third, sixth, or ninth hour. We should now examine why there are three instances that don't follow that same pattern. One of those is John 1:38-39. The other two are shown in the following verses.

Matthew 20:3-6

*"About the third hour he went out and saw others standing in the marketplace doing nothing. He told them, 'You also go and work in my vineyard, and I will pay you whatever is right.' So they went."*

*"He went out again about the sixth hour and the ninth hour and did the same thing. About the eleventh hour he went out and found still others standing around. He asked them, 'Why have you been standing here all day long doing nothing?'"*

John 4:52

*When he inquired as to the time when his son got better, they said to him, "The fever left him yesterday at the seventh hour."*

Matthew 20:3-6 show an example of a narrative that emphasizes the third, sixth, and ninth hours; but also shows an example of diverting from that pattern by describing the eleventh hour. So the narrative seems to follow the pattern already laid out about the third, sixth, and ninth hours but also diverts from that pattern in one instance. The narrative is about someone looking for workers. They go out at the third, sixth, and ninth hours looking for workers. The eleventh hour takes importance because it is one hour before the end of the workday. The twelfth hour marks the beginning of night-time, so the eleventh hour marks the last hour before the end of the workday, and therefore there is only one more hour to get workers. So the narrative goes by 3's until it reaches one hour before the end of the workday, at which point the narrative references the eleventh hour. So there is a specific reason why there is a diversion from the usual pattern of describing events as occurring at the third, sixth, or ninth hour.

John 4:52 describes the seventh hour. The number 7 takes very special importance among many societies, including Jewish society. The number 7 symbolizes completion. Chapter 1 of Genesis describes the seven days of Creation narrative. Our weeks are units of seven days. There were ancient traditions about people having seven demons in them. It seems that John 4:52 follows the importance of the number 7 to society. With the number 7 symbolizing completion, this narrative describes a fever leaving someone at the seventh hour. So there seems to be a specific reason why there is a diversion from the usual pattern of describing events as occurring at the third, sixth, or ninth hour.

As we return to John 1:38-39, there doesn't seem to be any reason to reference the tenth hour unless such a reference represents true testimony. As a result, the reference to the tenth hour shows evidence that John 1:38-39 possess fragments of real eyewitness testimony.

Another indication that John 1:38-39 probably represent real eyewitness testimony is the distinction that "Rabbi" means "Teacher". The Greek word for "Rabbi" is Ῥαββί ("Rhabbi") and the Greek word for "Teacher" is Διδάσκαλε ("Didaskale"). If a word that means "teacher" is in a verse written in Greek and the purpose of that word being in that verse is simply to convey the meaning of the word "teacher", then that word would probably be the Greek word for "teacher" unless the author of that verse favored the word "Rhabbi" for some specific reason. The next question then becomes about why the author favored the word "Rhabbi" over the Greek word for "Teacher".

It might seem that the probable reason is because the author was Jewish and the Hebrew word for "teacher" is "Rhabbi". However, there are 17 verses in the Gospels that use either the Greek word Ῥαββί ("Rhabbi") or the Greek word Ῥαββουνί ("Rabbouni"), which is similar to "Rhabbi" but may convey more respect, and only two of them express an explicit equivalency to the word "Didaskale". That shows that it was unusual for a Gospel author to have explicitly equated "Rhabbi" or "Rabbouni" to "Didaskale". Additionally, out of those 17 verses, 9 of them are in the Gospel of John and both of the instances in which either "Rhabbi" or "Rabbouni" is explicitly equated to "Didaskale" are in the Gospel of John. So even though the Gospel of John includes both of those instances, the Gospel of John usually does not explicitly equate "Rhabbi" or "Rabbouni" to "Didaskale". Meanwhile, none of the Synoptic Gospels does that. It seems that it was common to just use the word "Rhabbi" or "Rabbouni" without any explicit equivalency to the word "Didaskale". Therefore, there seems to be a more specific reason for the use of "Rhabbi" or "Rabbouni" in combination with an explicit equivalency to "Didaskale".

The explicit equivalency to "Didaskale" shows that the author was likely trying to convey the typical meaning of the word "Teacher" rather than trying to convey any kind of special Jewish meaning. In other

words, the use of the word “Rhabbi” is simply to convey the meaning of the word “Teacher” rather than to convey a more specific meaning such as “Jewish teacher”. Many people today interpret the word “rabbi” specifically as “Jewish teacher” rather than just “teacher”. In John 1:38-39, the author is defining “Rhabbi” as just “Teacher” rather than specifically as “Jewish teacher”. If the author simply wanted to convey the meaning of just “Teacher” rather than any kind of special Jewish meaning, then the word “Didaskale” could have just been used. “Didaskale” is used in plenty of other instances without an explicit equivalency to “Rhabbi” or “Rabbouni”. “Didaskale” and “Rhabbi” are used plenty without an explicit equivalency to each other. So the fact that the author was writing to a Greek speaking audience is still not enough of an explanation for why “Rhabbi” or “Rabbouni” were used in combination with an explicit equivalency to “Didaskale”. “Didaskale” could have just been used by itself. Additionally, as previously shown, if an author favored “Rhabbi” or “Rabbouni” instead of “Didaskale”, then it would not have been unusual for them to have just simply used “Rhabbi” or “Rabbouni” without an explicit equivalency to “Didaskale”. Therefore, it seems that it would not have been unusual for an author to have just simply used “Rhabbi”, “Rabbouni”, or “Didaskale” rather than complicating the verse with the use of “Rhabbi” or “Rabbouni” in combination with an explicit equivalency to “Didaskale”. So again, there seems to be a more specific reason for the use of “Rhabbi” or “Rabbouni” in combination with an explicit equivalency to “Didaskale”.

John 20:16 is the other verse that uses “Rhabbi” or “Rabbouni” in combination with an explicit equivalency to “Didaskale”.

John 20:16

*Jesus said to her, “Mary.”*

*She turned toward him and cried out in Aramaic, “Rabboni!”, which means Teacher.*

Only two verses out of a total of 17 verses in the Gospels explicitly equate “Rhabbi” or “Rabbouni” to “Teacher”. That shows a unique connection between John 1:38-39 and John 20:16. Additionally, it shows that it wasn’t common to clarify that the word “Rhabbi” or the word “Rabbouni” is equivalent to the word “Didaskale”, which shows that it was common for someone who wanted to use the word “Rhabbi” or the word “Rabbouni” to simply use that word and not provide any clarification as to what they mean. Therefore, it seems that the use of the word “Rhabbi” or the word “Rabbouni” in combination with an explicit equivalency to “Didaskale” shows that there is special significance to the specific word choice in the quoted dialogue. That significance is likely that real eyewitness testimony is being presented.

There are other instances in the Gospels of a Hebrew or Aramaic word being used and then explicitly equated to a Greek word. Such an instance isn’t necessarily probable truthful eyewitness testimony. Those instances simply show that the Hebrew or Aramaic word or words have special significance, but that special significance is not necessarily that of truthful eyewitness testimony. Mark and Matthew both provide a good example of that.

Mark 15:34

*And at the ninth hour Jesus cried out in a loud voice, “Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachtani?” – which means, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?”*

Matthew 27:46

*About the ninth hour Jesus cried out in a loud voice, “Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachtani?” – which means, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?”*

As shown in Part 1, these verses contradict theology found in the Gospel of John. John 19:25 has shown to probably represent real eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene. Mary Magdalene seems to have really been a witness to the Crucifixion of Christ. If Mark 15:34 and Matthew 27:46 contradict theology that revolves around the testimony of someone who was actually a witness of the Crucifixion of Christ, then Mark 13:34 and Matthew 27:46 would obviously probably be fraudulent, and therefore not likely to represent real eyewitness testimony. Additionally, these verses seem to be copied from the Hebrew Bible as shown by Psalm 22:1.

Psalm 22:1

*My God, my God, why have you forsaken me? Why are you so far from saving me, so far from the words of my groaning?*

The comparison to Psalm 22:1 not only shows that the verses shown from Mark and Matthew appear to be fraudulent, but also shows that the authors seem to have been fraudulently trying to relate Christ to the Hebrew Bible. So those verses apparently don't represent real eyewitness testimony. However, the use of a Hebrew or Aramaic phrase in combination with an explicit equivalency to the Greek translation shows a certain special significance to that phrase. In these instances, that special significance does not appear to be that of real eyewitness testimony. Instead, that special significance seems to derive from the special significance that the author or authors saw in that particular phrase from the Hebrew Bible. “Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachtani?” seems to have been an important phrase among the Jewish population. It seems that is where the special significance comes from. So the use of a Hebrew or Aramaic phrase in combination with an explicit equivalency to the Greek translation shows some sort of significance but does not necessarily serve as evidence of real eyewitness testimony.

The reason why John 1:38-39 and John 20:16 appear to serve as evidence of real eyewitness testimony while Mark 15:34 and Matthew 27:46 apparently don't is that the use of the word “Rhabbi” or “Rabbouni” in John 1:38-39 and John 20:16 doesn't seem to take on as much significance unless those verses represent real eyewitness testimony. It is the likelihood that John 1:38-39 and John 20:16 represent real eyewitness testimony that makes the exact wording of the quoted dialogue seem so important. If those verses don't represent real eyewitness testimony, then the exact wording wouldn't be as important. Mark 15:34 and Matthew 27:46 are different in that they place importance on specific wording by placing importance on a phrase from the Hebrew Bible. So the use of a Hebrew or Aramaic phrase in combination with an explicit equivalency to the Greek translation does not necessarily serve as evidence of real eyewitness testimony. Nevertheless, John 1:38-39 and John 20:16 likely represent real eyewitness testimony because it seems that those verses include an explicit equivalency to a Greek translation specifically because those verses represent real eyewitness testimony.

The shift from the use of “Rhabbi” in John 1:38-39 to the use of “Rabbouni” in John 20:16 also serves as evidence that those verses likely represent real eyewitness testimony. As previously stated, “Rabbouni” is similar to “Rhabbi” but may convey more respect. Therefore, a shift from “Rhabbi” to “Rabbouni” may be indicative of the development of the relationship between Christ and Mary Magdalene. If “Rabbouni” conveys more respect than “Rhabbi”, then it would make sense that “Rhabbi” shows up in a narrative about the beginning of Christ's Ministry and that “Rabbouni” shows up in a narrative about the

Resurrection of Christ. That shift shows a certain progression that may be indicative of the development of the relationship between Christ and Mary Magdalene. So the shift from the use of “Rhabbi” in John 1:38-39 to the use of “Rabbouni” in John 20:16 serves as further evidence that those verses likely represent real eyewitness testimony.

Specifically about John 20:16, additional evidence that shows that it likely represents real eyewitness testimony is that Mary Magdalene is the only person in that verse who is described as having seen Christ. As previously shown, there was societal influence to present at least two witnesses to validate a testimony and there is apparent desire in all of the Gospels to present multiple witnesses. In this case, only one person is present. If John 20:16 was fraudulent, then there would probably be more than one person described in that verse. Further support for that assertion can be seen in the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the discovery of the empty tomb and the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. All of those narratives describe multiple witnesses with the exception of Mark 16:9, which is the first verse of the later addition to the Gospel of Mark. Furthermore, especially given that only one person is described in John 20:16, that person having been a woman is even further evidence that John 20:16 is authentic. Not only is only one person described, but that person was a woman.

John 1:38-39 are different than John 20:16 in that those verses involve two people. Given the societal influence to present at least two witnesses to validate a testimony and the apparent desire in all of the Gospels to present multiple witnesses, we should now consider the likelihood that the source of the information contained in John 1:38-39 originally described only one person as having been present. John 20:16 wouldn't cause the same issue as John 1:38-39 would if John 1:38-39 only described one person because the Gospel of John includes other narratives about the Resurrection, and as previously shown, chapter 21 doesn't even count the appearance of Christ after the Resurrection to Mary Magdalene alone as an appearance to a disciple. Mary Magdalene is basically described as a messenger to so-called “disciples” and chapter 21 doesn't even consider Mary Magdalene to be a disciple. The modern version of the Gospel of John pretty much treats the appearance of Christ after the Resurrection to Mary Magdalene alone as an introduction to what the modern version of the Gospel of John seems to portray as appearances to more important people. The modern version of the Gospel of John does not place the importance on Mary Magdalene that she deserves. It instead focuses on so-called “disciples” who were men who disowned Christ. Since the appearance of Christ after the Resurrection to Mary Magdalene alone is not given the attention that is deserving, John 20:16 seems to have not been problematic in terms of the societal influence to present at least two witnesses to validate a testimony and the apparent desire in all of the Gospels to present multiple witnesses. John 1:38-39, on the other hand, describe the first disciple of Christ beginning their discipleship, and so there is no other narrative that falls into that same category. There are other Resurrection narratives that take attention away from John 20:16, but there isn't any other narrative that describes the beginning of Christ's Ministry like John 1:38-39. So the narrative that John 1:38-39 are a part of may have been altered to fraudulently include a fictional second person, in which case there is probably only one person who was the first disciple of Christ. That person is probably Mary Magdalene.

As previously stated, the fact that there is an unnamed disciple in combination with the evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene's name was fraudulently concealed shows that the mentioning of an unnamed disciple in John 1:38-39 is likely a reference to Mary Magdalene. Additionally, the similarities between John 1:38-39 and John 20:16 in combination with the evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene

is the only person who could have testified about the information contained in John 20:16 shows further evidence that John 1:38-39 likely refer to Mary Magdalene. Although John 1:38-39 seem to have been fraudulently altered to conceal Mary Magdalene's name and to include a fictional second person, it seems that the original source of the initial information contained in John 1:38-39 is Mary Magdalene. John 1:38-39 probably represent real eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene about the beginning of Christ's Ministry and the beginning of her discipleship with Christ. Furthermore, John 1:38-39 show evidence that Mary Magdalene was probably the first disciple of Christ and probably spent time with Christ during the first day of Christ's Ministry. Certain aspects of John 1:38-39 probably derived from Mary Magdalene's own memory as she passed on the story about the first day that she spent with Christ.

John 20:16 also appears to represent real eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene and appears to represent the only real eyewitness testimony in the Bible of the Resurrection of Christ. John 20:16 might be the most important verse in the entire Bible. The evidence that shows the apparent validity of John 20:16 serves as evidence that the Resurrection of Christ is a real historical event and that Christ really did appear to Mary Magdalene after she witnessed the Crucifixion of Christ.

John 1:38-39 and John 20:16 show incredible evidence that the Gospel of John possesses real eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene. John 1:38-39 appear to describe the beginning of Christ's Ministry and the beginning of Mary Magdalene's discipleship with Christ, and John 20:16 appears to give us the only real eyewitness testimony in the Bible of the Resurrection of Christ.

It appears probable that the Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene. Even if the Gospel of John possesses someone else's testimony, Mary Magdalene would still likely have been the source for a lot of the most important information considering a lot of that information involves her. Nevertheless, the probable scenario is that the Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene and that the Gospel of John was fraudulently altered to appear to represent someone else's testimony. That is reflected in the way that the two explicit references to testimony, verses 19:35 and 21:24, attribute such testimony to an unnamed person.

### **Instances of an Unnamed Disciple**

As shown earlier, there are several mysterious absences of a name of a disciple in multiple verses.

John 1:37-39

*When the two disciples heard him say this, they followed Jesus.*

*Turning around, Jesus saw them following and asked, "What do you want?"*

*They said, "Rabbi", which means Teacher, "where are you staying?"*

*"Come", he replied, "and you will see."*

*So they went and saw where he was staying, and spent that day with him. It was about the tenth hour.*

Those verses show that Mary Magdalene was probably the first disciple of Christ. We have already seen that there was probably a fictional second person added and so Mary Magdalene was probably the lone first disciple of Christ. Additionally, as we will go into more detail on later, a part of the likely fraudulent alterations to these verses is the mentioning of the unnamed disciple as having been a disciple of John the Baptist. As we will see, there seems to have been somewhat of an obsession with John the Baptist and

naming this disciple as a disciple of John the Baptist provides a bridge from the narratives about John the Baptist to the narratives about disciples all the while also providing a way to conceal the identity of this disciple. By describing them as a disciple of John the Baptist, less attention is placed on them because they are presented more as a disciple of John the Baptist rather than a disciple of Christ, which then puts more focus on the part about Peter. So Mary Magdalene probably wasn't a disciple of John the Baptist and probably was the lone first disciple of Christ.

The next occurrence is about the Last Supper.

John 13:23-25

*One of them, the disciple whom Jesus loved, was reclining next to him. Simon Peter motioned to this disciple and said, "Ask him which one he means." Leaning back against Jesus he asked him, "Lord, who is it?"*

We've already seen the presence of an unnamed disciple in apparently truthful verses in chapter 19 followed by the presence of an unnamed disciple in fraudulent verses in chapter 20. So we have already seen that there seems to be some verses describing an unnamed disciple that represent real history and that there seems to be other verses describing an unnamed disciple that represent fraudulent narratives. John 13:23-25 are probably fraudulent, which can be seen by the attention given to Peter. A similar strategy can be seen in chapters 20 and 21 where there is again an unnamed disciple and Peter is again put at center stage. So there seems to be multiple examples of an unnamed disciple in narratives that exalt Peter. That was probably a natural strategy because those who did that seem to have wanted to exalt Peter and conceal information about Mary Magdalene. So it seems to have been natural for them to use the presence of an unnamed disciple who is described as the beloved disciple to exalt Peter and to specifically place Peter above the beloved disciple all the while not naming who the beloved disciple is. We will go into more detail about the Last Supper in Part 3. For now, it should be recognized that John 13:23-25 are probably fraudulent.

The next occurrence of an unnamed disciple is in relation to Christ's arrest.

John 18:15

*Simon Peter and another disciple were following Jesus. Because this disciple was known to the high priest, he went with Jesus into the high priest's courtyard.*

The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes another person along with Peter as having followed Christ after Christ's arrest. At least one author who fraudulently altered the Gospel of John obviously seems to have favored Peter and so they were unlikely to add another person to the narrative, especially considering that the Synoptic Gospels only name Peter in their narratives centering around the arrest. A pro-Peter person would not likely have added the presence of a second person, especially not a mysteriously unnamed second person. In John 13:23-25, the presence of an unnamed disciple is being used to give Peter attention; but in John 18:15, the presence of an unnamed disciple takes attention away from Peter. This can be seen by how the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels only describe Peter as having followed after Christ was arrested. So the presence of a second person in John 18:15 takes attention away from Peter compared to the versions in the Synoptic Gospels. In contrast, none of the Synoptic Gospels describe a scene with Peter like the narrative that John 13:23-25 are a part of. So John 13:23-25 give attention to Peter in a way that the Synoptic Gospels don't. Therefore, John 18:15 is different than John

13:23-25 by taking attention away from Peter. So a pro-Peter person would not likely have added the presence of a second person in John 18:15. On the other hand, if there was someone else described in the narrative in the original version of the Gospel of John, a person who later fraudulently altered the Gospel of John could have had plenty of motivation to simply conceal that person's identity as we have already seen in other narratives. Much like John 1:38-39 and John 19:26-27, it seems that someone's presence in the original version of the Gospel of John remained as the Gospel of John was fraudulently altered, it's just that their identity was concealed. For further evidence, we can turn to the Gospel of Mark for what seems to be a response to the Gospel of John.

Mark 14:51-54

*A young man, wearing nothing but a linen garment, was following Jesus. When they seized him, he fled naked leaving his garment behind.*

*They took Jesus to the high priest, and all the chief priests came together. Peter followed him at a distance, right into the courtyard of the high priest. There he sat with the guards and warmed himself at the fire.*

Mark 14:51-54 begin by describing a young man following Christ leading up to the arrest and then running away naked after Christ was arrested. This is all described right before Peter is described as following Christ after the arrest. The presence of this naked man is very strange to say the least. It seems obvious that this is a response to the presence of a second person in the Gospel of John. We will go into more detail in Part 5 about how the Gospels seem to respond to information contained in each other. Mark 14:51-54 are just one example of that and it appears that these verses are responding to the presence of a second person in the Gospel of John.

So the original version of the Gospel of John likely described someone other than Peter as having followed Christ after Christ was arrested, and then the Gospel of John seems to have been fraudulently altered to conceal that person's identity and the Gospel of Mark was produced with the presence of a naked man running away after Christ was arrested. Given this evidence, the unnamed disciple in John 18:15 probably originally represented Mary Magdalene.

The narrative in the Gospel of John goes on to describe the unnamed disciple as having been well-known to the high priest. That was probably a fraudulent addition. The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes Peter as having been initially prohibited from entering the high priest's courtyard. All of the Synoptic Gospels describe Peter as having been initially allowed to enter. The Gospel of John is also the only Gospel that describes Peter as having been the person who cut off the ear of one of the high priest's servants. All of the Synoptic Gospels leave that person unnamed. So the description in the Gospel of John of Peter not having been able to enter the high priest's courtyard may be connected to the description in the Gospel of John of Peter having cut off the ear of one of the high priest's servants. It may be true that Peter cut off the ear of one of the high priest's servants and then wasn't allowed to enter the high priest's courtyard because of that. We of course don't know exactly what happened that night, but the description of the unnamed disciple having been well-known to the high priest is probably fraudulent and was probably added in response to Peter being described as having been initially prohibited from entering the high priest's courtyard.

The last example of an unnamed disciple who appears to represent Mary Magdalene is a part of verses previously examined.



John 19:25-27

*Near the cross of Jesus stood his mother, his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus saw his mother there, and the disciple whom he loved standing nearby, he said to his mother, "Dear woman, here is your son", and to the disciple, "Here is your mother." From that time on, this disciple took her into his home.*

John 19:25-27 show that Mary Magdalene appears to have been present during the Crucifixion, appears to have communicated with Christ during the Crucifixion, and appears to have taken Mother Mary into her home after the Crucifixion.

As mentioned earlier, there is an unnamed disciple described as having run to the tomb and then there are a few instances of an unnamed disciple in chapter 21. As previously shown, the mentions of an unnamed disciple in chapters 20 and 21 all appear to be fraudulent.

Based on the verses that describe an unnamed disciple, it is justified to believe that Mary Magdalene was the first disciple of Christ, that she followed Christ after Christ was arrested, that she is the beloved disciple, that she communicated with Christ during the Crucifixion, and that she took Mother Mary into her home after the Crucifixion.

We should now again look at the verse that describes Mary Magdalene having proclaimed that she had seen Christ after the Resurrection. While such a verse is probably fraudulent, there is still some important information that we can derive from it.

John 20:18

*Mary Magdalene went to the disciples with the news: "I have seen the Lord!" And she told them that she had said these things to her.*

John 20:18 as shown in Papyrus 66, which is a Greek manuscript that has been dated to the third century, shows the Greek name  $\mu\alpha\rho\iota\alpha\mu$  ("Mariam"). As far as can be seen by the public, Papyrus 66 is the earliest dated source that shows Mary Magdalene's name and that source shows her name in a way that can be translated as "Mariam". There are often changes to names with the use of different languages. Pretty much all of the ancient Greek New Testament documents use the names "Mariam", "Maria", "Marian", or "Marias" for anyone who the English version of the Bible calls "Mary", which is an English name. The transition from the name "Mariam" to "Mary" happened much later on. Back in the first century, "Mariam" would have likely been what Mary Magdalene's real name was rather than "Mary". The translation of her name from the apparently earliest dated public source that shows her name shows her name as "Mariam". Papyrus 46, which is also dated to the third century and shows Paul's letter to the Romans, shows a mentioning of "Mariam" and that shows further evidence of the common use of the name "Mariam" in the first century. Mary Magdalene, Mother Mary, and Mary of Bethany were all probably called "Mariam" in the first century. Additionally, "Magdalene" probably refers to the city where Mary Magdalene was from. We will go into more detail in Part 6 about the name "Magdalene" and where Mary Magdalene was from. For now, we can see that the name "Magdalene" is probably a

reference to the city where Mary Magdalene was from; and therefore, it doesn't seem that "Magdalene" should be considered a part of Mary Magdalene's real name.

The names "Mary Magdalene", "Mother Mary", and "Mary of Bethany" have been used in this book up until now for the purpose of familiarity. Moving forward, Mary Magdalene will be referred to as "Mariam", Mother Mary will be referred to as "Mother Mariam", and Mary of Bethany will be referred to as "Mariam of Bethany".

There is sufficient evidence to justifiably and confidently assert that Mariam is the beloved disciple. There is also sufficient evidence to justifiably and confidently assert that the Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mariam and that her Testimony is reliable eyewitness testimony. With that assertion, and with the knowledge that there appears to have been fraudulent concealment of information about Mariam, we can review all of the instances in which there is a reference to an unnamed disciple that appears to refer to Mariam, all of the instances that explicitly refer to Mariam, and all of the other information contained in the Gospel of John that appears to relate to Mariam to make better assessments about what we can learn from the Gospel of John about Mariam. With that kind of review, the following beliefs can be justifiably derived.

Mariam was the first disciple of Christ

Mariam anointed Christ in Bethany

Mariam proclaimed her faith in Christ as God before the Crucifixion and the Resurrection

Mariam followed Christ after Christ was arrested

Mariam was near the Cross during the Crucifixion

Christ spoke to Mariam during the Crucifixion

Christ expressed to Mother Mariam that Mariam is her daughter

Christ expressed to Mariam that Mother Mariam is her mother

Mariam took Mother Mariam into her home after the Crucifixion

Mariam anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial

Mariam expected the Resurrection

Mariam was at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection because she expected the Resurrection

Mariam was the only disciple to see Christ after the Resurrection

Mariam was the first disciple to believe in the Resurrection of Christ

Mariam was the first Christian to proclaim to others that Christ had risen

Mariam was the most faithful disciple of Christ during Christ's Ministry

Mariam was the true human leader of Christianity after the Resurrection

Mariam was chosen by God to be the human leader of Christianity after the Resurrection

The Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mariam

Corrupted efforts were made to conceal information about Mariam, to conceal information related to Mariam having been the true human leader of Christianity after the Resurrection, and to conceal information related to the Gospel of John possessing fragments of the Testimony of Mariam

It is justified to believe that Mariam was the top disciple and most faithful disciple during Christ's Ministry, that Mariam was the only disciple who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection, that Mariam was chosen by God to be the human leader of Christianity after the Resurrection, and that the Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mariam.

## **Part 3 – Enigma**

Now that we have seen that the Gospels appear to contain fraudulent narratives and that the Gospel of John appears to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, we should move further in assessing the reliability of the information contained in the Gospels. Despite the serious fraudulent aspects of the Gospels, we can still examine the fundamental structure of the narratives to assess the reliability of the information contained in the Gospels.

Later in Part 3, we will move our focus to the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament to find out what happened leading up to the first century. Through our examination of the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament as well as the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament, we will be able to piece together a clear picture of history, which will allow us to decode the enigma that is the Bible.

As previously shown, there are significant differences between the Gospel of John and the Synoptic Gospels. Such differences lead to the inability to reconcile all of the Gospels with each other. In many ways, one cannot accept both the Gospel of John as well as the Synoptic Gospels but must choose between them. The consistencies among the Synoptic Gospels suggest that those aspects were probably present in those Gospels upon the original production of each of those Gospels. The internal contradictions and the oddities in the Gospel of John show that there seems to have been alterations and contributions from different authors that were added at different times. As we proceed, we will assess the reliability of the information in the Gospels to better understand what information appears to be truthful and what information appears to be fraudulent. In that assessment, we will continue to look at probable fraudulent alterations to the Gospel of John to try to work our way to the truthful components within the Gospel of John.

### **The Beginning of Christ's Ministry**

We have already seen that the narratives related to the beginning of Christ's Ministry cannot be reconciled between the Gospel of John and the Synoptic Gospels. A defining contradiction is that of the timing of the first few days of Christ's Ministry. We saw that the first three days, or days of the first week depending on the interpretation of "the third day", seem to be specifically accounted for in the Gospel of John, and that Mark and Matthew describe Christ as if Christ went into the desert for 40 days right after having been identified as "the Son of God". Because of this specific timing, we can see that either the Gospel of John or the Synoptic Gospels probably contain false narratives related to the beginning of Christ's Ministry. The transitions from the baptism of Christ narratives to the temptation of Christ narratives in the Synoptic Gospels seem to contradict the timing in the Gospel of John in relation to the narratives about the calling of the first disciples and what is described as Christ's first miraculous sign of turning water into wine. Additionally, the calling of the first disciples narratives in the Synoptic Gospels contradict the calling of the first disciples narratives in the Gospel of John.

The first step in assessing what information we can rely on in relation to the beginning of Christ's Ministry is to recognize that the Synoptic Gospels place their respective narrative about the supposed

calling of the first disciples after their respective narratives about the supposed baptism of Christ and the supposed temptation of Christ. So who witnessed the supposed baptism of Christ and the supposed temptation of Christ? The Synoptic Gospels don't provide any explanation as to who may have witnessed the supposed baptism of Christ other than Christ and John the Baptist, or the supposed temptation of Christ other than Christ and the character called "Satan". What if the narratives aren't in chronological order? Mark and Matthew specifically describe the supposed calling of the first disciples as having happened chronologically after John the Baptist was imprisoned.

Mark 1:14

*After John was put in prison, Jesus went into Galilee, proclaiming the good news of God.*

Matthew 4:12

*When Jesus heard that John had been put in prison, he returned to Galilee.*

The first description in Mark and Matthew of Christ having interacted with one of the disciples is described as having happened chronologically after John the Baptist was imprisoned. Luke is the only one that is ambiguous, but even Luke has the narrative about the supposed calling of the first disciples placed after the narrative describing John the Baptist as having been imprisoned. So it doesn't appear that the Synoptic Gospels provide any explanation as to how the baptism of Christ or the temptation of Christ narratives ended up in any of the Gospels. Who was around to see all of that happen? The Gospel of John excludes those narratives and so that problem does not exist for the Gospel of John as it does for the Synoptic Gospels. So far, it already seems as though the Gospel of John is more reliable than the Synoptic Gospels in relation to the beginning of Christ's Ministry.

We have already identified that it seems that information about Mariam was concealed. Furthermore, there is always the risk that religious text is fraudulent for theological purposes, and the baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ narratives have provided substantial contributions to the theological structure of the Synoptic Gospels. After all, the tradition of baptizing is a focal point of the baptism of Christ narratives and the tradition of Lent is based on the temptation of Christ narratives. In addition to all of that, it would be very strange for such major narratives to be missing from any of the Gospels if they were true, and they are both missing from the Gospel of John.

Moving further, both the baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ narratives present issues when interpreting information about the divinity of Christ. Why would Christ have been baptized? Why would God have been baptized? For the forgiveness of sins? As an initiation process? To begin a new chapter of life? What does a baptism represent? Are we to think that God was forgiven for sins, was initiated into a human formed religion, or began a new chapter of life? What was accomplished by the supposed baptism of Christ? The Synoptic Gospels specifically describe the baptisms that were performed by John the Baptist as having been for repentance for the forgiveness of sins. So it appears that they imply that Christ was baptized for repentance for the forgiveness of sins. Why would God have ever sinned? How could God have ever sinned? Why would God need to be forgiven by God? It doesn't seem to make sense for Christ to have been baptized by John the Baptist. Instead, the baptism of Christ narratives are probably simply a part of a theological agenda to emphasize baptisms as a ritual and to present the supposed beginning of the public Messianic status of Christ. The baptism of Christ narratives seem to mark the supposed beginning of the public Messianic status of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels, but they are probably fraudulent in doing so.

As far as the temptation of Christ narratives, why would Christ have been tempted for 40 days in the desert? Why would God have been tempted for 40 days in the desert? Are we to believe that God tempted God for 40 days in the desert?

The baptism of Christ narratives describe a voice from heaven as having expressed satisfaction with Christ, which presents Christ's will as separate from God's will. The temptation of Christ narratives describe Christ as having been led by the Spirit into the desert, which presents Christ's will as separate from God's will. Both of them describe Christ's will as separate from God's will. They both describe Christ as separate from God.

These narratives refer to repentance for the forgiveness of sins as well as to temptation. Regardless of what form God appears as, why would God need to be forgiven for anything and why would God ever be tempted for 40 days in the desert? Both of these narratives show that the Synoptic Gospels venture into incredibly questionable territory and potentially contrast with the truth about the divinity of Christ. The theology of the baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ narratives appears to be a product of faulty human thinking and that shows that it is likely that neither the supposed baptism of Christ nor the supposed temptation of Christ ever happened.

To further show how unreliable the Synoptic Gospels seem to be regarding the beginning of Christ's Ministry, we can turn to the ministry of John the Baptist. In the Synoptic Gospels, the baptisms that were performed by John the Baptist are described as having been for repentance for the forgiveness of sins. However, the Gospel of John doesn't make any mention of that. Additionally, the following writing from Josephus, a Jewish-Roman historian who lived in the first century, indicates that the baptisms that were performed by John the Baptist were not for repentance for the forgiveness of sins.

*Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God as a just punishment of what Herod had done against John, who was called the Baptist.*

*For Herod had killed this good man, who had commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God. For only thus, in John's opinion, would the baptism he administered be acceptable to God, namely, if they used it to obtain not pardon for some sins but rather the cleansing of their bodies, inasmuch as it was taken for granted that their souls had already been purified by justice.*

This writing specifically rejects the concept that baptisms that were performed by John the Baptist were for repentance for the forgiveness of sins. This writing instead describes his baptisms as having been a physical ritual after someone had already cleansed their soul. This writing from Josephus is evidence that the Synoptic Gospels appear to be fraudulent in the way that they describe the purpose of the baptisms that were performed by John the Baptist.

Additionally, Mark and Matthew describe John the Baptist as having preached and baptized in Judea. They also describe Christ as coming from Galilee when they describe Christ as being baptized by John the Baptist. In other words, the Synoptic Gospels portray Christ as leaving Galilee and going to be baptized by John the Baptist who is described as mainly preaching and baptizing in Judea. However, Josephus describes John the Baptist as having been arrested and executed by Herod Antipas. Herod Antipas ruled over Galilee, which means that John the Baptist probably mainly resided in Galilee, not

Judea. Furthermore, the Synoptic Gospels also describe John the Baptist as having been arrested by Herod Antipas, so both Josephus and the Synoptic Gospels describe John the Baptist as having been arrested by Herod Antipas. Therefore, the Synoptic Gospels seem to contradict themselves by describing John the Baptist as having preached and baptized in Judea and then describing John the Baptist as having been arrested by the ruler of Galilee. So it appears that the Synoptic Gospels fraudulently shift away from Galilee and towards Judea in relation to descriptions about John the Baptist and the supposed baptism of Christ. That shows further evidence that the narratives about the supposed baptism of Christ are fraudulent.

So far, there has been plenty of evidence presented that shows that the baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ narratives in the Synoptic Gospels are fraudulent. The Gospel of John does not include those narratives; the timing of those narratives contradicts the Gospel of John; the Synoptic Gospels don't describe any disciple as having witnessed the supposed baptism of Christ or the supposed temptation of Christ; the Synoptic Gospels specifically describe the supposed calling of the first disciples as having happened after the supposed baptism of Christ and the supposed temptation of Christ; the theology in the baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ narratives seems to be fraudulent; there is evidence that the Synoptic Gospels fraudulently describe the purpose of the baptisms that were performed by John the Baptist as having been for repentance for the forgiveness of sins, which also shows further evidence that the theology in the Synoptic Gospels is fraudulent; and there is evidence that John the Baptist mainly resided in Galilee and the baptism of Christ narratives appear to focus on Judea, which shows further evidence that all of the baptism of Christ narratives are fraudulent. Already, we can see that the supposed baptism of Christ and the supposed temptation of Christ probably never happened.

For more evidence, we can further examine the narratives about the supposed calling of disciples. The Gospel of John describes an unnamed disciple and Andrew as the first two disciples of Christ, Peter as the third, Philip as the fourth, and Nathanael as the fifth. All of the Synoptic Gospels exclude the unnamed disciple and describe Peter as being one of the first disciples of Christ instead of the third. Mark and Matthew describe Peter and Andrew as the first two disciples of Christ, and James and John as the third and fourth. Luke describes Peter, James, and John as the first three disciples of Christ. The Synoptic Gospels don't explain how any disciple would have known about the supposed baptism of Christ or the supposed temptation of Christ. As already noted, that seems like a crucial detail that is missing from the Synoptic Gospels. A verse from Acts can help us understand even better just how crucial of a detail that is.

Acts 1:21-22

*“Therefore it is necessary to choose one of the men who have been with us the whole time the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from John’s baptism to the time when Jesus was taken up from us.”*

Acts 1:21-22 describe the selection process of a so-called “twelfth apostle” since Judas was no longer with them. It was written that part of their criteria for selecting a new member among them was that any potential member must have been with them “beginning from John’s baptism”. It’s not clear if they meant the supposed baptism of Christ or John the Baptist baptizing in general. Regardless, it seems that the criteria for the selection process at the very least would require a so-called “twelfth apostle” to have been a disciple of Christ while John the Baptist was still actively baptizing. In the Synoptic Gospels, John the Baptist is described as having been imprisoned before there is the narrative about the supposed calling of

the first disciples. It would seem that at least one of Christ's disciples became a disciple of Christ while John the Baptist was still actively baptizing. Otherwise, how could anyone have been a disciple "beginning from John's baptism"? So it seems that Christ had at least one disciple while John the Baptist was still actively baptizing. However, in the Synoptic Gospels, John the Baptist is described as having been imprisoned before the narrative about the supposed calling of the first disciples. Again, Mark and Matthew specifically describe the supposed calling of the first disciples as having happened chronologically after John the Baptist was imprisoned.

So it seems, according to Acts 1:21-22, that the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the supposed calling of the first disciples don't really describe the first disciples. According to Acts 1:21-22, Christ would have already had at least one disciple by the time that Peter is first described in the Synoptic Gospels as having been a disciple, whether Peter was with Andrew as in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew or with James and John as in the Gospel of Luke. What if Acts 1:21-22 is false? That's certainly a possibility. But what motivation would there have been to fraudulently describe people as having been disciples while John the Baptist was still actively baptizing if there wasn't a single person who was a disciple during that time-period? It seems that since that was mentioned, there seems to have been at least one disciple while John the Baptist was still actively baptizing. Additionally, we would still have to explain why the Synoptic Gospels are so different than the Gospel of John. So to accept the description of Peter having been a part of the very first group to have become disciples of Christ as shown in the Synoptic Gospels, we would have to reject Acts 1:21-22 as well as the account about the first disciple of Christ described in the Gospel of John, and we would have to accept the belief that there wasn't a single person who was a part of this group while John the Baptist was still actively baptizing. That shows that the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the supposed calling of the first disciples probably don't really describe the first disciples.

For even more evidence, we can again turn to John 1:38-39, which describe the first disciple of Christ as having spent the day with Christ until the tenth hour. It was previously asserted in Part 2 that the fundamental structure of John 1:38-39 seems to be authentic. Therefore, it seems that John 1:38-39 provide strong evidence to believe the Gospel of John instead of the Synoptic Gospels regarding the first disciple.

It has been shown that the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the supposed temptation of Christ and the supposed calling of the first disciples seem to contradict the timing of the narrative in the Gospel of John about the first disciple; there is evidence showing that the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the supposed baptism of Christ, the supposed temptation of Christ, and the supposed calling of the first disciples are fraudulent; and John 1:38-39 show evidence of real eyewitness testimony.

The absence of any description in the Synoptic Gospels of a disciple having witnessed the supposed baptism of Christ or the supposed temptation of Christ, the evidence that shows that the theology in the baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ narratives is fraudulent, the evidence that shows that the Synoptic Gospels fraudulently describe the purpose of the baptisms that were performed by John the Baptist as having been for repentance for the forgiveness of sins, the evidence that shows that Mark and Matthew fraudulently portray John the Baptist as having mainly preached and baptized in Judea, the contrast that the Synoptic Gospels show in relation to Acts 1:21-22, and the probable truthfulness of the fundamental structure of John 1:38-39 all give merit to the conclusion that the Gospel of John is probably

truthful in describing the first disciple of Christ and that the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the supposed baptism of Christ, the supposed temptation of Christ, and the supposed calling of the first disciples are fraudulent. Additionally, the fact that a disciple went unnamed in the Gospel of John is evidence that someone wanted to conceal their identity. That shows that there is probably testimony in the Gospel of John that is truthful and that testimony probably included the name of the first disciple, and that someone probably later altered that narrative to conceal that disciple's identity.

The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that doesn't include Peter in the first mentioning of anyone being a disciple of Christ, is the only Gospel that doesn't include a narrative about the supposed baptism of Christ, and is the only Gospel that doesn't include a narrative about the supposed temptation of Christ. There is plenty of support for the belief that the authors of the Synoptic Gospels had motivation to conceal information about Mariam, include Peter in the first group of disciples of Christ, and fabricate narratives as a part of a theological agenda. So it appears as though the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the supposed baptism of Christ, the supposed temptation of Christ, and the supposed calling of the first disciples were all used to conceal information about Mariam, include Peter in the first group of disciples of Christ, and contribute to a theological agenda.

Taking into account the questionable nature of Peter's path to having become a disciple of Christ as described in the Synoptic Gospels, we should now analyze his role in the Gospel of John.

John 1:35-37

*The next day John was there again with two of his disciples. When he saw Jesus passing by, he said, "Look, the Lamb of God!"*

*When the two disciples heard him say this, they followed Jesus.*

John 1:40-42

*Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, was one of the two who heard what John had said and who had followed Jesus. The first thing Andrew did was to find his brother Simon and tell him, "We have found the Messiah" (that is, the Christ). And he brought him to Jesus."*

*Jesus looked at him and said, "You are Simon son of John. You will be called Cephas" (which, when translated, is Peter).*

John 1:43-44

*The next day Jesus decided to leave for Galilee. Finding Philip, he said to him, "Follow me."*

*Philip, like Andrew and Peter, was from the town of Bethsaida.*

*Philip found Nathanael and told him, "We have found the one Moses wrote about in the Law, and about whom the prophets also wrote – Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph."*

The information being presented claims that the first two disciples of Christ were disciples of John the Baptist; the first two disciples were Andrew and an unnamed disciple; the third disciple was Peter; the fourth disciple was Philip; Philip, Peter, and Andrew were from Bethsaida; and the fifth disciple was Nathanael.

There are four points to make about the description of Andrew and Peter having become disciples of Christ. The first is that Andrew appears to go unnamed in the references to two disciples of John the Baptist before being named in a later reference to him. Why would Andrew initially go unnamed before



being named later on? The second is that immediately after Andrew is named, before Peter enters the scene, Andrew is identified as Peter's brother. Why is Andrew identified as Peter's brother before Peter even enters the scene? The third is that Andrew is introduced before Peter. In the Synoptic Gospels, Peter is introduced before Andrew. It's unusual for Andrew to appear first. The fourth is that Christ is described as having given Peter a new name and there isn't any explanation for that. Why does Peter get two names while there is a disciple who goes unnamed?

The fact that Andrew appears to go unnamed before being named later on is an indication that Andrew was probably not one of the first two disciples of Christ. Additionally, it has already been shown that Mariam was probably the lone first disciple of Christ. The fact that Andrew not only supposedly goes unnamed at first but is also identified as Peter's brother before Peter even enters the scene is an indication that Andrew's name was probably fraudulently inserted into the text for Peter's benefit. Andrew was probably not involved when someone first became a disciple of Christ and his name was probably fraudulently added to chapter 1 to give way to the introduction of Peter. That would also explain why Andrew is named before Peter. Andrew's name seems to have been used to bridge a gap between the information about the first disciple of Christ and the introduction of Peter. Andrew's name provides the transition from one narrative to the next and then is used to introduce Peter who is then put at center stage. The fact that Peter is described as having been given a new name and there is no explanation for that while there is a disciple who goes unnamed is an indication that someone probably forced that information into the text to exalt Peter. Given the assessment of the four points just previously stated, it is justified to believe that John 1:40-42 are fraudulent.

Not only were Andrew and Peter probably fraudulently added to chapter 1 of the Gospel of John, but Philip and Nathanael probably were too. We can look back at the analysis in Part 2 that showed that disciples of Christ choose to be disciples and remain in Christ, and that the only likely truthful account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection is in line with that teaching. The other Resurrection narratives in the Gospel of John describe Christ as having gone to where the male "disciples" were and those narratives appear to be fraudulent. The only likely truthful account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection describes Mariam as having gone to where Christ was. In chapter 1 of the Gospel of John, a disciple is described as having followed Christ without having been told to. Meanwhile, Philip is described as having been told to follow Christ.

John 1:37-39

*When the two disciples heard him say this, they followed Jesus. Turning around, Jesus saw them following and asked, "What do you want?"*

*They said, "Rabbi", which means Teacher, "where are you staying?"*

*"Come", he replied, "and you will see."*

John 1:43-45

*The next day Jesus decided to leave for Galilee. Finding Philip, he said to him, "Follow me."*

*Philip, like Andrew and Peter, was from the town of Bethsaida. Philip found Nathanael and told him, "We have found the one Moses wrote about in the Law, and about whom the prophets also wrote – Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph."*

A disciple is described as having followed Christ after John the Baptist allegedly identified Christ. Christ is described as having influenced them to continue to follow Christ only after they had already begun

following Christ. Philip is described as having been told to follow Christ. The difference between those two accounts is similar to the difference between the Resurrection narratives in the Gospel of John regarding Mariam being described as having gone to Christ and Christ being described as having gone to the male “disciples”. With both the narratives about the first disciples and the narratives about the Resurrection, there is someone described as having gone to Christ based on their own decision and then there are people who didn’t decide to go to Christ unless told to. An unnamed disciple is described as having decided on their own to follow Christ and then Philip is described as having been told to follow Christ. Mariam is described as having been at the empty tomb before it was discovered that the tomb was empty and the male “disciples” aren’t. The difference between the Resurrection narratives is that Mariam decided on her own to be at the tomb before it was discovered that the tomb was empty and the male “disciples” didn’t. The only likely truthful Resurrection narrative is the one about Mariam having decided on her own to be at the tomb. Similarly, the account about an unnamed person having become a disciple of Christ describes that person as having made the decision on their own to follow Christ and that account is probably truthful, and the account about Philip having become a disciple is probably fraudulent in part because it describes Philip as only having followed Christ after being told to. As explained in Part 2, a real disciple must make the decision for themselves whether to be a disciple. So Philip and Nathanael were probably fraudulently added to chapter 1 of the Gospel of John just as Andrew and Peter probably were as well.

Additionally, a disciple being described as having been told to follow Christ is in line with the Synoptic Gospels. The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes any disciple as having followed Christ without having been told to. It has already been shown, and will be shown in more detail later, that the Gospel of John appears to have been fraudulently altered to better fit in with the Synoptic Gospels. So any information in the Gospel of John that seems to align with the Synoptic Gospels that opposes likely truthful information in the Gospel of John is probably fraudulent. Philip being described as having been told to follow Christ is an example of that. Therefore, the supposed calling of Philip as described in the Gospel of John is probably fraudulent.

An additional point that shows that the narrative about the supposed callings of Philip and Nathanael is probably fraudulent is the mentioning of Andrew and Peter having been from Bethsaida. First, it’s strange that it is not until Philip enters the scene that it is described that Andrew and Peter were from Bethsaida. Why wasn’t Bethsaida mentioned when Andrew or Peter were first mentioned? Second, the Synoptic Gospels suggest that Andrew and Peter are from Capernaum, not Bethsaida. So any mentioning of Peter and Andrew being from anywhere other than Capernaum is probably fraudulent.

Another piece of evidence that shows that the calling of Philip as described in the Gospel of John is likely fraudulent is the level of attention that Philip receives in the Gospel of John. Philip is mentioned the second most of any of “the Twelve” in the Gospel of John. Peter is the only one of “the Twelve” that receives more attention than Philip does. In the Synoptic Gospels, Philip is only mentioned along with “the Twelve”.

It was shown in Part 2 that Mariam’s name appears to have been concealed in the Gospel of John. That shows that information appears to have been concealed about the disciple who should’ve gotten the most attention. Additionally, it has been shown that “the Twelve” seem to get an undue amount of attention in the Gospels and it has also been shown that all three of the mentions of “the Twelve” in the Gospel of

John are likely fraudulent. So it has been shown that information about Mariam seems to have been concealed and that “the Twelve” seem to have been fraudulently given attention. So the incredible attention that Philip, one of “the Twelve”, receives in the Gospel of John is probably fraudulent. Therefore, the supposed calling of Philip as described in the Gospel of John is probably fraudulent.

The probable scenario is that the supposed callings of Andrew, Peter, Philip, and Nathanael as described in the Gospel of John are all fraudulent additions. Therefore, there is probably only one disciple who is truthfully described in the Gospel of John as having become a disciple of Christ. That disciple is Mariam.

So far, evidence has been shown that the supposed baptism of Christ and the supposed temptation of Christ never happened; the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the supposed callings of Peter, Andrew, James, and John are fraudulent; “the Twelve” were never specially appointed in the way that the Synoptic Gospels describe; the narratives in the Gospel of John about the supposed callings of Andrew, Peter, Philip, and Nathanael are fraudulent; the Gospel of John is fraudulent in describing two people as having become the first disciples of Christ instead of describing one person as having become the first disciple of Christ; the fundamental structure of John 1:38-39 is truthful; and Mariam was the first disciple of Christ.

We should move forward from here by further analyzing the ministry of John the Baptist. John the Baptist is described as the person who prepared the way for Christ. However, certain writing from Josephus can lead us in a different direction.

*Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God as a just punishment of what Herod had done against John, who was called the Baptist.*

*For Herod had killed this good man, who had commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God. For only thus, in John's opinion, would the baptism he administered be acceptable to God, namely, if they used it to obtain not pardon for some sins but rather the cleansing of their bodies, inasmuch as it was taken for granted that their souls had already been purified by justice.*

*Now many people came in crowds to him, for they were greatly moved by his words. Herod, who feared that the great influence John had over the masses might put them into his power and enable him to raise a rebellion for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise, thought it best to put him to death. In this way, he might prevent any mischief John might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent it when it would be too late.*

*Accordingly John was sent as a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Machaerus, the castle I already mentioned, and was put to death. Now the Jews thought that the destruction of his army was sent as a punishment upon Herod, and a mark of God's displeasure with him.*

So it appears that many people were aware of the execution of John the Baptist and developed beliefs about consequences to Herod Antipas for executing John the Baptist. If the main purpose of the ministry of John the Baptist was to prepare the way for Christ, then why isn't that mentioned? The writing describes that people thought that John the Baptist was a prophet. The writing also describes the kind of baptisms that were performed by John the Baptist. So the writing goes into enough detail to describe John the Baptist as possibly a prophet and goes into detail about what kind of baptisms that he performed, but

says nothing about John the Baptist in relation to Christ. If the main purpose of the ministry of John the Baptist was about preparing the way for Christ, then it seems that would be mentioned before describing John the Baptist as possibly a prophet or going into detail about the kind of baptisms that he performed. The main purpose of his ministry would have probably been mentioned if that main purpose was to prepare the way for the Messiah, yet there is no mention of that. The exclusion of any mention about preparing the way for the Messiah shows that the main purpose of the ministry of John the Baptist probably wasn't about preparing the way for the Messiah in the way that the Bible describes. Additionally, Josephus states "Herod, who feared that the great influence John had over the masses might put them into his power and enable him to raise a rebellion for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise, thought it best to put him to death". Josephus describes that John had great influence over the masses and that the masses "seemed ready to do anything he should advise". This great influence that John had over the people that made them seem ready to do anything that John advised is described as so great that it instilled so much fear into Herod that Herod had John executed. If John the Baptist was such a great influence over so many people and the main purpose of his ministry was to prepare the way for the Messiah, then not only would Josephus have probably described that, but also, many more people would have probably followed Christ during Christ's Ministry. Josephus states "they seemed ready to do anything he should advise". If that many people would do as John the Baptist advised them and John the Baptist advised them to follow Christ, then there would have probably been a lot more people who followed Christ during Christ's Ministry. However, it seems that there weren't many people who followed Christ during Christ's Ministry and people continued to follow John the Baptist. For these reasons, it is justified to believe that John the Baptist did not prepare the way for Christ in the way that the Bible describes.

For further evidence, we can turn to descriptions about disciples of John the Baptist.

Mark 2:18

*Now John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting. Some people came and asked Jesus, "How is it that John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees are fasting, but yours are not?"*

Matthew 9:14

*Then John's disciples came and asked him, "How is it that we and the Pharisees fast, but your disciples do not fast?"*

Luke 5:33

*They said to him, "John's disciples often fast and pray, and so do the disciples of the Pharisees, but yours go on eating and drinking."*

Matthew 11:2

*When John heard in prison what Christ was doing, he sent his disciples to ask him, "Are you the one who was to come or should we expect someone else?"*

Luke 7:18

*John's disciples told him about all these things. Calling two of them, he sent them to the Lord to ask, "Are you the one who was to come, or should we expect someone else?"*

All of these verses describe disciples of John the Baptist. If the main purpose of the ministry of John the Baptist was to prepare the way for Christ, then why would there be any disciples of John the Baptist who weren't disciples of Christ at the points described in the verses just previously shown? Obviously, since there seems to have been people who remained disciples of John the Baptist who weren't disciples of Christ, that is further evidence that John the Baptist did not prepare the way for Christ in the way that the Bible describes. Additionally, there are two other points that we can derive from these verses. One is that three of the verses specifically differentiate between disciples of Christ and disciples of John the Baptist. That shows that people who were labeled as disciples of John the Baptist were not disciples of Christ; but if the main purpose of the ministry of John the Baptist was to prepare the way for Christ, then being a disciple of John the Baptist should have inherently involved being a disciple of Christ. The second additional point is that two of these verses describe John the Baptist wanting to know if Christ is the Messiah. If John the Baptist had really prepared the way for Christ and publicly identified Christ's divinity in the way that the Bible describes, then John the Baptist would have presumably already known that Christ is the Messiah. So there are several pieces of evidence that show that John the Baptist did not prepare the way for Christ or publicly identify Christ's divinity in the way that the Bible describes.

For even further evidence that the narratives about John the Baptist are fraudulent, we can turn to the narratives that describe his arrest and execution.

Mark 6:17-18

*For Herod himself had given orders to have John arrested and he had him bound and put in prison. He did this because of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, whom he had married. For John had been saying to Herod, "It is not lawful for you to have your brother's wife".*

Mark 6:22-25

*When the daughter of Herodias came in and danced, she pleased Herod and his dinner guests. The king said to the girl, "Ask me for anything you want, and I'll give it to you." And he promised her with an oath, "Whatever you ask I will give you, up to half my kingdom." She went out and said to her mother, "What shall I ask for?" "The head of John the Baptist", she answered. At once the girl hurried in to the king with the request: "I want you to give me right now the head of John the Baptist on a platter."*

Matthew 14:3-4

*Now Herod had arrested John and bound him and put him in prison because of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, for John had been saying to him: "It is not lawful for you to have her."*

Matthew 14:6-8

*On Herod's birthday the daughter of Herodias danced for them and pleased Herod so much that he promised with an oath to give her whatever she asked. Prompted by her mother, she said, "Give me here on a platter the head of John the Baptist."*

These verses claim that John the Baptist was arrested for supposedly speaking out against Herod's marriage to Herodias. These verses also claim that he was executed because Herodias told her daughter to ask for that. Josephus, however, says "Herod, who feared that the great influence John had over the masses might put them into his power and enable him to raise a rebellion for they seemed ready to do

anything he should advise, thought it best to put him to death". The Gospels tell a dramatic story that is not only very different but specifically contradicts what Josephus said. There have been several pieces of evidence showing that the Gospels are fraudulent in narratives about John the Baptist and the narratives about his arrest and execution provide even further evidence.

John the Baptist seems to be a real person who really was a preacher who performed baptisms. However, it appears that the main purpose of the ministry of John the Baptist was not to prepare the way for the Messiah in the way that the Bible describes. So all of the narratives that describe John the Baptist as being the one who prepared the way for the Messiah appear to be fraudulent. That in turn serves as additional evidence that John the Baptist didn't identify the divinity of Christ in the way that the Bible describes. All of the narratives that describe that appear to be fraudulent as well. It has already been shown that the Bible seems to be fraudulent in the way that it describes the purpose of the baptisms that John the Baptist performed and in the way that it describes John the Baptist as mainly preaching and baptizing in Judea. Now, we can see that the Bible also seems to be fraudulent in the way that it describes John the Baptist as having prepared the way for Christ and having publicly identified Christ's divinity. There might not be a single narrative in the Gospels about John the Baptist that is truthful. John the Baptist seems to have been a very popular preacher in Galilee, and that is probably why authors of the Gospels were influenced to produce narratives about him. They seem to have used the popularity of John the Baptist to produce false narratives as a part of a theological agenda. So the narratives about John the Baptist, the supposed baptism of Christ, and the supposed temptation of Christ were all apparently used to push a fraudulent theological agenda. All of those narratives appear to be fraudulent.

With our analysis so far here in Part 3, we can see that the Synoptic Gospels appear to be fraudulent in narratives about the beginning of Christ's Ministry and that the Gospel of John appears to have been fraudulently altered to better fit in with the Synoptic Gospels. The truth appears to be that Mariam was the first disciple of Christ, neither Peter nor Andrew were the first disciple of Christ, "the Twelve" were never specially appointed in the way that the Synoptic Gospels describe, John the Baptist did not prepare the way for Christ or identify Christ's divinity in the way that the Bible describes, and neither the supposed baptism of Christ nor the supposed temptation of Christ ever happened.

So far, we have examined the beginning of Christ's Ministry in our comparison of the Gospels here in Part 3. We will now turn our attention to the Last Supper, Christ's arrest, Christ having been questioned by the Sanhedrin, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection.

### **The Last Supper**

As shown in Part 1, the Synoptic Gospels all describe the Last Supper as having been a Passover Seder and the Gospel of John contradicts that by describing the Last Supper as having been before that Passover Seder. As also shown earlier, that contradiction then carries forward and also applies to what day the Crucifixion occurred on as well.

Christ is described in all of the Gospels as having been arrested after the Last Supper and as having been questioned by the Sanhedrin sometime after that. All of the Gospels describe Christ as having been brought to Pontius Pilate sometime after Christ was questioned by the Sanhedrin. The following verses

suggest that Christ was brought to Pontius Pilate during the period of daylight immediately following the Last Supper, although that is not specifically stated.

Mark 15:1

*Very early in the morning, the chief priests, with the elders, the teachers of the law, and the whole Sanhedrin, reached a decision. They bound Jesus, led him away, and handed him over to Pilate.*

Matthew 27:1

*Early in the morning, all the chief priests and the elders of the people came to the decision to put Jesus to death. They bound him, led him away, and handed him over to Pilate, the governor.*

Luke 22:66

*At daybreak the council of the elders of the people, both the chief priests and teachers of the law, met together, and Jesus was led before them.*

Luke 23:1

*Then the whole assembly rose and led him off to Pilate.*

John 18:28

*Then the Jews led Jesus from Caiaphas to the palace of the Roman governor. By now it was early morning, and to avoid ceremonial uncleanness the Jews did not enter the palace; they wanted to be able to eat the Passover.*

All of the Gospels describe a trial as having happened after Christ was brought to Pontius Pilate and describe the Crucifixion as having happened after the trial described. So all of the Gospels describe the same general sequence that we're examining right now. After the Last Supper, Christ was arrested, then Christ was questioned by the Sanhedrin, then Christ was brought to Pontius Pilate, then Christ was on trial, and then Christ was crucified. The text does not specifically describe that Christ was crucified during the period of daylight immediately after the Last Supper; however, none of the Gospels indicate that more than a day, or even a full day, passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. In other words, there isn't any evidence that shows that more than 24 hours passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. Additionally, it seems unrealistic for Christ to have been held as a prisoner for more than 24 hours given the Jewish law that the priests abided by and the schedule of celebrating Passover and the week of unleavened bread. Christ having been arrested during the night is evidence that the priests wanted to take care of everything quietly, which would mean that they probably also wanted to take care of everything quickly. Therefore, it seems unrealistic for more than 24 hours to have passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. The simplest and what seems obvious interpretation is that less than 24 hours passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. Furthermore, the phrases "very early in the morning", "early in the morning", "at daybreak", and "by now it was early morning" wouldn't make much sense if there was more than one morning involved in this sequence. Those phrases indicate that there seems to have been only one morning involved in this sequence, which would mean that it seems that no more than one day passed. More evidence will be assessed later to show that it is probable that less than 24 hours passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, but we can already see that to be the case.

The Last Supper is described in the Synoptic Gospels as having been the Passover Seder and is described in the Gospel of John as having occurred before the Passover Seder. Additionally, it is justified to believe that less than 24 hours passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. The same general sequence, which probably occurred entirely within 24 hours, is described in all of the Gospels; but the Gospel of John describes that sequence as having begun at least one day earlier than the accounts described in the Synoptic Gospels. This matters a great deal not only for general reliability but also specifically because of the scheduling of celebrating Passover and the week of unleavened bread. So which account is reliable?

First, we should explore certain aspects of Passover and the week of unleavened bread as described in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. We will begin with the Book of Exodus, which describes “the Lord’s Passover” and “the exodus” of Israelites out of Egypt. We will also assess certain verses from Genesis and Leviticus.

Exodus 12:3

*“Tell the whole community of Israel that on the tenth day of this month each man is to take a lamb for his family, one for each household.”*

Exodus 12:6-8

*“Take care of them until the fourteenth day of the month, when all the people of the community of Israel must slaughter them at twilight. Then they are to take some of the blood and put it on the sides and tops of the doorframes of the houses where they eat the lambs. That same night they are to eat the meat roasted over the fire, along with bitter herbs, and bread made without yeast.”*

Exodus 12:11

*“This is how you are to eat it: with your cloak tucked into your belt, your sandals on your feet and your staff in your hand. Eat it in haste; it is the Lord’s Passover.”*

Exodus 12:12-14

*“On that same night I will pass through Egypt and strike down every firstborn – both men and animals – and I will bring judgment on all the gods of Egypt. I am the Lord. The blood will be a sign for you on the houses where you are; and when I see the blood, I will pass over you. No destructive plague will touch you when I strike Egypt. This is a day you are to commemorate; for the generations to come you shall celebrate it as a festival to the Lord – a lasting ordinance.”*

In these verses, references to certain days that are numbered are references to days during the month of Nisan, the first month of the religious Jewish calendar. For example, the “fourteenth day” is the fourteenth day of Nisan, the fourteenth day of the first month of the religious Jewish calendar.

Exodus 12:3 describes families getting a lamb on the tenth day to sacrifice later. Exodus 12:6-8 describe people sacrificing those lambs on the fourteenth day and having a feast “that same night”, which would imply that this feast occurred during the night that immediately followed the period of daylight on the fourteenth day. Exodus 12:11 defines this feast as the feast of “the Lord’s Passover”, which is commonly referred to as the Passover Seder. Exodus 12:12-14 describe “the Lord’s Passover” as occurring on “that same night”. So the sacrificing of lambs occurred on the fourteenth day, and “the Lord’s Passover” as well as the preceding feast of “the Lord’s Passover” occurred during the night that immediately followed the period of daylight on the fourteenth day.



Exodus 12:15

*“For seven days you are to eat bread made without yeast. On the first day remove the yeast from your houses, for whoever eats anything with yeast in it from the first day through the seventh must be cut off from Israel.”*

Exodus 12:16

*“On the first day hold a sacred assembly and another one on the seventh day. Do no work at all on these days, except to prepare food for everyone to eat – that is all you may do.”*

Exodus 12:17

*“Celebrate the Feast of Unleavened Bread, because it was on this very day that I brought your divisions out of Egypt. Celebrate this day as a lasting ordinance for the generations to come.”*

The verses in Exodus 12:15-17 describe the week of unleavened bread, the day of preparation for the week of unleavened bread, that there should be a sacred assembly (Sabbath) on the first and seventh days of the week of unleavened bread, and that the Feast of Unleavened Bread should be celebrated because it was the day that God is described as having brought the Israelites out of Egypt.

In the second sentence of Exodus 12:15, the phrase “on the first day” is instead sometimes translated as “on the preceding day”. The Hebrew words used for that translation are (“harisown”) הָרִאשׁוֹן (“bayyowm”) בַּיּוֹם (“ak”) אַךְ (Hebrew is read from right to left). The Hebrew word הָרִאשׁוֹן (“harisown”) is translated as “first”, which is how anyone might translate the whole phrase as “on the first day”. However, the Hebrew word אַךְ (“ak”) means “but”, which could represent a contrast with what was previously said. In other words, the week of unleavened bread is described in the first sentence and then the word “but” is used in the second sentence to describe a day that is not within the week of unleavened bread. The Hebrew word בַּיּוֹם (“bayyowm”) can be translated as “the day”. So the entire phrase could be translated as “but the day first”. Going by the Hebrew words of Exodus 12:15, we can produce a translation of the first part of the second sentence of verse 15 as “but the day first you shall remove leaven from your houses”, which can be interpreted as meaning “but first there is the day on which you shall remove leaven from your houses”. With that interpretation, the word “first” is not used to describe the first day of the week of unleavened bread, but is instead used to describe a day that comes before the week of unleavened bread. The word that gets translated as “first” can mean “before” or “preceding”. Therefore, “but the day first” can mean “but the day before” or “but on the preceding day”. That produces a translation of “but the day before you shall remove leaven from your houses” or “but on the preceding day you shall remove leaven from your houses”.

We can also examine Hebrew words that are in Exodus 12:16. The English translation just previously shown is “On the first day hold a sacred assembly”. The Hebrew words in that verse that translate to the phrase “on the first day” are הָרִאשׁוֹן (“harisown”) וּבַיּוֹם (“ubayyowm”). There is the word הָרִאשׁוֹן (“harisown”), which means “first”, just like in Exodus 12:15. However, the word וּבַיּוֹם (“ubayyowm”) can be translated as “and the day”. So instead of “but the day first” as in Exodus 12:15, the Hebrew words in Exodus 12:16 translate as “and the day first”, which can be interpreted as “and the first day”. The word “first” can refer to the first of a sequence or can give way to the meaning of “preceding”. The main difference between verses 15 and 16 is the contrast between the words “but” and “and”. With the use of the word “and”, there can be a continuation with what was previously described. For example, verse 16 continues to refer to the week of unleavened bread. With the use of the word “but”, there can be a change

from what was previously described. For example, verse 15 refers to a day other than what was previously described, which gives way to the word “first” meaning “before” or “preceding”. Verse 15 refers to the day before the week of unleavened bread, and verse 16 refers to the first day of the week of unleavened bread. Therefore, the day to remove leaven is the day before the week of unleavened bread, and then the next day is the first day of the week of unleavened bread and is a sacred assembly.

So when Exodus 12:15 says “on the first day”, a better translation of the Hebrew words is “but the day before”; and when Exodus 12:16 says “on the first day”, that is a sufficient translation. This distinction is very important because, otherwise, the current translation shows that the day to remove leaven is on the same day as a sacred assembly. There is to be no work on a sacred assembly. So the preparation day should not be on the same day as a sacred assembly. The preparation day is for the preparation of a sacred assembly and should not be on the same day as a sacred assembly. It makes much more sense that the preceding day is the preparation day. So there is the week of unleavened bread, “but the day before you shall remove leaven from your houses”. The day to remove leaven is the day immediately before the week of unleavened bread begins. That interpretation agrees with ancient Jewish tradition.

We should now turn to Exodus 12:18.

Exodus 12:18

*“In the first month you are to eat bread made without yeast, from the evening of the fourteenth day until the evening of the twenty-first day.”*

Exodus 12:18 describes the evening of the fourteenth day as the first evening on which unleavened bread should be eaten. The fourteenth day was the day to sacrifice lambs. It seems that the following day, the fifteenth day, was the day that commemorates what is described as the Israelites having been brought out of Egypt, which would also be the first day of the week of unleavened bread. The day that is described as the preparation day for the week of unleavened bread would then seem to be the fourteenth day. So it seems that the preparation day for the week of unleavened bread is on the same day as the day to sacrifice lambs, the fourteenth day; and then the next day, the fifteenth day, is the first day of the week of unleavened bread, the day that commemorates what is described as “the exodus”. With that interpretation, the evening right after the period of daylight on the fourteenth day would seem to be the first evening of unleavened bread, after leaven was removed earlier. According to Exodus 12:18, that evening would seem to be that of the fourteenth day. That might seem obvious. However, there is the issue of how ancient Jewish tradition accounted for the structure of a day. It is believed by many that ancient Jewish tradition considered the beginning of a day to be evening rather than morning. In other words, it is believed that each day began with sunset rather than sunrise. That belief causes several issues when interpreting the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. That belief would require the evening of the fourteenth day to occur before the period of daylight on the fourteenth day, and would require the beginning of the fifteenth day to begin with the evening immediately after the period of daylight on the fourteenth day.

The main reasoning given for the common current belief of how ancient Jewish tradition accounted for the structure of a day takes us to Genesis.

Genesis 1:3-5

*And God said “Let there be light”, and there was light. God saw that the light was good, and separated the light from the darkness. God called the light “day”, and the darkness he called “night”. And there was evening, and there was morning – the first day.*

Many people interpret this to mean that evening is the beginning of a day rather than towards the end of a day because “evening” is described before “morning”. However, an alternative interpretation would be that the coming of morning marks the end of the first day and so the first day does not include the morning that is described. The morning described would be the beginning of day two while the preceding evening would be a part of day one. With that interpretation, the first day would begin with light when “let there be light” is declared; and then there would be evening; and then there would be the next morning, the morning of day two. With the onset of the next morning, day one would come to an end and day two would begin. That alternative interpretation would also explain why “day” is described before “night”. “Day” would be the first half of a day and “night” would be the second half of a day; and when the next morning arrives, a new day would begin. There is “let there be light”, and with that, the first day begins with light; and then after that, there is the evening of the first day; and then after that, there is the morning of the second day. So there are two different ways to interpret how Genesis accounts for the structure of a day. Merit can be given to both interpretations. However, a deeper analysis will favor one interpretation over the other.

We can come to a clearer conclusion if we break down each piece of what is being described in Genesis 1:3-5. “Let there be light” is declared and then day is separated from night with light being day and darkness being night. So there is light and then light is specifically designated as day. Darkness is first described in verse 1:2 and then light is first described in verse 1:3 with the declaration of “let there be light”. So according to Genesis, darkness existed before light, but it’s not until light appears that there is any designation of day or night. Those designations occur after there is light and before any description of sunset. Therefore, when there is the first designation of day and night, it is day. The darkness that is described as existing before light was not designated as night before light is described. Instead, the darkness that is described before light would have existed before day one began. It seems that the day would have a beginning and darkness is never described as having begun. Darkness is just described as having been there before light. There is the description of the beginning of light with “let there be light”, but there doesn’t seem to be a description of a beginning of darkness. The darkness is just there and then light appears. So when the designations of day and night are described, what matters is that the appearance of light had already been described and sunset had not yet been described. Therefore, when day and night are first described, it is day and so it seems that the first night had not happened yet according to Genesis. Just from that we can see that day is shown before night.

Moving further, this now brings us to the descriptions of “evening” and “morning”. Different Hebrew words are used for evening and morning than for night and day, so evening is not exactly equal to night and morning is not exactly equal to day. Evening is within night and morning is within day, but evening is not all of night and morning is not all of day. Evening refers to an early part of night and morning refers to an early part of day. If the morning described in verse 1:5 is a part of day one, then the description of day one would end with morning and would exclude any description of afternoon. Alternatively, the descriptions of evening and morning can be seen more specifically as references to sunset and sunrise. In that case, the description of morning would be a reference to the sun rising; and that would seem to be a reference to the sun rising on day two, which would show the end of day one.

One alternative ignores that day and night are designated after light is described and before any sunset is described; ignores that day is described before night; and would end the description of day one with morning, which leaves out afternoon. The other alternative takes into account that day and night are designated after light is described and before any sunset is described, takes into account that day is described before night, and would end the description of day one with the last part of night before sunrise on day two. It seems clear that Genesis actually describes a day as beginning with sunrise and ending right before the next sunrise. In that case, day one begins with the declaration of “let there be light”, then the description of evening presents a sunset, and then the description of morning presents a sunrise to start day two. Therefore, the right interpretation of Genesis seems to be that morning precedes evening.

Exodus and Leviticus can give us even more specific guidance on this issue.

Leviticus is very clear that the sacrificing of lambs occurs on the fourteenth day and that the first day of the week of unleavened bread, a sacred assembly, occurs on the fifteenth day.

Leviticus 23:5-6

*“The Lord’s Passover begins at twilight on the fourteenth day of the first month. On the fifteenth day of that month the Lord’s Feast of Unleavened Bread begins; for seven days you must eat bread made without yeast. On the first day hold a sacred assembly and do no regular work. For seven days present an offering made to the Lord by fire. And on the seventh day hold a sacred assembly and do no regular work.”*

The Hebrew words that are translated as “the Lord’s Passover” are often translated as referring specifically to the sacrifices that take place on the fourteenth day, not the actual “Passover” or the Passover Seder. So Leviticus indicates that the sacrificing of lambs occurs on the fourteenth day and that the first day of the week of unleavened bread occurs on the fifteenth day. So the Passover Seder must take place on the fourteenth or the fifteenth day. The Passover Seder either occurs on the fourteenth day, the same day as the sacrificing of lambs, or it occurs on the fifteenth day, the same day as the first day of the week of unleavened bread.

So now we can return to Exodus 12:18. If the beginning of a day was considered to be evening, then the evening of the fourteenth day would have been before the removal of leaven on the fourteenth day. Additionally, the evening of the fourteenth day would stand alone apart from the Passover Seder and the week of unleavened bread that would begin with the evening of the fifteenth day. There would be the evening of the fourteenth day, which would include unleavened bread; and then after that would be the period of daylight on the fourteenth day, during which there would be the removal of leaven and the sacrificing of lambs; and then after that the Passover Seder would fall on the evening of the fifteenth day, the first day of the week of unleavened bread; and then on the twenty-first day, only the evening would be covered under the instruction of Exodus 12:18 because it states “until the evening of the twenty-first day”. That would leave the period of daylight on the twenty-first day excluded from the week of unleavened bread unless the week of unleavened bread goes beyond the instruction of Exodus 12:18 and includes the period of daylight on the twenty-first day, which would then mean that Exodus 12:18 mysteriously stops short by a half of a day. There are two problems with this scenario. One is that there isn’t any explanation given for why unleavened bread would need to be eaten on the evening of the fourteenth day, before the removal of leaven and apart from the Passover Seder and the week of unleavened bread. The second is

that either the week of unleavened bread would end halfway through the twenty-first day and would then not be a full seven days, or Exodus 12:18 mysteriously stops short by a half of a day.

Alternatively, if a day begins with morning instead of evening, then the period of daylight on the fourteenth day would occur before the evening of the fourteenth day. In that case, the removal of leaven would occur before the evening of the fourteenth day. Also, the Passover Seder would then be on the fourteenth day instead of the fifteenth day. The week of unleavened bread would begin with the morning of the fifteenth day and end with the evening of the twenty-first day. In this scenario, there are seven full days of unleavened bread beginning with the morning of the fifteenth day and ending with the evening of the twenty-first day. Additionally, the evening of the fourteenth day is an evening of unleavened bread that comes before the week of unleavened bread. The evening of the fourteenth day being an evening of unleavened bread is in accordance with Exodus 12:8, which instructs that the Passover Seder be eaten with unleavened bread. So there is the requirement to remove leaven, there is the requirement to eat the Passover Seder with unleavened bread, and there is the requirement to not have any leaven for the week of unleavened bread. If a day begins with morning, then the removal of leaven would occur during the period of daylight on the fourteenth day, then the Passover Seder would be eaten with unleavened bread during the evening of the fourteenth day, and then the week of unleavened bread would begin with the morning of the fifteenth day and end with the evening of the twenty-first day. That would meet all of the requirements as previously set forth. There would be unleavened bread beginning with the evening of the fourteenth day and ending with the evening of the twenty-first day in accordance with Exodus 12:18, and the removal of leaven would occur before the evening of the fourteenth day.

Leviticus can provide further support.

Leviticus 23:26

*The Lord said to Moses, "The tenth day of this seventh month is the Day of Atonement. Hold a sacred assembly and deny yourselves, and present an offering made to the Lord by fire."*

Leviticus 23:32

*"From the evening of the ninth day of the month until the following evening you are to observe your Sabbath."*

Verse 26 shows that the Day of Atonement, which is to be a Sabbath, is the tenth day of that month. Verse 32 shows that the Sabbath should be observed from the evening of the ninth day to the evening of the tenth day. If evening precedes morning, then that Sabbath would be observed for all of the ninth day and only half of the tenth day. The observance would begin with the evening of the ninth day, continue through the period of daylight on the ninth day, and then end with the evening of the tenth day, while excluding the period of daylight on the tenth day. That Sabbath is specifically stated to be the tenth day, so all of the tenth day needs to be included. Instead, if morning precedes evening, then the observance of that Sabbath would begin with the evening of the ninth day, continue through the period of daylight on the tenth day, and then end with the evening of the tenth day. In this case, all of the tenth day is included as well as the preceding evening on the ninth day. Evenings are typically periods of rest while work and preparation is done during periods of daylight. When there is a Sabbath, there can be rest for a day and a half. There is a full day of rest for the Sabbath, which is a continuation of rest that would have begun the evening before. Preparation for a Sabbath would typically occur during the period of daylight on the day before a Sabbath, and then by evening of that day, the preparation is done and so begins a period of rest

that continues through all of the Sabbath day on the next day. The requirement that verse 26 lays out that the tenth day of that month be a Sabbath would not be met by verse 32 if evening preceded morning. On the other hand, if morning precedes evening, then the requirements of both verses 26 and 32 are satisfied.

Even if the right interpretation of Genesis was that evening precedes morning, Exodus and Leviticus should hold as authority on this issue because they contain Moses' law and Genesis doesn't. Moses' law dictated how people lived their lives. Genesis is a lot about origins, and Exodus and Leviticus are a lot about Moses' law and how the people are instructed to live. The accounting for the structure of a day would relate to how people lived because it related to how people accounted for the days that they lived. Therefore, Exodus and Leviticus should hold as authority over Genesis on how to account for the structure of a day.

Further support for that assertion can be shown by the difference between two different Jewish calendars. The civil Jewish calendar begins with the month of Tishri, which corresponds to Jewish tradition of when the world was created and that relates to Genesis. The religious Jewish calendar begins with the month of Nisan, which corresponds to when Israelites are described as having escaped Egypt and that relates to Exodus and Leviticus. The religious calendar would have been the calendar that derives from religious text, the Hebrew Bible. Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus are all religious books and the religious calendar is dictated by Exodus and Leviticus over Genesis. Genesis relates to the creation of the world but the calendar that relates to the creation of the world is the civil calendar, not the religious calendar. Genesis is a religious book and is therefore within the religious realm; and that religious realm gave way to the religious calendar being dictated by the verses in Exodus and Leviticus, not Genesis. The comparison of the civil and religious Jewish calendars shows the authoritative nature of Exodus and Leviticus over Genesis in this regard. As a result, we should abide by what Exodus and Leviticus say on this matter regardless of how we interpret Genesis. But as noted before, the right interpretation of Genesis does seem to be that morning precedes evening, which does agree with Exodus and Leviticus.

In conclusion, the only way for the laws of the Hebrew Bible to be satisfied is if morning precedes evening on a given day in the Jewish calendar. Therefore, the Passover Seder is to be eaten on the fourteenth day, not the fifteenth day.

A change in interpretation seems to have taken shape at some point. The question becomes about when such a change took place. Such a change probably took shape hundreds of years after the first century. Even if such a change took place in the first century, it likely would not have happened until after the destruction of the temple in 70. For any later tradition that deviates from the Hebrew Bible, the destruction of the temple in 70 serves as the beginning of the time-frame in which such a change would have likely taken place. The destruction of the temple in 70 brought devastation upon the Jewish population, and particularly among Jewish priests. The temple represented a center for Jewish priests. It was their headquarters. There were many Jewish traditions that specifically involved the temple. Once the temple had been destroyed in 70, that center of stability for Jewish priests was gone. There was devastation and disorganization after the temple was destroyed in 70. Before that, Jewish priests had more organization and control, and a lot of that organization and control came from the text of the Hebrew Bible. After the destruction of the temple in 70, there was more deviation from the old organized structure. Jewish priests were much more likely to adhere to traditions that came straight from the Hebrew Bible before the destruction of the temple in 70 than afterwards. A change in interpretation of Genesis

1:3-5 likely took shape hundreds of years after the first century, but even if it took shape in the first century, it likely happened after the destruction of the temple in 70. Therefore, for most of the first century, if not all of the first century, the structure of a day in the Jewish calendar probably involved morning preceding evening. So for most of the first century, if not all of the first century, the Passover Seder was probably eaten on the fourteenth day, not the fifteenth day.

The fourteenth day is a preparation day for the week of unleavened bread; and then, by evening, the Passover Seder is being eaten along with unleavened bread. It is the fifteenth day that is considered the first day of the week of unleavened bread and is a sacred assembly. So there are a full seven days, days fifteen through twenty-one, on which unleavened bread should be eaten. There also should be unleavened bread eaten on the preceding evening, the evening of the fourteenth day, a day when leaven is removed, lambs are sacrificed, and the Passover Seder is eaten. This can be further confirmed by Exodus 12:8 and Exodus 12:11 previously mentioned.

Exodus 12:8

*“That same night they are to eat the meat roasted over the fire, along with bitter herbs, and bread made without yeast.”*

Exodus 12:11

*“This is how you are to eat it: with your cloak tucked into your belt, your sandals on your feet, and your staff in your hand. Eat it in haste; it is the Lord’s Passover.”*

Exodus 12:8 describes a meal that should be eaten with unleavened bread (“bread made without yeast”) and does not indicate any affiliation with the week of unleavened bread that begins on the fifteenth day. Exodus 12:11 shows that this meal is the feast of “the Lord’s Passover”.

So on the fourteenth day, there is to be the removal of leaven, the sacrificing of lambs, and the Passover Seder, which is to include unleavened bread. The fourteenth day is not a full day of unleavened bread. The day can begin with leavened bread, but by evening, the Passover Seder is to be eaten with unleavened bread. The fifteenth day is to be the first of seven full days of unleavened bread and is to be a sacred assembly. The twenty-first day is to be the seventh day of seven full days of unleavened bread and is also to be a sacred assembly. This sequence of days is very important when interpreting the timing of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion.

All of the Synoptic Gospels describe the day that the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ was buried on, which was probably the same day as the Crucifixion, as “Preparation Day”. The Gospel of John describes the day that the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ was buried on as “the day of Preparation of Passover Week” and “the Jewish day of Preparation”; and describes the day of the trial described, which was also probably the same day as the Crucifixion, as “the day of Preparation”. Most of those descriptions are a little ambiguous but the one in the Gospel of John that describes the day of the burial as “the day of Preparation of Passover Week” is very specific.

Mark 15:42:43

*It was Preparation Day (that is, the day before the Sabbath). So as evening approached, Joseph of Arimathea, a prominent member of the Council, who was himself waiting for the kingdom of God, went boldly to Pilate and asked for Jesus’ body.*

Matthew 27:62

*The next day, the one after Preparation Day, the chief priests and the Pharisees went to Pilate.*

Luke 23:54

*It was Preparation Day, and the Sabbath was about to begin.*

John 19:14

*It was the day of Preparation of Passover Week, about the sixth hour. "Here is your king," Pilate said to the Jews.*

John 19:31

*Now it was the day of Preparation, and the next day was to be a special Sabbath.*

John 19:42

*Because it was the Jewish day of Preparation and since the tomb was nearby, they laid Jesus there.*

It is now time to apply what we went over earlier from Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus to analyze the sequences described in each Gospel regarding the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. All of the Synoptic Gospels describe the Last Supper as having been the Passover Seder; so based on that, if less than 24 hours passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, then the Synoptic Gospels would seem to portray Christ as having been crucified sometime during the period of daylight that immediately followed the Passover Seder, which would seem to have been the first day of the week of unleavened bread. It would have been incredibly unrealistic for the Crucifixion to have occurred on a Sabbath day. Jewish law would have been broken. The priests are described as having been involved with imprisoning Christ, interrogating Christ, taking Christ to Pontius Pilate, and requesting of Pontius Pilate that Christ be crucified. All of that would have been against Jewish law on a Sabbath day. So it's incredibly unrealistic that the priests would have waited until the first day of the week of unleavened bread to carry out their plan. Instead, it's much more realistic that they would have carried out their plan a day earlier as described in the Gospel of John. Additionally, the verses just previously shown suggest that Christ was crucified on the preparation day before the Passover Seder took place. If that is the case, then the Synoptic Gospels contradict themselves because they would then be portraying the Last Supper and the Crucifixion as both having occurred on the fourteenth day of Nisan, the preparation day for the week of unleavened bread. As noted earlier, the descriptions in the Synoptic Gospels are a little ambiguous and there is one description in the Gospel of John that is more specific. The Gospel of John clearly shows that the Crucifixion seems to have happened on the preparation day for the Passover week. So it does seem that the Synoptic Gospels show a contradiction there. However, just within the Synoptic Gospels, the descriptions of that day are ambiguous. Therefore, it's possible that the Synoptic Gospels could refer to a preparation day for a weekly Sabbath and not for the first day of the week of unleavened bread. If that is the case, then there would have to have been more than 24 hours between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion for the Crucifixion to have not happened on the first day of the week of unleavened bread.

One opposing theory is that some people ate the Passover Seder on the thirteenth day of Nisan instead of the fourteenth day. According to tradition, a beginning of a new month in the Jewish calendar was associated with the sighting of a sliver of the moon after a new moon (the moon isn't visible when there is a new moon). Once the first day of a month is determined, then succeeding days in that month can be determined. Through this process, the day to eat the Passover Seder would not be determined until the



first day of Nisan was determined. People who lived far from Jerusalem may not have received the news in time regarding when the Passover Seder is supposed to be eaten. Since a month in the Jewish calendar is either 29 or 30 days long, a person could estimate within a margin of error of 1 day when the Passover Seder should be eaten. According to this theory, some people could then eat the Passover Seder on the thirteenth day of Nisan. Even if this theory has any merit, it would only apply to people who lived far away from Jerusalem. The theory is entirely based on geographical distance. The events that we are discussing occurred in Jerusalem. So this theory should be dismissed when analyzing when the Last Supper occurred.

There is only one scenario in which the Synoptic Gospels would seem to appear reliable in relation to the timing of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. That scenario is one in which the Last Supper was a Passover Seder, and the Crucifixion happened on a day that was more than one day removed from the Last Supper and was a preparation day for a weekly Sabbath but not for the first day of the week of unleavened bread. That interpretation contradicts the Gospel of John. The Gospel of John describes the Last Supper as having happened before the Passover Seder, presumably one day before the Passover Seder because the trial described is portrayed as having occurred specifically on “the day of Preparation of Passover Week”. So the Gospel of John seems to describe Christ as having been crucified during the period of daylight that immediately preceded the Passover Seder.

The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that specifies which preparation day is described as having been the day of the Crucifixion. Just based on that, the Gospel of John seems more reliable. Additionally, there are three other reasons to show that the Gospel of John is more reliable than the Synoptic Gospels in relation to the timing of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. First and foremost, there isn't any evidence at all to show that there were more than 24 hours that passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. The second is that Christ is described in all of the Gospels as having been arrested during the night, which shows that the priests seem to have wanted to take care of everything quietly and therefore probably quickly as well. The first and second points both support the assertion that there were probably less than 24 hours that passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, and that assertion supports the Gospel of John and shows that the Synoptic Gospels are probably unreliable in relation to the timing of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. The third point is that it would make much more sense for the priests to have wanted Christ crucified before the Passover Seder rather than after the Passover Seder and during the week of unleavened bread.

In conclusion, there were probably less than 24 hours that passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, which shows that the Synoptic Gospels seem to portray the Crucifixion as having happened on the first day of the week of unleavened bread based on the portrayal of the Last Supper as the Passover Seder. Not only would it have been unrealistic for the Crucifixion to have happened on a Sabbath day, but the Synoptic Gospels would also then seem to be in contradiction with themselves because they specifically describe the day that the Crucifixion occurred on as having been a preparation day. Additionally, even if there were more than 24 hours that passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, it would have been much more realistic for the Crucifixion to have happened before the Passover Seder rather than after the Passover Seder and during the week of unleavened bread. Therefore, the Gospel of John seems more reliable in relation to the timing of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, and the Synoptic Gospels seem to fraudulently describe the Last Supper as having been the Passover Seder for theological purposes.

There's one more point to make about the sequence of the Last Supper and the week of unleavened bread. All of the Synoptic Gospels seem to describe the day of sacrificing lambs as the first day of unleavened bread.

Mark 14:12

*On the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, when it was customary to sacrifice the Passover Lamb, Jesus' disciples asked him, "Where do you want us to go and make preparations for you to eat the Passover?"*

Matthew 26:17

*On the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the disciples came to Jesus and asked "Where do you want us to make preparations for you to eat the Passover?"*

Luke 22:7

*Then came the day of Unleavened Bread on which the Passover lamb had to be sacrificed. Jesus sent Peter and John, saying, "Go and make preparations for us to eat the Passover."*

All of the Synoptic Gospels are discussing the day in which preparations are made for the Passover Seder and refer to that same day as either "the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread" as described in Mark and Matthew, or "the day of Unleavened Bread" as described in Luke. So it seems as though the Synoptic Gospels refer to the day that leaven is removed as the first day of the week of unleavened bread, which would be incorrect. The Greek text that gives way to the translation of the phrase "the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread" can be more appropriately translated as "the first day of the unleavened". Some could argue that the phrases "the first day of the unleavened" and "the day of Unleavened Bread" could be interpreted as the day to remove leaven. The use of the word "first" in the phrase "the first day of the unleavened" would either indicate that the first of a sequence is being described, like the first of seven days, or hold the same meaning as "before" or "preceding". In this instance, it does not seem as though the word "first" would mean "before" because there aren't two subjects being described that would represent before and after. If "first" means "before", then two subjects would have to be present to establish a relationship between before and after. In this instance, only one day is being mentioned. So the phrase "the first day of the unleavened" seems to describe the first of a sequence that is beyond simply a relationship between before and after, and so that day appears to be the first day of the week of unleavened bread. The phrase "the day of Unleavened Bread" as described in Luke would also seem to do the same. The phrase "the day of Unleavened Bread" is more likely to represent a day in which there isn't any leaven rather than a day in which there is the removal of leaven. So it does seem as though the Synoptic Gospels describe the preparation day as the first day of the week of unleavened bread, which would be incorrect and shows further evidence that the Synoptic Gospels are very unreliable.

## **The Crucifixion**

As shown earlier, all of the Synoptic Gospels describe women as having been witnesses to the Crucifixion, but they also all describe these women as having been relatively far away from the Cross. Only the Gospel of John describes any women as having been near the Cross. The description of witnesses having been near the Cross during the Crucifixion raises the perceived reliability of that

testimony. It's very strange, and therefore suspicious, that the Synoptic Gospels specifically refer to the witnesses of the Crucifixion as having been at "a distance" from the Cross during the Crucifixion. Regarding the descriptions of the witness' proximity to the Cross during the Crucifixion, the Gospel of John seems to be more reliable.

The Gospel of John provides the only description throughout all of the Gospels of Christ having communicated during the Crucifixion with a human being other than Roman soldiers or the people who are described as having been crucified at the same time as Christ. As alluded to earlier, the probable fraudulent removal of Mariam's name actually provides evidence for the authenticity of the fundamental aspects of the description of that communication. If the entire narrative was false, then there probably wouldn't be an unnamed disciple. There being an unnamed disciple shows that the fundamental aspects of the description of that communication are probably truthful.

The Gospel of John also provides the only description throughout all of the Gospels of the two men described as having been crucified at the same time as Christ as having had their legs broken. Roman soldiers would do that sometimes to bring the completion of a crucifixion sooner. Crucifixions often took days to complete. The desire that the priests seem to have had to have the Crucifixion of Christ completed sooner seems to have given way to the request described in the Gospel of John for Roman soldiers to break the legs of the bodies that were being crucified. According to the narrative in the Gospel of John, the Crucifixion of Christ appeared complete to them so they instead pierced the side of the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ with a spear. That is not described in any of the Synoptic Gospels.

The Gospel of John already appears to be far more reliable regarding the Crucifixion narratives. Additionally, as shown in Part 2, certain portions of chapter 19 of the Gospel of John appear to likely be fragments of the Testimony of Mariam. That shows further evidence that we should only rely on fragments of the Gospel of John regarding the Crucifixion narratives.

Moving further, Mark and Matthew both describe Christ as having felt forsaken during the Crucifixion.

Mark 15:34

*And at the ninth hour Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachtani?" – which means, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"*

Matthew 27:46

*About the ninth hour Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachtani?" – which means, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"*

As shown in Part 2, these verses seem to be copied from the Hebrew Bible.

Psalms 22:1

*My God, my God, why have you forsaken me? Why are you so far from saving me, so far from the words of my groaning?*

The comparison to Psalm 22:1 not only shows that Mark and Matthew are probably fraudulent, but also shows that the authors seem to have been fraudulently trying to relate Christ to the Hebrew Bible.

We previously discussed in Part 1 the mention in Mark and Matthew of a woman named “Mary” who is not Mariam and who is not explicitly described as Mother Mariam. Mark and Matthew both describe a woman named “Mary” who was the mother of people named James and Joses and who witnessed the Crucifixion. So it appears that Mark and Matthew either don’t describe Mother Mariam as having been present during the Crucifixion or refer to her in a way that doesn’t explicitly describe her as Mother Mariam. We will go into more detail later about Mother Mariam’s relationship with Christ, but for now we can see that the way that Mark and Matthew portray Mother Mariam in the Crucifixion narratives is very strange and is therefore probably fraudulent.

The Gospel of John clearly seems to provide the most reliable account of the Crucifixion, which seems to include real eyewitness testimony from Mariam, although fraudulently altered to exclude her name at certain points.

### **The Resurrection**

We discussed the Resurrection narratives in Part 2. The conclusion of that assessment was that there seems to be only one truthful account in the Gospels of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, the account in the Gospel of John of Christ having appeared to Mariam alone.

So far here in Part 3, we have compared the Gospel of John with the Synoptic Gospels in relation to narratives about John the Baptist, the identification of Christ, the supposed baptism of Christ, the supposed temptation of Christ, the first day of Christ’s Ministry, the supposed calling of the first disciples, the Last Supper, Christ’s arrest, Christ having been questioned by the Sanhedrin, Christ having been brought to Pontius Pilate, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection. In relation to those narratives, the Gospel of John seems much more reliable than the Synoptic Gospels. Despite the fraudulent alterations that appear to have been made to the Gospel of John, in relation to the most important information, the Gospel of John seems much more reliable than the Synoptic Gospels. Additionally, the Synoptic Gospels don’t just seem less reliable than the Gospel of John; they appear to be very unreliable as a whole and particularly in some of the most important narratives, including those about the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, two of the most important narratives in the entire Bible. So, given how unreliable the Synoptic Gospels appear to be, it seems that there is a good possibility that the Synoptic Gospels were fraudulent upon their original production. In contrast, it seems that the Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, the top disciple of Christ. With that assessment having been presented, there are now some more narratives that we should examine.

As mentioned before, the Synoptic Gospels all include narratives that refer to the end of ages, often referred to as “the end times”. We will go into even greater detail about these narratives in Part 4. For now, we will focus on three general components: what these narratives propose would happen, that these narratives propose that it all would happen during that generation, and that most of it didn’t happen during that generation.

All three Synoptic Gospels claim in their respective end of ages narratives that Christ would physically appear again during a later time-period, the temple would be destroyed, nations and kingdoms would fight each other, there would be earthquakes, there would be famines, and “the heavenly bodies” would be shaken. Additionally, Mark and Matthew claim that the sun would be darkened, light would not reflect from the moon, and stars would fall from the sky; and Luke claims that there would be signs from the sun, moon, and stars. Mark and Matthew both specifically claim that these times would be the worst since the beginning of the world and would never be equaled.

The following verses show that all of that was supposed to occur during that generation; in other words, during the first century.

Mark 13:30

*“I tell you the truth, this generation will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened.”*

Matthew 24:34

*“I tell you the truth, this generation will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened.”*

Luke 21:32

*“I tell you the truth, this generation will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened.”*

The Greek word that gets translated as “generation” is γενεά (“genea”). “Genea” can be translated as generation, race, birth, or offspring. If one were to translate “genea” as “race”, then one could argue that the use of the word “genea” does not necessarily mean that all that is described in those narratives was supposed to happen back in the first century. However, not only is that word consistently translated as “generation” throughout the Gospels, even in other narratives, it also wouldn’t really make sense to translate that word as “race” within the end of ages narratives. If these narratives were saying that all that is described in those narratives was supposed to occur simply before the human race would become extinct, then the description of the timing of those events wouldn’t really be relevant. It’s not really relevant to specifically describe the timing of events if those events are simply supposed to occur sometime before the human race would become extinct. If that’s all a description of timing indicates, then such a description isn’t really needed at all. It would realistically be inherently implied that any events that are described would occur before the human race would become extinct; otherwise, the events wouldn’t really need to be described. The narratives obviously wouldn’t need to describe events that would occur after the entire human race would become extinct, so it appears obvious that it would be inherently implied that events being described would occur before the human race would become extinct. Even if one were to argue that the writing was intended for a Jewish audience and therefore that “race” would refer specifically to the Jewish race rather than the entire human race, it would still appear to be inherently implied that any events being described would occur before the “race” would become extinct because such information wouldn’t really be relevant to a Jewish audience or any other human audience otherwise. So it seems obvious that “genea” in the end of ages narratives should be specifically translated as “generation”, and therefore indicates that all that is described in the end of ages narratives was supposed to happen back in the first century.

Additionally, the Gospel of Matthew provides further clarification.

Matthew 10:23

*“When you are persecuted in one place, flee to another. I tell you the truth, you will not finish going through the cities of Israel before the Son of Man comes.”*

Matthew 10:23 states “you will not finish going through the cities of Israel before the Son of Man comes”. The phrase “before the Son of Man comes” is a reference to the concept of the second coming of the physical appearance of Christ, which is also referred to in the end of ages narratives. All of the Synoptic Gospels claim that Christ would return in physical form during “the end times”, so any reference in the Synoptic Gospels to the concept of the second coming of the physical appearance of Christ would be a reference to “the end times”. Additionally, it wouldn’t realistically make much sense for the Gospel of Matthew to claim that “the Twelve” wouldn’t make it through the cities of Israel during a time-period that was before the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, which shows further that Matthew 10:23 is referring to a time-period that was after the Resurrection and therefore is referring to the concept of the second coming of the physical appearance of Christ. Since Matthew 10:23 is referring to the second coming of the physical appearance of Christ and claims that “the Twelve” wouldn’t make it through the cities of Israel beforehand, Matthew 10:23 is obviously realistically claiming that “the end times” would occur during the generation of “the Twelve”, which clearly shows additional evidence that the Greek word “genea” in the end of ages narratives should be translated as “generation”. Therefore, the end of ages narratives are clearly realistically describing a time-period during the first century.

As far as we know, there wasn’t any second coming of the physical appearance of Christ in the first century after the Resurrection. Additionally, it doesn’t appear that the sun darkened, that light would not reflect from the moon, that stars fell from the sky, or that “the heavenly bodies” were shaken. Also, it would be unrealistic for anyone to believe that anything that happened in the first century after the Resurrection represents the worst times since the beginning of the world and would never be equaled again. World War II alone can show that.

Additionally, regardless of the end of ages narratives showing that these events were supposed to happen back in the first century, simply judging by the fact that the temple was actually destroyed in 70 clearly shows that the rest of the events described in the end of ages narratives were supposed to have happened around that time as well. More specifically, Mark and Matthew express that “the end times” would be cut short so that there would be survivors, which indicates that “the end times” were supposed to entirely occur within one generation. Furthermore, all of the Synoptic Gospels reference the book of Daniel in the end of ages narratives and the book of Daniel gives specific counts of days that only span a total of a few years. So according to the Synoptic Gospels as well as the timeline set up by the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament, all of the other events described in the end of ages narratives were supposed to happen around the same time as the destruction of the temple. Meanwhile, the actual destruction of the temple occurred in 70 and most of the other events did not occur back in the first century. That is defining evidence that the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels are fraudulent.

In conclusion, the end of ages narratives make claims about what was supposed to happen during the first century, and the remainder of the first century simply turned out very differently; and most notably, as far as we know, there wasn’t any second coming of the physical appearance of Christ in the first century after the Resurrection. Therefore, the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels are obviously fraudulent.

As has been shown a lot already, there is a heavy dose of exaltation specifically for Peter in the Synoptic Gospels. All three Synoptic Gospels give particular attention to Peter. The Gospel of Matthew goes really far in declaring Peter in a top spot.

Matthew 16:17-19

*Jesus replied, "Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for this was not revealed to you by man, but by my Father in heaven. And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven."*

The Synoptic Gospels give attention to Peter over and over again and the Gospel of Matthew presents a narrative that describes Christ as having said that Christ's Church will be built on a rock with that rock being Peter. Meanwhile, all four Gospels describe Peter as having disowned Christ three times and none of them describe Peter as having been present during the Crucifixion or having been one of the first people who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection. Furthermore, three of the Gospels describe Mariam as having been present during the Crucifixion; all four Gospels describe Mariam as having been present during the discovery of the empty tomb; three of the Gospels describe Mariam as having been one of the first people to see Christ after the Resurrection; and the Gospel of John describes only Mariam as having been the first person who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection. So it's justified to believe that the narrative about Christ's Church being built on a rock represented by Peter is fraudulent, and that a lot of the attention that Peter gets in the Gospels is fraudulent. It's even easier to see the exaltation of Peter as fraudulent given the strong evidence showing that Mariam is the beloved disciple and that information about her was fraudulently concealed.

"The Twelve" are proudly proclaimed in the Synoptic Gospels. There is a narrative in all of the Synoptic Gospels describing the appointing of "the Twelve" and lists each of them by name. These are narratives that claim that there was an official appointing of these men by Christ. Additionally, Matthew and Luke both include narratives that really take an extreme view on the importance of "the Twelve".

Matthew 19:28

*Jesus said to them, "I tell you the truth, at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man sits on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."*

Luke 22:28-30

*"You are those who have stood by me in my trials. And I confer on you a kingdom, just as my Father conferred one on me, so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."*

Here we see Luke describing "the Twelve" as being people who a kingdom will be conferred to just as a kingdom was conferred to Christ. That sounds like "the Twelve" are being portrayed as having the ability to be like Christ in that way, and so those verses obviously appear to be fraudulent. Furthermore, both Matthew and Luke claim that "the Twelve" will sit on thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. These verses are really extreme. These verses obviously appear to be fraudulent.

The Gospel of John, on the other hand, does not include any such claims or any narrative that describes the appointing of “the Twelve”. As shown in Part 2, there are only three references in the Gospel of John to “the Twelve”, they are simple, they don’t make any serious claims, and all three of those references appear to be later fraudulent additions.

The Synoptic Gospels as a whole seem to provide narratives that suggest that people should pay taxes and give money to the temple.

Mark 12:15-17

*“Should we pay or shouldn’t we?”*

*But Jesus knew their hypocrisy. “Why are you trying to trap me?” he asked. “Bring me a denarius and let me look at it.” They brought the coin and he asked them, “Whose portrait is this? And whose inscription?”*

*“Caesar’s”, they replied.*

*Then Jesus said to them, “Give to Caesar what is Caesar’s and to God what is God’s.”*

*And they were amazed at him.*

Matthew 22:17-22

*“Tell us then, what is your opinion? Is it right to pay taxes to Caesar or not?”*

*But Jesus, knowing their evil intent, said, “You hypocrites, why are you trying to trap me? Show me the coin used for paying the tax.” They brought him a denarius, and he asked them, “Whose portrait is this? And whose inscription?”*

*“Caesar’s”, they replied.*

*Then he said to them, “Give to Caesar what is Caesar’s and to God what is God’s.”*

*When they heard this, they were amazed. So they left him and went away.*

Luke 20:22-26

*“Is it right for us to pay taxes to Caesar or not?”*

*He saw through their duplicity and said to them, “Show me a denarius. Whose portrait and inscription are on it?”*

*“Caesar’s”, they replied.*

*He said to them, “Then give to Caesar what is Caesar’s, and to God what is God’s.”*

*They were unable to trap him in what he had said there in public. And astonished by his answer, they became silent.*

Matthew 17:24-26

*After Jesus and his disciples arrived in Capernaum, the collectors of the two-drachma tax came to Peter and asked, “Doesn’t your teacher pay the temple tax?”*

*“Yes, he does”, he replied.*

*When Peter came into the house, Jesus was the first to speak.” “What do you think, Simon?” he asked.*

*“From whom do the kings of the earth collect duty and taxes – from their own sons or from others?”*

*“From others”, Peter answered.*

*“Then the sons are exempt”, Jesus said to him. “But so that we may not offend them, go to the lake and throw out your line. Take the first fish you catch; open its mouth and you will find a four-drachma coin. Take it and give it to them for my tax and yours.”*



Mark 12:43-44

*Calling his disciples to him, Jesus said, "I tell you the truth, this poor widow has put more into the treasury than all the others. They all gave out their wealth; but she, out of her poverty, put in everything – all she had to live on."*

Luke 21:3-4

*"I tell you the truth", he said, "this poor widow has put in more than all the others. All these people gave their gifts out of their wealth; but she out of her poverty put in all she had to live on."*

All of the Synoptic Gospels describe Christ as having been asked if people should pay taxes. Christ is described as having said, "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's." That phrase is presented as a clever comeback to outsmart those who are described as having tried to trap Christ. That may have been the case, but what seems more likely is that these are political statements intended to better a relationship with the Roman government. The phrase describes that which is purported to be Caesar's as if it was separate from that which is God's. All of existence belongs to God. However, that phrase seems to distinguish between that which belongs to Caesar and that which belongs to God as if there is anything that belongs to Caesar that doesn't belong to God. One could argue that such a phrase does not necessitate that anything belongs to Caesar. However, in these narratives, Christ is described as having asked whose portrait and inscription are on a denarius and the people are described as responding by saying "Caesar's". So it seems as though the Synoptic Gospels are suggesting that people should pay taxes to Caesar, which probably represents a political move to better a relationship with the Roman government. We have seen narratives that describe Jewish priests as having had some sort of political relationship with Pontius Pilate. After all, it appears that these priests were responsible for requesting of Pontius Pilate the Crucifixion of Christ. It seems as though there were certain people connected with the productions of the Synoptic Gospels who also had a political relationship with the Roman government.

Additionally, the Gospel of Matthew throws in an extra narrative about paying taxes. This time the narrative is about the temple tax as shown in Matthew 17:24-26. Interestingly, Peter takes center stage in this narrative and appears to be enthusiastic about paying the temple tax. Similar to the narratives that seem to be attempts to better a relationship with the Roman government, the narrative that contains Matthew 17:24-26 seems to be an attempt to better a relationship with the Jewish priests of the temple.

In addition to paying taxes to Caesar and to the temple, it appears that Mark and Luke also suggest that people should give money to the temple even if they are in poverty and the money that they give is all that they have. That is even worse than suggesting that people should pay taxes.

So all of the Synoptic Gospels seem to include attempts to better a relationship with the Roman government by suggesting that people should pay taxes to Caesar, Matthew seems to include an attempt to better a relationship with the Jewish priests of the temple by suggesting that people should pay taxes to the temple, and Mark and Luke seem to include attempts to influence people to give money to a religious establishment even if they are poor and even if it's all the money that they have.

Now we should look at narratives in the Synoptic Gospels that describe Christ as having prayed before Christ was arrested.

Mark 14:33-36

*He took Peter, James, and John along with him, and he began to be deeply distressed and troubled. "My soul is overwhelmed with sorrow to the point of death", he said to them. "Stay here and keep watch." Going a little farther, he fell to the ground and prayed that if possible the hour might pass from him. "Abba, Father", he said, "everything is possible for you. Take this cup from me. Yet not what I will, but what you will."*

Mark 14:49

*"Every day I was with you, teaching in the temple courts, and you did not arrest me. But the Scriptures must be fulfilled."*

Matthew 26:37-39

*He took Peter and the two sons of Zebedee along with him, and he began to be sorrowful and troubled. Then he said to them, "My soul is overwhelmed with sorrow to the point of death. Stay here and keep watch with me."*

*Going a little farther, he fell with his face to the ground and prayed, "My Father, if it is possible, may this cup be taken from me. Yet not as I will, but as you will."*

Matthew 26:56

*"But this has all taken place that the writings of the prophets might be fulfilled." Then all the disciples deserted him and fled.*

Luke 22:41-44

*He withdrew about a stone's throw beyond them, knelt down and prayed, "Father, if you are willing, take this cup from me, yet not my will, but yours be done." An angel from heaven appeared to him and strengthened him. And being in anguish, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was like drops of blood falling to the ground.*

These verses show two excerpts each from Mark and Matthew and one excerpt from Luke. Each of the first excerpts from Mark and Matthew and the one from Luke describe Christ as having prayed before Christ was arrested. Each of the second excerpts from Mark and Matthew refer to Christ's arrest.

As shown earlier, all of the Synoptic Gospels describe Christ as having not wanted to move forward with the Plan of God. Additionally, Mark and Matthew seem to have internal contradictions as shown by the two excerpts just previously presented from each. The first excerpt from each, along with the one from Luke, portrays Christ as having not wanted to move forward with the Plan of God. Then Mark describes Christ as having referred to the fulfillment of "Scriptures" and Matthew describes Christ as having referred to the fulfillment of "the writings of the prophets". So one excerpt from each describes Christ as having not wanted to move forward with the Plan of God and the other excerpt from each describes Christ as having been determined to fulfill the Plan of God. Such a transition in Mark and Matthew shows evidence that the first excerpt from each appears to be fraudulent, which would show evidence that the one shown from Luke appears to be as well.

All of the Synoptic Gospels describe Christ as having been baptized by a human being, having been tempted in the desert for 40 days, and having not wanted to move forward with the Plan of God. The Synoptic Gospels describe Christ as separate from God. Meanwhile, the Gospel of John describes Christ as God in flesh.

All of the Synoptic Gospels appear to be incredibly unreliable; appear to suppress information about Mariam; appear to exalt “the elite”, more specifically “the Twelve”, and even more specifically Peter; appear to contain political statements to better a relationship with the Roman government by apparently supporting the payment of taxes to Caesar; describe Christ as separate from God; and describe Christ as having not wanted to move forward with the Plan of God. Additionally, Matthew appears to contain an attempt to better a relationship with the Jewish priests of the temple by supporting the payment of the temple tax, and Mark and Luke appear to contain attempts to influence people to give money to a religious establishment even if they are poor and even if it’s all the money that they have. For all of those reasons, it is justified to believe that the Synoptic Gospels are massively fraudulent and should not be considered to represent true Christianity. They were probably fraudulent upon their original production. The Gospel of John, on the other hand, while probably containing a lot of text that does not represent true Christianity, also probably possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, the top disciple of Christ and probably the only person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection.

So far, we have dismantled a lot of the New Testament. We have dismissed three of the four Gospels and much of the remaining Gospel. The Synoptic Gospels should not be relied upon for religion and only fragments of the Gospel of John should be relied upon. We have yet to go into deep analysis about Acts, Paul’s letters, and the other documents in the New Testament, including the book of Hebrews and the book of Revelation. Analyses of those materials are forthcoming later. While we’re still in Part 3, we will move forward from here by analyzing the Old Testament and then being able to have a better view of the Bible as a whole.

## **The Old Testament**

The issues of the Bible don’t just pertain to the New Testament. The Old Testament is riddled with problems too. The Old Testament focuses on a genealogy that goes from Adam and Eve to Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, eventually King David, and so on. The Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke both carry on this genealogy and do so all of the way to the man described as having been the husband of Mother Mariam, a man who is also given the name Joseph. In other words, it is believed by many that the so-called “seed” of Adam was carried forward all of the way to a man described as Mother Mariam’s husband.

Chapter 1 of Genesis is about the seven days of Creation. Chapters 2 and 3 are about Adam and Eve, their creation, and sin. Chapter 4 is about Adam and Eve, and their offspring. At first, they are described as having two sons, Cain and Able. Chapter 4 goes on to describe Cain killing Able and then Adam and Eve having another son named Seth. The main genealogy in the Bible moves forward with Seth. Chapter 5 describes the genealogy going from Adam to Noah. Chapters 6-9 are about Noah and the flood. Chapters 10 and 11 refer to the genealogy, population disbursement, and an introduction to racial diversity. Chapter 11 leaves off with Abraham, Sarah (described as Abraham’s wife), and Lot (described as Abraham’s nephew) as the main people of focus. The rest of Genesis shows the genealogy of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. Exodus describes Moses leading the Israelites out of slavery in Egypt. Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy all describe Moses as the leader of the people. Deuteronomy describes Moses as having passed away. The Old Testament goes on to describe the Israelites defeating the Canaanites, taking their land, and rising up as a kingdom. The Bible places Saul as the first king and then

David as king after that. David is hailed as the great king who defeated Goliath and went on to unify the kingdom. Eventually, the Old Testament goes on to describe division within the kingdom and the splitting off of a new kingdom. The new northern kingdom is named the kingdom of Israel and the southern kingdom that is described as having represented the original kingdom is named the kingdom of Judah. Jerusalem is in the southern half of Israel and is described in the Old Testament as having been a part of the kingdom of Judah. Later on, the Old Testament describes the Assyrian Empire as having destroyed the kingdom of Israel. After that, the Old Testament describes the Babylonian Empire as having destroyed the kingdom of Judah and the temple in Jerusalem. The Old Testament describes many of the educated people and many other people of the kingdom of Judah as having been taken captive and exiled to Babylon. It is believed that the Babylonian Exile began towards the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE and that the Israelites and their descendants were released towards the end of that century. After that began what is called “the second temple period” as there was another temple built in Jerusalem. The second temple period was still going on when the first century CE came around. It lasted until 70 CE when the temple was destroyed by the Roman Empire during the Jewish-Roman War that began with the riots of Jerusalem in 66 CE.

Similar to what we saw with the New Testament, the Old Testament also contains some truth as well as plenty of fraud. The law that was established in the Old Testament is so extreme that it seems unjustifiable not to believe that such text is fraudulent. We should revisit some verses that were discussed in the introduction of this book while we take a first look at some other verses.

Exodus 21:2-11

*“If you buy a Hebrew servant, he is to serve you for six years. But in the seventh year, he shall go free, without paying anything. If he comes alone, he is to go free alone; but if he has a wife when he comes, she is to go with him. If his master gives him a wife and she bears him sons or daughters, the woman and her children shall belong to her master, and only the man shall go free. But if the servant declares ‘I love my master and my wife and children and do not want to go free’, then his master must take him before the judges. He shall take him to the door or the doorpost and pierce his ear with an awl. Then he will be his servant for life. If a man sells his daughter as a servant, she is not to go free as menservants do. If she does not please the master who has selected her for himself, he must let her be redeemed. He has no right to sell her to foreigners, because he has broken faith with her. If he selects her for his son, he must grant her the rights of a daughter. If he marries another woman, he must not deprive the first one of her food, clothing, and marital rights. If he does not provide her with these three things, she is to go free, without any payment of money.”*

Exodus 21:20

*“If a man beats his male or female slave with a rod and the slave dies as a direct result, he must be punished, but he is not to be punished if the slave gets up after a day or two, since the slave is his property.”*

Exodus 30:12

*“When you take a census of the Israelites to count them, each one must pay the Lord a ransom for his life at the time he is counted. Then no plague will come on them when you number them.”*

Leviticus 12:2-5

*“Say to the Israelites: ‘A woman who becomes pregnant and gives birth to a son will be ceremonially unclean for seven days, just as she is unclean during her monthly period. On the eighth day the boy is to be circumcised. Then the woman must wait thirty-three days to be purified from her bleeding. She must not touch anything sacred or go to the sanctuary until the days of her purification are over. If she gives birth to a daughter, for two weeks the woman will be unclean, as during her period. Then she must wait sixty-six days to be purified from her bleeding.’”*

Leviticus 15:19-24

*When a woman has her regular flow of blood, the impurity of her monthly period will last seven days, and anyone who touches her will be unclean till evening. Anything she lies on during her period will be unclean, and anything she sits on will be unclean. Whoever touches her bed must wash his clothes and bathe with water, and he will be unclean till evening. Whoever touches anything she sits on must wash his clothes and bathe with water, and he will be unclean till evening. Whether it is the bed or anything she was sitting on, when anyone touches it, he will be unclean till evening. If a man lies with her and her monthly flow touches him, he will be unclean for seven days; any bed he lies on will be unclean.”*

Leviticus 19:20

*“If a man sleeps with a woman who is a slave girl promised to another man but who has not been ransomed or given her freedom, there must be due punishment. Yet they are not to be put to death, because she had not been freed.”*

Leviticus 20:13

*“If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman, both of them have done what is detestable. They must be put to death; their blood will be on their own heads.”*

Leviticus 21:9

*“If a priest’s daughter defiles herself by becoming a prostitute, she disgraces her father; she must be burned in the fire.”*

Numbers 5:12-15

*“Speak to the Israelites and say to them: ‘If a man’s wife goes astray and is unfaithful to him by sleeping with another man, and this is hidden from her husband and her impurity is undetected (since there is no witness against her and she had not been caught in the act), and if feelings of jealousy come over her husband and he suspects his wife and she is impure – or if he is jealous and suspects her even though she is not impure – then he is to take his wife to the priest.’”*

Numbers 18:8-9

*Then the Lord said to Aaron, “I myself have put you in charge of the offerings presented to me; all the holy offerings the Israelites give me I give to you and your sons as your portion and regular share. You are to have the part of the most holy offerings that is kept from the fire. From all the gifts they bring me as most holy offerings, whether grain or sin or guilt offerings, that part belongs to you and your sons.”*

Numbers 36:8

*Every daughter who inherits land in any Israelite tribe must marry someone in her father’s tribal clan so that every Israelite will possess the inheritance of his fathers.*

Those verses show that the Old Testament condones slavery, including slavery of children; condones violence against slaves; condones forced marriage; condones murder; claims that a plague will come upon people unless they pay a ransom for their life; asserts that a woman is unclean for twice the amount of time after giving birth to a daughter than to a son; asserts that contact with a woman could render someone unclean for seven days; promotes that priests should determine if a woman is guilty of adultery even without any evidence of adultery; promotes priests profiting from offerings made by other people to God; and promotes restricting a woman in who she can marry for the sake of controlling the ownership of property. Those verses show that there are major portions of the Old Testament that are obviously fraudulent and were formed with the corrupt purpose of trying to control the people.

We should also take a look at the famous story of David and Goliath.

1 Samuel 17:4

*A champion named Goliath, who was from Gath, came out of the Philistine camp. He was over nine feet tall.*

1 Samuel 17:7

*His spear shaft was like a weaver's rod, and its iron point weighed six hundred shekels. His shield bearer went ahead of him.*

1 Samuel 17:48-50

*As the Philistine moved closer to attack him, David ran quickly toward the battle line to meet him. Reaching into his bag and taking out a stone, he slung it and struck the Philistine on the forehead. The stone sank into his forehead, and he fell facedown on the ground.*

*So David triumphed over the Philistine with a sling and a stone; without a sword in his hand he struck down the Philistine and killed him.*

We should now take a look at a story that is not so famous.

2 Samuel 21:19

*In another battle with the Philistines at Gob, Elhanan son of Jaare-Oregim the Bethlehemite killed Goliath the Gittite, who had a spear with a shaft like a weaver's rod.*

1 Samuel describes an extravagant story about David defeating Goliath in a battle with the Philistines and that story describes Goliath as having a spear shaft like a weaver's rod. 2 Samuel describes a less extravagant story about someone named Elhanan defeating Goliath in a battle with the Philistines and that story describes Goliath as having a spear shaft like a weaver's rod. The Goliath in the story in 1 Samuel is described as being from Gath and the Goliath in the story in 2 Samuel is described as a Gittite, and a Gittite is someone who is from Gath. So both stories describe their respective Goliaths as being from the same place. Both stories describe a battle with the Philistines, describe someone named Goliath from Gath being defeated, and describe their respective Goliath with a spear shaft like a weaver's rod. The only main difference is that David is the victor in one story and Elhanan is the victor in the other. It seems obvious that at least one of these stories is fraudulent and that one was copied from the other one. There doesn't seem to be much reason to copy details from an extravagant tale about King David to produce a brief and simple story about someone who isn't mentioned anywhere else in the Bible, but there's plenty of reason to copy details from anywhere to produce a legendary story about King David. Therefore, the

legendary story about David defeating Goliath was probably copied from the story in 2 Samuel. That shows that one of the most famous stories in the Old Testament appears to be fraudulent.

Similar to the New Testament, the presence of fraud does not necessarily invalidate the entirety of the text. As with the New Testament, we will have to slice the Old Testament text to separate truth from fraud.

The first component of any Old Testament narrative that we should analyze is the Hebrew words that are often used to refer to God. The English version of the Old Testament often shows the name “the Lord” and the name “God”. The name “the Lord” is often translated from the Hebrew word יהוה (“Yahweh”), which should really be translated as “Yahweh”. “Yahweh” was the name that God was often called by Israelites in ancient times. The name “God” is often translated from the Hebrew word אֱלֹהִים (“Elohim”), which originally was a word that referred to the pantheon of Canaanite “gods”. The use of the word “Elohim” shows that there was Canaanite influence on the Israelite community even to the point that the Hebrew language was altered to use a Canaanite word to refer to God. Additionally, the name “Israel” comes from the Hebrew word יִשְׂרָאֵל (“yisra’el”); and the Hebrew word אֵל (“el”), which is shown at the end of the Hebrew word for Israel, refers to the chief Canaanite “god” named El. That shows that the last two letters of “Israel” seem to have come from the name of the chief Canaanite “god” El.

The use of the word “Elohim” begins with the very first verse of the Bible.

Genesis 1:1

*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.*

In Genesis 1:1, the word translated as “God” is translated from the Hebrew word for “Elohim”. An alternative translation follows.

Genesis 1:1

*In the beginning Elohim created the heavens and the earth.*

Genesis 17:1 provides an example of the use of the name “El”.

Genesis 17:1

*When Abram was ninety-nine years old, the Lord appeared to him and said, “I am God Almighty; walk before me and be blameless.”*

The part of Genesis 17:1 that is shown as “I am God” should really be translated as “I am El”.

Canaanites, who were polytheists, infiltrated the Israelite community so much so that the word “Elohim” and the name “El”, polytheistic terms used by the Canaanites, are often used in the Bible to refer to God; and the name “El” is represented in the name “Israel” even to this day. One objection is that the word “Elohim” and the name “El” were eventually adopted as monotheistic terms. Even if that were the case, the word “Elohim” and the name “El” have Canaanite and polytheistic origins. So for the word “Elohim” or the name “El” to have ever been integrated into the Bible in the first place, whether in a polytheistic way or a monotheistic way, a Biblical author would seem to have been influenced by Canaanite culture in some way because it was the Canaanite society from which those words came. So, one way or another, Canaanite culture influenced the Israelite society in such a way that a word that originally referred to the

Canaanite pantheon of “gods” is used in the Bible to refer to God, and the name of the chief Canaanite “god” is represented in the name “Israel” even to this day. Furthermore, the suffix of “Elohim”, “im”, refers to plurality in the Hebrew language, so every instance of the word “Elohim” as a reference to God is the use of a plural word to refer to God. There is only one God so a plural word should never be used to refer to God. The use of this plural word shows the presence of polytheistic influence.

Some of the authors of the Bible used polytheistic terms when referring to God and many archaeological findings show that many of the people who inhabited Israel in ancient times were polytheists. But it’s not just that polytheistic terms were used. There are actually polytheistic beliefs represented in the Bible.

First, we will take a look at a narrative that describes actions committed by priests and then we will examine certain verses that show polytheistic beliefs.

Ezekiel 8:9-11

*And he said to me, “Go in and see the wicked and detestable things they are doing here.” So I went in and looked, and I saw portrayed all over the walls all kinds of crawling things and detestable animals and all the idols of the house of Israel. In front of them stood seventy elders of the house of Israel, and Jaazaniah son of Shapan was standing among them. Each had a censer in his hand, and a fragrant cloud of incense was rising.*

Ezekiel 8:16

*He then brought me into the inner court of the house of the Lord, and there at the entrance to the temple, between the portico and the altar, were about twenty-five men. With their backs toward the temple of the Lord and their faces toward the east, they were bowing down to the sun in the east.*

These verses from the book of Ezekiel describe elders of the temple as having worshipped idols and as having practiced polytheistic rituals. So we have seen that there are polytheistic words used to refer to God, there have been idols found in archaeological excavations in Israel, and some elders of the temple seem to have worshipped idols and practiced polytheistic rituals. In addition to all of that, we will now examine verses that show polytheistic beliefs.

Genesis 1:26

*Then God said, “Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground.”*

This verse describes God as having used the words “us” and “our”. Additionally, only the word “Elohim” is used in chapter 1 of Genesis to refer to God. The use of the words “us” and “our” to describe words used by God shows polytheistic beliefs. Some Christians propose that this is evidence of the concept of the Trinity. However, chapter 1 of Genesis was probably written hundreds of years, maybe even more than a millennium, before the first century. If the author intended the words “us” and “our” to refer to the concept of the Trinity, then the concept of the Trinity would have been communicated among people hundreds of years, maybe even more than a millennium, before the first century. That is incredibly unrealistic because Christ appeared in the first century and so the concept of the Trinity wouldn’t realistically have been known by any human being before the first century. So it’s unrealistic to believe that the author of chapter 1 of Genesis was aware of the concept of the Trinity.



We will go into more detail about the concept of the Trinity and how that concept developed in Part 4. For now, we simply need to recognize that there probably wasn't a single person who had ever heard of the concept of the Trinity before the first century, and so the author of chapter 1 of Genesis probably wasn't aware of the concept of the Trinity and probably was really writing from a polytheistic perspective. Additionally, as will be shown shortly, polytheistic writing was very common in ancient Israel and some of that polytheistic writing made its way into the Hebrew Bible and later on the Old Testament. So Genesis 1:26 was probably written without any awareness of the concept of the Trinity and seems to include polytheistic references.

There are other references in the Bible that show that some authors of the Bible seem to have believed in a "divine council".

Genesis 6:1-3

*When men began to increase in number on the earth and daughters were born to them, the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful, and they married any of them they chose. Then the Lord said, "My Spirit will not contend with man forever, for he is mortal; his days will be a hundred and twenty years."*

1 Kings 22:19

*Micaiah continued, "Therefore hear the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his throne with all the host of heaven standing around him on his right and on his left."*

Psalm 82:1

*God presides in the great assembly; he gives judgment among the "gods".*

Psalm 82:6

*"I said, 'You are "gods"; you are all sons of the Most High.'"*

Isaiah 6:8

*Then I heard the voice of the Lord saying, "Whom shall I send? And who will go for us?"  
And I said, "Here am I. Send me!"*

Genesis 6:1-3 describe the "sons of God" who are portrayed as divine beings who had disappointed God and who would no longer have God's Spirit with them after 120 years. That leads into the flood narrative. 1 Kings 22:19 describes a council as "all the host of heaven". Psalm 82:1 and Psalm 82:6 both specifically refer to multiple "gods". Psalm 82:1 describes God as having presided over an assembly. Isaiah 6:8, similar to Genesis 1:26, describes God as having used the word "us". These verses present a set of beliefs that are similar to beliefs about the Canaanite pantheon of "gods". In Canaanite culture, El was believed to have been the chief creator "god" and there were also beliefs about a group of subordinate "gods". Then as we turn to the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament, we see the name "El" that originally referred to the chief Canaanite "god", we see the word "Elohim" that originally referred to the Canaanite pantheon of "gods", and we see verses that refer to an assembly of supposed divine beings. It seems that some Canaanite theology made its way into the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament.

Genesis 33:20 provides an incredible example.

Genesis 33:20

*There he set up an altar and called it El Elohe Israel.*

“El Elohe Israel” in Genesis 33:20 is often translated as “God, God of Israel”. There are two different Hebrew words in Genesis 33:20 that refer to God: “El” and “Elohe”. Since there are two different words that refer to God, it is more appropriate to view one of those words as a name. From that perspective, “El” would represent a name and that name was the name of the chief Canaanite “god”, and “Elohe Israel” would represent “God of Israel”. An alternative translation follows.

Genesis 33:20

*There he set up an altar and called it El God of Israel.*

Genesis 33:20 suggests that the chief Canaanite “god” El was the “god” of Israel. Genesis 33:20 provides incredibly specific evidence of Canaanite theology in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament.

Again, an objection that can be made is that “El” and “Elohim” were adopted as monotheistic terms. It is true that those words have been used in monotheistic ways, even though such writing is technically incorrect from a linguistic perspective. Nevertheless, there are two points that stand. One is that for polytheistic words to be used incorrectly as monotheistic words, those polytheistic words would first have to be introduced into the society that would eventually use them in a monotheistic way. Even if a particular author used a polytheistic word incorrectly as a monotheistic word, it would still stand that the society was influenced by polytheistic thinking at some point. For those polytheistic words to be used at all, polytheism must have been some sort of influence at some point, even if that point had already passed by the time that a particular document was written. The second point is that the name “El” is being specifically used to refer to the “god of Israel”. “El” is the name of the chief Canaanite “god”. The name “El” has its origin in polytheism. If a monotheist used the name “El” to refer to God, then that person was influenced by a society that at some point was influenced by polytheism because that’s where that name came from. For a name that has its roots in polytheism, the use of that name must be a part of a sequence that began with polytheistic thinking. Furthermore, the name “Yahweh” is the name that is specifically introduced in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament as the name that God is supposed to be called. So the use of another name, not just a word but a specific name, that isn’t the name “Yahweh” is evidence that there was an external influence such as Canaanite theology.

As we turn back to Psalm 82:1, more evidence can be seen that the use of the name “El” and the word “Elohim” are specifically tied to polytheistic beliefs.

Psalm 82:1

*God presides in the great assembly; he gives judgment among the “gods”.*

Psalm 82:1 is translated from the following Hebrew words.

אֱלֹהִים (“elohim”) אֵל (“el”) בְּקִרְבָּן (“beqereb”) אֵלֶּיךָ (“ba-a-dat”) בְּעֵדוּתָם (“nissab”) אֱלֹהִים (“elohim”) מִזְמוֹר (“mizmor”) לְאָסָפִי (“leasap”) אֱלֹהִים (“yispat”)

Those Hebrew words can be translated as follows.

A Psalm of Asaph. Elohim stand in the assembly of El. Among Elohim will be judged.

Psalm 82:1 uses the word “Elohim” twice and the name “El” once. The second mention of the word “Elohim” is correctly translated as “gods”. The last part of Psalm 82:1 expresses that “gods” will be judged, meaning that subordinate divine beings will be judged. The question becomes about how to properly understand the part before that: “Elohim stand in the assembly of El”. The second mention of the word “Elohim” is in reference to subordinate divine beings and that shows evidence that the first mention of the word “Elohim” should be understood in the same way. Additionally, since both the word “Elohim” and the name “El” are used in the same sentence, the word “Elohim” probably represents a different kind of reference than the name “El”; and “El” is the name of chief Canaanite “god”, so that is further evidence that the first mention of the word “Elohim” does not refer to the Creator of the world and instead refers to subordinate divine beings. Furthermore, since both the word “Elohim” and the name “El” are used, it seems that polytheistic theology is involved, in which case “Elohim” should be understood in a polytheistic way. An alternative translation follows.

Psalm 82:1

*A Psalm of Asaph. The “gods” stand in the assembly of El. Among the “gods” will be judged.*

That alternative translation expresses that the subordinate divine beings stand in the assembly of El and that they will be judged. In Psalm 82:1, the word “Elohim” is specifically used in a polytheistic way. Psalm 82:1 describes an assembly of divine beings. Any expression of multiple divine beings is inherently polytheistic. Not only is the word “Elohim” being used in a polytheistic way, but also among this polytheistic writing, the name “El” is used. Psalm 82:1 expresses that there are multiple divine beings and that subordinate divine beings will be judged by “El”. That shows that the Bible uses both the word “Elohim” and the name “El” in polytheistic ways. Even if those words are sometimes used in a monotheistic way, they are obviously also used in the Bible in polytheistic ways.

Psalm 82:6 doubles down on what was just shown by Psalm 82:1

Psalm 82:6

*“I said, ‘You are “gods”; you are all sons of the Most High.’”*

Psalm 82:6 refers to multiple divine beings and describes them as “sons of the Most High”. Both Psalm 82:1 and Psalm 82:6 are very similar to Canaanite theology that describes El as the chief creator “god” and the creator of subordinate divine beings. Psalm 82:1 even specifically uses the name “El”.

Exodus 6:3 shows further evidence of Canaanite influence and takes us even deeper into what was going on with theology in ancient Israel.

Exodus 6:3

*“I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as God Almighty, but by my name the Lord I did not make myself known to them.”*

The Hebrew word used in Exodus 6:3 that is translated to the name “God” is the Hebrew word for “El”. The Hebrew word that is translated as “Almighty” is the Hebrew word for “Sad-day”. The meaning of “Sad-day” is unknown. Some translate it as “the mountains” or “the wilderness” instead of “Almighty”. So those translations would be “El of the mountains” or “El of the wilderness” instead of “God Almighty”. The Hebrew word that is translated to the name “the Lord” is the Hebrew word for the name “Yahweh”. An alternative translation follows.

Exodus 6:3

*"I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El Sad-day, but by my name Yahweh I did not make myself known to them."*

Exodus 6:3 suggests that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew God by the name of the chief Canaanite "god" El. The writing in of the name "El" shows a likely attempt to convince people to use the name "Yahweh" instead of the name "El". The verse describes God as having expressed that God was formerly known as "El", and the verse indicates that God is now known as "Yahweh". The use of the name "El" in Exodus 6:3 is evidence that there was an attempt to convince people to use the name "Yahweh" instead of the name "El". That shows evidence of conversion tactics. Such tactics are still used today. Christian missionaries often use religious concepts of native people to explain Christianity to them. Exodus 6:3 shows an attempt to convince people to be more in line with the Hebrew religion. We've seen that there is archaeological evidence that shows that many people in ancient Israel were polytheists, we've seen not only polytheistic language but also polytheistic beliefs represented in the Bible, and now we've seen from Exodus 6:3 evidence of conversion tactics. Exodus 6:3 is incredible evidence of the struggle between monotheism and polytheism in ancient Israel, and further confirms the presence of Canaanite theology that was within ancient Israelite society and is in the Bible today.

The Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament describe the Israelites escaping Egypt, wandering the desert for 40 years, and then conquering a part of Canaan that eventually became Israel. Many biblical scholars believe that the Israelites established themselves in Israel, which was a part of Canaan, sometime around the 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE or before. Canaan encompassed a larger area than just the land that became Israel. There were several relatively heavily populated cities throughout Canaan. These Canaanite cities were developed societies with governmental leadership in place. To the southwest was Egypt. The Egyptian Empire was the main power-house for much of the timeline described in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament, particularly in the 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE. Ramses II seems to have been the Egyptian Pharaoh from 1279-1213 BCE. Many believe that the beginning of the book of Exodus describes a time-period during the reign of Ramses II because there is the description of forced labor building two cities, which matches archaeological evidence of two cities that were apparently built by forced labor during the reign of Ramses II. After him, Merneptah seems to have ruled from 1213-1203 BCE. An important piece of archeological evidence is the Merneptah Stele, which many believe shows an inscription that can be translated as "Israel". If the Merneptah Stele really does refer to Israel, then that shows that Israel was established as a community by the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE. During that time-period, the Egyptian Empire had a strong hold on the cities in Canaan. Meanwhile, apart from the Merneptah Stele, which is an Egyptian artifact, many archaeological findings of excavations in Israel show that a unique community developed in the highlands of Israel, which was in western Canaan during that time-period. The community that became known as Israel was in the land of Canaan and we can see that Canaanite culture influenced some of the documents in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament.

The Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament are mostly written from the perspective of the kingdom of Judah. Far less attention is given to the kingdom of Israel and it is described as having been a rogue kingdom that was involved with polytheism. The kingdom of Judah is described as having carried on the legacy of King David. The Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament are clearly mostly written from a Judahite perspective.

There are four very important points to recognize. The first is that the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament use the word “Elohim” and the name “El”, and also express some polytheistic beliefs. The second is that the name “Israel” contains the name of the chief Canaanite “god” El. The third is that the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament favor the kingdom of Judah. The fourth is that the name “Yahweh” is used much more often than the word “Elohim” and the name “El” in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. So the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament favor the kingdom of Judah and use the name “Yahweh” much more often than the word “Elohim” and the name “El”, and the name “Israel” contains the name of the chief Canaanite “god” El. With all of that information having been presented, the use of the word “Elohim” and the name “El” seem to be more linked to the kingdom of Israel than to the kingdom of Judah.

If the use of the word “Elohim” was not as common in the kingdom of Judah, and the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament favor the kingdom of Judah, then how did the word “Elohim” or the name “El” end up in the Bible at all?

The kingdom of Israel was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire in the 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE. After that, the kingdom of Judah became the main kingdom in Israel. In the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE, the kingdom of Judah was attacked by the Babylonian Empire and the temple in Jerusalem was destroyed. Many of the educated Israelites were taken captive and sent into exile in Babylon. A common belief is that the use of the word “Elohim” and the name “El” in the Bible came about through the compilation of documents during the Exile, which many also believe is how the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament took on a lot of their current form. The theory is that Israelites compiled documents together while exiled in Babylon to maintain their community amongst the Babylonian society, and that some of those documents were Yahwist documents and some were Elohist documents.

An example of the combination of the name “Yahweh” and the word “Elohim” is the flood narrative. The following are alternative translations that show the name “Yahweh” and the word “Elohim” instead of the name “the Lord” and the name “God”.

Genesis 6:2

*Then Yahweh said, “My Spirit will not contend with man forever, for he is mortal; his days will be a hundred and twenty years.”*

Genesis 6:5-7

*Yahweh saw how great man’s wickedness on the earth had become, and that every inclination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the time. Yahweh was grieved that he had made man on the earth, and his heart was filled with pain. So Yahweh said, “I will wipe mankind, whom I have created, from the face of the earth – men and animals, and creatures that move along the ground, and birds of the air – for I am grieved that I have made them.”*

Genesis 6:12-13

*Elohim saw how corrupt the earth had become for all the people on earth had corrupted their ways. So Elohim said to Noah, “I am going to put an end to all people, for the earth is filled with violence because of them. I am surely going to destroy both them and the earth.”*

Genesis 6:22

*Noah did everything just as Elohim commanded him.*

An interesting point to take notice of is that verses 6:12-13 seem to mirror verses 6:5-7. Verses 6:5-7 and verses 6:12-13 seem to contain the same kind of information while verses 6:5-7 use the name “Yahweh” and verses 6:12-13 use the word “Elohim”. That is specific evidence that documents that contained the word “Yahweh” were combined together with documents that contained the word “Elohim”. Otherwise, there likely wouldn’t be both verses 6:5-7 and verses 6:12-13 because they contain such similar information. The redundancy among them and the different terminology used in each of them show that they were likely combined together from different documents that were originally written by different people who used different terminology.

Given that the word “Elohim” is a polytheistic term, and therefore the use of the word “Elohim” contradicts the use of the name “Yahweh”, it is justified to believe that most biblical authors were unlikely to have used both the name “Yahweh” and the word “Elohim” to refer to God. So it would seem that the use of the name “Yahweh” and the word “Elohim” to refer to God within the same narrative shows that different documents that used different terminology were combined together to form fuller narratives.

There are other examples that show that different pieces of writing were compiled together.

Chapters 15 and 17 of Genesis contain similar narratives about a covenant. It is believed that one covenant was made with Abraham, but Genesis contains two different narratives about similar covenants. Additionally, chapter 15 uses the name “Yahweh” while chapter 17 uses the word “Elohim”. So not only were there two different narratives circulating about a covenant with Abraham, but they each contain different terminology. That shows that different documents that used different terminology were combined together to form fuller narratives.

Genesis: 15:5

*He took him outside and said, “Look up at the heavens and the stars – if indeed you can count them.” Then he said to him, “So shall your offspring be.”*

Genesis 15:18-21

*On that day the Lord made a covenant with Abram and said, “To your descendants I give this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the Euphrates – the land of the Kenites, Kenizzites, Kadmonites, Hittites, Perizzites, Rephaites, Amorites, Canaanites, Girgashites, and Jebusites.”*

Genesis 17:3-4

*Abram fell facedown, and God said to him, “As for me, this is my covenant with you: You will be father of many nations.”*

Genesis 17:8

*The whole land of Canaan, where you are now an alien, I will give as an everlasting possession to you and your descendants after you; and I will be their God.”*

Chapters 32 and 35 of Genesis contain similar narratives about Jacob being named Israel. Presumably, there would have only been one time that Jacob’s name was changed to Israel, but Genesis contains two different narratives about the same name change.

Genesis 32:28

*Then the man said, "Your name will no longer be Jacob, but Israel, because you have struggled with God and with men and have overcome."*

Genesis 35:10

*God said to him, "Your name is Jacob, but you will no longer be called Jacob; your name will be Israel." So he named him Israel.*

Chapters 28 and 35 of Genesis contain similar narratives about the naming of Bethel. Realistically, there would have only been one naming of that city as Bethel.

Genesis 28:18-19

*Early the next morning Jacob took the stone he had placed under his head and set it up as a pillar and poured oil on top of it. He called that place Bethel, though the city used to be called Luz.*

Genesis 35:6-7

*Jacob and all the people with him came to Luz (that is, Bethel) in the land of Canaan. There he built an altar and he called the place El Bethel, because it was there that God reeled himself to him when he was fleeing from his brother.*

Genesis 35:14-15

*Jacob set up a stone pillar at the place where God had talked with him, and he poured out a drink offering on it; he also poured oil on it. Jacob called the place where God had talked with him Bethel.*

Those verses about a covenant, about Jacob being named Israel, and about the naming of Bethel show that there are duplicate narratives contained in Genesis. That redundancy shows that different sources seem to have been combined together.

Based on the difference in use of the name "Yahweh" and the word "Elohim", the compilation of the Hebrew Bible was obviously a messy process. You can find the name "the Lord" in one sentence and the name "God" in another, which often shows that the name "Yahweh" is used in one sentence and the word "Elohim" is used in the other. That is because there were some documents that were written by people who used the name "Yahweh" to refer to God and there were other documents that were written by people who used the Canaanite word "Elohim". It seems that different pieces from different documents that used different terminology were spliced together. Those who compiled what eventually became known as the Hebrew Bible and later the Old Testament probably took information from different sets of documents in an attempt to create a fuller set of scriptures. Some documents had the same information and some documents had different information, so different pieces of information were probably combined together to present more narratives and fuller narratives. The flood narrative is a great example of that.

So far, we can see that it seems that different documents from different sources that used different terminology were combined together to form what eventually became the Hebrew Bible and later the Old Testament. The question now becomes about when this compilation took place. As previously asserted, it is commonly believed that this compilation took place during the Babylonian Exile. Specific evidence for that assertion can be found in the Tower of Babel narrative in chapter 11 of Genesis.

Genesis 11:1-9

*Now the whole world had one language and a common speech. As men moved eastward, they found a plain in Shinar and settled there.*

*They said to each other, "Come, let's make bricks and bake them thoroughly." They used brick instead of stone, and tar for mortar. Then they said, "Come, let us build ourselves a city, with a tower that reaches to the heavens, so that we may make a name for ourselves and not be scattered over the face of the whole earth."*

*But the Lord came down to see the city and the tower that the men were building. The Lord said, "If as one people speaking the same language they have begun to do this, then nothing they plan to do will be impossible for them. Come, let us go down and confuse their language so they will not understand each other."*

*So the Lord scattered them from there over all the earth, and they stopped building the city. That is why it was called Babel – because there the Lord confused the language of the whole world. From there the Lord scattered them over the face of the whole earth.*

The narrative begins by describing the entire human race as having one language and one common speech, then goes on to describe God as having spread the human race all over the earth to confuse their language so that they wouldn't understand each other, then explains that the town is called Babel because there God confused the language of the whole world, and then portrays this narrative as the explanation for why there are human beings all over the world. So according to this narrative, the entire human race was in Babel before being spread throughout the world. The Hebrew word that gets translated to "Babel" is בָּבֶל ("Babel"), which is the same Hebrew word that gets translated elsewhere as "Babylon". So this narrative describes the entire human race as having been in Babylon before having been spread throughout the world. That shows evidence that the Tower of Babel (Babylon) narrative was probably produced during the Babylonian Exile.

Another example in chapter 11 of Genesis that shows writing that was likely produced during the Babylonian Exile is the description of Abraham as having been from Ur.

Genesis 11:31

*Terah took his son Abram, his grandson Lot son of Haran, and his daughter-in-law Sarai, the wife of his son Abram, and together they set out from Ur of The Chaldeans to go to Canaan. But when they came to Haran, they settled there.*

The Bible describes Abraham as having been from Ur and Ur appears to have been relatively close to Babylon. The mentioning of Ur is probably indicative of writing that was produced during the Babylonian Exile. Additionally, Ur is described as "Ur of the Chaldeans". "Chaldeans" comes from the Hebrew word כַּשְׁדִּימ ("kasdim"). 2 Kings 25:10-11 can give us a good understanding of what "Chaldeans" refers to.

2 Kings 25:10-11

*The whole Babylonian army, under the commander of the imperial guard, broke down the walls around Jerusalem. Nebuzaradan the commander of the guard carried into exile the people who remained in the city, along with the rest of the populace and those who had gone over to the king of Babylon.*

Both the "Babylonian army" and the "king of Babylon" are referred to in 2 Kings 25:10-11. In the second sentence, the word "Babylon" in the phrase "king of Babylon" is translated from the Hebrew word בָּבֶל ("babel"), which as previously shown means "Babylon". In the first sentence, the word "Babylonian" in



the phrase “Babylonian army” is translated from the same Hebrew word that is translated in Genesis 11:31 as “Chaldeans”: “kasdim”. That shows that the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament equate “Chaldeans” with “Babylonians”. Therefore, “Ur of the Chaldeans” can be interpreted as “Ur of the Babylonians”, which would make sense anyway since Ur appears to have been so close to Babylon and appears to have been a part of the Babylonian Empire. That shows further evidence that the description of Abraham as having been from Ur probably originated during the Babylonian Exile.

Another example of writing that was likely produced during the Babylonian Exile is Ezekiel 26:7.

Ezekiel 26:7

*“For this is what the Sovereign Lord says: From the north I am going to bring against Tyre Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, king of kings, with horses and chariots, with horsemen and a great army.”*

Ezekiel 26:7 describes Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, as “king of kings”. Such an impressive compliment for the king of Babylon wasn’t likely to be produced unless the kingdom of Judah had already been destroyed and Israelites were in exile in Babylon. There probably wouldn’t be much reason to produce such a compliment unless the king of Babylon was the author’s direct ruler. That shows evidence that the author of Ezekiel 26:7 was probably in exile in Babylon when they wrote that verse, which shows evidence that Ezekiel 26:7 was probably produced during the Babylonian Exile.

Isaiah 45:1, which is the verse presented in the introduction of this book that was shown to describe the Persian king Cyrus as a messiah, shows an example of writing that was probably written towards the end of the Babylonian Exile or afterward.

Isaiah 45:1

*“This is what the Lord says to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I take hold of to subdue nations before him and to strip kings of their armor, to open doors before him so that gates will not be shut.”*

The book of Isaiah was supposedly written by someone named Isaiah who lived during and/or shortly after the reign of the kingdom of Israel, which was before the Babylonian Exile. However, Isaiah 45:1 references the Persian king Cyrus who was the king who ended the Exile for the Israelites. So Isaiah 45:1 seems to have been written toward the end of the Babylonian Exile or afterward, and since the book of Isaiah is proposed to have been written long before then, Isaiah 45:1 seems to serve as an example of a fraudulent alteration that was made during or after the Exile.

We should now analyze the Adam and Eve narratives. While we are still in search of traces of writing that was produced during the Babylonian Exile, our analysis of the Adam and Eve narratives will also go beyond that search.

## **Adam and Eve**

There is so much mystery to Adam and Eve. Were they the first human beings to have ever existed? Are we all descendants of Adam and Eve? What about the scientific theory of evolution? Was there a Garden of Eden? Was there a talking snake? Did Eve take an apple?

There are two points to recognize at the onset of our analysis of the Adam and Eve narratives. The first is that these narratives describe God as if God does not have foreknowledge. God is described as making decisions based on the sins of Adam and Eve. That could only be true if God does not have foreknowledge. If Eve was a real person and really did take an apple, then God would have known that was going to happen before it happened. That shows that there is false theology in the Adam and Eve narratives. The second point is that the Hebrew word that is translated to “Adam” is the Hebrew word that means “man”. That shows that Adam is probably an allegorical character. A character named “man” is likely an archetype for an allegorical story. So there are two points already that show problems with the Adam and Eve narratives and show the likely fraudulent nature of those narratives. We should keep these points in focus as we proceed with our analysis.

The Adam and Eve narratives are a fascinating example of a certain writing style and provide insight into the development of the language that probably occurred during the Exile. Chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis show a translation of “the Lord God”, but a more accurate translation would be “Yahweh Elohim”. That shows that the name “Yahweh” and the word “Elohim” are oddly placed right next to each other. In fact, the only time that those chapters don’t do that when either word is used within the Adam and Eve narratives is when there is dialogue in quotations, in which case only the word “Elohim” is used. Besides that, chapters 2 and 3 run at a 100% rate for showing the name “Yahweh” and the word “Elohim” right next to each other when either of them is used within the Adam and Eve narratives. It’s one thing if they’re used in adjacent paragraphs; it’s another when they’re used in the same sentence, let alone right next to each other. Those words being presented right next to each other and at a 100% rate shows that the text was probably not combined together from different sources but was probably originally produced that way. However, it is incredibly strange to use both of those words right next to each other and at a rate of 100% nonetheless. That is a major reason why the Adam and Eve narratives seem to provide such an incredible example of what seems to have gone on during the Exile.

The name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name only occurs 36 times throughout the entire Old Testament. To put that into some perspective, God is referred to over 800 times in just Genesis and Exodus combined. There are 39 books in the Old Testament and through just the first two, God is referred to over 800 times. Meanwhile, the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name only occurs 36 times throughout the entire Old Testament. So obviously the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name is an incredibly rare instance. Additionally, 20 of those 36 instances occur just within chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis. So chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis contain the majority of the instances of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name while only 16 occur throughout the rest of the Old Testament. With all of that information having been presented, the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis represent a very rare writing style in the Old Testament. Such a rare writing style shows that the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were probably originally produced during the Babylonian Exile. Again, a biblical author was unlikely to have used both the name “Yahweh” and the word “Elohim” to refer to God. So the use of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name in chapter 2 and 3 of Genesis shows that something very unique in history was going on, like the compilation of documents during the Babylonian Exile.

As shown in Exodus 6:3 and as can be shown by other verses, there seems to have been an effort to guide people to use the name “Yahweh”. Many different names and words were used back then among the people who inhabited Israel. People seem to have been guided to use the name “Yahweh” instead of words or names like “Elohim”, “El”, and “Bel”. Given that chapter 1 of Genesis only refers to God with

the word “Elohim”, the use of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name in the very next chapter appears to provide a bridge from the use of the word “Elohim” to the use of the name “Yahweh”. Chapter 4 of Genesis then uses the name “Yahweh” to refer to God. Chapter 1 only uses the word “Elohim”, Chapters 2 and 3 use the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name, and chapter 4 uses the name “Yahweh”. So the writing style of chapters 2 and 3 seem to provide a bridge from the use of the word “Elohim” in chapter 1 to the use of the name “Yahweh” in chapter 4. Such a bridge was likely formed as a finishing touch to a compilation, and such a compilation likely occurred during the Babylonian Exile. Additionally, the use of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name was not likely a later alteration to chapters 2 and 3. The use of the word “Elohim” in chapter 1 and the general variation of words to refer to God throughout the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament is evidence that the authors of the Bible don’t seem to have usually changed the wording of previously written material. They seem to have added and subtracted material, but they don’t seem to have usually changed words within previously written material. If they had, then chapter 1 of Genesis likely wouldn’t use the word “Elohim” 32 times and there would likely be less variation of words used to refer to God throughout the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. Furthermore, if a biblical author was willing to add the name “Yahweh” to writing that already used the word “Elohim”, then that author likely would have been willing to do that to chapter 1 of Genesis, and the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name probably would appear more often throughout the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. So the use of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name was likely a part of the original production of chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis. The rarity of the use of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name shows that something very unique in history was going on, like the compilation of documents during the Babylonian Exile. Hypothetically, if a biblical author was willing to add the name “Yahweh” to writing that already used the word “Elohim” during the Babylonian Exile, then that probably would have been done to chapter 1 of Genesis. So again, the use of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name was likely a part of the original production of chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis. Therefore, if the use of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name came about during the compilation of documents, then chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were likely originally produced during that time-period, and therefore would appear to be fraudulent productions.

Additionally, the fact that only the word “Elohim” is used in quoted dialogue as opposed to the use of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name outside of quoted dialogue shows that chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were probably produced after the original production of Exodus because that contrast seems to take into account information that is found in Exodus. Exodus describes the alleged introduction of the name “Yahweh” to Moses in Midian. Since the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name is used outside of quoted dialogue at a 100% rate in the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis, the exclusion of the name “Yahweh” within quoted dialogue seems to take into account that introduction in Exodus of the name “Yahweh” by avoiding describing any character as knowing the name “Yahweh”. Therefore, it is justified to believe that the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were originally produced sometime after the original production of Exodus. That is striking because chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis supposedly describe the creation of the human race and so that story would seem to have existed long before the story told in Exodus. So the exclusion of the name “Yahweh” in quoted dialogue in the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis is evidence that those chapters are probably fraudulent.

One objection could be that narratives in Genesis were passed down, orally or in written form, with the awareness that the name “Yahweh” was not known to the people described in the narratives, and therefore the exclusion of the name “Yahweh” in quoted dialogue in the Adam and Eve narratives is not necessarily

an indication that those narratives were produced after the initial production of the book of Exodus. If that were the case, then every narrative in Genesis should exclude the name “Yahweh” in quoted dialogue because all of Genesis describes a time-period before the one in the book of Exodus when it describes the presentation of the name “Yahweh” to Moses. So according to the Bible, every person described in Genesis should not have known the name “Yahweh” yet. Therefore, if narratives were passed down through the generations in a way that took that into account, then there shouldn’t be a single narrative in Genesis that shows the name “Yahweh” in quoted dialogue. However, the name “Yahweh” is shown in quoted dialogue in chapters 9, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, and 49. The name “Yahweh” appears in quoted dialogue in over a quarter of the chapters in Genesis. Furthermore, 13 different people are described as having spoken the name “Yahweh” in Genesis: Noah, Abraham, Sarah, the servant of Abraham, Isaac, Rebekah, Abimelech, Ahuzzath (personal advisor of Abimelech), Phicol (commander of forces of Abimelech), Jacob, Leah, Rachel, and Laban. If narratives were passed down in a way that took into account the presentation of the name “Yahweh” to Moses in the book of Exodus, then there shouldn’t have been a single appearance of the name “Yahweh” in quoted dialogue throughout all of Genesis. Therefore, the abundance of appearances of the name “Yahweh” in quoted dialogue throughout Genesis shows that narratives were not passed down in a way that accounted for the presentation of the name “Yahweh” to Moses in the book of Exodus. So it appears that the exclusion of the name “Yahweh” in quoted dialogue in the Adam and Eve narratives is a result of those narratives having been produced after the book of Exodus was already in circulation. That conclusion provides clear evidence that the Adam and Eve narratives are fraudulent.

Also, chapters 2 and 3 show some striking resemblances to text found in the book of Ezekiel.

Ezekiel 28:11-15

*The word of the Lord came to me. “Son of man, take up a lament concerning the king of Tyre and say to him: “This is what the Sovereign Lord says: ‘You were the model of perfection, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. You were in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone adorned you: ruby, topaz and emerald, chrysolite, onyx and jasper, sapphire, turquoise and beryl. Your settings and mountings were made of gold; on the day you were created they were prepared. You were anointed as a guardian cherub, for so I ordained you. You were on the holy mount of God; you walked among the fiery stones. You were blameless in your ways from the day you were created till wickedness was found in you.’ ”*

The book of Ezekiel refers to the Garden of Eden and also refers to a king being exiled from Eden, which is incredibly similar not only to the Adam and Eve narratives but also to the destruction of the temple and the Babylonian Exile. In all three cases, there was access to supposedly sacred space and then there was an exile from that supposedly sacred space. If the Garden of Eden was a real garden that Adam and Eve were actually in and then exiled from, then the book of Ezekiel probably wouldn’t describe a king who wasn’t Adam or Eve having been exiled from the Garden of Eden. That would be unrealistic because the Garden of Eden is described in chapter 3 of Genesis as having been guarded from the human race. Who was this king who wasn’t Adam or Eve who was supposedly exiled from the Garden of Eden?

Given that a king of Tyre is described as having been in Eden, as having been on the “holy mount of God”, and as having been anointed by God as a “guardian cherub”, we can view being in Eden, being on the “holy mount of God”, and being anointed by God as a “guardian cherub” as equivalent to each other. That would then mean that being in Eden means being on the “holy mount of God” and/or being anointed

by God as a “guardian cherub”. In other words, being in Eden can be viewed as an allegorical reference to having a certain religious status.

Given the mentioning of someone who wasn’t Adam or Eve, a king of Tyre, as having been in Eden, the mentioning of the Garden of Eden in Genesis is probably allegorical. Like the book of Ezekiel, Genesis is probably referring to a certain religious status when referring to Eden and not to an actual garden. Genesis 2:15 can be viewed that way and compared to what was described about the king of Tyre mentioned in Ezekiel 28:11-15.

Genesis 2:15

*The Lord God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and take care of it.*

Similar to how Ezekiel 28:11-15 describe a king of Tyre as having been in Eden and as having been ordained as a “guardian cherub”, Genesis 2:15 describes Adam as having been in Eden and as having been assigned the responsibility of taking care of Eden, which can be compared to being ordained as a “guardian cherub”. Genesis 2:15 shows that Adam is described as having had a similar religious status as a king of Tyre is described as having had in Ezekiel 28:11-15.

To better see what the mentioning of Eden in Genesis is specifically referring to, we can examine the river system that is described in chapter 2.

Genesis 2:10-14

*A river watering the garden flowed from Eden; from there it was separated into four headwaters. The name of the first is the Pishon; it winds through the entire land of Havilah, where there is gold. The gold of that land is good; aromatic resin and onyx are also there. The name of the second river is the Gihon; it winds through the entire land of Cush. The name of the third river is the Tigris; it runs along the east side of Asshur. And the fourth river is the Euphrates.*

Genesis 2:10-14 mention four bodies of water: the Pishon, the Gihon, the Tigris, and the Euphrates. The Tigris and the Euphrates are well-known rivers today. The Pishon and the Gihon, on the other hand, are much more mysterious. The Gihon is at least mentioned elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament so we have somewhat of a basis to work with.

1 Kings 1:38

*So Zadok the priest, Nathan the prophet, Benaiah son of Jehoiada, the Kerethites and the Pelethites went down and put Solomon on King David’s mule and escorted him to Gihon.*

2 Kings 20:1

*In those days Hezekiah became ill and was at the point of death. The prophet Isaiah son of Amoz went to him and said, “This is what the Lord says: Put your house in order, because you are going to die; you will not recover.”*

2 Kings 20:20

*As for the other events of Hezekiah’s reign, all his achievements and how he made the pool and the tunnel by which he brought water into the city, are they not written in the book of annals of the kings of Judah?*

2 Chronicles 32:24

*In those days Hezekiah became ill and was at the point of death. He prayed to the Lord, who answered him and gave him a miraculous sign.*

2 Chronicles 32:30

*It was Hezekiah who blocked the upper outlet of the Gihon spring and channeled the water down to the west side of the City of David. He succeeded in everything he undertook.*

2 Chronicles 33:14

*Afterward he rebuilt the outer wall of the City of David, west of the Gihon spring in the valley, as far as the entrance of the Fish Gate and encircling the hill of Ophel; he also made it much higher. He stationed military commanders in all the fortified cities in Judah.*

Nehemiah 3:15

*The Fountain Gate was repaired by Shallun son of Col-Hozeh, ruler of the district of Mizpah. He rebuilt it, roofing it over and putting its doors and bolts and bars in place. He also repaired the wall of the Pool of Siloam, by the King's Garden, as far the steps going down from the City of David.*

1 Kings 1:38 describes King David's son Solomon as having traveled to the Gihon to get anointed. There are two important points to derive from that. One is that 1 Kings 1:38 is an indication that the Gihon was in Israel. The second is that the Gihon was important enough to be the place to where Solomon is described as having traveled to be anointed. The information contained in 2 Kings 20:1 and 2 Kings 20:20 is similar to the information contained in 2 Chronicles 32:24 and 2 Chronicles 32:30. 2 Kings 20:1 and 2 Chronicles 32:24 both describe King Hezekiah as having become ill. That indicates that chapter 20 of 2 Kings and chapter 32 of 2 Chronicles describe historical events within the same time-period. 2 Kings 20:20 describes King Hezekiah as having built "the pool" and "the tunnel". Since 2 Chronicles seems to represent a similar timeline as 2 Kings, we can use 2 Chronicles to give us details about what 2 Kings describes. 2 Chronicles 32:30 describes King Hezekiah as having channeled water from the Gihon to "the City of David" (Jerusalem). 2 Chronicles 33:14 provides further evidence that the Gihon was in Israel by describing "the City of David" as west of the Gihon. If the Gihon wasn't close enough to "the City of David" to be in Israel then the Gihon probably wouldn't have been close enough to "the City of David" for "the City of David" to be described in relation to the Gihon. So "the City of David" being described in relation to the Gihon is an indication that the Gihon was in Israel. So we can so far gather that the Gihon was in Israel to the east of "the City of David"; and that King Hezekiah ordered the water from the Gihon to be channeled to "the City of David", and ordered the building of "the pool" and "the tunnel". Then, when we take a look at Nehemiah 3:15, we can see that "the pool" seems to be the Pool of Siloam, which is described as having been near the "King's Garden". So the Gihon seems to have been a spring that was in Israel that supplied water to "the City of David" and supplied water to the Pool of Siloam, which was near the "King's Garden".

When we examine the Tigris and the Euphrates, we come to some different conclusions.

Daniel 10:4

*On the twenty-fourth day of the first month, as I was standing on the bank of the great river, the Tigris, I looked up and there before me was a man dressed in linen, with a belt of the finest gold around his waist.*

2 Kings 24:7

*The king of Egypt did not march out from his own country again, because the king of Babylon had taken all his territory, from the Wadi of Egypt to the Euphrates River.*

Psalm 137:1

*By the rivers of Babylon we sat and wept when we remembered Zion.*

Daniel 10:4 describes Daniel as having been exiled in the Babylonian Empire and having been standing on the bank of the Tigris. That shows that the Tigris ran through the Babylonian Empire and that the Tigris influenced writing that is about a time-period during the Babylonian Exile. 2 Kings 24:7 shows that the Euphrates also ran through the Babylonian Empire. Psalm 137:1 describes Israelites weeping near the “rivers of Babylon”. Babylon was between the Tigris and the Euphrates and we can view those rivers as the “rivers of Babylon”.

Neither the Tigris nor the Euphrates runs through Israel and there doesn't seem to be any connection between the Gihon and the Tigris or the Euphrates like the one described in chapter 2 of Genesis. Therefore, it seems that real bodies of water were used to describe a fictional river system. There seems to have been at least two different geographical areas used to describe one geographical area. The Gihon shows the presence of a spring in Israel, and the Tigris and the Euphrates show the presence of rivers that ran through the Babylonian Empire. So the description of the river system in chapter 2 of Genesis seems to have been influenced by both Israel as well as the Babylonian Empire. That shows that the author of Genesis 2:10-14 was probably an Israelite who was exiled in Babylon and that Genesis 2:10-14 were probably written during the Babylonian Exile. So not only does the likelihood that the river system is fictional show that Genesis 2:10-14 appear to be fraudulent, but the evidence showing that those verses appear to have been produced during the Babylonian Exile also shows that they appear to be fraudulent.

Given that the mentioning of Eden is probably an allegorical reference and that chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were probably written during the Babylonian Exile, the exile from the Garden of Eden probably allegorically represents the Babylonian Exile. Therefore, the Garden of Eden probably represents Israel, or more specifically Jerusalem, or even more specifically the temple in Jerusalem.

Another reason to believe that the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 were produced during the Exile is the comparison of Adam to the ground. That is probably characteristic of a writing style during the Exile when certain authors of the Bible seem to have taken on a more shameful and repenting attitude, which seems to have been brought on by the destruction of the temple and them having been exiled. The description of Adam and Eve sinning is in step with that. Chapters 2 and 3 present Adam and Eve as sinners and show them being exiled from the Garden of Eden. In contrast, chapter 1 exalts human beings by describing them as made in the image of God and as rulers of all creatures on earth. The attitude towards the human race is very different in chapter 1 then it is in chapters 2 and 3. As such, chapter 1 was probably produced before the Exile, and chapters 2 and 3 were probably produced during the Exile. Further evidence of that assertion can be found in Genesis 1:26, which as shown earlier describes God as having used the words “us” and “our”. The use of the words “us” and “our” in that verse shows polytheistic thinking, which would probably have been more characteristic of writing produced before the Exile rather than during the Exile.

There have been several pieces of evidence shown that the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis are probably fraudulent. God is described in those narratives as if God does not have

foreknowledge, which is false theology; Adam's name means "man", which shows that Adam is likely an allegorical character and not a real person; the use of the name "Yahweh Elohim" as one name shows that those narratives were likely originally produced during the process of compiling documents, which shows that the information contained in those narratives was likely falsely made up during that process; the use of the word "Elohim" in quoted dialogue shows that those narratives were likely produced after the original production of Exodus, which shows that the information contained in those narratives was likely fraudulently made up sometime after the original production of Exodus; the references to Eden in the book of Ezekiel show that the references to the Garden of Eden in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were likely allegorical references that represent Israel, Jerusalem, and/or the temple in Jerusalem, and so the Garden of Eden as described in the Adam and Eve narratives probably didn't actually exist; the river system described in chapter 2 of Genesis shows both Israeli and Babylonian influences, which shows that the author was likely an Israelite exiled in Babylon; and the comparison of Adam to the ground and the emphasis on sin both show a writing style that is likely representative of a time-period during the Exile, which shows that those narratives were likely fraudulently made up during the Exile. Therefore, the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis appear to be fraudulent and appear to have been produced during the Babylonian Exile.

2 Kings 19:12 might be able to give us insight into what influenced the imagination of an Israelite to think about the Garden of Eden.

2 Kings 19:12

*"Did the gods of the nations that were destroyed by my forefathers deliver them: the gods of Gozan, Haran, Rezep, and the people of Eden who were in Tel Assar?"*

This verse describes a warning from the Assyrian Empire to the kingdom of Judah after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed. The verse describes "the people of Eden who were in Tel Assar". Gozan, Haran, Rezep, and Tel Assar are all believed to have been in Mesopotamia and in locations that were later controlled by the Babylonian Empire. It seems that Eden was a real place that was at some point controlled by the Babylonian Empire. So there may have been a real place that provided inspiration during the Babylonian Exile to the author of the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis.

The Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis also provide evidence that documents were probably compiled together during the Exile. First, the usage of the word "Elohim" along with the name "Yahweh" in the same narratives throughout the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament is general evidence that a compilation occurred at some point. Second, the name "Yahweh Elohim" as one name in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis shows that the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were probably originally produced during the same time-period as that compilation. Third, the river system described and the reference to the exile from supposedly sacred space, the Garden of Eden, shows that the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were probably produced during the Babylonian Exile. If the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were originally produced during the Babylonian Exile and during the same time-period in which the compilation occurred in, it would then follow that the compilation occurred during the Babylonian Exile.

We have seen many references that serve as evidence that a compilation of documents occurred during the Babylonian Exile. We have also seen evidence that several narratives in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament appear to be fraudulent. The Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis serve as



an example of narratives that appear to have been fraudulently produced during the Babylonian Exile. Now that we have gone through the fraudulent nature of the Adam and Eve narratives, we should now turn to the rest of Genesis and then to Exodus.

## **Genesis and Exodus**

Chapters 6-9 of Genesis describe Noah and the flood. There are three points to make about those narratives. The first is that the beginning of chapter 6 describes the “sons of God”, that God’s Spirit will not contend with man forever, and that the “Nephilim” were the offspring of sons of God and daughters of men. The “sons of God” as described in chapter 6 is a polytheistic reference. They are a part of the “divine council” as described elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. Any polytheistic narratives in the Bible should immediately be recognized as fraudulent. The second is that there have been many flood narratives from different cultures and some specific aspects of the flood narrative in the Bible are the same as the Epic of Gilgamesh, which is a narrative that circulated in Mesopotamia. That suggests that the flood narrative in the Bible copied details from a flood narrative that circulated in Mesopotamia. The third is that the theology of the flood narrative presents God as if God does not have foreknowledge. Chapter 6 describes God as having regretted having made the human race. If God regretted making the human race, then God would not have foreknowledge and God would not be infinite. God has foreknowledge of all and God is infinite. These three points show that chapters 6-9 of Genesis appear to be fraudulent. There may have been a real flood that inspired certain aspects of those chapters, but those chapters appear to be mostly fraudulent. Even if there was a real flood that inspired certain aspects of those chapters, there doesn’t seem to have been a global flood in the way that so many people today believe.

Chapter 10 of Genesis describes population disbursement and suggests that Noah gave way to the human race surviving and that everyone who was born after that is a descendant of Noah. Chapter 10 obviously appears to be fraudulent. Additionally, chapter 10 makes a reference to Babylon and that serves as additional evidence that chapter 10 appears to be fraudulent.

As previously shown, Chapter 11 describes people building a tower and then God changing their language to confuse them and spreading them all over the world. Like the Adam and Eve narratives and the flood narrative, chapter 11 suggests that God does not have foreknowledge. So already we can see that chapter 11 appears to be fraudulent. Additionally, this narrative attempts to explain why there are different races of human beings. That is further evidence that chapter 11 appears to be fraudulent. Also, it has already been shown that the Tower of Babel narrative and the mentioning of Abraham as from Ur are probably products of the Babylonian Exile, and therefore appear to be fraudulent.

We should now turn back to the very beginning of the Bible and analyze chapter 1 of Genesis. First and foremost, the seven days of Creation narrative is a function oriented narrative, meaning that the creation of Earth is explained through functions of Earth. That appears to be representative of human thinking. That point alone shows that chapter 1 of Genesis appears to be fraudulent. Second, day 2 is described as having been a day when water was separated from water so that there was water on the

ground and water in the sky. That seems to be representative of a world view of a human being. People in ancient times saw water on the ground and water coming down from the sky. As such, day 2 in chapter 1 seems to be representative of human observation. Third, day having been separated from night is described in both day 1 and day 4. Fourth, Genesis 1:26 describes God as having said “Let us make man in our image” and the words “us” and “our” are characteristic of polytheistic thinking. As previously shown, some Christians propose that this is evidence of the concept of the Trinity. However, chapter 1 of Genesis was probably written hundreds of years, maybe even more than a millennium, before the first century. If they intended the words “us” and “our” to refer to the concept of the Trinity, then the concept of the Trinity would have been communicated among people hundreds of years, maybe even more than a millennium, before the first century. That is incredibly unrealistic because Christ appeared in the first century and so the concept of the Trinity wouldn’t realistically have been known by any human being before the first century. So it’s unrealistic to think that the author of chapter 1 of Genesis was aware of the concept of the Trinity. Again, we will go into more detail about the concept of the Trinity and how that concept developed in Part 4. For now, we simply need to recognize that there probably wasn’t a single person who had ever heard of the concept of the Trinity before the first century, and so the author of chapter 1 of Genesis probably wasn’t aware of the concept of the Trinity and probably was really writing from a polytheistic perspective. Additionally, as already shown, polytheistic writing was very common in ancient Israel and some of that polytheistic writing made its way into the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. So Genesis 1:26 was probably written without any awareness of the concept of the Trinity and seems to include a polytheistic reference. Fifth, the human race is incredibly exalted in chapter 1. That appears to be representative of fraudulent human writing.

Chapter 5 of Genesis references chapter 1 and so appears to be fraudulent. Additionally, chapter 5 leads into chapter 6 and that also shows that chapter 5 appears to be fraudulent. The first 11 chapters of the Bible all appear to be fraudulent.

We will now turn to narratives about Abraham, Sarah, Lot, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, and Esau. That set of narratives begins towards the end of chapter 11 of Genesis. The rest of Genesis can be linked to some very important archeological findings related to people who were called “Shasu” by the Egyptian Empire.

Six groups of Shasu people are shown on a list of enemies inscribed on column bases at the temple of Soleb that has been dated to the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE. That list appears to have then been copied in the 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE. The word “Shasu” was used to refer to nomads and the use of the word “Shasu” as a proper noun to represent an enemy of Egypt likely refers to a specific community that was nomadic. One of the groups was the Shasu of YHW (can be pronounced as “Yahu”). As already mentioned, the name “Yahweh” comes from the Hebrew word יהוה (“Yahweh”). The initial translation of that Hebrew word is actually “YHWH” and many pronounce that translation as “Yahweh”. Words in the Hebrew language often didn’t contain vowels and the pronunciation of vowels was often decided based on the consonants. Many believe that the name Yahweh (YHWH) derived from the Shasu of YHW. If the Shasu of YHW worshipped Yahweh, then the name “Shasu of YHW” could be interpreted as “Nomads of Yahweh”.

The earliest known reference to what looks like “Israel” is a reference to what has been translated as “Isriar” on the Merneptah Stele, which has been dated to 1213-1203 BCE. Many people believe that “Isriar” is a reference to “Israel”.

There seems to have been a population who used a name similar to the name “Yahweh” as early as the 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> century BCE while the earliest dated archaeological evidence that has been linked to Israel is from the late 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE. So there is more archaeological evidence dated earlier on related to the Shasu of YHW than there is related to Israel. That evidence suggests that the Shasu of YHW were probably a community before Israel was; although even if that wasn’t the case, that evidence at least shows that nomads who seem to have worshipped Yahweh seem to have originally been a separate community from Israel. Since these two communities seem to have been originally separate and since Israelites eventually worshipped Yahweh, Israelites who worshipped Yahweh seem to have at least somewhat derived their beliefs from the Shasu of YHW. Additionally, the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament show evidence of the name “Yahweh” having origins outside of Israel.

Deuteronomy 33:1-2

*This is the blessing that Moses the man of God pronounced on the Israelites before his death. He said: “The Lord came from Sinai and dawned over them from Seir; he shone forth from Mount Paran. He came with myriads of holy ones from the south, from his mountain slopes.”*

Judges 5:4-5

*“O Lord, when you went out from Seir, when you marched from the land of Edom, the earth shook, the heavens poured, the clouds poured down water. The mountains quaked before the Lord, the One of Sinai, before the Lord, the God of Israel.”*

Habakkuk 3:3

*God came from Teman, the Holy One from Mount Paran. His glory covered the heavens and his praise filled the earth.*

These verses mention Edom, Seir, Sinai, Teman, and Mount Paran. All of these locations were probably south and/or east of Israel. We already saw that archaeological evidence supports the assertion that a nomadic community used a name similar to the name “Yahweh” and did so separately from Israel, and we can now also see that biblical text supports the assertion that Yahwist beliefs derived from outside of Israel. There is more biblical text that supports that conclusion.

Genesis 25:23

*The Lord said to her, “Two nations are in your womb, and two peoples from within you will be separated; one people will be stronger than the other, and the older will serve the younger.”*

*When the time came for her to give birth, there were twin boys in her womb. The first to come out was red, and his whole body was like a hairy garment so they named him Esau. After this, his brother came out, with his hand grasping Esau’s heel; so he was named Jacob. Isaac was sixty years old when Rebekah gave birth to them.*

Genesis 25:29-34

*Once when Jacob was cooking some stew, Esau came in from the open country, famished. He said to Jacob, “Quick, let me have some of that red stew! I’m famished!” That is why he was also called Edom.*

*Jacob replied, "First sell me your birthright."*

*"Look, I am about to die", Esau said. "What good is the birthright to me?"*

*But Jacob said, "Swear to me first." So he swore an oath to him, selling his birthright to Jacob.*

*Then Jacob gave Esau some bread and some lentil stew. He ate and drank, and then got up and left.*

*So Esau despised his birthright.*

Genesis 27:35

*But he said, "Your brother came deceitfully and took your blessing."*

Genesis 32:3

*Jacob sent messengers ahead of him to his brother Esau in the land of Seir, the country of Edom.*

Genesis 32:28

*Then the man said, "Your name will no longer be Jacob, but Israel, because you have struggled with God and with men and have overcome."*

Genesis 36:9

*This is the account of Esau the father of the Edomites in the hill country of Seir.*

We've already established through archaeological evidence and biblical text that Israelites who worshipped Yahweh seem to have at least somewhat derived their beliefs from the Shasu of YHW and that Yahwist beliefs seem to have derived from outside of Israel with Mount Seir and elsewhere in Edom being likely places. We can now also see that biblical text describes an older brother giving way to a population in Edom and a younger brother giving way to a population in Israel. The story in the Bible expresses that the Israel population and the Edom population are descendants of either Jacob or Esau, both Jacob and Esau are descendants of Abraham, Esau was named "Esau" because he was hairy, Esau was also named Edom because he wanted red stew, Esau sold his birthright to Jacob for that red stew, Jacob deceitfully took Isaac's blessing away from Esau, Edom is "the land of Seir", Jacob was named Israel, and Esau is the father of the Edomites in the hill country of Seir. So there is a population in Israel and a population in Edom that both represent descendants of Abraham. Israel is younger than Edom, but Edom sold his birthright to Israel and Israel took Isaac's blessing.

That story can be taken either literally or allegorically. If taken literally, then all of the Israelites were descendants of Jacob and all of the Edomites were descendants of Esau, and all of the Israelites and Edomites were descendants of Abraham. Scientific evidence can easily show the improbability of that being true. If taken allegorically, then Jacob and Esau are likely not real people and merely represent population disbursement. There are several reasons to believe that this story should be taken allegorically. First and foremost, certain aspects of this story seem quite unrealistic. Those aspects include an entire population being attributed to one person, the older brother Esau being described as one who will serve the younger brother Jacob, Esau being hairy upon birth, Esau being so hairy upon birth that Esau was named for his hairiness, Esau also being called Edom because he wanted red stew, Esau selling his birthright to Jacob for that red stew and that being relevant to their long-term relationship, and Jacob deceitfully taking away Isaac's blessing and that being relevant to Jacob's and Esau's long-term relationship and status among the wider regional community. The second reason is that Jacob and Esau are described as representing two nations, which seems to be a very direct example of allegory. The third reason is that Jacob and Esau are described as two nations that will be separated with one being stronger

than the other and the older one serving the younger one. That seems to be representative of a political relationship. That is also representative of a bias towards Israel given that Esau is described as being one who will serve Jacob even though Esau is described as the older brother. The fourth reason is the fact that Esau is presented as having been older. That probably represents which population existed first. Esau being described as older may represent a community in Edom having been a community before Israel was a community. As ancient artifacts have shown, there appears to have been a population who used a name similar to the name “Yahweh” as early as the 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> century BCE while the earliest dated archaeological evidence that has been linked to the name “Israel” has been dated to the late 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE. The two populations being described as brothers shows that there was probably some kind of religious and/or political relationship between Israel and the population in Edom. The fifth reason is that Esau is described as being named Esau because he was hairy. That links the name Esau to Mount Seir because one of the alleged meanings of “Seir” in Hebrew is “hairy”. Also, since Esau represents Edom, it would make sense that Esau also represents Mount Seir. Seir can also mean “windy”, which is likely similar to the intended meaning of Seir in relation to Mount Seir. However, Seir can mean “hairy”, which shows that the name Esau is probably related to the name Seir. So Esau’s two names are Esau, which is likely related to Mount Seir; and Edom, which of course is related to the region of Edom. So Esau’s two names seem to relate to Mount Seir and Edom. Additionally, a baby is unlikely to be that hairy upon birth, especially to the extent that they are named for their hairiness. The sixth reason is how it is explained that Esau is also called Edom. That is done through the description of Esau wanting red stew. Edom can mean “red”. However, the region of Edom was likely called Edom because of the color of the soil. Esau is described as being called Edom because of the color of the stew that he ate. That seems like quite a ridiculous reason to call someone a certain name, because of the color of stew that they ate. The oversimplification of such a narrative points to the likely allegorical nature of the narrative. So the color of the stew that Esau supposedly ate likely represents the color of the soil in the region of Edom. That shows that the region of Edom was probably called Edom for a reason entirely separate from any person named Esau, and so the assertion about Esau being the father of the Edomites appears to be fraudulent.

Biblical narratives matched up with archaeological evidence show that a nomadic community that used a name similar to the name “Yahweh” likely existed before the Israelite community existed, and that Israelites who worshipped Yahweh seem to have at least somewhat derived their beliefs from the Shasu of YHW and that those beliefs seem to have traveled from Edom. Additionally, Jacob and Esau are probably not real people, and we have a historical basis for the Israelite community but it’s very different than how the Bible is typically understood.

We don’t necessarily know that “Shasu of YHW” should be interpreted as “Nomads of Yahweh”. However, it appears that such an interpretation is likely correct; and even if it’s not correct, biblical text shows that Yahwist beliefs seem to have been exported from Edom and imported into Israel. The Bible is unlikely to show that if it weren’t true because it is unlikely that Israelites would want to express that Yahwist beliefs originated outside of Israel unless that were true. So even if “Nomads of Yahweh” is not the correct interpretation of “Shasu of YHW”, it still seems as though Yahwist beliefs were exported from Edom and imported into Israel. Therefore, the likely scenario is that a Yahwist community existed outside of Israel before Israelites began worshipping Yahweh.

When we turn to Lot we see something similar.

Genesis 19:36

*So both of Lot's daughters became pregnant by their father. The older daughter had a son, and she named him Moab, he is the father of the Moabites of today. The younger daughter also had a son, and she named him Ben-Ammi; he is the father of the Ammonites of today.*

This narrative references the Moabites and the Ammonites. The kingdom of Ammon is estimated to have begun around the tenth century BCE. If that is correct, then any mention of them would probably have been written in the tenth century BCE or later. However, the events that are being described are estimated to have happened centuries before that. Additionally, this narrative is likely an attempt to insult the Moabites and the Ammonites by describing all of their populations as descendants of women who had sex with their father. Archaeological evidence and biblical text show that the Moabites and the Ammonites were enemies of Israel. Genesis 19:36 seems to reflect that. So the information about Lot's descendants giving way to the Moabites and the Ammonites is probably fraudulent and was probably added later on to explain some of the population disbursement that was present during the time that information was first written. If that information related to Lot was produced in such a way, then the information about Jacob and Esau was probably written around the same time or later. By those estimates, the genealogies described related to Lot, Jacob, and Esau were all probably produced in the tenth century BCE or later, which shows evidence that they are probably fraudulent. Additionally, there is evidence that those genealogies were probably added to explain certain population disbursements, which shows further evidence that they are probably fraudulent.

We've already established that Jacob, Esau, and Lot are probably not real people and that those names were probably used to explain population disbursement. So a precedent has been set in this analysis that shows that fictional characters have probably been used to explain population disbursement. That precedent suggests that Isaac and Ishmael are probably not real people either, in which case Abraham is probably not a real person because his name means "father of many". Even if we don't apply that precedent to Isaac and Ishmael, it is still justified to believe that Abraham is not a real person simply because Jacob and Esau are probably not real people. Jacob is the one described as having carried on the legacy of Abraham and Isaac. So if Jacob is not a real person, then Abraham and Isaac probably aren't either, which would also mean that Ishmael probably isn't. Additionally, as previously shown, the description of Abraham as having been from Ur is probably fraudulent and was probably made up during the Babylonian Exile. If Abraham was a real person who really received a covenant from God, then there probably wouldn't be fraudulent information made up related to where Abraham was from.

It was common for ancient writers to use allegorical language and it appears that authors of Genesis did just that. Abraham, Lot, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, and Esau all appear to not be real people and appear to represent populations of people. Additionally, Abraham's and Sarah's names can shed some more light.

Genesis 17:5

*"No longer will you be called Abram; your name will be Abraham, for I have made you a father of many nations."*

"Abram" means "exalted father" and "Abraham" means "father of many". Why would Abraham have ever been called "exalted father" before ever having had children? The meanings of these names provide further evidence that Abraham is an allegorical character. Sarah's name leads to a similar conclusion.

Genesis 17:15-16

*God also said to Abraham, "As for Sarai your wife, you are no longer to call her Sarai; her name will be Sarah. I will give you a son by her. I will bless her so that she will be the mother of nations; kings of peoples will come from her."*

There is no explanation for Sarah's name change, unlike the explanation provided for Abraham's name change from "Abram" to "Abraham". "Sarai" is translated from the Hebrew word שָׂרַי ("sa-ray"), which is the plural form of שָׂר ("sar"), which can be translated as "chief" or "ruler". "Sarah" is translated from the Hebrew word שָׂרָה ("sarah"), which is the feminine form of "sar". "Sarai" is the plural form of "sar" and "Sarah" is the feminine form of "sar". So "Sarai" is the plural form of the word that "Sarah" is the feminine form of. The word that connects "Sarai" to "Sarah" can be translated as "chief" or "ruler". So the name change from "Sarai" to "Sarah" seems to represent a change in leadership. That change seems to have been from multiple leaders to an individual leader. That could be representative of a change in human leadership or could be representative of a change from polytheism to monotheism. Whatever this name change exactly represents, it seems to be a reference to leadership and a change from plurality to singularity. Regardless of the exact meaning of the name change from "Sarai" to "Sarah", the main conclusion is that the presence of Sarah in the Bible is probably allegorical and probably represents much more than just one person as that also seems to be the case with Abraham, Lot, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, and Esau.

For more evidence of false narratives that were probably produced to explain population disbursement and/or political results, we can turn to three different stories in Genesis that all seem related. These three stories are shown in Genesis 12:10-20, Genesis 20:1-18 and 21:22-34, and Genesis 26:1-35. There are three aspects of each of these narratives that all of them have in common. One is that each describes either Abraham or Isaac claiming that the woman described as their wife is their sister. Another is that each involves a conflict with a foreign ruler. A third is that the cause for each conflict involves the claim that the woman described as their wife is their sister. Below are select verses from these stories.

Genesis 12:11-13

*As he was about to enter Egypt, he said to his wife Sarai, "I know what a beautiful woman you are. When the Egyptians see you, they will say, 'This is his wife.' Then they will kill me but will let you live. Say you are my sister, so that I will be treated well for your sake and my life will be spared because of you."*

Genesis 12:18-19

*So Pharaoh summoned Abram. "What have you done to me?" he said. "Why didn't you tell me she was your wife? Why did you say, 'She is my sister', so that I took her to be my wife? Now then, here is your wife. Take her and go!"*

Genesis 20:1-2

*Now Abraham moved on from there into the region of the Negev and lived between Kadesh and Shur. For a while he stayed in Gerar, and there Abraham said of his wife Sarah, "She is my sister." Then Abimelech king of Gerar sent for Sarah and took her.*

Genesis 20:9-10

*Then Abimelech called Abraham in and said, "What have you done to us? How have I wronged you that you have brought such great guilt upon me and my kingdom? You have done things to me that should not be done." And Abimelech asked Abraham, "What was your reason for doing this?"*

Genesis 26:7-10

*When the men of that place asked him about his wife, he said, "She is my sister", because he was afraid to say, "She is my wife". He thought, "The men of this place might kill me on account of Rebekah, because she is beautiful."*

*When Isaac had been there a long time, Abimelech king of the Philistines looked down from a window and saw Isaac caressing his wife Rebekah. So Abimelech summoned Isaac and said, "She is really your wife! Why did you say, 'She is my sister'?"*

*Isaac answered him, "Because I thought I might lose my life on account of her."*

*Then Abimelech said, "What is this you have done to us? One of the men might well have slept with your wife, and you would have brought guilt upon us."*

The story in chapter 12 and the story in chapters 20-21 have two other common aspects. One is that the foreign ruler was frightened by an act of God. The other is that sheep and cattle were given.

The story in chapter 12 and the story in chapter 26 have four other common aspects. One is that a famine is mentioned. The second is that Egypt is mentioned. The third is that the foreign ruler ordered Abraham and Sarah, or Isaac to leave. The fourth is that orders are given to people other than Abraham, Sarah, and Isaac.

The story in chapters 20-21 and the story in chapter 26 have seven other common aspects. One is that Abimelech is described as the foreign ruler. The second is that Abimelech expresses the belief that Abraham and Sarah, or Isaac were favored by God. The third is that at least one well is mentioned. The fourth is that a treaty was reached and there was an oath. The fifth is that they were in Beersheba. The sixth is that there is either a tree planted or an altar built. The seventh is that Abimelech is described as referring to guilt having been brought upon him.

So there are three common aspects among all three stories, two other common aspects among the story in chapter 12 and the story in chapters 20-21, four other common aspects among the story in chapter 12 and the story in chapter 26, and seven other common aspects among the story in chapters 20-21 and the story in chapter 26. Given all of the similarities, there is a substantial percentage of each of these stories that are repeated in at least one of the other stories. These three stories share a large percentage of information with each other and the wife-sister component is the most telling piece. That suggests that details were copied among these stories; and therefore, these stories are probably fraudulent productions to explain political relationships.

The presence of two different foreign rulers described among these three stories shows that there were likely two different political situations being represented among these three stories. The two that describe Abimelech seem to be related to a political relationship with the Philistines. We also saw a political relationship with the Philistines being represented in the David and Goliath narrative as well as the other Goliath narrative that we previously examined. The other one of these three stories, the one in chapter 12, is about Egypt.



Those three stories are not only similar to each other, but are also similar to the book of Exodus. All four involve a conflict with a foreign ruler. The story in chapter 12 of Genesis and the story in Exodus both involve a conflict with the Pharaoh of Egypt. The story in chapter 12 of Genesis, the story in chapters 20-21 of Genesis, and the story in Exodus all describe the foreign ruler as having been frightened by an act of God. The story in chapter 12 of Genesis, the story in chapter 26 of Genesis, and the story in Exodus all mention a famine, Egypt, and the foreign ruler demanding that Abraham, Isaac, or Moses leave. The story in chapters 20-21 of Genesis, the story in chapter 26 of Genesis, and the story in Exodus all describe people wanting water, water being given to people, there being sacred space, and the foreign ruler as believing that Abraham, Isaac, or Moses were favored by God. The story in chapter 26 of Genesis and the story in Exodus both mention names of wells and provide names that refer to conflict (dispute, opposition, testing, and quarreling). Many of the aspects used in the three stories in Genesis were also used in the book of Exodus. That provides evidence that those aspects of the book of Exodus are probably fraudulent.

Chapter 37 of Genesis through the end of Genesis, which tells the story of Joseph and his brothers who are described as children of Jacob, also shares many similarities with those three stories in Genesis and the book of Exodus. The similarity that chapters 37-50 of Genesis have with all of them is that there is a foreign ruler involved. Furthermore, in chapters 37-50 of Genesis, it is the Pharaoh of Egypt who is involved, much like the story in chapter 12 of Genesis and the book of Exodus. Other similarities with the stories in Genesis and/or the book of Exodus include the mentioning of a well, a famine, abundance before that famine, and a dream that the Pharaoh of Egypt had that frightened him.

There are three points to now make about the story in chapters 37-50 of Genesis. The first is that Joseph and his brothers are probably not real people given that Jacob is described as having been their father and Jacob is probably not a real person. Therefore, the narratives in chapters 37-50 of Genesis are probably all fraudulent. The second is that the similarities that chapters 37-50 of Genesis have with those other stories in Genesis and the book of Exodus is further reason to believe that those narratives are fraudulent and were influenced by the stories in Genesis and/or the book of Exodus. The third is that chapters 37-50 of Genesis seem to serve as an introduction to the book of Exodus by describing Israelites going to Egypt. The book of Exodus picks up where Genesis leaves off in Egypt.

Evidence has been shown that the first eleven chapters of Genesis are fraudulent; Abraham, Sarah, Lot, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, Esau, and Joseph and his brothers are all not real people; and there are three different narratives in Genesis about a conflict with a foreign ruler that involve describing someone's supposed wife as their sister and that have several other aspects in common with each other. Given all of that evidence, it is justified to believe that most of the book of Genesis is fraudulent.

There are several points to now make about the book of Exodus. First, given that the genealogy in Genesis appears to be fraudulent, the description of that genealogy going to Moses is probably fraudulent as well. If Moses' genealogy is fraudulent, then there is a good possibility that Moses is not a real person. Second, it has already been shown that many aspects of the book of Exodus are very similar to certain aspects found in the stories in Genesis about a conflict with a foreign ruler. That shows that certain aspects of the book of Exodus were probably copied from other narratives. Third, one of those narratives in Genesis, the one in chapter 12, specifically references a conflict with the Pharaoh of Egypt. There being another narrative about the Pharaoh of Egypt and there being no exodus mentioned in that narrative

shows that there was motivation to write a narrative about a conflict with Egypt that has nothing to do with an exodus. There was longstanding conflict between Egypt and a lot of surrounding communities. The narrative in chapter 12 of Genesis shows that there was conflict with Egypt and that such conflict seems to not have been related to any exodus. That shows evidence that the book of Exodus was probably a fraudulent production and that it was probably inspired by real conflict with Egypt. Fourth, the tradition of the week of unleavened bread seems to have come from the Canaanites so the narratives in the book of Exodus about the week of unleavened bread are probably fraudulent. Fifth, there are multiple narratives beyond the one about the parting of the Red Sea that describe Moses performing a miracle with water using a staff or some piece of wood. There are several verses that we should now look at to analyze the parting of the Red Sea and the providing of water to people.

Exodus 14:12

*“Didn’t we say to you in Egypt, ‘Leave us alone; let us serve the Egyptians?’ It would have been better for us to serve the Egyptians than to die in the desert!”*

Exodus 14:15-16

*Then the Lord said to Moses, “Why are you crying out to me? Tell the Israelites to move on. Raise your staff and stretch out your hand over the sea to divide the water so that the Israelites can go through the sea on dry ground.”*

Exodus 15:24-25

*So the people grumbled against Moses, saying, “What are we to drink?” Then Moses cried out to the Lord, and the Lord showed him a piece of wood. He threw it into the water, and the water became sweet.*

Exodus 17:2-4

*So they quarreled with Moses and said, “Give us water to drink.” Moses replied, “Why do you quarrel with me? Why do you put the Lord to the test?” But the people were thirsty for water there, and they grumbled against Moses. They said, “Why did you bring us up out of Egypt to make us and our children and livestock die of thirst?” Then Moses cried out to the Lord, “What am I to do with these people? They are almost ready to stone me.”*

Exodus 17:6

*“Take with you some of the elders of Israel and take in your hand the staff with which you struck the Nile, and go. I will stand there before you by the rock at Horeb. Strike the rock, and water will come out of it for the people to drink.” So Moses did this in the sight of the elders of Israel.*

Numbers 20:2-6

*Now there was no water for the community, and the people gathered in opposition to Moses and Aaron. They quarreled with Moses and said, “If only we had died when our brothers fell dead before the Lord! Why did you bring the Lord’s community into this desert, that we and our livestock should die here? Why did you bring us up out of Egypt to this terrible place? It has no grain or figs, grapevines or pomegranates. And there is no water to drink!” Moses and Aaron went from the assembly to the entrance to the Tent of Meeting and fell facedown, and the glory of the Lord appeared to them.*

Numbers 20:11

*Then Moses raised his arm and struck the rock twice with his staff. Water gushed out, and the community and their livestock drank.*

There is the parting of the Red Sea, the making of bitter water into sweet water, and two instances of water coming from a rock. These verses show that there are four different stories that have the following three aspects in common: the people complained to Moses, Moses received help from God, and Moses used a staff or a piece of wood in relation to water. The similarities among these different stories can be compared to the repetition previously discussed of narratives about a conflict with a foreign ruler. That suggests that the stories about the parting of the Red Sea, the making of bitter water into sweet water, and water coming from a rock all share copied information with each other. Additionally, there are further similarities among these stories and others.

Genesis 26:19-22

*Isaac's servants dug in the valley and discovered a well of fresh water there. But the herdsmen of Gerar quarreled with Isaac's herdsman and said, "The water is ours!" So he named the well Esek, because they disputed with him. Then they dug another well, but they quarreled over that one also; so he named it Sitnah. He moved on from there and dug another well, and no one quarreled over it. He named it Rehoboth, saying, "Now the Lord has given us room and we will flourish in the land."*

Exodus 17:7

*And he called the place Massah and Meribah because the Israelites quarreled and because they tested the Lord saying, "Is the Lord among us or not?"*

Numbers 20:13

*These were the waters of Meribah, where the Israelites quarreled with the Lord and where he showed himself holy among them.*

All of those mention some sort of conflict being associated with a well. That is further evidence that these stories about water share copied information with each other. Again, we can compare that assessment with the one regarding the narratives about a foreign ruler. There being so many narratives similar to the narrative about the parting of the Red Sea shows that the narrative about the parting of the Red Sea is probably a fraudulent narrative and that certain details were probably influenced by another story. Additionally, given the evidence already shown that the book of Exodus was probably a fraudulent production and that Moses is probably not a real person, the parting of the Red Sea probably never happened.

The exodus from Egypt as described in the Bible probably didn't happen either. As previously shown, chapter 12 of Genesis includes a narrative that shares certain components with the book of Exodus. Both of these are representative of a conflict with Egypt, but that conflict probably wasn't how the Bible describes it as. Egypt was a power-house during this time-period and many of the surrounding communities suffered at the behest of the Egyptian Empire. Canaanite cities were destroyed and people were enslaved. The book of Exodus may have been influenced by real experiences related to the Egyptian Empire taking control and enslaving people. However, the exodus story as described in the Bible probably never happened. Almost all of Genesis has been shown to appear to be fraudulent, several aspects of the book of Exodus have been shown to appear to be fraudulent, Moses probably isn't a real

person, and the parting of the Red Sea probably never happened. So the exodus story probably represents a real conflict with the Egyptian Empire, but the exodus story as described in the Bible appears to be a fraudulent myth.

## **Yahwism and the Development of Ancient Israel**

Egyptian artifacts show the presence of the Shasu of YHW in the 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> century BCE. Biblical text suggests that beliefs about Yahweh came from people in Edom. A likely scenario is that Yahwists either migrated from Edom to the highlands of Israel and/or they shared their beliefs with people who already lived in the highlands of Israel. Either way, the likely scenario is that Yahwist beliefs were exported from Edom and imported into the highlands of Israel. Whatever exactly happened, it seems that information about Yahwist beliefs traveled from Edom to the highlands of Israel.

The Canaanite cities were mostly in the lowlands of Canaan. Archaeological evidence from excavations within Israel show that smaller communities seem to have developed in the highlands of Israel during different periods of time through hundreds of years. The Merneptah Stele, dated to 1213-1203 BCE, seems to show a name similar to "Israel". So Israel was probably established as a community by the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE.

The Shasu of YHW seem to have been around at least as early as the 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> century BCE, Israel seems to have been established as a community by the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE, and information about Yahwist beliefs seems to have traveled from Edom to the highlands of Israel.

The book of Joshua in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament describes the Israelites taking over Canaan through the use of violence. Archaeological evidence is not very favorable to the belief that Israelites violently defeated Canaanites in multiple cities. Additionally, archaeological evidence shows that there probably wasn't a developed enough of a community in the highlands of Israel in the 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE to have had an organized military that would have been able to conquer Canaanite cities in the way that the Bible describes. Also, there is plenty of evidence that shows that Canaanite cities were vassals of the Egyptian Empire. It's unrealistic enough that the Israelites had enough force to defeat the Canaanites in the way that the Bible describes. On top of that, the Egyptian Empire likely would have wiped out the Israelites if they attacked Canaanite cities. For the Israelites to have violently attacked multiple Canaanite cities would have been to go up against the Egyptian Empire. Taking over land like that sends shockwaves through surrounding communities. The conquering of multiple cities isn't likely to go unnoticed and isn't likely to not go responded to. There are also the obvious motivations for falsifying such narratives. On a fundamental level, these narratives are about violently conquering land. Why would land and violence be so important to a religion? Should land or violence be important to a religion? Religion is about belief in God. A religion that asserts that land should be violently conquered obviously shows probable fraud. The likely scenario is that people settled in the highlands of Israel without the magnitude of violence described in the Bible, and they either brought Yahwist beliefs with them or Yahwist beliefs were otherwise somehow imported into that area.

Based on excavations of ancient cities in Israel and elsewhere, there is evidence that there was widespread destruction in the ancient Near East over a period of about one hundred years, and this array of attacks is

believed to have occurred during the time-period of 1250-1050 BCE. One specific attack is described by an Egyptian artifact that mentions sea people who arrived on ships. There are different artifacts from different time-periods found in the ancient Near East that describe sea people. The references to sea people most likely refer to people who arrived on ships on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea. The references to sea people on different artifacts don't necessarily relate to each other. Different groups of people could have arrived on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea during different time-periods. The Philistines are an example of sea people, but a reference to sea people doesn't necessarily relate to the Philistines. Philistines have been called sea people but there are also other groups of people who could have been called sea people. Of these different groups who could have been called sea people, there seems to have been a group who arrived on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea in the time-period of 1200-1100 BCE who attacked and caused destruction in the ancient Near East. That group of people could have been the Philistines or could have been a different group of people. There isn't much detail other than that there was an attack by sea people who arrived on ships, and it is believed that this attack occurred in the time-period of 1200-1100 BCE. There were also other attacks. There is archaeological evidence that Egypt attacked certain Canaanite cities. It is believed that even the Egyptian Empire was suffering during this time-period, and an economic depression in Egypt could have been motivation behind attacks of Canaanite cities. The Merneptah Stele is one piece of evidence that boasts about Egyptian attacks, and those attacks include an attack on what appears to be Israel. As mentioned earlier, the Merneptah Stele might contain the earliest known reference to Israel. That reference is in regard to an attack. The Merneptah Stele appears to describe the destruction of the seed of Israel. If the seed of Israel was destroyed, that likely means that the agriculture in Israel was destroyed, which would have likely caused a famine. So Israel was probably involved in the destruction that occurred during the time-period of 1250-1050 BCE. There is also a theory that has proposed that there was internal rebellion within Canaanite cities. Regardless of what exactly happened or who attacked who, the main point is that there appears to have been widespread destruction over a period of about one hundred years during the time-period of 1250-1050 BCE.

Amidst this destruction was also probably an economic depression in the ancient Near East. More specifically, there might have been an incredibly severe economic breakdown among several different communities in the ancient Near East. As previously mentioned, even the Egyptian Empire seems to have suffered economically during this time-period. Regarding Israel, it seems that Egypt destroyed their agriculture, which would have likely caused a famine. This destruction and economic breakdown in the ancient Near East likely caused a kind of reset for society in Canaan, and more specifically in Israel.

Studies of archaeological surveys of artifacts in Israel have shown that there appears to have been gradual population growth in the highlands of Israel in the time-period of 1200-900 BCE. This time-period also likely included the destruction and economic breakdown just previously mentioned. So in the aftermath of what appears to have been a kind of reset for society in Canaan, the population in the highlands of Israel seems to have gradually grown over a period of about a few hundred years. Much of the old society in Canaan was destroyed and a society with a growing population in the highlands of Israel seems to have been developing in the aftermath of that destruction and the economic breakdown that occurred along with it. The likely scenario is that displaced Canaanites migrated to the highlands of Israel and added to the population that already identified as Israel. At that point, Israel was probably not organized as a nation-state, but was probably a smaller agricultural and/or pastoral community within Canaan. The Canaanite cities were in the lowlands of Canaan, and a smaller agricultural and/or pastoral community

called Israel seems to have been in the highlands of Israel. The population in the highlands of Israel seems to have grown and a lot of that growth may have been caused by the migration of displaced Canaanites. In that case, Canaanites who lived in cities in the lowlands of Canaan were displaced and then migrated to the highlands of Israel adding to the already existing population there. Regardless of what exactly happened, the likely scenario is that the population in the highlands of Israel grew over a period of about a few hundred years leading to a relatively much larger population in the 10<sup>th</sup> century BCE than in the 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE. That population growth likely caused serious economic growth, which would have likely led to a more developed and organized society with more advanced administrative functions.

Even though there was a lot of destruction to Canaanite cities and there was likely a kind of reset in Canaan, there were still cities existing in the lowlands of Canaan after that destruction. Their society wasn't completely wiped out. However, it seems that in or around 926 BCE, the Egyptian Empire again launched in array of attacks on Canaanite cities, and these attacks may have also included Israel. These attacks may have again fueled economic change in the highlands of Israel. Even if Israel was attacked, the destruction to Canaanite cities likely eventually led to economic growth in the highlands of Israel. We can see that the economic system in Israel seems to have developed substantially during and after this time-period because the kingdom of Israel seems to have been established within about 50-100 years from then. There is archaeological evidence that shows that the kingdom of Israel seems to have existed in the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE, and maybe even within the first half of that century.

The kingdom of David is thought to have existed in the 10<sup>th</sup> century BCE. However, archeological evidence suggests that there wasn't a kingdom ruled from Jerusalem in the 10<sup>th</sup> century BCE and that the kingdom of Israel was the first kingdom in the highlands of Israel. Population levels seem to have been relatively low in the southern highlands of Israel. The north was much more populated. The communities in the highlands of Israel seem to have mostly depended on agriculture. The land in the northern highlands was much more fruitful and seems to have led to much more prosperity than the land in the southern highlands. In the north, there were more abundant water sources; and fertile valleys gave way to production of grain, olive trees, and grape vines. There have also been remains of presses found that show evidence of a developed agricultural system that likely produced oil and wine. In the south, vegetation was scarce and rainfall was not frequent.

Given the different conditions in the north versus the south, two different ecosystems seem to have developed in the highlands of Israel. As a result of the different conditions, population levels seem to have been much higher in the north than in the south. Eventually, population growth combined with favorable conditions in the north seems to have resulted in economic growth in the northern highlands, which in turn seems to have resulted in the formation of the kingdom of Israel. So not only does archaeological evidence support the assertion that the kingdom of David didn't exist as the Bible describes and that the kingdom of Israel was the first kingdom in the highlands of Israel, but the evidence of the flow of economic activity back then in the fruitful north as opposed to the scarce south also shows that the first kingdom would have probably arisen in the north rather than in the south. Archaeological evidence shows that population levels in the southern highlands seem to have grown much more after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire.

There is archaeological evidence of a "House of David" having existed in the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE. So the character of David in the Bible may actually be based on a real person. The south does seem to have been

separate from the north. So the south may have had their own local government. However, such a local government would have likely been relatively very small, not likely much of a kingdom. Also, the evidence of the House of David seems to be from the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE, not the 10<sup>th</sup> century BCE, and also seems to show an inscription that refers to the kingdom of Israel. So the House of David seems to have been a local government that existed during the same time-period as the kingdom of Israel. The kingdom of David as described in the Bible supposedly existed before the kingdom of Israel and encompassed all of Israel, not just the southern highlands. The real House of David likely was a smaller local government that was only in the southern highlands, existed during the same time-period as the kingdom of Israel, and was overshadowed by the kingdom of Israel.

Probably the most defining piece of evidence that the kingdom of Israel was the first kingdom in Israel is the fact that it is named "Israel". The Merneptah Stele shows evidence that a community named Israel likely existed by the 13<sup>th</sup> century BCE. If there was going to be a kingdom named after Israel, then that kingdom would have likely been the first kingdom to arise in Israel. Beginning thousands of years ago, the nation of Israel and the kingdom of Israel shared the same name. That is very defining evidence that the kingdom of Israel took priority in Israel. For the nation of Israel as it is today to share the same name as an ancient kingdom, that kingdom would have likely been either the first kingdom or the most recent kingdom. The most recent kingdom was the kingdom of Judah and the name "Judah" is different than the name "Israel". If the name "Israel" doesn't correspond to the name of the most recent kingdom, then it probably corresponds to the first kingdom, which shows that the kingdom of Israel was likely the first kingdom. It would have been strange for there to have been a community called Israel, then for there to have been the kingdom of David that was not named after Israel, and then for there to have been a kingdom afterward that went back to the name "Israel". Instead, it is more likely that the first kingdom adopted the name of Israel that already existed amongst that community. In addition to all of the other evidence already shown that the kingdom of Israel was probably the first kingdom in Israel, the fact that the nation of Israel and the kingdom of Israel share the same name gives incredible evidence that the kingdom of Israel was the first kingdom in Israel and that the kingdom of David didn't exist as the Bible describes. As previously stated, in contrast to the Bible, the real House of David likely was a smaller local government that was only in the southern highlands, existed during the same time-period as the kingdom of Israel, and was overshadowed by the kingdom of Israel. Additionally, there is evidence that suggests that the House of David may have been a vassal for the kingdom of Israel at some point, so people of the House of David may have even identified as Israelites. The probable scenario is that there was first a community called Israel that grew into a kingdom called Israel, a kingdom named for the people it arose from, and then afterward people in the kingdom of Judah identified as Israelites because generations of people who had lived there had already identified as Israelites for centuries; and so the name "Israel" continued on and still exists to this day.

The legacy of the House of David seems to have grown into the kingdom of Judah, and the kingdom of Judah seems to have thrived after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire. There could have been substantial migrations of people from the north to the south after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed. The Assyrian Empire seems to have taken some Israelites captive while taking control of northern Israel and placing captives from other places in that land. A result of that could have been that many Israelites who had previously lived in the north who were not taken captive migrated to southern Israel. Those migrations could have fueled the economic system in the south. Alternatively or in addition, the kingdom of Judah may have expanded into the north. Either way, there was likely substantial

population growth and an increase in resources leading to a more advanced economic system. A little over a century after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire, the kingdom of Judah was destroyed by the Babylonian Empire, and Israelites were then exiled and taken into captivity in Babylon.

### **Remnants of the Real Ancient Israel**

There are a few pieces of archaeological evidence that can be linked to certain verses in the Bible. We should first revisit the attacks carried out by the Egyptian Empire around 926 BCE. These attacks seem to have included some Israelite territory. There was a stele found from Megiddo (a city in ancient Israel) that bears the name of the Egyptian pharaoh King Shoshenq I and there are topographical lists that indicate that the northern kingdom of Israel seems to have been attacked. The Bible includes verses that can be linked to these attacks. However, the Bible seems to include different details.

1 Kings 14:25-26

*In the fifth year of King Rehoboam, Sishak king of Egypt attacked Jerusalem. He carried off the treasures of the temple of the Lord and the treasures of the royal palace. He took everything, including all the gold shields Solomon had made.*

These verses mention a king named “Sishak” and that name likely corresponds to King Shoshenq I. The main question is about whether Jerusalem was included in this attack. Given that the archaeological evidence includes northern Israel but not Jerusalem, it is likely the case that either Jerusalem wasn’t attacked or the community in southern Israel was not large enough to be considered important enough to list on any of the inscriptions that were produced about those attacks. So the likely scenario is that these verses do refer to the actual attacks by King Shoshenq I, but either details were fabricated to include Jerusalem in the story or the community in the south was not large enough to be recognized on the same level as the kingdom in the north.

The Mesha Stele, which has been dated to the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE, describes relations between the House of Omri and Moab. Omri was a king of the kingdom of Israel. It was previously mentioned that the Bible fraudulently describes Moabites as descendants of Lot and that the entire Moabite race is the product of incest. Such an insult is indicative of the hostility that was shared between Israel and Moab. The following text is from the Mesha Stele.

*I am Mesha, son of Chemosh-gad, king of Moab, the Dibonite. My father reigned over Moab thirty years, and I have reigned after my father. And I have built this sanctuary for Chemosh in Karchah, a sanctuary of salvation, for he saved me from all aggressors, and made me look upon all mine enemies with contempt. Omri was king of Israel, and oppressed Moab during many days, and Chemosh was angry with his aggressions. His son succeeded him, and he also said, I will oppress Moab. In my days he said, Let us go, and I will see my desire upon him and his house, and Israel said, I shall destroy it for ever. Now Omri took the land of Madeba, and occupied it in his day, and in the days of his son, forty years. And Chemosh had mercy on it in my time. And I built Baal-meon and made therein the ditch, and I built Kiriathaim. And the men of Gad dwelled in the country of Ataroth from ancient times, and the king of Israel fortified Ataroth. I assaulted the wall and captured it, and killed all the warriors of the city for the well-pleasing of*



*Chemosh and Moab, and I removed from it all the spoil, and offered it before Chemosh in Kirjath; and I placed therein the men of Siran, and the men of Mochrath. And Chemosh said to me, Go take Nebo against Israel, and I went in the night and I fought against it from the break of day till noon, and I took it: and I killed in all seven thousand men, but I did not kill the women and maidens, for I devoted them to Ashtar-Chemosh; and I took from it the vessels of Jehovah, and offered them before Chemosh. And the king of Israel fortified Jahaz, and occupied it, when he made war against me, and Chemosh drove him out before me, and I took from Moab two hundred men in all, and placed them in Jahaz, and took it to annex it to Dibon.*

The following verses from the Bible seem to correspond with the text just previously examined from the Mesha Stele.

#### 2 Kings 3:4-9

*Now Mesha king of Moab raised sheep, and he had to supply the king of Israel with a hundred thousand lambs and with the wool of a hundred thousand rams. But after Ahab died, the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel. So at that time King Joram set out from Samaria and mobilized all Israel. He also sent this message to Jehoshaphat king of Judah: "The king of Moab has rebelled against me. Will you go with me to fight against Moab?"*

*"I will go with you", he replied. "I am as you are, my people as your people, my horses as your horses."*

*"By what route shall we attack?" he asked.*

*"Through the Desert of Edom", he answered.*

*So the king of Israel set out with the king of Judah and the king of Edom. After a roundabout march of seven days, the army had no more water for themselves or for the animals with them."*

#### 2 Kings 3:26-27

*When the king of Moab saw that the battle had gone against him, he took with him seven hundred swordsmen to break through to the king of Edom, but they failed. Then he took his firstborn son, who was to succeed him as king, and offered him as a sacrifice on the city wall. The fury against Israel was great; they withdrew and returned to their own land.*

These verses describe a battle between Israel and Moab. The kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom are described as having joined forces for this battle with Moab. Much like the Mesha Stele, these verses describe Mesha as having made a sacrifice to the Moabite "god". Unlike the Mesha Stele, these verses describe Mesha as eventually backing off the attack against Israel. The story as described in the Bible probably isn't very accurate, but there does seem to be some fragments of truth there.

The Tel Dan Stele, which has been dated to the 9<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> centuries BCE, contains the following text.

*I slew [seve]nty kin[gs], who harnessed th[ousands of cha]riots and thousands of horsemen (or: horses). [I killed Jeho]ram son [of Ahab] king of Israel, and [I] killed [Ahaz]iahu son of [Jehoram kin]g of the House of David*

That text describes the slaying of seventy kings, the killing of Jehoram ("Joram" in the Bible) son of Ahab king of Israel, and the killing of Ahaziahu son of Jehoram (different Jehoram) king of the House of David. That text can be compared to following verses from the Bible.

#### 2 Kings 9:24

*Then Jehu drew his bow and shot Joram between the shoulders. The arrow pierced his heart and he slumped down in his chariot.*

2 Kings 9:27

*When Ahaziah king of Judah saw what had happened, he fled up the road to Beth Hagan. Jehu chased him, shouting, "Kill him too!" They wounded him in his chariot on the way up to Gur near Ibleam, but he escaped to Megiddo and died there.*

2 Kings 10:1-4

*Now there were in Samaria seventy sons of the house of Ahab. So Jehu wrote letters and sent them to Samaria: to the officials of Jezreel, to the elders, and to the guardians of Ahab's children. He said, "As soon as this letter reaches you, since your master's sons are with you and you have chariots and horses, a fortified city and weapons, choose the best and most worthy of your master's sons and set him on his father's throne. Then fight for your master's house."*

2 Kings 10:6-7

*Then Jehu wrote them a second letter, saying, "If you are on my side and will obey me, take the heads of your master's sons and come to me in Jezreel by this time tomorrow."*

*Now the royal princes, seventy of them, were with the leading men of the city, who were rearing them. When the letter arrived, these men took the princes and slaughtered all seventy of them. They put their heads in baskets and sent them to Jehu in Jezreel.*

These verses from chapters 9 and 10 of 2 Kings present a story about Joram son of Ahab king of Israel and Ahziah son of Jehoram king of Judah as having been killed. These verses also describe seventy sons of Ahab as having been killed. That information is very similar to the information we examined from the Tel Dan Stele. The major difference is that these killings are described in the Bible as having been ordered by Jehu who is described as the new king of Israel. The Tel Dan Stele doesn't claim who the author is, however, given the Aramaic language, it was probably written by the kingdom of Aram. If we add to that assertion the biblical context of chapters 9 and 10 of 2 Kings, which describe Israel as having defended against King Hazael of Aram, then the Tel Dan Stele is probably a product of the kingdom of Aram during the reign of King Hazael. So the story in the Bible is similar but also quite different. One difference relates to the Bible describing Jehu king of Israel as having ordered those killings, while the Tel Dan Stele seems to portray King Hazael of Aram as the one who ordered those killings.

There is also Sennacherib's Annals, which are annals of the Assyrian king Sennacherib and have been found inscribed on clay prisms. They describe a siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib during the reign of King Hezekiah. The following verse shows that the Bible addresses the attack described on the clay tablets that show Sennacherib's Annals.

2 Kings 17:13

*In the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah's reign, Sennacherib king of Assyria attacked all the fortified cities of Judah and captured them.*

The Bible goes on to describe King Hezekiah giving treasures to Sennacherib and the kingdom of Judah continuing on. It seems that the kingdom of Judah became a vassal of the Assyrian Empire and that also seems to have been the case with the kingdom of Israel before it was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire.

Historical evidence shows that it seems that the kingdom of Israel was a vassal of the Assyrian Empire and then tried to form somewhat of an alliance with the Egyptian Empire to go against the Assyrian Empire. It seems that in part led to the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by the Assyrian Empire. Later on, the Assyrian Empire apparently attacked the kingdom of Judah and King Hezekiah seems to have worked out a deal for the survival of the kingdom of Judah. This all before the Babylonian Empire eventually destroyed the kingdom of Judah.

There are four stories from the Bible that we have just previously matched to archaeological evidence. Those stories are of Shisak king of Egypt attacking Israel, a battle between Israel and Moab, the killings of Joram son of Ahab king of Israel and Ahziah son of Jehoram king of Judah, and the attack of the kingdom of Judah by the Assyrian king Senacherib. The differences can probably be mainly attributed to the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament being mostly written from a Judahite perspective. That would also explain why the archaeological evidence seems to describe the House of David while the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament describe the kingdom of Judah. So there appears to be some historical truth in these narratives, but these narratives also seem fraudulently tailored to assign undue importance to Judah.

### **Dating the Productions of Old Testament Narratives**

The formation of kingdoms gives way to the development of different aspects of society. One of the aspects of society that often develops is literacy, and therefore written material. Simply judging by how a society would likely develop as a kingdom first develops and considering the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament are mostly written from a Judahite perspective, we can arrive at the conclusion that a lot of the information that is in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament was likely first recorded in written form during the reign of the kingdom of Judah, likely in the time-period of 750-600 BCE.

Additional evidence can be found in chapter 12 of Genesis.

Genesis 12:6-8

*Abram traveled through the land as far as the site of the great tree of Moreh at Shechem. At that time the Canaanites were in the land. The Lord appeared to Abram and said, "To your offspring I will give this land." So he built an altar there to the Lord, who had appeared to him.*

*From there he went on toward the hills east of Bethel on the west and Ai on the east. There he built an altar to the Lord and called on the name of the Lord. Then Abram set out and continued toward the Negev.*

Chapter 12 of Genesis describes a promise of land. In chapter 12, Abraham is described as traveling to Shechem and Bethel. Shechem and Bethel are both located in northern Israel and were both very important cities to the kingdom of Israel. Shechem is described as the first capital of the kingdom of Israel and Bethel is described as a major city for worship. Additionally, the name "Bethel" means "house of El". A presumably fictional character like Abraham being described as having gone to cities that were so important to the northern kingdom of Israel is evidence that the kingdom of Judah was trying to lay claim to northern Israel. The kingdom of Israel had been destroyed; the kingdom of Judah had survived an attack by the Assyrian Empire and apparently became a vassal of the Assyrian Empire; and with Genesis

12:6-8, we can see that the kingdom of Judah seems to have been trying to convert people in northern Israel by claiming that Abraham was in major cities in northern Israel before the kingdom of Israel was established. These claims show evidence of an expansion strategy. The Assyrian Empire had destroyed the kingdom of Israel and so had control over northern Israel. The Assyrian Empire also attacked the kingdom of Judah and controlled that kingdom. All of Israel seems to have been engulfed by the Assyrian Empire, but the kingdom of Judah was left to be its own nation-state within the Assyrian Empire. As we will see in more detail later, a similar situation existed between Israel and the Persian Empire after the Babylonian Exile, and between Judea and the Roman Empire in the first century. At different times, Israel, or more specifically Judea, has been able to maintain some level of self-governance as a part of a larger empire. This also seems to have been the case between the kingdom of Judah and the Assyrian Empire. As a result, the kingdom of Judah survived for a while and had room to expand into northern Israel. The claims made in chapter 12 of Genesis about Abraham traveling to Shechem and Bethel serve as evidence that the kingdom of Judah pumped fraudulent information to people as a part of conversion tactics and an expansion strategy into the north.

The narrative in chapter 12 of Genesis that describes Abraham in Egypt serves as additional evidence that the character of Abraham was used to make fraudulent claims.

Genesis 12:10

*Now there was a famine in the land, and Abram went down to Egypt to live there for a while because the famine was severe.*

Genesis 12:17

*But the Lord inflicted serious diseases on Pharaoh and his household because of Abram's wife Sarai.*

As shown earlier, this part of chapter 12 of Genesis mirrors certain aspects of the book of Exodus. There are two points to make. One is that archaeological evidence shows that the tradition of the week of unleavened bread probably came from Canaanite society. The second is that the simplification of details from the book of Exodus shows that such details were probably produced after the original exodus story was produced. For there to be such similarities and for those similarities to be so briefly described shows that such a story seems to have been copied from the exodus story and shows that the exodus story seems to have been already well-known. Given that the tradition of the week of unleavened bread probably came from Canaanite society, it seems that the character of Moses may have as well. Just as chapter 12 of Genesis claims that Abraham was in Shechem and Bethel before the kingdom of Israel was established, it also claims that Abraham faced off with the pharaoh of Egypt before Moses did. Abraham is the supposed patriarch of Judaism and chapter 12 does a lot to show that the kingdom of Judah used the character of Abraham to bolster its own prestige and expansion.

Chapter 17 of Genesis shows additional evidence of an expansion strategy and describes another promise of land.

Genesis 17:8

*"The whole land of Canaan, where you are now an alien, I will give as an everlasting possession to you and your descendants after you; and I will be their God."*

Again using the character of Abraham, chapter 17 describes the promise of all of Canaan to the supposed descendants of Abraham. Additionally, the word “Elohim” and the name “El” are used in chapter 17, which shows evidence that such writing was likely produced in such a way as a conversion tactic. We saw a similar conversion tactic with Exodus 6:3, which seems to be an attempt to convince people to use the name “Yahweh” instead of the name “El”. Likewise, chapter 17 of Genesis describes Canaan being promised to Abraham and uses the word “Elohim” and the name “El” in what seems to be an attempt to convince people who were familiar with those words that all of Canaan belonged to the kingdom of Judah. Such strategies have often been used by kingdoms and empires that take over new territory. On one hand, a king or emperor wants to rule over people. On the other hand, a king or emperor also wants people to be loyal. Using certain language to appeal to people who are different is a strategy that can help in the process of a conversion of a population. Polytheism seems to have been dominant in northern Israel and a monotheistic kingdom in the south seems to have tried to expand into the north while using words that were familiar to polytheists in the north.

These examples from chapters 12 and 17 of Genesis show evidence of an expansion strategy from the kingdom of Judah in the aftermath of the destruction of the kingdom of Israel. Therefore, chapters 12 and 17 show specific evidence of the production of documents during the reign of the kingdom of Judah, likely in the time-period of 750-600 BCE.

We can also see a similar strategy in the narratives about King David and the supposed splitting off of the north afterward. These narratives describe the kingdom of David as a united monarchy that ruled over all of Israel. The Bible later describes that the kingdom of Israel split off later on as its own kingdom. As already shown, the kingdom of David probably didn't exist as the Bible describes and instead the kingdom of Israel was probably the first kingdom in Israel. But the narratives about the kingdom of David claim that a united monarchy ruled from the south and controlled all of Israel before the kingdom of Israel ever existed. The Bible doubles down on that by also describing the kingdom of Israel as having split off from the united monarchy rather than developing as its own kingdom before any other kingdom existed in Israel. Since the narratives about the kingdom of David are trying to claim that the kingdom of David ruled over all of Israel before the kingdom of Israel was established and since those narratives favor the legacy of the kingdom of Judah, those narratives were probably produced during the reign of the kingdom of Judah, likely in the time-period of 750-600 BCE.

We can look to the reign of King Josiah for more specific dating.

2 Chronicles 34:1-7

*Josiah was eight years old when he became king, and he reigned in Jerusalem thirty-one years. He did what was right in the eyes of the Lord and walked in the ways of his father David, not turning aside to the right or the left.*

*In the eighth year of his reign, while he was still young, he began to seek the God of his father David. In his twelfth year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem of high places, Asherah poles, carved idols, and cast images. Under his direction the altars of the Baals were torn down; he cut to pieces the incense altars that were above them, and smashed the Asherah poles, the idols, and the images. These he broke to pieces and scattered over the graves of those who had sacrificed to them. He burned the bones of the priests on their altars, and so he purged Judah and Jerusalem. In the towns of Manasseh, Ephraim, and Simeon, as far as Naphtali, and in the ruins around them, he tore down the altars and the Asherah poles*

*and crushed the idols to powder and cut to pieces all the incense altars throughout Israel. Then he went back to Jerusalem.*

*In the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, to purify the land and the temple, he sent Saphan son of Azaliah and Maaseiah the ruler of the city, with Joah son of Joahaz, the recorder, to repair the temple of the Lord his God.*

#### **2 Kings 23:4-15**

*The king ordered Hilkiah the high priest, the priests next in rank and the doorkeepers to remove from the temple of the Lord all the articles made for Baal and Asherah and all the starry hosts. He burned them outside Jerusalem in the fields of the Kidron Valley and took the ashes to Bethel. He did away with the pagan priests appointed by the kings of Judah to burn incense on the high places of the towns of Judah and on those around Jerusalem – those who burned incense to Baal, to the sun, and moon, to the constellations and to all the starry hosts. He took the Asherah pole from the temple of the Lord to the Kidron Valley outside Jerusalem and burned it there. He ground it to powder and scattered the dust over the graves of the common people. He also tore down the quarters of the male shrine prostitutes, which were in the temple of the Lord and where women did weaving for Asherah.*

*Josiah brought all the priests from the towns of Judah and desecrated the high places, from Geba to Beersheba, where the priests had burned incense. He broke down the shrines at the gates – at the entrance to the Gate of Joshua, the city governor, which is on the left of the city gate. Although the priests of the high places did not serve at the altar of the Lord in Jerusalem, they ate unleavened bread with their fellow priests.*

*He desecrated Topheth, which was in the Valley of Ben Hinnom, so no one could use it to sacrifice his son or daughter in the fire to Molech. He removed from the entrance to the temple of the Lord the horses that the kings of Judah had dedicated to the sun. They were in the court near the room of an official named Nathan-Melech. Josiah then burned the chariots dedicated to the sun.*

*He pulled down the altars the kings of Judah had erected on the roof near the upper room of Ahaz, and the altars Manasseh had built in the two courts of the temple of the Lord. He removed them from there, smashed them to pieces and threw the rubble into the Kidron Valley. The king also desecrated the high places that were east of Jerusalem on the south of the Hill of Corruption – the ones Solomon king of Israel had built for Ashtoreth the vile goddess of the Sidonians, for Chemosh the vile god of Moab, and for Molech the detestable god of the people of Ammon. Josiah smashed the sacred stones and cut down the Asherah poles and covered the sites with human bones.*

*Even that altar at Bethel, the high place made by Jeroboam son of Nebat, who had caused Israel to sin – even that altar and high place he demolished. He burned the high place and ground it to powder, and burned the Asherah pole also.*

#### **2 Chronicles 34:14-21**

*While they were bringing out the money that had been taken into the temple of the Lord, Hilkiah the priest found the Book of the Law of the Lord that had been given through Moses. Hilkiah said to Shaphan the secretary, "I have found the Book of the Law in the temple of the Lord." He gave it to Shaphan.*

*Then Shaphan took the book to the king and reported to him: "Your officials are doing everything that has been committed to them. They have paid out the money that was in the temple of the Lord and have entrusted it to the supervisors and workers." Then Shaphan the secretary informed the king, "Hilkiah the priest has given me a book." And Shaphan read from it in the presence of the king.*

*When the king heard the words of the Law, he tore his robes. He gave these orders to Hilkiah, Ahikam son of Shaphan, Abdon son of Micah, Shaphan the secretary, and Asaiah the king's attendant: "Go inquire of the Lord for me and for the remnant in Israel and Judah about what is written in this book that has been found. Great is the Lord's anger that is poured out on us because our fathers have not kept the word of the Lord; they have not acted in accordance with all that is written in this book."*

2 Chronicles 34:29-31

*Then the king called together all the elders of Judah and Jerusalem. He went up to the temple of the Lord with the men of Judah, the pope of Jerusalem, the priests, and the Levites – all the people from the least to the greatest. He read in their hearing all the words of the Book of the Covenant, which had been found in the temple of the Lord. The king stood by his pillar and renewed the covenant in the presence of the Lord – to follow the Lord and keep his commands, regulations, and decrees with all his heart and all his soul, and to obey the words of the covenant written in this book.*

2 Chronicles 35:1-4

*Josiah celebrated the Passover to the Lord in Jerusalem, and the Passover lamb was slaughtered on the fourteenth day of the first month. He appointed the priests to their duties and encouraged them in the service of the Lord's temple. He said to the Levites, who instructed all Israel and who had been consecrated to the Lord: "Put the sacred ark in the temple that Solomon son of David king of Israel built. It is not to be carried about on your shoulders. Now serve the Lord your God and his people Israel. Prepare yourselves by families in your divisions, according to the directions written by David king of Israel and by his son Solomon."*

These verses allege that religious reforms were implemented by King Josiah, that the book of the law was supposedly found in the midst of those religious reforms, that King Josiah renewed the covenant, and that King Josiah ordered that Passover be celebrated. The verses that describe the book of the law as having been found seem to serve as an explanation for why new writings were to be accepted by the kingdom. There are two possibilities that can derive from that. One is that those verses are truthful, in which case old documents were really found in that way. The other is that those verses are fraudulent, in which case those documents were likely produced during the reign of King Josiah and those verses were added to fraudulently explain the addition of new religious documents and to fraudulently make those documents appear authoritative. We can turn to 1 Kings and the book of Exodus for support in finding out which possibility is more likely.

1 Kings 12:28-33

*After seeking advice, the king made two golden calves. He said to the people, "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem. Here are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of Egypt." One he set up in Bethel, and the other in Dan. And this thing became a sin; the people went even as far as Dan to worship the one there.*

*Jeroboam built shrines on high places and appointed priests from all sorts of people, even though they were not Levites. He instituted a festival on the fifteenth day of the eighth month, like the festival held in Judah, and offered sacrifices on the altar. This he did in Bethel, sacrificing to the calves he had made. And at Bethel he also installed priests at the high places he had made. On the fifteenth day of the eighth month, a month of his own choosing, he offered sacrifices on the altar he had built at Bethel. So he instituted the festival for the Israelites and went up to the altar to make offerings.*

Exodus 32:4-5

*He took what they handed him and made it into an idol cast in the shape of a calf, fashioning it with a tool. Then they said, "These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of Egypt."*

*When Aaron saw this, he built an altar in front of the calf and announced, "Tomorrow there will be a festival to the Lord." So the next day the people rose early and sacrificed burnt offerings and presented fellowship offerings. Afterward they sat down to eat and drink and got up to indulge in revelry.*

The account in 1 Kings describes King Jeroboam as having golden calves built for people to worship, and the account in the book of Exodus describes Aaron as having built a golden calf for people to worship. The account in 1 Kings describes King Jeroboam as having made a sacrifice on an altar, and the account in the book of Exodus describes Aaron as having built an altar. The account in 1 Kings describes King Jeroboam as having said "Here are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of Egypt", and the account in the book of Exodus describes Aaron as having said "These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of Egypt". These accounts are so similar that one is probably copied from the other. Since the golden calves built on orders of King Jeroboam probably really did exist and probably really were destroyed on orders of King Josiah, the account in the book of Exodus is probably fraudulent and was probably copied from the account in 1 Kings. The motivation to add the fraudulent account in Exodus was likely to instill fear into people about worshipping golden calves. Worshipping golden calves would have been a major issue for King Josiah given that he seems to have ordered them to be destroyed and seems to have implemented serious religious reforms to change how people worshipped. The account in the book of Exodus was probably fraudulently added during the reign of King Josiah in response to the golden calves that had been previously built in Israel on orders of King Jeroboam and in response to people worshipping smaller idols that also represented a golden calf. Different supposed "gods" that people worshipped in the ancient Near East were often represented by idols that were made to look like a bull. Idols that looked like bulls were used to worship El, Baal, Bel, and others. So not only were there likely large golden calves built in Israel, but there were also small idols that looked like bulls that people worshipped. So preventing the Israelites from worshipping calves was likely a top priority for King Josiah, and so the account in the book of Exodus was likely fraudulently produced during the reign of King Josiah. The likelihood that the account in the book of Exodus was fraudulently added during the reign of King Josiah shows that the verses about the book of the law that was supposedly found during the reign of King Josiah are probably fraudulent and were probably added to explain the addition of fraudulent documents and to fraudulently make those documents appear authoritative. Exodus 32:4-5 are a good example of probable fraud committed during the reign of King Josiah.

Another example of probable fraud related to King Josiah is a supposed prophecy about King Josiah having those golden calves destroyed.

1 Kings 13:2

*He cried out against the altar by the word of the Lord: "O altar, altar! This is what the Lord says: 'A son named Josiah will be born to the house of David. On you he will sacrifice the priests of the high places who now make offerings here, and human bones will be burned on you.'"*

This verse appears in the chapter that is right after the chapter that contains the narrative about King Jeroboam having the golden calves built. The supposed prophecy in 1 Kings 13:2 is in response to the building of the golden calves and claims to be a prophecy about what King Josiah would do about those



golden calves. So 1 Kings 13:2 is probably fraudulent and was likely produced either shortly before or sometime after King Josiah destroyed those golden calves. So this supposed prophecy was probably already fulfilled shortly after or sometime before it was ever written down. 1 Kings 13:2 is another example of probable fraud committed in relation to the reign of King Josiah.

We can turn to Isaiah 7:14-17 for even more specific dating.

Isaiah 7:14-17

*“Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and will call him Immanuel. He will eat curds and honey when he knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right. But before the boy knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right, the land of the two kings you dread will be laid waste. The Lord will bring on you and on your people and on the house of your father a time unlike any since Ephraim broke away from Judah – he will bring the king of Assyria.”*

As shown in the introduction of this book, these verses relate to the destruction of the kingdom of Israel and therefore are not about Christ. However, these verses do seem to be about a coming messiah. How could these verses be about a coming messiah but not about Christ? Similar to the supposed prophecy about King Josiah having the golden calves destroyed, Isaiah 7:14-17 seem to be about a prophecy about a king.

For further evidence, we can turn to the very next chapter in the book of Isaiah.

Isaiah 8:3-4

*Then I went to the prophetess, and she conceived and gave birth to a son. And the Lord said to me, “Name him Maher-Shalal-Hash-Baz. Before the boy knows how to say ‘My father’ or ‘My mother’, the wealth of Damascus and the plunder of Samaria will be carried off by the king Assyria.”*

Isaiah 8:8

*“And sweep on into Judah, passing through it and reaching up to the neck. Its outspread wings will cover the dreadth of your land, O Immanuel!”*

Isaiah 8:10

*Devise your strategy, but it will be thwarted; propose your plan, but it will not stand for God is with us.*

In both Isaiah 7:14-17 and Isaiah 8:3-4, we see the same general sequence: a woman gives birth to a son, a prophecy is given for the name of the son, that prophecy goes on to describe the destruction of two cities by the Assyrian Empire, and the destruction of those cities is described as happening before the son learns either right from wrong or how to say “My father” or “My mother”. Such a sequence like that being described in two different supposed prophecies shows that one was probably copied from the other one.

Additionally, Isaiah 7:14-17 state that the name of “the boy” will be “Immanuel”. That translation should instead show two words: “Immanu” and “El”. “Immanu” means “with us”. As shown earlier here in Part 3, the name “El” was originally used as a name for the chief Canaanite “god” but is used here to refer to God. So “Immanuel” should really be translated as “God with us”. “O Immanuel” is shown at the end of Isaiah 8:8 and “God is with us” is shown at the end of Isaiah 8:10. “Immanuel” in Isaiah 7:14-17,

“Immanuel” in Isaiah 8:8, and “God is with us” in Isaiah 8:10 are all translated from the Hebrew phrase (“El”) :לָאֵל (“Immanu”) עִמָּנוּ (read from right to left), which can be translated as “God with us”. Such similar wording, particularly with the specific use of the word “El” within writing that refers to the House of David in Isaiah 7:14-17, shows further evidence that one supposed prophecy was copied from the other one.

There are five main components that each narrative possesses: a woman gives birth to a son, a prophecy is given for the name of the son, that prophecy goes on to describe the destruction of two cities by the Assyrian Empire, the destruction of those cities is described as happening before the son learns either right from wrong or how to say “My father” or “My mother”, and the Hebrew phrase “Immanu El” is used.

The name of “the boy” in each narrative can show which one was likely copied from the other. The name used in chapter 8, “Maher-Shalal-Hash-Baz”, which can be translated as “quick to plunder”, seems to specifically refer to the destruction of the kingdom of Israel because the name refers to plundering. The narrative in chapter 7, on the other hand, uses a name that can be translated as “God with us”. Both narratives refer to the destruction of the kingdom of Israel, but chapter 7 goes further by placing special importance on “the boy”. Chapter 8 is really focused on the destruction of the kingdom of Israel and the name of “the boy” even seems to refer to the destruction of the kingdom of Israel. Therefore, the destruction of the kingdom of Israel is the main focus of chapter 8. Chapter 7, on the other hand, puts some focus on the destruction of kingdom of Israel but also places an exalted level of focus on “the boy”. That additional focus is likely representative of a later production. It wouldn’t be very useful to copy a narrative if the focus of the new narrative is included in the focus of the older narrative. In other words, the motivation to copy a narrative would likely arise from a desire to provide new information. Since the narrative in chapter 7 refers to the destruction of the kingdom of Israel, there wouldn’t seem to be much motivation to copy that narrative to produce a new narrative about the destruction of the kingdom of Israel because that would seem redundant. However, there could be motivation to copy a narrative to expand on that information and present some new information. Therefore, the narrative in chapter 7 seems to have been copied from the narrative in chapter 8 because both narratives put some focus on the destruction of the kingdom of Israel but chapter 7 expands to put exalted focus on “the boy”. Chapter 8 seems to use the name of “the boy” to refer to the destruction of the kingdom of Israel and so “the boy” seems to take a backseat to the main focus of chapter 8. Meanwhile, chapter 7 exalts “the boy” while still placing focus on the destruction of the kingdom of Israel.

Further evidence that the narrative in chapter 7 was copied from the narrative in chapter 8 can be seen by how each narrative uses the phrase “God with us”. Chapter 8 uses that phrase to simply state “God is with us”. Chapter 7 not only uses that phrase but also specifically uses that phrase as the name of “the boy”. Both narratives use that phrase, but chapter 7 goes further by using that phrase specifically as a name. That is another example of chapter 7 using similar information as chapter 8 but doing something additional that chapter 8 doesn’t. That shows further evidence that information in chapter 7 was copied from chapter 8.

Additionally, as previously mentioned, it’s particularly telling that Isaiah 7:14-17 use the word “El” within writing that refers to the House of David. The word “El” is not commonly used in the Bible, not nearly as much as “Elohim”, and it is particularly uncommon to see it in narratives that refer to the

kingdom of David or the kingdom of Judah. To see the word “El” in Isaiah 7:14-17 given that those verses refer to the House of David strongly suggests that the part about the name “Immanuel” came from writing that already existed.

So it seems that Isaiah 7:14-17 use copied information from chapter 8 of the book of Isaiah to exalt someone who has been portrayed as a messianic figure. First and foremost, someone who isn't Christ being exalted as a messianic figure shows incredibly clear evidence that Isaiah 7:14-17 are fraudulent. Additionally, the likelihood that Isaiah 7:14-17 use copied information from elsewhere shows further evidence that Isaiah 7:14-17 are fraudulent. The evidence that shows that Isaiah 7:14-17 are fraudulent shows evidence that those verses were produced with the main purpose of presenting someone as a messianic figure. So who is this person?

Isaiah 7:1

*When Ahaz son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, was king of Judah, King Rezin of Aram and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel marched up to fight against Jerusalem, but they could not overpower it.*

Isaiah 7:3

*Then the Lord said to Isaiah, “Go out, you and your son Shear-Jashub, to meet Ahaz at the end of the aqueduct of the Upper Pool, on the road to the Washerman’s Field.”*

Isaiah 7:5-7

*“Aram, Ephraim, and Remaliah’s son have plotted against your ruin, saying, ‘Let us invade Judah; let us tear it apart and divide it among ourselves, and make the son of Tabeel king over it.’ Yet this is what the Sovereign Lord says:*

*‘It will not take place, it will not happen.’ ”*

Isaiah 7:10-14

*Again, the Lord spoke to Ahaz, “Ask the Lord your God for a sign, whether in the deepest depths or in the highest heights.”*

*But Ahaz said, “I will not ask; I will not put the Lord to the test.”*

*Then Isaiah said, “Hear now, you house of David! Is it not enough to try the patience of men? Will you try the patience of God also? Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: the virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son and will call him Immanuel. He will eat curds and honey when he knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right. But before the boy knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right, the land of the two kings you dread will be laid waste. The Lord will bring on you and on your people and on the house of your father a time unlike any since Ephraim broke away from Judah – he will bring the king of Assyria.”*

These verses describe a scene that involves Isaiah and King Ahaz. This scene shows a threat to Judah from northern kingdoms. So this threat to Judah is the background of this scene moving into the supposed prophecy. The verses then proceed with that supposed prophecy about a boy and the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by the Assyrian Empire. So these verses are meant to be comforting and securing in that they express that Judah is protected in the midst of threats from northern kingdoms.

The Hebrew word that gets translated as “virgin” comes from the Hebrew word *הַעַלְמָה* (“alma”) and that word doesn't really specifically mean “virgin” but instead refers to a young unmarried woman. So there is

no claim being made about an immaculate conception. These verses instead simply refer to the birth of “the boy”. The woman is not named so we don’t necessarily know who she is. However, if there is any woman who would go unnamed in reference to Ahaz being told that a boy is going to be born, it would probably be his wife or some other woman who he had an intimate relationship with. So the probable scenario is that Ahaz is the father of “the boy”. The Bible describes King Hezekiah as a son of Ahaz. Therefore, the boy described in Isaiah 7:14-17 is probably a reference to King Hezekiah.

The conclusion that King Hezekiah is being referred to in Isaiah 7:14-17 is further supported by the evidence in the Bible that shows that Hezekiah was king of Judah when the Assyrian Empire destroyed the kingdom of Israel.

2 Kings 18:9-11

*In King Hezekiah’s fourth year, which was the seventh year of Hoshea son of Elah king of Israel, Shalmaneser king of Assyria marched against Samaria and laid siege to it. At the end of three years the Assyrians took it. So Samaria was captured in Hezekiah’s sixth year, which was the ninth year of Hoshea king of Israel. The king of Assyria deported Israel to Assyria and settled them in Halh, in Gozan on the Habor River, and in towns of the Medes.*

According to the Bible, Hezekiah was king of Judah when the Assyrian Empire destroyed the kingdom of Israel. So the destruction of the kingdom of Israel seems to have been a current event during the reign of King Hezekiah and that shows evidence that a false prophecy about the destruction of the kingdom of Israel would have likely been produced during the reign of King Hezekiah.

Further evidence can be seen by the Bible’s portrayal of the relationship between Hezekiah and Isaiah.

Isaiah 38:4-6

*Then the word of the Lord came to Isaiah: “Go and tell Hezekiah, ‘This is what the Lord, the God of your father David, says: I have heard your prayer and seen your tears; I will add fifteen years to your life. And I will deliver you and this city from the hand of the king of Assyria. I will defend this city.’ ”*

According to the Bible, both in the book of Isaiah as well as 2 Kings, Isaiah is described as having been a prophet during the reign of King Hezekiah. Just based on that, any false prophecy about a messiah described in the book of Isaiah would likely have been produced during the reign of King Hezekiah.

Further evidence can be found as we take a look at the pool described in chapter 7 of the book of Isaiah.

Isaiah 7:3

*Then the Lord said to Isaiah, “Go out, you and your son Shear-Jashub, to meet Ahaz at the end of the aqueduct of the Upper Pool, on the road to the Washermain’s Field.”*

Isaiah 7:3 is a part of the same narrative as the apparently false prophecy contained in Isaiah 7:14. Isaiah 7:3 describes the “Upper Pool” existing during the reign of King Ahaz, Hezekiah’s father. However, 2 Kings describes a pool that was built during the reign of King Hezekiah.

2 Kings 20:20

*As for the other events of Hezekiah's reign, all his achievements and how he made the pool and the tunnel by which he brought water into the city, are they not written in the book of the annals of the kings of Judah?*

This verse not only shows that Hezekiah had a pool built during his reign, but the building of that pool is specifically mentioned in a concluding statement about King Hezekiah's reign that generally refers to "all of his achievements" and only specifically refers the building of "the pool and the tunnel by which he brought water into the city". The building of this pool and tunnel are being portrayed as Hezekiah's top achievement. Meanwhile, the book of Isaiah seems to refer to the same pool but describes that pool as having existed before Hezekiah became king. That shows evidence that Isaiah 7:3 was produced during the reign of King Hezekiah and therefore shows evidence that the apparently false prophecy in Isaiah 7:14 was produced during the reign of King Hezekiah.

It was previously asserted that many of the documents in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament were probably produced during the reign of the kingdom of Judah, likely in the time-period of 750-600 BCE. Based on the use of the word "Elohim" and the name "El", particularly in the conversion tactics displayed in chapter 17 of Genesis and in Exodus 6:3, a lot of the Elohist documents were probably produced during a transitional period after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel during the rise of the kingdom of Judah. Although it seems that the word "Elohim" and the name "El" continued to be used in a limited fashion, most of the use of such Canaanite language in the Bible was probably earlier on. Based on the expansion strategies shown in chapters 12 and 17 of Genesis and the narratives about the kingdom of David, at least parts of those chapters were probably produced during the rise of the kingdom of Judah as it advanced into northern Israel. Based on the likely fraudulent additions during the reigns of King Hezekiah and King Josiah, a lot of the narratives about supposed prophecies, Moses, the law, and Passover were probably produced during the 7<sup>th</sup> century BCE or later. Although the original legends of Moses, the exodus, and the week of unleavened bread may have been around before the kingdom of Judah was ever established, it seems that major portions of the writings related to those legends were produced during the reign of the kingdom of Judah. Based on what appears to be Babylonian influences, a lot of the documents in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament were probably produced or at least edited during the Babylonian Exile. Chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis, a lot of the rest of Genesis, and other documents were probably produced during the Babylonian Exile in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE. Different documents were probably compiled together during the Babylonian Exile and those documents probably continued to be edited during and after the Exile. Some writing seems to show evidence that it was added towards the end of the Exile or afterward. Isaiah 45:1, which was shown before and describes Cyrus, the Persian king who released Israelites from Babylon, as a messianic figure, was obviously produced around the time that the Exile ended. Additionally, as will be shown in Part 4, some documents in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament were probably originally produced well after the Exile, maybe even as late as the second century BCE.

## **The Formation of Judaism**

There seems to have been religious reforms and fraudulent religious documents produced during the reigns of King Hezekiah and King Josiah, and maybe other kings as well. Those religious reforms and fraudulent religious documents seem to have then been taken along with some Elohist documents to

Babylon where Israelites seem to have compiled a lot of what became the Hebrew Bible and later on the Old Testament.

As shown before, the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament are mostly written from a Judahite perspective. Additionally, the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament seem to have taken on a lot of their current form during the Babylonian Exile. The combination of those two assertions shows that the people who seem to have compiled documents together during the Exile seem to have favored Judah. That makes sense considering the kingdom of Judah was the last Israelite kingdom standing before the Exile. Since the Israelites who were first exiled in Babylon had just previously lived in the kingdom of Judah, it makes sense that they would favor Judah.

Toward the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE, after the Persian Empire defeated the Babylonian Empire, the Persian emperor Cyrus freed Israelites who were in captivity in Babylon, and Israelite priests brought a new order to the people in Israel. That new order became known as Judaism. The name “Judaism” comes from the same root as the name “Judah”. “Judaism” can be viewed as “Judah-ism”. Judaism is the Judahite religion that seems to have risen to fame during the reign of the kingdom of Judah and seems to have been further solidified in writings that came out of the Babylonian Exile.

After the Exile, a new temple was built in Jerusalem, the priests had taken control, and there wasn’t a king among the Jews. Israel had become a vassal for the Persian Empire; but among the Jews, the priests took control. From then on, Judaism progressed and so much of Israel’s history was buried. Eventually, the Roman Empire controlled much of the area surrounding the Mediterranean Sea with Israel on the east side of that empire. Then, in the first century CE, Christ appeared in physical form.

### **The Immaculate Conception and the Following Years**

The only references in the Gospels to the supposed physical “birth” of the physical appearance of Christ are in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, which have both been shown to be incredibly fraudulent and unreliable. We will begin by analyzing Matthew and then move on to Luke.

The Gospel of Matthew begins with a genealogy that is described as going from Abraham to Christ. That genealogy names Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and King David. As already shown here in Part 3, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are probably not real people; so any genealogy that names them is probably fraudulent. Also already shown here in Part 3, King David was probably not a real king in the way that the Bible describes; so any genealogy describing David as a king is probably fraudulent. The likely fraudulent nature of this genealogy shows that the very beginning of the Gospel of Matthew appears to be fraudulent.

After the genealogy leads to Joseph, the man described as Mother Mariam’s husband, the Gospel of Matthew moves forward with the narrative about the supposed physical “birth” of the physical appearance of Christ. The following describes the naming of “Jesus”.

Matthew 1:21-23

*She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins.”*

*All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet: “The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel”, which means “God with us”.*

These verses refer to the Isaiah 7:14-17 as shown below.

Isaiah 7:14-17

*“Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and will call him Immanuel. He will eat curds and honey when he knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right. But before the boy knows enough to reject the wrong and choose the right, the land of the two kings you dread will be laid waste. The Lord will bring on you and on your people and on the house of your father a time unlike any since Ephraim broke away from Judah – he will bring the king of Assyria.”*

First and foremost, the evidence that shows that Isaiah 7:14 is fraudulent provides evidence that the reference to that verse in the Gospel of Matthew is fraudulent. Additionally, as previously shown, Isaiah 7:14 is about a supposed prophecy about the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by the Assyrian Empire; so the prophecy contained in Isaiah 7:14 does not appear to be a prophecy about Christ and that shows further evidence that the reference to that verse in the Gospel of Matthew is fraudulent. One could argue that even though the reference to Isaiah 7:14 seems to be fraudulent, the rest of the narrative could be truthful. However, the Gospel of Matthew focuses on the fulfillment of prophecies, and the supposed fulfillment of Isaiah 7:14 is a foundational piece to the fundamental structure of this narrative. Therefore, the evidence that shows that that the reference to Isaiah 7:14 is fraudulent shows that the entire narrative about the supposed physical “birth” of the physical appearance of Christ in the Gospel of Matthew appears to be fraudulent.

Chapter 2 of the Gospel of Matthew begins with the narrative about the supposed visit of the Magi.

Matthew 2:1

*After Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, during the time of King Herod, Magi from the east came to Jerusalem.*

Matthew 2:1 describes the supposed “birthplace” of the physical appearance of Christ as Bethlehem. The exaltation of Bethlehem comes from narratives about King David. David is described as having been from Bethlehem. The supposed importance of Bethlehem is tied to King David and David was probably not a king in the way that the Bible describes. Therefore, the exaltation of Bethlehem in the Gospel of Matthew is probably fraudulent. Bethlehem is named four times in the narrative about the supposed visit of the Magi. The main scene that describes the Magi is described as having taken place in Bethlehem. Bethlehem is a foundational piece of the fundamental structure of the narrative. Therefore, the entire narrative about the supposed visit of the Magi appears to be fraudulent.

Chapter 2 of the Gospel of Matthew goes on to describe the supposed escape to Egypt.

Matthew 2:13-15

*When they had gone, an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream. “Get up”, he said, “take the child and his mother and escape to Egypt. Stay there until I tell you, for Herod is going to search for the child to kill him.” So he got up, took the child and his mother during the night and left for Egypt, where*

*he stayed until the death of Herod. And so was fulfilled what the Lord had said through the prophet: "Out of Egypt I called my son."*

The supposed prophecy that is described as stating "Out of Egypt I called my son" is improperly used in these verses. That statement is referencing Hosea 11:1.

Hosea 11:1

*"When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son."*

Hosea 11:1 refers to Israel as the son called out of Egypt. Hosea 11:1 is not a prophecy about the coming Messiah. That is further evidenced by Hosea 11:2 and Hosea 9:1

Hosea 11:2

*"But the more I called Israel, the further they went from me."*

Hosea 9:1

*Do not rejoice O Israel; do not be jubilant like the other nations. For you have been unfaithful to your God; you love the wages of a prostitute.*

Hosea 11:1 refers to the son called out of Egypt as Israel. Hosea 11:2 describes Israel as having moved further away after having been called, which seems to be a reference to the nation of Israel rather than the coming Messiah. Hosea 9:1 specifically relates Israel to other nations, which shows that the reference to Israel refers to a nation rather than the coming Messiah. So the use of that supposed prophecy in the Gospel of Matthew in relation to Egypt appears to be fraudulent. Therefore, the narrative in the Gospel of Matthew about Egypt appears to be fraudulent.

The rest of chapter 2 of the Gospel of Matthew consists of a narrative about the supposed return to Nazareth after the supposed escape to Egypt. That narrative continues the storyline from the narrative about the supposed escape to Egypt and so the entire narrative appears to be fraudulent.

Evidence has been shown that the first two chapters of the Gospel of Matthew appear to be entirely fraudulent. Chapter 3 describes the ministry of John the Baptist. Therefore, all of the narratives in the Gospel of Matthew about the supposed physical "birth" and the supposed physical "childhood" of the physical appearance of Christ appear to be fraudulent.

As we turn to the Gospel of Luke, the first point that shows the likely fraudulent nature of the narratives that we will cover within this analysis is that Luke is the most extreme of all of the Gospels. The Gospel of Luke contains a narrative about the birth of John the Baptist supposedly being foretold, which isn't in any other Gospel; a narrative about John the Baptist supposedly being a biological cousin of Christ, which isn't in any other Gospel; a narrative about John the Baptist being circumcised, which isn't in any other Gospel; a narrative about Mother Mariam supposedly singing a song, which isn't in any other Gospel; a narrative about the physical appearance of Christ supposedly being circumcised, which isn't in any other Gospel; and a narrative about Christ being in the temple as a "boy", which isn't in any other Gospel. The extremes that the Gospel of Luke goes to show the likely fraudulent nature of all of those narratives.

The parents of John the Baptist are described as people named Zechariah and Elizabeth and are described as descendants of Aaron. Aaron is described in the book of Exodus as the brother of Moses, who has been



shown here in Part 3 to probably not be a real person. Therefore, Aaron is probably not a real person and so Zechariah and Elizabeth are probably either not real people, or even if they are real people they probably weren't descendants of Aaron because Aaron as described as the brother of Moses probably isn't a real person. The very beginning of these extreme narratives already seems fraudulent.

Chapter 1 of the Gospel of Luke goes on to describe Joseph as a descendant of David. The Jewish religion has an obsession with David and David was probably not a king in the way that the Bible describes. Such an obsession with David is likely the product of the kingdom of Judah exalting fraudulent traditions. As a result, Jews in the first century exalted David in a way that he shouldn't have been. That shows that the description of Joseph as a descendant of David appears to be a fraudulent attempt to connect Christ to the fake kingdom of David. Chapter 1 also mentions Abraham and Jacob, which appears to be fraudulent because Abraham and Jacob appear to not be real people. Chapter 2 of the Gospel of Luke refers to David and Bethlehem, which again appears to be a part of a fraudulent attempt to exalt David. Chapter 2 also places a lot of importance on the law of Moses, which appears to be fraudulent because Moses probably wasn't a real person. Both chapters 1 and 2 place importance on circumcision, which exalts the presumably fraudulent narratives in Genesis about a supposed covenant with Abraham about circumcision, and so those narratives appear to be fraudulent.

Chapter 2 goes on to describe Christ as supposedly a young boy and describes Christ as having referred to the temple as "my Father's house". The Jewish temple was a temple dedicated to a fraudulent Judahite religion that came out of the Babylonian Exile and became known as Judaism. Therefore, the description of the Jewish temple as Christ's "Father's house" is obviously fraudulent.

Chapter 3 of the Gospel of Luke includes an even more ridiculous genealogy than the one described in the Gospel of Matthew. The one in Luke goes all of the way back to Adam, the supposed first man to have ever lived who has been shown here in Part 3 to appear to not be a real person. This genealogy includes Adam, Abraham, Jacob, and of course David. Such a genealogy obviously appears to be fraudulent.

Evidence has been shown that the first two chapters of the Gospel of Luke appear to be entirely fraudulent and that the genealogy described in chapter 3 also appears to be fraudulent. Chapter 3 goes on to describe the ministry of John the Baptist. Therefore, all of the narratives in the Gospel of Luke about the supposed physical "birth" and the supposed physical "childhood" of the physical appearance of Christ appear to be fraudulent.

Both the Gospels of Matthew and Luke present an extensive genealogy leading up to Joseph, the man described as Mother Mariam's husband. Not only have several characters in these genealogies shown to appear to be fictional, but also, these genealogies stop with Joseph. The genealogies are used to connect Adam, Abraham, and many others to Christ; but such a connection ends with Joseph. The fact that these supposed genealogies stop with Joseph makes them irrelevant to the Gospels. These Gospel authors went to such great lengths to connect Adam, Abraham, and others to Christ; but ultimately, they stopped short of what they were really trying to accomplish. The failure to connect this genealogy to Christ shows that such a genealogy is useless to the Gospels and is therefore obviously fraudulent. These genealogies attempt to explain a bridge from the most important Jewish characters to Christ, and are therefore a foundation that Matthew and Luke build off of. For such a foundation to be fraudulent shows how fraudulent Matthew and Luke are as a whole and particularly in relation to the supposed physical "birth" and the supposed physical "childhood" of the physical appearance of Christ.

John 1:1 describes existence before Creation and then chapter 1 of the Gospel of John goes on to describe Christ having appeared in the physical world. There isn't any description in the Gospel of John that refers to the supposed physical "birth" of the physical appearance of Christ involving Mother Mariam. There isn't any description in the Gospel of John of the supposed physical "childhood" of the physical appearance of Christ. There isn't any indication in the Gospel of John of what Christ did while physically appearing in this world before Mariam became a disciple of Christ. Since we know about Christianity through the Testimony of Mariam, we don't know what Christ did while physically appearing in this world before Mariam became a disciple of Christ. We don't know anything about a physical "birth" or anything about a physical "childhood". John 1:1 describes existence before Creation and then we know of a narrative that appears to describe Mariam having become a disciple of Christ. Based on what we seem to know from the Testimony of Mariam, we don't have any kind of reliable information about anything related to the supposed physical "birth" of the physical appearance of Christ involving Mother Mariam.

As shown in Part 1, the Gospel of John describes Christ differently than the Synoptic Gospels. The Synoptic Gospels describe Christ as "the Son of God" while the Gospel of John describes Christ as the Creator of the world.

John 1:10

*He was in the world, and though the world was made through him, the world did not recognize him.*

John 1:10 expresses that the Creator of the world came into the world. John 1:10 shows that Christ is God.

All of the narratives about the supposed physical "birth" and the supposed physical "childhood" of the physical appearance of Christ appear to be fraudulent. Meanwhile, there is plenty of evidence that shows that Christ is God. When Christ first appeared in physical form in the first century, was the physical appearance of Christ represented by an appearance that looked like a baby or an appearance that looked like an adult man?

We will address that question in Part 4. For now, we should recognize that the narratives about the supposed physical "birth" and the supposed physical "childhood" of the physical appearance of Christ appear to be fraudulent, and that the Gospel of John describes Christ as the Creator of the world.

Leading up to the Babylonian Exile, the kingdom of Judah gave way to fraudulent religious documents that were then compiled together with writing that was produced during and after the Exile. That compilation became known as the Hebrew Bible and was the basis for a reformed religion called Judaism. Judaism, paganism, and the rest of Greco-Roman society set the stage heading into the first century CE.

In the first century CE, Christ appeared in physical form. Mariam was the most faithful disciple of Christ during Christ's Ministry. The priests who were in control in Jerusalem wanted Christ crucified. Christ was crucified and the physical appearance of Christ resurrected. Mariam appears to have been the only disciple to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. Sometime later, different beliefs were spread and four different Gospels were produced. One of those Gospels possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mariam

and the other three Gospels were fraudulent productions. Those four Gospels were compiled together along with the other documents found in the New Testament and the documents found in the Old Testament. Those documents were copied and edited over and over again for hundreds of years, all the while truth was concealed and false information was fraudulently produced. Today, we have the Bible, which seems to contain fragments of true testimony surrounded by a vast array of fraudulent propaganda.

## Part 4 – The Logic

So far, we have dismantled a lot of the Bible and built up a record that represents a very different history. If so much of the Bible is false, then why should we believe any of it? Well, one analysis has already been provided in Part 2 that shows evidence of the Foreknowledge of Christ related to the Crucifixion and Mariam being chosen to lead the Christian Revolution. That analysis will be revisited here in Part 4 and plenty of more evidence and analysis that shows that Christianity is the true religion will be shown here in Part 4 as well. Before we get there, we should first explore the existence of God on our way to finding true Christianity.

Why does God exist?

It is very common for a child to continue to ask “Why?”. Adults sometimes get frustrated by such a line of questioning because the continuous asking of “Why?” seems unnecessary and because they struggle to come up with more answers. However, there is an important aspect of such a line of questioning that often goes unnoticed. Children who continue to ask “Why?” show an incredible understanding of the principle of sufficient reason, which expresses that there is a reason associated with every state of being. In other words, there is a reason for the existence of everything that exists.

If we adopt the curiosity of a child and continue to ask “Why?”, can our curiosity ever be satisfied? Would such curiosity be endless? How could such a line of questioning ever end?

If we continue to ask “Why?”, we will arrive at the most fundamental question: Why is there existence? Why is there anything at all that exists instead of there being absolute non-existence? Why is there something rather than nothing? We are discussing any form of existence rather than just specifically the existence of the cosmos that we live in. So, why is there anything at all instead of absolutely nothing?

Some people called “rejectionists” believe that there isn’t a reason for existence. Eliminating reasoning would eliminate justification. Therefore, such a belief is unjustifiable and we should dismiss it from consideration. The only way to develop justifiable beliefs is to proceed with the premise that the principle of sufficient reason is valid; and therefore, there is a reason for why there is existence instead of absolute non-existence.

Have you ever heard or seen a justified explanation for why there is existence instead of absolute non-existence, or in other words, why God exists?

### **The Reason for Existence**

We first need to assess whether existence could have come from absolute non-existence. Was there ever absolute non-existence before there was ever any form of existence? Logically, existence could not have come from absolute non-existence because if there was ever absolute non-existence then there would have never even been the possibility of existence. If the possibility of existence exists, then there is already some form of existence instead of absolute non-existence. So it is impossible for even the possibility of

existence to exist if there was absolute non-existence. In other words, if there was ever absolute non-existence, then logically, there would have never been any form of existence. So if there was ever any form of existence, then it is logically necessary that there was always some form of existence. It then follows that any form of existence is logical evidence that there was always some form of existence. Given this reasoning, it is justified to believe that there was not a beginning to existence. Again, we are discussing any form of existence rather than just specifically the existence of the cosmos that we live in. There seems to have been a beginning to the existence of the cosmos that we live in, but there also seems to have been some form of existence before the cosmos that we live in existed. The main point is that it is a logical truth that if there was ever any form of existence then there was always some form of existence.

We should proceed by assessing what could have always existed. To do so, we need to recognize that it is logically necessary that the form of being that always existed inherently exists. If a form of being doesn't inherently exist, then that form of being must have come into existence after previously not existing, which would mean that form of being didn't always exist. So it is logically necessary that the form of being that always existed inherently exists.

If a form of being inherently exists, then it is impossible for that form of being to not exist. If it is impossible for a form of being to not exist, then that form of being must always exist, which means that the existence of that form of being is necessary. Therefore, necessary existence is the only logical reason for a form of being to inherently exist.

If the existence of a form of being is necessary, then that form of being is the reason for why that form of being was always in existence. A self-explanatory form of being possesses the reason for their own existence within their own being. If a form of being is not self-explanatory, then the reason for the existence of that form of being would have arisen from reasoning that existed beyond that form of being, which would mean that the existence of that form of being is dependent on another form of being and therefore the existence of that form of being would not inherently be necessary. Therefore, it is logically necessary that the form of being that always existed be self-explanatory.

For a form of being to have always existed, that form of being must necessarily and inherently exist, possessing the reason for their own existence within their own being. So we are in search of a necessary form of being. If what always existed is not a necessary form of being, then there wouldn't be a logical reason for why what always existed was always in existence, and therefore, there wouldn't be a logical reason for why there is existence. The complete absence of logical reasoning is logically impossible. Therefore, it is logically necessary that the form of being that always existed is a necessary form of being. Such a form of being necessarily and inherently exists, is self-explanatory, and is the reason for why there is existence. So what form of being would qualify as a necessary form of being? What always existed?

John 1:1

*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*

As shown in Part 1, "Word" in John 1:1 is translated from the Greek word λόγος ("Logos"), which could instead be translated as "Logic". The following is an alternative translation.

John 1:1

*In the beginning was the Logic, and the Logic was with God, and the Logic was God.*

Did logic always exist? Or was the existence of logic created and brought into being in a realm that was previously entirely illogical? Did an entirely illogical form of being, conscious or unconscious, in an entirely illogical realm suddenly become logical? Or did logic always exist?

Logic is always logical. Validity is always valid. What makes sense is always sensible. There isn't any way for those statements to not be true. Those statements will always be true regardless of any circumstances. Since logic is always logical, it would be logical for logic to have always existed. That statement doesn't necessarily prove that logic always existed, it's just a logical statement. Nevertheless, shouldn't we seek a logical explanation for what always existed? How would that be possible if logic didn't always exist? A logical explanation for what always existed would need to include logic that always existed.

If logic always existed because logic is always logical, it would then follow that logic inherently exists and that logic is the reason for the existence of logic. This would not only explain what could have always existed, but would also satisfy the logical necessity for what always existed to be self-explanatory, and therefore, could possibly explain the reason for why there is existence. So it is logically possible that logic always existed, that logic is the reason for why logic always existed, and that logic is the reason for why there is existence. Even so, why would logic have ever existed instead of never having existed?

There are two aspects that we should consider when assessing the relationship between existence and logic: whether there is existence or absolute non-existence, and whether or not logic always existed. The consideration of both possibilities for both aspects initially produces four possible conclusions. One of them, that it is true that there is absolute non-existence and logic always existed, is a contradiction and should be eliminated from consideration. If there was absolute non-existence, then logic wouldn't exist. So there are three possible conclusions remaining: there is absolute non-existence and logic didn't always exist (which would mean that logic never existed), there is existence and logic always existed, and there is existence and logic didn't always exist.

For there to be existence without logic that always existed would mean that there is existence for an illogical reason if any reason at all. If there was always existence but logic didn't always exist, then there would have been existence before the existence of logic, and therefore, there wouldn't be a logical reason in existence to logically explain why there is existence. So it is logically necessary for logic to have always existed for there to be a logical reason for existence. Therefore, these are the possible conclusions: there is absolute non-existence and logic never existed, there is existence for a logical reason, there is existence for an illogical reason, or there isn't any reason at all for existence.

If there was existence instead of absolute non-existence for an illogical reason or if there wasn't any reason at all, why would anything make sense? Why would there be existence, let alone all that exists? If logic didn't always exist and existence were illogical, then absolute non-existence would be logical, which is impossible because then logic wouldn't exist and so absolute non-existence couldn't be logical. The belief that there is existence for an illogical reason or that there isn't any reason at all is unjustifiable because any possible explanation would be automatically illogical or there wouldn't be any possible explanation at all. It is logically impossible for there to be existence for an illogical reason or for there to not be any reason at all. So there are only two conclusions remaining to consider. It is a logical truth that either there is absolute non-existence and logic never existed, or there is existence and logic always existed.

Either there is absolute non-existence, logic never existed, and no explanation is required because there isn't anything to explain; or there was always existence, logic always existed, and there is a reason for all of existence. Well, given that there is existence instead of absolute non-existence, it is justified to believe the latter and unjustifiable to believe the former. Therefore, it is justified to believe that logic always existed and it is unjustifiable to not believe that.

The next question then becomes: What form of logic always existed?

As previously shown, a form of being that always existed would need to be a necessary form of being. That means that any form of being that always existed would have existed because the existence of that form of being is necessary. In other words, it is impossible for that form of being to not exist. Therefore, since logic always existed, the existence of logic is necessary and it is impossible for logic to not exist. There is existence instead of absolute non-existence and logic necessarily and inherently exists. Therefore, the existence of logic is necessary and inherent, and absolute non-existence is impossible.

It has been shown that logic always existed and it has been shown that any form of being that always existed would have existed because the existence of that form of being is necessary. Therefore, the existence of logic is necessary and it is impossible for logic to not exist. Logic has existed forever, even before the creation of the cosmos that we live in. Before the creation of the cosmos that we live in, there was existence instead of absolute non-existence, the existence of logic was necessary and inherent, and it was impossible for logic to not exist.

Logic necessarily and inherently exists. Therefore, there isn't any part of existence that is separate from logic. For logic to necessarily and inherently exist, logic must necessarily and inherently exist throughout all of existence. Otherwise, there would be a part of existence in which logic didn't exist and so logic wouldn't necessarily and inherently exist within that part of existence. Therefore, logic necessarily and inherently encompasses all of existence.

One objection could be that there are illogical occurrences that happen and so there are parts of existence that don't possess logic. However, for every occurrence that appears illogical, there is a logical reason for why that occurrence happened. From a limited human perspective, we can classify a decision as illogical; but even when someone is acting illogical, there is still a reason why that happens. We need to understand logic on a more fundamental level. On a less fundamental level, we can associate logical and illogical with good and bad respectively; but even when an illogical decision is made, logic still encompasses all of existence. There is a reason for every occurrence that happens. When there is reasoning, there is logic, and there is a reason for everything that happens. Even a bad decision is encompassed by logic because there is a reason for why that bad decision occurred, and therefore, it is logical that the bad decision happened given all other factors. This can be seen when someone acts irrational due to feeling emotional. The behavior may appear to be irrational, but if there is a reason for a person to be emotional and a natural reaction is for that person to act irrational when emotional, then it makes sense that it all unfolded that way, and so logic would be encompassing the entire situation even though there is irrational behavior. The behavior of a human being can be considered illogical, but even then, there is logic encompassing their illogical behavior because there is a reason for them acting that way. So even when circumstances appear illogical, all of existence still makes sense and there is a reason for everything that occurs, and so logic still encompasses all of existence on the most fundamental level.

Given that logic necessarily and inherently encompasses all of existence, the form of logic that always existed is necessarily uniform. As previously stated, any form of being that always existed would need to be a necessary form of being. The form of logic that always existed exists because that form of logic is necessary. It is impossible for that form of logic to be nonexistent, and so it is impossible for that form of logic to be nonexistent within any part of existence. Therefore, there isn't any part of existence in which that form of logic doesn't exist. The form of logic that always existed uniformly exists as all of existence.

There is one of all of existence. All of existence is one. There is one form of logic that encompasses all of existence because that form of logic necessarily and inherently exists, and therefore no part of existence is separate from that form of logic.

A characteristic must be defined within a particular form of logic for that characteristic to exist within that particular form of logic. If a characteristic is not defined within a particular form of logic, then that characteristic does not exist within that particular form of logic. For example, if A equals B and C equals D, there is a form of logic that defines A as equal to B and there is a form of logic that defines C as equal to D; but the form of logic that defines A as equal to B would not define C as equal to D, and the form of logic that defines C as equal to D would not define A as equal to B. Nowhere in the form of logic that defines A as equal to B does it exist that C equals D, and nowhere in the form of logic that defines C as equal to D does it exist that A equals B. There would need to be more logic defined within at least one of those forms of logic for either of those forms to include the existence of the other form. That example shows that if a characteristic is not defined within a particular form of logic, then that characteristic does not exist within that particular form of logic. So a characteristic must be defined within a particular form of logic for that characteristic to exist within that particular form of logic.

For the necessary and inherent form of logic to necessarily and inherently exist apart from non-existence, there must be some characteristic that defines the necessary and inherent form of logic apart from non-existence. There must be some difference between existence and non-existence that is defined within the necessary and inherent form of logic. Otherwise, existence would be equal to non-existence, which is impossible. The defining difference between existence and non-existence is that existence exists and non-existence does not exist. Therefore, existence must be defined within the necessary and inherent form of logic for the necessary and inherent form of logic to exist apart from non-existence. So existence must be defined within the necessary and inherent form of logic. What characteristic of the necessary and inherent form of logic would define existence apart from non-existence?

Any characteristic that is defined within a particular form of logic is identified within that particular form of logic. If a form of logic defines A as equal to B, then that form of logic identifies both A and B. For existence to be defined within a form of logic, that form of logic would need to identify existence. So the necessary and inherent form of logic would need to identify existence for existence to be defined within the necessary and inherent form of logic. The necessary and inherent form of logic encompasses all of existence and so is equal to all of existence as one. If the necessary and inherent form of logic identifies existence, then the necessary and inherent form of logic would identify all of existence because all of existence is existence. So if the necessary and inherent form of logic identifies all of existence and the necessary and inherent form of logic is all of existence as one, then the necessary and inherent form of logic identifies the necessary and inherent form of logic. In other words, the necessary and inherent form of logic identifies their own existence. Any form of being that identifies their own existence is aware of



their own existence, and therefore is self-aware. Since the necessary and inherent form of logic identifies their own existence, the necessary and inherent form of logic is self-aware. Therefore, self-awareness is the defining characteristic that separates existence from non-existence.

For a form of being to be aware of their own existence, they must be conscious. Awareness of anything would require a form of being to recognize that they have the ability to be aware. If a form of being has the ability to be aware, then they are aware of their own existence. If a form of being is aware of their own existence, then that form of being is conscious. If a form of being is not aware of their own existence, then they wouldn't be aware of anything at all. Consciousness does not exist within a form of being if that form of being is not aware of anything at all. For a form of being to be aware of anything at all, they must at least be aware of their own existence. Therefore, self-awareness inherently involves consciousness. Self-awareness cannot exist without consciousness and consciousness cannot exist without self-awareness. Necessarily and inherently, the necessary and inherent form of logic is self-aware and conscious. Any form of being that is self-aware and conscious possesses a conscious mind. Therefore, the necessary and inherent form of logic is the necessary and inherent Mind. The necessary and inherent Mind has always been aware that the necessary and inherent Mind exists. In other words, God has always been aware that God exists.

The analysis that has been presented so far here in Part 4 shows logical proof of the existence of God. That analysis shows that God is the necessary and inherent Logic. Any opposition to that conclusion is automatically logically invalid because any opposition would oppose the necessary and inherent Logic. Atheism and Polytheism are both logically invalid. Only monotheism is logically valid.

Furthermore, that analysis is consistent with John 1:1. The Logic is described as God in John 1:1.

John 1:1

*In the beginning was the Logic, and the Logic was with God, and the Logic was God.*

The Logic is with God and the Logic is God. God is the Logic, the necessary and inherent Logic. God is the necessary and inherent Knowledge. God is the necessary and inherent Mind.

We have seen logical proof that God exists and that God has always existed. We still need to explore the original question: Why does God exist?

We've established that it is necessary for God to exist and that it is impossible for God to not exist. But why is that the case? Why is it impossible for there to be absolute non-existence?

Truth inherently exists. It is inherently true that truth is truth. It could never not be true that truth is truth. No matter what circumstances are imagined, truth is truth. Hypothetically, if there was absolute non-existence, then it would be true that there isn't any existence at all; but if that was true, then truth would exist and so there couldn't be absolute non-existence. So truth inherently exists. But in what form?

As human beings, we can recognize truths, concepts, and possibilities without recognizing the form that they exist as. If something is true, we don't necessarily need to perceive that truth in any particular form for that truth to exist. But that's from the perspective of a human being. How does a truth fundamentally exist? Before Creation was created, how did truths fundamentally exist?

As human beings, we can decipher between our minds and the physical world. In other words, we can decipher between our minds and space. Our minds are not entirely contained by the physical world and do not entirely exist within space. Your brain exists in the physical world and in space; but your mind, your consciousness, goes beyond the physical world and space. So as human beings, we can decipher between mental and physical, or mental and spatial.

Our minds, our consciousness, our spirit, our knowledge, our thoughts are all one. This is really who we are fundamentally. Even our perception of the physical world is transmitted to us through our knowledge. We know that we perceive the world the way that we do. If something is entirely unknown to you, then you don't perceive it. If you perceive something, then you know that you perceive it. You can't perceive anything that never enters your realm of knowledge. Every part of your personal experience is known to you in some form. Your mind encompasses your entire realm of knowledge. All of the knowledge that you possess exists in the form of your mind.

It was previously mentioned that we can decipher between mental and spatial. As just previously shown, our realm of knowledge is our mental capacity. So the decipherment between mental and spatial is a decipherment between knowledge and space. In other words, knowledge exists beyond space, beyond the physical world. So just based on our own human perspective, we can derive the conclusion that anything that exists beyond space would exist in the form of knowledge. Additionally, as previously shown, the necessary and inherent Logic, the Mind of God, necessarily and inherently encompasses all of existence. The Logic of God, the Knowledge of God, necessarily and inherently encompasses all of existence. So any truth that is inherently true would inherently exist as knowledge possessed by the Mind of God. Therefore, all inherent truths exist in the form of knowledge possessed by the Mind of God.

The awareness of all of existence exists in the form of knowledge that is possessed by the necessary and inherent Mind. With inherent knowledge of all of existence, the necessary and inherent Mind eternally lives.

God is the necessary and inherent Logic. God is the necessary and inherent Knowledge. God is the necessary and inherent Life. God is the necessary and inherent Consciousness. God is the necessary and inherent Decision Maker. God is the necessary and inherent Mind.

So now we should return to the original question: Why does God exist?

God exists because truth inherently exists, truth fundamentally exists in the form of knowledge, and the existence of knowledge necessarily requires the existence of consciousness and therefore necessarily requires the existence of the necessary and inherent Mind.

### **Necessary and Inherent**

God necessarily and inherently exists. Therefore, there isn't any part of existence that is beyond God. Nothing is beyond God. God is the necessary and inherent Mind and encompasses all of existence.

Some people struggle with the concept that God encompasses all of existence; and particularly, some people struggle with the concept that God encompasses Creation. Some people believe that Creation is

separate from God. If a part of existence were separate from God, then God would not necessarily and inherently exist because God would not necessarily and inherently exist within a certain part of existence. If a part of existence were separate from God, then God would not be necessary within that part of existence. There would then be a part of existence in which God would not be necessary. So for God to always be necessary, God must encompass all of existence. To truly necessarily and inherently exist, God must necessarily and inherently exist throughout all of existence.

One reason why people struggle with the concept of God encompassing all of Creation is that people believe that God cannot change. The physical world changes, so people believe that the physical world is separate from God. More specifically, this has stirred up much debate going back to the first few centuries about the divinity of Christ. There has been debate about whether God can appear in the physical world. There is debate about that because people believe that God cannot change. Additionally, if God necessarily and inherently exists, then how can any finite form of being exist? Why would any form of being exist that is not the necessary and inherent form of existence? This brings us to the distinction between necessary and possible.

It is necessary for God to exist, for the Mind of God to exist. It is necessary for God to exist, for God to be self-aware, and for God to possess all knowledge. God possesses all knowledge and so God knows all logical possibilities. Every logical possibility is a concept known by God.

Every concept, every piece of knowledge, exists abstractly. Your knowledge that  $1 = 1$  exists abstractly as a concept in your mind. There is a difference between that equation existing in your mind as knowledge and that equation existing in written form on a piece of paper. That kind of difference can be described as the abstract/concrete distinction. Each logical possibility exists in abstract form as a concept. Concrete existence can be viewed as the existence of realized possibilities. The physical world is an example of a realized possibility that concretely exists. All of concrete existence also exists in the form of abstract concepts. For example, the concept of the existence of Earth exists abstractly and the actual physical presence of Earth exists concretely in the physical world.

All equations exist abstractly. Any equation written on a piece of paper exists abstractly as well as concretely. At any time, you can recall the equation  $1 = 1$ . Without recalling that equation, it exists abstractly. When you write that equation down on a piece of paper, it then exists both abstractly and concretely. The physical reality that we perceive exists abstractly as well as concretely.

Knowledge is possessed within a conscious mind and so knowledge is perceived by a conscious mind. If a concept is known, then knowledge of that concept can be perceived. If knowledge of a concept can be perceived, then a concept can be perceived because a concept is an abstract form of certain information that is recognizable through knowledge. So if a concept is known, then that concept can be perceived. If you look at a picture, then you would be perceiving the visual image of that picture. If you perceive the visual image of that picture, then you would know the visual image of that picture. If you no longer look at the picture but know the visual image of that picture, then you can perceive that image in your mind. You know what you perceive and you can perceive what you know. Given that God knows all logical possibilities, any logical possibility can be perceived by God. God knows all knowledge and can perceive any logically possible concept. God necessarily and inherently exists and possesses the ability to perceive any logically possible concept.

With knowledge of different concepts comes the ability to make decisions. For example, darkness is the absence of light, so total darkness can only be perceived if light is completely absent. If any light is present, then total darkness is not perceived. The concepts of light and darkness contrast each other, which naturally presents a choice between them. Knowledge of contrasting concepts naturally produces a choice between alternatives. Knowledge of a choice between alternatives naturally gives way to the ability to make a decision. Either total darkness can be perceived or some light can be perceived. If there is total darkness, then there isn't any light. If there is light, then there isn't total darkness. It must be one or the other. It is impossible for neither total darkness nor light to be perceived. Total darkness is naturally perceived if there isn't any perception of light. Knowledge of both light and darkness presents a choice between them.

You know the concept of a triangle, but it's your choice whether to think about a triangle or not to. You know that choice is available to you because you know the concept of a triangle and you know that you have the ability to not think about a triangle. You can choose to think about a triangle or you could choose not to. You know both choices because you know what a triangle is and you know that you have the ability to not think about a triangle. The knowledge of contrasting concepts gives way to a choice between alternatives, and therefore gives way to the ability to make a decision.

All abstract concepts exist in the form of knowledge possessed by God. Necessarily and inherently, God possesses all knowledge of all logical possibilities. Necessarily and inherently, God is self-aware. God is aware of all of the knowledge that God possesses. God is aware of all possibilities and God can make decisions. If God decides to specifically perceive certain possibilities beyond how they were perceived before, then those possibilities would be perceived in a way that they weren't perceived before. God would have always been aware of those possibilities, but when certain possibilities are specifically perceived beyond how they were perceived before, then an occurrence that wasn't previously occurring would occur.

The existence of Earth is possible, but not necessary. Necessarily and inherently, God exists and possesses knowledge of all possibilities. The existence of Earth as it is right now in this moment was always possible, and that possibility was always known by God. The existence of Earth as it is right now in this moment represents the realization of specific perception of certain possibilities beyond how they were perceived before. Earth previously did not concretely exist in the physical world, but the possibility of Earth always existed. Earth previously did not concretely exist in the physical world, but then the possibility of Earth was specifically perceived beyond how that possibility was perceived before. Previously, there was knowledge of the possibility of Earth, and then, Earth was specifically perceived beyond how the possibility of Earth was perceived before. God necessarily and inherently exists and possesses all knowledge of all possibilities, and possibilities can be specifically perceived beyond how they were perceived before.

We can analyze our own minds to better understand how Creation is encompassed by God. When you have a thought, that thought does not exist in space in the way that your physical body does. If you imagine a place in your mind, that image does not exist in space, only in your mind. How is your mind able to form a place that does not exist in space? If you talk to yourself in your own mind, how can you hear your own thoughts without using your ears? A blind person can see through their thoughts and a deaf person can hear through their thoughts. How do those thoughts exist? They exist because of the ability to

think. A human being can form thoughts that give way to a vision that is not seen by their eyes or a sound that is not heard by their ears. A human being perceives an external reality, but there are visions and sounds that can be produced by the mind of that human being that are not a part of the external reality that they perceive. We live in the same world but in different minds. You can produce thoughts that are entirely separate from every other human being's perception of the world. Likewise, someone could be sitting right next to you and you still wouldn't be able to hear their thoughts, but they would. These thoughts come from decisions made by a conscious mind that possesses the ability to perceive abstract concepts. These thoughts come from within a conscious mind through the perception of information.

Imagine in your mind Earth from outer space. Then imagine traveling into Earth far enough in to see people walking in a park. Then imagine being a person walking in that park while other people are also walking around. In that process, you imagined an entire world in your mind, you observed people living in that world, and you imagined yourself living in that world among those people. You created in your mind a world full of people and then experienced living among those people. All of that was encompassed by your mind. All of those thoughts were within your mind. No part of those thoughts was separate from your mind. That whole process began with your ability to think. Before you created that world in your mind, you had consciousness, the ability to think, the ability to make decisions, and the ability to create thoughts within your mind. All of Creation was created because of decisions made by the eternal Mind, and all of Creation is encompassed by the eternal Mind. All of Creation was created because of decisions made by God, and all of Creation is encompassed by God.

One main difference between creating a world full of people in your mind and real people living in the real world is that only one person at a time can have consciousness in your mind. If you imagine a person in your mind, the only way that person experiences anything is if you experience it. If you imagine two people in your mind, only one person could experience life at one time. You can only imagine being one person at one time. For us to have life, God gives us life. Our life comes from God and God encompasses all of life. God encompasses our lives. There isn't any part of us or our lives that is separate from God. Therefore, God lives our lives with us. We cannot exist at all apart from God. Our conscious minds have life because of the life given to us by the necessary and inherent Mind, by God.

In our lives, we view reality from our own relative perspective. Each of us has our own relative perspective. The absolute perspective is the perspective of all of existence. From the absolute perspective, all is one. From a relative perspective, there is an external reality to perceive. Therefore, it is necessary for every relative perspective that is not the absolute perspective to possess less knowledge than God. Life permeates throughout all of existence, which encompasses all knowledge, and there are relative perspectives of life that have finite realms of knowledge. Necessarily and inherently, God encompasses all of existence and has absolute perspective that encompasses all of existence. Human beings have relative perspectives and possess finite realms of knowledge.

Our lives are logical possibilities. God possesses all of knowledge, so it is possible for God to form a perspective with less than all of knowledge. It is possible for God to form a perspective that does not possess knowledge of being God. In such a perspective, a conscious mind would experience life with their own individual identity while living within the Mind of God. Our lives are our own perspective. We know that we are alive and we possess some knowledge. Our lives, our finite realms of knowledge, were formed through perception within the Mind of God.

Infinity can only exist concretely if infinity is in union with one. Infinity as a defined amount is logically impossible. An infinite amount is an undefined amount because infinity is limitless and so would not be able to be defined as a specific amount. A defined amount has the property of being able to be counted. An infinite amount cannot be counted. So an infinite amount cannot exist concretely. However, there is limitless capability in terms logical possibilities. That limitless capability cannot concretely exist within more than one being. If there is more than one being, then at least one being is limited. Only one being can be limitless. So infinity can only concretely exist within one being. Infinity can only concretely exist as a characteristic of one being.

God is infinite. This can be shown by there not being a limit in terms of logical possibilities. God possesses all knowledge of all that is logical possible. The knowledge of God is infinite. God eternally exists and possesses infinite knowledge. God is infinite, and all other beings are finite and are encompassed by God.

If God did not encompass all of existence, then God would not be infinite. If God did not encompass all of existence, then there would be a part of existence that is separate from God. If there is a part of existence that is separate from God, then God would be finite in at least one way. If Creation were separate from God, then God would be restricted from a part of existence and therefore be finite in some way. For God to be infinite, God must encompass all of existence. Therefore, God encompasses all of Creation. God is infinite, and all other beings are finite and are encompassed by God.

Christ having appeared in physical form in the first century is an example of God living in Creation. The Logic of God is with God, the Logic of God is God, and the Logic of God lives both beyond Creation as well as within Creation. God encompasses all of existence. All of existence is encompassed by the Mind of God.

Since God encompasses all of existence, we are within God and God is within us. We are entirely encompassed by the Mind of God. We exist within the Mind of God, and so the Mind of God exists within us because we cannot exist apart from the Mind of God. Therefore, we are within God and God is within us.

There are still many questions about the existence of God. What is the relationship between eternity and the movement of time? How does space and matter exist in the way that we perceive? These questions are for another book. For now, we can move forward without investigating those questions yet. More importantly, we should move forward with the recognition that it is justified to believe in God and unjustifiable not to, that God encompasses all of existence, and that we are within God and God is within us. From here, we should proceed with analyzing justification for believing specifically in the Resurrection of Christ.

### **The Case for the Christian Revolution**

The Hebrew Bible, the Bible, and the Quran all have similar narratives related to times before the first century. Only the Bible and the Quran have some of their most significant historical events take place in the first century or later. The Bible and the Quran describe some of the same historical events in the first century differently from each other so it is easy to relate them to each other on the way to reaching a

sufficient conclusion about each of them. An analysis of Christianity can include an analysis of Islam and an analysis of Islam can include an analysis of Christianity.

An assessment of the truthfulness of a religion should include an assessment of the origin of information about that religion. Truth is possessed by the origin of information. The origin of all information is God. The level of origin that we are seeking is the origin within Creation. God encompasses all of existence and God gives way to reasons and results within Creation. We want to know the origins within Creation of information about Christianity and Islam.

We know that Christianity and Islam are major religions in the modern world and have been for a long time. How did that happen? They can't both be true. At most, only one of them is true. So at least one of them is false. There is at least one false religion between Christianity and Islam. An important aspect of this investigation is assessing potential motives for forming a false religion. We should assess how a false religion could have been formed and see if any possibilities seem likely in the case of Christianity or Islam.

Power is a very obvious motive. That kind of motivation can come from two different sides. An organizer of a false religion could already be in power and desire more power, desire to sustain their current level of power, and/or desire to unify their empire. On the other hand, they could be someone who was seeking a political revolution to overthrow someone else who was already in power.

A common opposing theory against Christianity is that power and violence can be attributed to the formation and spreading of Christianity. Constantine became the Roman emperor in 313 and merged the Roman Empire with Christianity. He called the First Council of Nicaea in 325. Many believe that Constantine used Christianity for selfish purposes to unite his empire. Could Constantine or any other person who was already in power at some point have formed Christianity simply for purposes of power?

It seems unlikely that someone already in power would form a false religion that proposed that the one true God was crucified. While it is true that polytheistic traditions have included the death and resurrection of "gods", Christianity differs from such traditions by being a monotheistic religion, which makes an incredible difference when assessing the formation and spreading of a religion. In polytheism, if one "god" died, then another "god" likely prevailed; or even if that wasn't the case, simply the presence of there being other "gods" would make each one less important than if the religion focused on the one true God. In monotheism, there is only one God. Somebody who was in power in ancient times would not likely have formed a false religion that proposed that the one true God was crucified because that kind of religion would suggest that an emperor could be crucified. It's very unlikely that anyone who was already in power would have formed a religion like Christianity. A person already in power would likely have formed a polytheistic religion or a monotheistic religion that doesn't include a description of the one true God being crucified.

Constantine merged the Roman Empire and Christianity probably because Christianity was already widespread by the fourth century. Christianity presented an opportunity to Constantine to unify his empire. Constantine's use of Christianity is evidence that Christianity was so widespread by the fourth century that the Roman emperor was influenced that it would be a good strategy to use Christianity to unify the Roman Empire.

What about somebody who wasn't already in power? What about someone trying to start a political revolution? The consideration of a political revolution takes us to the opposite end of the spectrum of obvious potential motives to form a false religion. We already explored potential motives of someone who was already in power. Now we are exploring potential motives of someone who would want to overthrow someone who was already in power. Political revolutions are often brewing and there seems to have been some in the works in or around the first century with all of the hatred towards the Roman Empire. There seems to have been a revolt led by a Jew named Judas in 6 BCE and there was the Jewish-Roman war that seems to have started in 66 CE. Both of those are examples of real-life political revolutions in or around the first century CE. The history of the Christian movement doesn't seem to have anything like these examples having gone on in the first century. If there was a violent war between the Christian movement and the Roman Empire in the first century, then that would cast some suspicion. However, there doesn't seem to be anything like that in Christianity's early history. Additionally, there is plenty of violence in the later history of Christianity so the apparent absence of such violence in the first century of Christian history does appear to be reliable.

Of the two obvious potential motives presented so far in relation to the formation of a false religion, neither seems to be very plausible when assessing Christianity. The mainstream story of Islam, however, provides plenty of evidence for a very different conclusion. There were two battles early on in Islam's history. The first was the battle of Badr, believed to have occurred around 624. The other was the Battle of Uhud. The Treaty of Hudaibiyyah is believed to have been signed between Mecca and Muslims around 628. It is believed that around 629 or 630, Muslims conquered the city of Mecca. In this story, we can see violence, power, and politics. So it's certainly plausible that Islam is a false religion that was formed to gain power.

Could Christianity be a false religion even if the two main potential motives to form a false religion previously mentioned don't apply to Christianity? Is there a way for Christianity to be a false religion even if Christianity is some kind of revolution that is beyond violence, power, and politics?

Polytheism was the easy temptation for people in ancient times. Judaism is thought of as the first main monotheistic religion and the history of Judaism is riddled with people having fallen into the temptation of worshiping idols instead of the one true God. In ancient times, monotheism was a break from the mainstream. Polytheism dominated religious practices in the ancient world. A monotheistic religion that proposes that the one true God was crucified would have been an incredibly hard sell to people in the ancient world if such a religion didn't represent the truth. If Christianity wasn't already in a position of power, and it doesn't seem as though Christianity was, then it seems highly unlikely that Christianity would have spread the way that Christianity did in the first few centuries unless Christianity represents the truth. How can we assess whether Christianity was really spreading in the first few centuries?

There have been many ancient Christian documents found, some of which date back to the second and third centuries. Even though it would be better to have documents from the first century, the main point is that there is tangible evidence that Christian documents were being produced and circulating within the first few centuries and before Constantine was the Roman emperor. But even if we didn't have any tangible evidence at all, as previously mentioned, Constantine's use of Christianity is evidence that Christianity was already widespread by the fourth century. We don't even need those recovered historical documents to make a sufficient argument in favor of Christianity, but they certainly support the argument.



Christianity wouldn't have likely been a religion that someone already in power would have wanted to form. Christianity wouldn't have likely been a religion that someone seeking to overthrow someone already in power would have wanted to form. Christianity wouldn't have likely been a religion that someone seeking any kind of revolution other than spreading truth would have wanted to form. Furthermore, someone seeking to overthrow someone already in power would likely only be successful through the use of violence and nothing like that seems to have been present in Christianity's early history. We can already see from this argument so far that the probable scenario is that Christ is the origin within Creation of information about Christianity and that Christ is God. How else would Christianity have formed and spread as successfully as Christianity did in the first few centuries? The spreading of Christianity in the first few centuries provides incredible evidence for the validity of Christianity.

Islam gained a lot of power through battles and conquering land early on in the history of Islam. It's easy to see how Islam may have formed and spread so successfully. There isn't that much mystery to the success of Islam. Furthermore, acceptance of Islam leaves no obvious plausible explanation for the early success of Christianity. On the other hand, there is still an obvious plausible explanation for the success of Islam with the rejection of Islam and the acceptance of Christianity.

The division, disorganization, and confusion involved with early Christian history show further evidence that it is unlikely that Christianity was first formed with corrupt intentions. The spreading of Christianity involved corruption but the origin within Creation of information about Christianity is Christ. If Christianity was a false religion, then how would such a divided, disorganized, and confused group of people as described in the New Testament have been so successful in spreading Christianity? If Christianity was a false religion, then those who would have formed such a false religion would likely have been more organized and more sophisticated to carry out such an elaborate plan, especially without the use of violence or a power structure like the Roman Empire. The success of the spreading of Christianity in the first century despite the division, disorganization, and confusion involved with early Christian history show evidence that there was someone who spread true Christianity before such a divided, disorganized, and confused group of people got very far.

As has been shown, there appears to have been a lot of cover-up of female leadership in early Christianity. All of that cover-up is evidence of the validity of Christianity because an effort to spread a false religion wouldn't likely have started with information that such an effort would try to cover up. A cover-up in religious text usually involves the covering up of truth. Truth gets covered up and fraud gets exposed. False information usually doesn't need to be covered up because it can be exposed as fraud. It is truth that is so often covered up in religious text. So the cover-up of female leadership in early Christianity is evidence of the validity of Christianity. If Christianity was a false religion, then why would there be any presence of the importance of any woman in the Gospels? Why wouldn't the story have changed to completely exclude women? The apparent reason is because Christ really did appear to Mariam after the Resurrection and information about that was already widely circulated. If that information wasn't widely circulated, then those trying to spread a false religion probably would have been willing to exclude Mariam's name entirely. Her presence in the Synoptic Gospels, particularly in narratives about the discovery of the empty tomb and the Resurrection, shows evidence that information about her was widely circulated. Additionally, the shift from Mark to Matthew shows even further evidence of that. In the Gospel of Mark through verse 16:8, there isn't a single mention of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. As we move to the Gospel of Matthew, there is all of a sudden much

more detail. Mark was apparently written before Matthew and the lack of details about the Resurrection through Mark 16:8 is representative of that. The description of Christ having appeared to Mariam in the Gospel of Matthew is likely a result of those involved with the production of Matthew having felt influence or pressure to write the narrative with her name included because information about her was widely circulated. Those trying to spread false information seem to have been pressured to conform to some widely circulated information to convince people of their narratives. If it was widely known that Christ appeared to Mariam after the Resurrection, then a Gospel that doesn't represent that would have been a tough sell to people. If Mariam wasn't as well-known, then the authors of the Synoptic Gospels likely would have excluded her name in narratives about the discovery of the empty tomb and the Resurrection. So the inclusion of her name in those narratives in the Synoptic Gospels shows evidence that information about Mariam was widely circulated, and that is evidence that Mariam is a real person who really did spread Christianity. Therefore, it seems that Mariam spread Christianity, and then other people tried to also spread Christianity but in a way that concealed information about her. If the Resurrection hadn't happened, then those people who concealed information about Mariam in the early days probably would not have wanted to spread Christianity because they probably wouldn't have wanted to spread a false religion that was being spread by a woman. Instead, the Resurrection did happen and certain people wanted to take Christianity and reform it to their own liking. The inclusion of Mariam's name in the Synoptic Gospels, particularly in narratives about the discovery of the empty tomb and the Resurrection, is evidence of that.

The presence in the Gospels of any of "the disciples" having turned away from Christ shows further evidence that truthful history is represented in the Gospels. If a false religion were being formed from the beginning, that religion likely wouldn't include narratives about "disciples" having lost faith. The inclusion of such narratives seems counterintuitive to spreading the religion. If people formed a false religion and tried to sell that religion to other people, they would have made it an even tougher sell with narratives about "disciples" having lost faith. If people wanted to sell a false religion to other people, they probably wouldn't want to describe that religion in a way that shows that there was doubt during such a crucial time. People who form a false religion usually want to make the religion in a way that seems miraculous and spectacular. The description of "disciples" having lost their faith would make a false religion seem less spectacular and would seem to be very counterintuitive to spreading the religion. The presence of any of "the disciples" having turned away from Christ probably wouldn't be in the Gospels if there weren't really people who turned away from Christ. If the Resurrection hadn't occurred and people who turned away after Christ was arrested then formed a false story about a resurrection that never occurred, then they likely would have left out the part about them having lost their faith. If they were going to be so bold to completely falsely make up the original account of a resurrection that didn't actually happen, then they probably would have been bold enough to omit the part about them having turned away. Much like the inclusion of Mariam's name in narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the discovery of the empty tomb and the Resurrection, the inclusion of narratives about "disciples" having turned away from Christ is probably the result of information about that having been widely circulated. If that information was not widely circulated, then that information likely would have been excluded. Therefore, the presence in the Gospels of any of "the disciples" having turned away from Christ shows evidence that there really were people who lost faith after Christ was arrested and that Christ really did appear to Mariam after the Crucifixion.

We can further see the validity of Christianity when we analyze the teachings in the Gospel of John on a metaphysical level. As previously shown, John 1:1 is a variation of the most fundamental truth of existence, and there are other verses in the Gospel of John that are consistent with fundamental truths of existence.

The Gospel of John has been shown to be consistent with the most fundamental truth of existence and other fundamental truths of existence, someone in power would have been unlikely to have started a religion like Christianity, and someone looking to overthrow someone already in power would have been unlikely to have started a religion like Christianity. So it seems that a monotheistic religion that is consistent with fundamental truths of existence spread through a polytheistic world without origins of power or desire for power.

Additionally, the contradictions and confusing material in the New Testament and the apparent division among some of the people involved with Christianity in the first century show that certain people who seem to have been acting corrupt during those days don't seem to have been organized and sophisticated enough to have been very successful on their own. Instead, it seems that something else happened. Therefore, it is justified to believe that most of the success of Christianity in the first century was separate from those who were acting in such a corrupt way.

Given the apparent concealment in the New Testament of Mariam as the most faithful disciple of Christ, it is justified to believe that Mariam was the true human leader of Christianity at the very beginning of the Christian movement after the Resurrection of Christ. Therefore, it is justified to believe that a monotheistic religion that is consistent with fundamental truths of existence spread through a polytheistic world without origins of power or desire for power, that the person who led that movement was a woman, and that there was an effort to conceal information about that woman.

Christianity spread to gentiles all over the Roman Empire. That gentile population for the most part wouldn't have likely put much hope in Jewish prophecies, so Christianity likely spread to those gentiles in another way. Christianity is about service, sacrifice, and resurrecting. Among the gentile as well as Jewish populations, this message would have likely resonated the most with the lower class and there is evidence that much of the Christian population in the early days was poor. Such an apparent appeal to the lower class shows further evidence of the validity of Christianity. If a false religion were being formed from the beginning, the lower class probably wouldn't have been affected in such a way as when early Christianity was developing.

It is justified to believe that a monotheistic religion that is consistent with fundamental truths of existence spread through a polytheistic world without origins of power or desire for power, that the person who led that movement was a woman, that there was an effort to conceal information about that woman, and that many of the people who Christianity spread to in the early days were poor.

Why did this woman begin to spread this religion? How was a religion with female leadership spread so successfully in the first century through the Roman Empire? How was the spreading of this religion so successful despite there not having been power or desire for power, and with so many of the people involved having been poor?

The answer is that Christianity represents the true religion. Christianity likely appealed to a mass population because of the truth that Christianity represents, the real justification for the belief in Christianity. When a person focuses on fundamentals, they can be led to truth. That is probably how Christianity was spread in the early days.

The spreading of Christianity through teachings of a woman in the first century is evidence of the validity of Christianity. It would have been so incredibly challenging for a woman who was not wealthy to spread a religion in the first century that the success of spreading Christianity in the first century is evidence that Mariam had knowledge of the true religion. For Mariam to have been as successful as she seems to have been, she appears to have had knowledge of the true religion. The combination of the early success of the spreading of Christianity, the evidence that shows that Mariam is the true human leader of Christianity, and the incredibly challenging societal constraints on women in the first century show evidence that Christianity is the true religion.

As shown in Part 2, the evidence in the Gospels of the Revolution that Mariam spread can also show evidence for the Resurrection, and therefore that Christianity is the true religion. The evidence that shows the concealment of information about the Revolution shows that the Revolution really was spreading. Not only that, it also shows that the Revolution was spreading information about Mariam being the top disciple and that the Revolution was so widely spread that those who opposed it had to address it. They weren't able to ignore it. So the Gospels show evidence that the Revolution was spreading, that it had been widely spread, and that it spread information about Mariam being the top disciple. Evidence of the Revolution can also be found in the Gnostic Gospels, which show evidence that the Revolution spread information about Mariam being the top disciple into the second century and maybe into the third and fourth centuries and so on. In the sixth century, Pope Gregory labeled Mariam as a prostitute. Such a disgusting attack is evidence that the pope felt the need to combat the fame of Mariam. Therefore, it appears that the Revolution spread information about Mariam being the top disciple into the sixth century. That shows that the Revolution appears to have spread information about Mariam being the top disciple for over half a millennium.

The Revolution that Mariam began spreading in the first century seems to have still been spreading information about her over 500 years after the Resurrection. But to see how this shows evidence of the Resurrection, we must analyze how the Revolution began.

First and foremost, the fact that Christianity is about Christ shows evidence that Christ is the Teacher of someone. If Christ wasn't the Teacher of someone, then it is incredibly unlikely that Christianity would have been formed around Christ. Furthermore, the presence of the Crucifixion narratives serves as evidence that the Crucifixion really did happen. Anyone forming a false religion would have been unlikely to falsely describe a crucifixion of the leader of that religion if that leader wasn't really crucified. So there is evidence that shows that Christ really was the Teacher of someone, that Christ really was crucified, and that a woman spread the Revolution about the Teacher.

If money, power, politics, or violence is a part of a revolution, then there is a good possibility that such a revolution is fraudulent. This can be seen with the early spread of Islam. Islam is a religion that has a history that places a battle very early on in the formation of Islam. From the beginning of the history of Islam, there seems to have been money, power, politics, and violence. But that doesn't seem to be the case with the Revolution that Mariam spread. As we have already seen here in Part 4 and as we will see

more detail on in Part 6, her Revolution seems to have been spread mostly among the lower class. There doesn't seem to have been any ruling power gained from the Revolution. Instead, it seems that those who tried to conceal information about her Revolution were seeking power, and that in turn involves politics. There also doesn't seem to have been any violence initiated by the spread of true Christianity in the first century.

Aside from money, power, politics, and violence, a person could want to spread a false religion if they are the main focus of the religion. In Islam, Muhammad is a main focus and he may have been a king who formed a false religion to gain power and to conquer. In Mormonism, Joseph Smith has been labeled as a prophet who had visions. Even though Mormonism was developed to appear to be a Christian religion, there is still incredible focus on Joseph Smith as a prophet. Both Muhammad and Joseph Smith take center stage with these false religions. Although Mariam has been known as the top disciple of Christ, true Christianity is really about Christ and the mentioning of a top disciple really only refers to them as a student of Christ. Mariam is not center stage. She is a student of the Teacher who is Christ. The claims made about Muhammed and Joseph Smith are very different. Islam focuses on Muhammad as a prophet and Mormonism focuses on Joseph Smith as a prophet while true Christianity focuses on Christ. The Revolution that Mariam spread appears to have included information about her being the top disciple, but ultimately, the Revolution that she spread is about Christ.

So there doesn't seem to be money, power, politics, violence, or a pursuit of fame associated with the origin of the Revolution that Mariam spread. With that conclusion having been presented, it seems that the probable reason remaining for why the Revolution spread so widely is because of the message of the Revolution, in other words, the teachings. That means that Christ's teachings seem to be the reason why the Revolution spread so widely. It was the knowledge that people were given. On a fundamental level, Christianity can be shown to be the true religion through the logic of Christ's teachings. That is probably how Mariam was so successful in spreading true Christianity. If money, power, politics, violence, and a pursuit of fame aren't involved, then we're left with the teachings. Mariam seems to have been able to reach a large portion of the population simply by spreading the truth of Christ's teachings.

Since it seems to have been Christ's teachings that allowed Mariam to be so successful, then it seems that a man could have done the same. Mariam was at a disadvantage in the first century because she was a woman. Additionally, she was likely poor. A man would have been at a much greater advantage than a woman in the process of spreading a false religion. Since Christ's teachings appear to have been the catalyst for the successful spread of Christianity, then it seems that a man could have been successful at spreading the teachings. Hypothetically, if Christ was merely a man, in other words, if Christianity was a false religion, Christianity could have still been successful just based on the evidence that shows that the teachings were the catalyst for the successful spread of Christianity. If Christ was merely a man and Christianity was a false religion, then it wouldn't seem to make much sense that the spreading of the religion was so successful after the Crucifixion rather than before the Crucifixion. One objection to that is that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection convinced people to believe in Christianity. However, there were plenty of religions in ancient times that involved a description of a death and a resurrection. One example is the ancient Egyptian myth of Isis and Osiris about the death and resurrection of Osiris. There also seems to have been a group of people who spread information about Simon of Peraea, who seems to have been a man who was crucified who this group claimed was the Messiah, but that group wasn't very successful. So it wasn't simply expressing that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection occurred that allowed

Mariam to be so successful. It was more specifically the teachings of Christ. As a result, it seems that Christianity could have been successfully spread before the Crucifixion; but there seems to have been a shift after Mariam began spreading Christianity.

So it seems that Christianity could have been spread as successfully before the Crucifixion as afterward, but that success was instead delayed until afterward. That shows evidence that Christ deliberately chose to pass Christianity to Mariam so that she could lead the Revolution. That in turn shows evidence of the Foreknowledge of Christ. That evidence of the Foreknowledge of Christ in turn shows evidence that Christ is God.

One objection could be that the reason why the Revolution spread to less people before the Crucifixion was because there wasn't as much time from the beginning of Christ's Ministry until the Crucifixion as there was for Mariam after the Crucifixion. In other words, more time led to a larger spread. So it could be argued that the Revolution wasn't deliberately given to Mariam but was instead simply left for her taking after the Teacher was crucified, and she had more time that led to more success. However, the different results of Christ having been crucified versus Mariam leading the Revolution combined with Mariam having been taught by Christ shows that Mariam was taught to take a certain path that would lead to a different result. As previously shown, Mariam's success can be attributed to the teachings of Christ. If Christ was able to teach Mariam in a way that led to such success, then Christ knew how to be that successful, and yet Christ was crucified while someone who Christ taught led the Revolution. A student follows the example of their teacher, and Mariam took a different path than Christ, which shows that she was taught to take a different path. That shows evidence that Christ deliberately took a path that led to the Crucifixion and deliberately gave Christianity to Mariam for her to lead the Revolution. That in turn shows evidence of the Foreknowledge of Christ, which in turn shows evidence that Christ is God.

Now that we've gone through that assessment, we can see that the spreading of Christianity by Mariam can be instrumental in showing that Christianity is the true religion. We can see that the evidence of the Revolution that Mariam spread provides evidence that Christianity is the true religion. Christ gave Christianity to Mariam and she in turn gave Christianity to the rest of the world.

The only likely truthful verse about the Resurrection of Christ can show us more evidence of the validity of Christianity.

John 20:16

*Jesus said to her "Mary."*

*She turned toward him and cried out in Aramaic, "Rabboni!", which means Teacher.*

In Part 2, this verse was shown to probably be real eyewitness testimony. Also shown in Part 2, only two verses out of a total of 17 verses in the Gospels explicitly equate "Rabbi" or "Rabboni" to "Teacher". That shows a unique connection between John 1:38-39 and John 20:16. Additionally, it shows that it wasn't common to clarify that the word "Rabbi" or the word "Rabboni" is equivalent to the word "Didaskale", which shows that it was common for someone who wanted to use the word "Rabbi" or the word "Rabboni" to simply use that word and not provide any clarification as to what they mean. Therefore, it seems that the use of the word "Rabbi" or the word "Rabboni" in combination with an explicit equivalency to "Didaskale" shows that there is special significance to the specific word choice in

the quoted dialogue. That significance in the case of John 20:16 is likely that real eyewitness testimony is being presented.

Additional evidence that shows that John 20:16 is likely real eyewitness testimony is that Mariam is the only person in that verse who is described as having seen Christ. Jewish law stated that at least two people must be present for testimony to be validated and there was societal influence to do so as can be seen by the apparent desire in all of the Gospels to present multiple witnesses. In this case, only one person was present. If John 20:16 was fraudulent, then there would probably be more than one person described in that verse. Further support for that assertion can be seen in the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the discovery of the empty tomb and the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, which all describe multiple witnesses. Additionally, especially given that only one person is described in John 20:16, that person having been a woman is even further evidence that John 20:16 is probably authentic. Not only is only one person described, but that person was a woman. If John 20:16 was fraudulent, there would not only probably be more than one person described but also there would probably be a man described instead of a woman if there was to only be one person described.

John 20:16 probably represents real eyewitness testimony from Mariam and probably represents the only real eyewitness testimony of the Resurrection of Christ. John 20:16 might be the most important verse in the entire Bible. The evidence that shows the probable validity of John 20:16 serves as evidence that the Resurrection of Christ is a real historical event and that Christ really did appear to Mariam after she witnessed the Crucifixion of Christ.

There is still more evidence to go through. We will continue to develop an even deeper argument for the validity of Christianity, but you should already be able to see that early Christianity wouldn't have likely unfolded the way that it did unless Christianity represents the truth. If the origin within Creation of information about Christianity was corrupt, then early Christianity wouldn't have likely unfolded the way that it did. So just based on the argument presented so far, it is justified to believe that the origin within Creation of information about Christianity is Christ and that Christ is God.

For further evidence that the Resurrection of Christ did actually happen, we should move into an analysis of the dating of the Resurrection. Such an analysis will produce several different conclusions. We will of course come to a conclusion on the date of the Resurrection, but also, we will see even more evidence that the Resurrection of Christ did actually happen.

### **Dating the Resurrection**

The most common belief is that the Crucifixion occurred on a Friday and the Resurrection occurred on a Sunday. That belief derives from the Gospels stating that the empty tomb was discovered on the first day of the week and that Christ would rise in three days. In first century Jewish society, the concept of inclusive counting appears to have been the main method of counting used by the Jewish population back then. Inclusive counting includes partial units as whole units. In other words, a partial day would be counted as one day. So the description of three days would not describe a duration of three days as we would count today. Instead, it would include partial days. So if Sunday was the third day in the sequence of three days, then Friday would be the first day. Today, we would consider a duration spanning from

Friday afternoon/evening to Sunday morning as the passing of two days: Friday to Saturday and Saturday to Sunday. With inclusive counting, Friday would have been counted as day one regardless of how much of Friday was involved, and Sunday would have been counted as day three regardless of how much of Sunday was involved. The quantity of days involved would lead to how the duration is described. So if a duration of three days is described, that duration would be described in terms of how many days are involved (three – Friday, Saturday, and Sunday) rather than how many days passed (two – Friday to Saturday and Saturday to Sunday).

The Old Testament can provide us with some examples.

Esther 4:16-17

*“Go, gather together all the Jews who are in Susa, and fast for me. Do not eat or drink for three days, night or day. I and my maids will fast as you do. When this is done, I will go to the king, even though it is against the law. And if I perish, I perish.” So Mordecai went away and carried out all of Esther’s instructions.*

Esther 5:1

*On the third day Esther put on her royal robes and stood in the inner court of the palace, in front of the king’s hall. The king was sitting on his royal throne in the hall, facing the entrance.*

Esther 4:16-17 describe that people will fast for “three days”. So “three days” there refers to duration. Esther 5:1 describes what was planned to occur after the duration of “three days” as having occurred on “the third day”. How can something occur on a day that is a part of the duration that was supposed to pass before that something occurred? These verses show the concept of inclusive counting, which includes partial days.

There are also examples that show inclusive counting in terms of years instead of days.

1 Kings 15:1-2

*In the eighteenth year of the reign of Jeroboam son of Nebat, Abijah became king of Judah, and he reigned in Jerusalem three years. His mother’s name was Maacah daughter of Abishalom.*

1 Kings 15:9

*In the twentieth year of Jeroboam king of Israel, Asa became king of Judah.*

In 1 Kings 15:1-2, it is described that Abijah became king of Judah in the 18<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Jeroboam and that Abijah reigned for three years. Then, in 1 Kings 15:9, it is described that Asa became king of Judah in the 20<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Jeroboam. That shows that Abijah was the king of Judah from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Jeroboam. Today, we would count two years as having passed from the 18<sup>th</sup> year to the 20<sup>th</sup> year; but with inclusive counting, that duration is counted as three years. So with inclusive counting, Abijah is described as having reigned for three years even though it appears that only about two years passed during his reign.

We can now turn to the verses that seem to describe the Resurrection as having occurred on the first day of the week.

Mark 16:2



*Very early on the first day of the week, just after sunrise, they were on their way to the tomb.*

Matthew 28:1

*After the Sabbath, at dawn on the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went to look at the tomb.*

Luke 24:1

*On the first day of the week, very early in the morning, the women took the spices they had prepared and went to the tomb.*

John 20:1

*Early on the first day of the week, while it was still dark, Mary Magdalene went to the tomb and saw that the stone had been removed from the entrance.*

In terms of timing, we should focus on the phrase “the first day of the week”. That phrase gets translated from the Greek phrase μιᾷ (“mia”) τῶν (“ton”) σαββάτων (“sabbaton”), or depending on the manuscript, μίαν (“mian”) σαββάτων (“sabbaton”) or μίας (“mias”) σαββάτων (“sabbaton”), which are equivalent to “mia ton sabbaton”. There are two particular parts to analyze about that. There’s “the first day” and “week”. The Greek word that has been translated to “the first day” is μιᾷ (“mia”), which can be more appropriately translated as “one”. Furthermore, the word “day” is not a part of the correct translation. The Greek word for “day” is ἡμέρα (“hemera”) and that word is not included in any of the Greek versions of the verses above. The Greek word that has been translated to “week” is σαββάτων (“sabbaton”), which can be more appropriately translated as “Sabbaths”. So instead of “the first day of the week”, a more appropriate translation would be “one of the Sabbaths”.

For support of the interpretation as “the first day of the week”, some cite the Didache, which was a set of instructions for certain supposed leaders of Christianity and many believe that it was likely produced in the second century. The Didache includes the following text.

δευτέρα (“deftera”) σαββάτων (“sabbaton”) καὶ (“kai”) πέμτη (“pemti”)

That text is translated as “the second day of the week and the fifth”. A more direct translation is “the second from the Sabbath and the fifth”, which, depending on the context, could be interpreted as “the second day of the week and the fifth”. As we will go into more detail on later, the word “sabbaton” is a plural word and really means “Sabbaths” rather than “Sabbath”, but some Christian writers incorrectly used it in a singular way and so the context determines how we should interpret the use of the word “sabbaton” in Christian writings. The context of this text from the Didache refers to days of the week that people fasted on, so the Didache shows that the Greek word “sabbaton” was used to refer to days of the week. However, that text used the Greek words for “second” and “fifth” instead of the Greek words for “two” and “five”. In contrast, the phrase “mia ton sabbaton” uses the Greek word “mia”, which means “one” instead of “first”. If the text was specifically saying “the first day of the week”, then the Greek word for “first” would have likely been used instead of the Greek word for “one”. We can see evidence of that in the later addition in the Gospel of Mark.

Mark 16:9

*When Jesus rose early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had driven seven demons.*

In Mark 16:9, the phrase “the first day of the week” is translated from the following Greek words.

πρώτη (“prote”) σαββάτου (“sabbatou”)

Mark 16:9 uses the Greek word σαββάτου (“sabbatou”), which is another word for “Sabbath”. Mark 16:9 also uses the Greek word πρώτη (“prote”), which means “first”. Mark 16:9 was likely added in the second century or later and uses the Greek word for “first” rather than the Greek word for “one”. That follows the style of the Didache, which uses the Greek words for “second” and “fifth” instead of the Greek words for “two” and “five”. When describing the first day of the week, it was common to use the Greek word for “first”, and so the use of the Greek word for “one” shows that the translations should be “one” instead of “first”. Therefore, “mia ton sabbaton” should not be directly translated as “the first day of the week”.

One objection could be that the use of “prote” in Mark 16:9 shows a correlation with the use of “mia” in Mark 16:2 because the same day is being described in both. “Mia ton sabbaton” in Mark 16:2 and “prote sabbatou” in Mark 16:9 refer to the same day. Therefore, a person could argue that the author viewed “mia ton sabbaton” as equivalent to “prote sabbatou” and so “mia ton sabbaton” was interpreted as “the first day of the week”. However, Mark 16:9 was likely written about a century or so after Mark 16:2. By then, the author of Mark 16:9 was likely writing based on popular tradition rather than writing to coordinate with the language shown in Mark 16:2. The author of Mark 16:9 likely based that verse on popular tradition rather than on the information that was already contained in the Gospel of Mark. If the author of Mark 16:9 was basing that verse on Mark 16:2, then “mia ton sabbaton” would have likely been used instead of “prote sabbatou”. The change in language shows that the author of Mark 16:9 was probably drawing from popular tradition rather than from what was already in the Gospel of Mark. Additionally, Mark 16:9-20 seem to be an attempt to harmonize with the other Gospels and with Acts. So the author of Mark 16:9 seems to have altered the Gospel of Mark to better fit with other information, and therefore they were probably more influenced by other information than they were by the Gospel of Mark. So the information in Mark 16:9 probably came from popular tradition rather than from what was already in the Gospel of Mark, which would mean that “mia ton sabbaton” is not necessarily equivalent to “prote sabbatou” just because they are both used to refer to the same day in the Gospel of Mark.

Another objection could be in reference to 1 Corinthians 16:2.

1 Corinthians 16:2

*On the first day of every week, each one of you should set aside a sum of money in keeping with his income, saving it up, so that when I come no collections will have to be made.*

In this verse, “the first day of every week” is translated from the following Greek words κατὰ (“kata”) μίαν (“mian”) σαββάτου (“sabbatou”). A similar situation is happening here. The Greek words for “day”, “week”, and “first” are not present and so “kata mian sabbatou” should not be directly translated as “the first day of every week”. Instead, the direct translation is “every one from the Sabbath”, which in turn refers to the first day of every week. So the translation as it is appropriately refers to the first day of the week, but it’s not a direct translation of the actual Greek words. This shows that the Greek words for Sabbath should not be directly translated as “week”. Although “mia ton sabbaton” can refer to the first day of the week depending on the context, it doesn’t necessarily and the direct translation should either be “one of the Sabbaths” or “one from the Sabbath”.

The use of “sabbaton” in the Didache, Mark 16:9, and 1 Corinthians 16:2 shows that an alternative translation could be “one from the Sabbath” instead of “one of the Sabbaths”. “One from the Sabbath” could potentially refer to the first day of the week but should not be directly translated as “the first day of the week” and could potentially refer to a day that was a day after a Sabbath that was not a weekly Sabbath. So the two possible correct translations of “mia ton sabbaton” are “one of the Sabbaths” and “one from the Sabbath”. There are two major differences between those two translations. One is the difference between the word “of” and the word “from”. The other difference is between the plural form of “Sabbaths” and the singular form of “Sabbath”.

So it seems that the Resurrection probably either occurred on a Sabbath day or on a day that was right after a Sabbath day. Additionally, even if “mia ton sabbaton” is to be translated as “one from the Sabbath”, that doesn’t necessarily mean that it refers to the first day of the week. It’s possible that a Sabbath day that was not a weekly Sabbath is being referred to (the first day of the week of unleavened bread appears to have occurred on the day after the Crucifixion), in which case the reference to the day after that Sabbath day could have been a different day than the first day of the week. So the Resurrection could have happened on a different day than Sunday and could have happened on a Sabbath day.

For more evidence, we can turn to references to three days in Mark and Matthew.

Mark 8:31

*He then began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders, chief priests, and teachers of the law, and that he must be killed and after three days rise again.*

Mark 9:30-31

*They left that place and passed through Galilee. Jesus did not want anyone to know where they were, because he was teaching his disciples. He said to them, “The Son of Man is going to be betrayed into the hands of men. They will kill him and after three days he will rise.”*

Mark 10:33-34

*“We are going up to Jerusalem”, he said, “and the Son of Man will be betrayed to the chief priests and teachers of the law. They will condemn him to death and will hand him over to the Gentiles, who will mock him and spit on him, flog him and kill him. Three days later he will rise.”*

Matthew 27:63

*“Sir”, they said, “we remember that while he was still alive that deceiver said, ‘After three days I will rise again.’ ”*

Mark 8:31, Mark 9:30-31, Mark 10:33-34, and Matthew 27:63 all include a phrase that is translated from the Greek phrase μετὰ (“meta”) τρεῖς (“tres”) ἡμέρας (“hemeras”), which means “after three days”. The Greek word that is translated to “after” is μετὰ (“meta”), which means “after” when used in reference to a sequence. That word being used appears to indicate that the three days would need to be completed. In other words, three days would have already passed so the third day of that sequence would need to be over, which would then mean that “after three days” refers to a fourth day.

We can turn to more verses for support of that assertion.

Matthew 26:1-2

*When Jesus had finished saying all these things, he said to his disciples, “As you know, the Passover is two days away – and the Son of Man will be handed over to be crucified.”*

Matthew 26:1-2 show a statement that was supposedly made two days before the Passover. The Greek word “meta” is used again here. “The Passover is two days away” could be more appropriately translated as “after two days the Passover takes place”. Using inclusive counting, day one would be the day that the statement was supposedly made on, and day two would be the day after that. Given the use of the Greek word “meta”, it would seem that the Passover should be considered to have taken place on day three in relation to the day that the statement was supposedly made on. If the Passover occurred on day two in relation to the day that the statement was supposedly made on, then the Passover would have occurred on the very next day, in which case the word for “tomorrow” could have been used instead of a reference to two days. The following verses show the use of the word “tomorrow”.

Matthew 6:30

*“If that is how God clothes the grass of the field, which is here today and tomorrow is thrown into the fire, will he not much more clothe you, O you of little faith?”*

Matthew 6:34

*“Therefore do not worry about tomorrow, for tomorrow will worry about itself. Each day has enough trouble of its own.”*

These verses show the use of the Greek word αὔριον (“aurion”), which is translated as “tomorrow”. This word is not used in Matthew 26:1-2, which shows that Matthew 26:1-2 are probably not referring to the next day, which would be day two in that sequence. Instead, Matthew 26:1-2 appear to be referring to day three in that sequence. Therefore, it seems that two days would need to have passed to reach the day that Passover occurred on according to Matthew 26:1-2 and the use of the Greek word “meta”, which means that “after two days” refers to a third day. So it is justified to believe that with the use of the Greek word “meta”, the phrase that gets translated as “after three days” in Mark and Matthew refers to an occurrence that is predicted to happen after three days have passed, on the fourth day. So “after three days” appears to refer to a fourth day.

An even clearer example comes from Acts.

Acts 28:13

*From there we set sail and arrived at Rhegium. The next day the south wind came up, and on the following day we reached Puteoli.*

In Acts 28:13, “the next day” is translated from the Greek words μετὰ (“meta”) μίαν (“mian”) ἡμέραν (“hermeran”), which can be more appropriately translated as “after one day”, with “after” being translated from the Greek word “meta”. If “after one day” referred to the same day as the day that they arrived in Rhegium, then “after one day” would refer to the passing of zero days, which would make the entire phrase irrelevant. Instead, it is more appropriate to interpret “after one day” as a reference to the second day in relation to the day that they arrived in Rhegium. Additionally, the phrase that is translated as “and on the following day” is also translated incorrectly. The word “and” should not be included and the phrase “the following day” comes from the Greek word δευτεραῖοι (“deuteraioi”), which is a variation of the

Greek word δεύτερος (“defteros”), which means “second”. The following is an alternative translation of Acts 28:13.

Acts 28:13

*From there we set sail and arrived at Rhegium. After one day having come on a south wind, on the second day we came to Puteoli.*

That translation describes them having traveled on a south wind, and after one day of that, having arrived in Puteoli on the second day. So not only would it not make sense for “after one day” to refer to zero days having passed, but Acts 28:13 appears to specifically refer to the day after one day as the second day. That shows that the second day occurs after one day. That then shows that a third day would occur after two days and that a fourth day would occur after three days. Therefore, the phrase “after three days” appears to refer to a fourth day.

Before getting to more evidence that shows that Mark and Matthew refer to a four-day sequence, we should now examine the verses that describe a prophecy about the Resurrection happening on “the third day”.

Matthew 16:21

*From that time on Jesus began to explain to his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem and suffer many things at the hands of the elders, chief priests, and teachers of the law, and that he must be killed and on the third day be raised to life.*

Matthew 17:22-23

*When they came together in Galilee, he said to them, “The Son of Man is going to be betrayed into the hands of men. They will kill him, and on the third day he will be raised to life.” And the disciples were filled with grief.*

Matthew 20:18-19

*“We are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be betrayed to the chief priests and the teachers of the law. They will condemn him to death and will turn him over to the Gentiles to be mocked and flogged and crucified. On the third day he will be raised to life!”*

Matthew 27:64

*“So give the order for the tomb to be made secure until the third day. Otherwise, his disciples may come and steal the body and tell the people that he has been raised from the dead. This last deception will be worse than the first.”*

Luke 9:22

*And he said, “The Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders, chief priests, and teachers of the law, and he must be killed and on the third day be raised to life.”*

Luke 18:31-33

*Jesus took the Twelve aside and told them, “We are going up to Jerusalem, and everything that is written by the prophets about the Son of Man will be fulfilled. He will be handed over to the Gentiles. They will mock him, insult him, spit on him, flog him, and kill him. On the third day he will rise again.”*

Luke 24:6-7

*“He is not here; remember how he told you, while he was still with you in Galilee: ‘The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, be crucified, and on the third day be raised again.’ ”*

Luke 24:46-48

*He told them, “This is what is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and repentance and forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.”*

In all of those verses, “the third day” is mentioned. Because Christ is believed to have risen in three days, “the third day” is commonly thought of as the final day of that particular three-day sequence. However, as already shown, Mark and Matthew appear to refer to a four-day sequence.

In the ancient Jewish calendar, there weren’t names for the days of the week except by their order within the week, so “the third day” can refer specifically to the third day of the week, which would have been Tuesday. So when one reads “the third day” in the New Testament, that could be a reference to the third day of the week and/or the third day of some other sequence of days.

One objection could be that the phrase “the third day” would have been commonly known as the third day of a three-day sequence leading up to the Resurrection. In response, John 2:1 provides a good example that shows that “the third day” was used in a way that does not refer to the Resurrection, and so “the third day” is not inherently connected to a three-day sequence leading up to the Resurrection.

John 2:1

*On the third day a wedding took place at Cana in Galilee. Jesus’ mother was there, and Jesus and his disciples had also been invited to the wedding.*

As early on as chapter 2 of the Gospel of John, the phrase “the third day” is used and it does not refer to the day of the Resurrection. John 2:1 uses the phrase “the third day” to refer to a day that is not the day of the Resurrection, and therefore John 2:1 uses the phrase “the third day” in a way that does not refer to a three-day sequence leading up to the Resurrection. So John 2:1 is an example that shows that the phrase “the third day” does not necessarily refer to the three days leading up to the Resurrection.

Given that “the third day” wouldn’t inherently be recognized as referring to the three days leading up to the Resurrection, we should now recognize that “the third day” as referenced in the verses previously shown from Matthew and Luke don’t reference any particular sequence of three days. They are often believed to be referring to the three days leading up to the Resurrection, however, that would have to be based on information that is not contained in those verses. Those verses themselves don’t provide any context that would lead to the presence of three different days other than the phrase “the third day” but only if “the third day” is actually referring to the third day of a three-day sequence, which might not be the case. Therefore, the phrase “the third day” as shown in those verses from Matthew and Luke could refer to the third day of the week.

Luke 24:20-21 contain the only information in the Gospel of Luke that specifically relates the phrase “the third day” to a sequence of multiple days.

Luke 24:20-21

*“The chief priests and our rulers handed him over to be sentenced to death, and they crucified him; but we had hoped that he was the one who was going to redeem Israel. And what is more, it is the third day since all this took place.”*

Luke 24:20-21 describe a conversation that is proposed to have happened on the day of the Resurrection. In this case, “the third day” is specifically related to a sequence spanning multiple days, unlike the other verses from Matthew and Luke just previously examined. Luke 24:20-21 provide an example of what it would look like if “the third day” was specifically related to a sequence spanning multiple days. However, the other verses that were just previously examined don’t do that. That shows that there might not be a specific three-day sequence that they relate to; and therefore, they could refer to the third day of the week, Tuesday.

One objection could be that Luke 24:20-21 show evidence that Luke presents a three-day sequence and so the phrase “the third day” in Luke could relate to that three-day sequence even if that sequence isn’t specifically referenced in other narratives that reference “the third day”. In other words, it might be enough for that sequence of days to only be referenced once throughout the entire Gospel. In that case, within the Gospel of Luke, “the third day” could be interpreted as always referring to that three-day sequence.

We have seen that all of the descriptions of a prophecy about the Resurrection happening on “the third day” don’t include any specific context about a sequence spanning multiple days. We have also seen that the only other reference in Luke to the day of the Resurrection having been “the third day” is the only instance in Luke that relates “the third day” to a specific sequence spanning multiple days. Since all of the references to “the third day” in Matthew and Luke within a description of a prophecy about the Resurrection don’t include any specific context that presents a sequence of multiple days, it could be the case that those references are in relation to the third day of the week. However, it does seem that Luke 24:20-21 refer to a three-day sequence in contrast to the four-day sequence described in Mark and Matthew. So Luke is ambiguous. However, Matthew is much more definitive. Since Matthew is the only Gospel that includes both phrases “after three days” and “the third day”, Matthew can be used to come to a more definitive conclusion about “the third day”.

Matthew 27:63-64

*“Sir”, they said, “we remember that while he was still alive that deceiver said, ‘After three days I will rise again.’ So give the order for the tomb to be made secure until the third day. Otherwise, his disciples may come and steal the body and tell the people that he has been raised from the dead. This last deception will be worse than the first.”*

Matthew 27:63-64 combine for a very unique set of verses because they together include a reference to “after three days” as well as a reference to “the third day”. In this case, we have a sequence being referred to, and at initial glance, it may seem as though “the third day” refers to the third day of the sequence of days referenced in the phrase “after three days”. However, as shown before, the phrase “after three days” appears to refer to a four-day sequence, in which case the reference to “the third day” is not in connection to the third day of the sequence of days referenced in the phrase “after three days” because that phrase refers to the fourth day, and so “the third day” is somehow the fourth day of that sequence. Therefore, the reference to “the third day” does not appear to be connected to any specific sequence. Furthermore, the reference to “the third day” would seem to oppose the reference to “after three days” if it specifically

referred to that sequence of days because the use of the word “meta” shows that the three days would have to pass before that “third day” would arrive. “After three days” appears to refer to a fourth day, yet that fourth day is also referred to as “the third day”. So the fourth day of that four-day sequence is also somehow “the third day”. Therefore, the reference to “the third day” must refer to a different sequence of days than the sequence of days referenced in the phrase “after three days”, in which case it appears to refer to the third day of the week, Tuesday. That would be the only realistic way that the fourth day of a four-day sequence would be referred to as “the third day”, if the fourth day of that four-day sequence was the third day of the week.

Both Mark and Matthew appear to refer to a four-day sequence, but Matthew is the only one of those two that also appears to refer to the Resurrection as having happened on a Tuesday. Luke 24:20-21 seem to refer to a three-day sequence. However, given that Matthew appears to refer to a Tuesday, the references in Luke to “the third day” in descriptions of prophecies about the Resurrection appear to refer to a Tuesday as well. So Luke appears to refer to a three-day sequence and to a Tuesday. So in relation to the Resurrection, Mark appears to refer to a four-day sequence, Matthew appears to refer to a four-day sequence and to a Tuesday, Luke appears to refer to a three-day sequence and to a Tuesday, and John refers to a three-day sequence.

There is more evidence to show that Mark and Matthew both portray the Resurrection as having happened on the fourth day of a four calendar day sequence and we will get to that shortly. But first, to provide insight as to why Mark and Matthew were produced in such a way, we should now look at the ancient Jewish tradition that a person could rise in three days.

Genesis Rabbah 100:7

*The very height of mourning is not until the third day. For three days the spirit wanders about the tomb, wondering if it may return into the body... then it hovers no more, but leaves the body to itself.*

Hosea 6:2

*After two days he will revive us; on the third day he will restore us, that we may live in his presence.*

When Mark and Matthew reference “after three days”, they seem to be taking this ancient Jewish tradition that applied to human beings and they seem to have added one more day for Christ. This ancient Jewish tradition appears to explain why Mark and Matthew added an extra day to get to four days. It was believed that a human being could possibly rise within three days, so it appears that the authors of Mark and Matthew wanted to describe the Messiah as having a greater ability than that and so one more day was added to the sequence to come to a four-day sequence rather than a three-day sequence.

The narratives about Lazarus having been raised from the dead provide further evidence.

John 11:17

*On his arrival, Jesus found that Lazarus had already been in the tomb for four days.*

Lazarus is described in John 11:17 as having been dead for four days before having been raised from the dead. That shows a contrast to the ancient Jewish tradition that a human being could rise within three days because it describes the raising of Lazarus as having surpassed that tradition. Had it been only three days, then people may not have been as astonished given that tradition. But since it was four days, that tradition was surpassed. Meanwhile, the Synoptic Gospels don't include the narratives about Lazarus having been



raised from the dead, and Mark and Matthew appear to describe Christ as having risen within four days instead of three days.

Matthew 12:40 can bring us further in understanding the assertion that Mark and Matthew refer to a four-day sequence rather than to a three-day sequence.

Matthew 12:40

*“For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of a huge fish, so the Son of Man will be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.”*

Matthew 12:40 claims that three days and three nights would need to be involved spanning from the burial to the Resurrection. In this case, “day” refers to a period of daylight rather than to a calendar day; so in our analysis here of Matthew 12:40, the word “day” will refer to a period of daylight rather than to a calendar day. Both Mark and Matthew describe the burial as having happened during the evening. The Greek words in the burial narrative in Mark that translate to “as evening approached” can be more appropriately translated to “already evening having arrived”. The Greek words in the burial narrative in Matthew that translate to “as evening approached” can be more appropriately translated to “evening now having arrived”. Since Mark and Matthew describe the burial as having happened during the evening, one could believe that the first night would occur before the first day if evening is considered a part of night. On the other hand, one could argue that evening is considered a part of day and that night begins after evening, in which case the first day would occur before the first night. We will examine both possibilities.

If evening is to be considered a part of night, then the first calendar day would include the first night but not the first day. The second calendar day would then include the first day and the second night. The third calendar day would include the second day and the third night. Then the fourth calendar day would include the third day. Only half of the first and fourth calendar days would be included in the three days and three nights. The first calendar day would only include the first night and the fourth calendar day would only include the third day. Therefore, three days and three nights would involve four calendar days.

If evening is to be considered a part of day, then the first calendar day would include both the first day and the first night. The second calendar day would then include the second day and the second night. Then the third calendar day would include the third day and the third night. So only three calendar days would be involved in the counting of three days and three nights. However, the Gospel of Matthew specifically describes the sun as having already risen when describing the Resurrection. So the Gospel of Matthew would be portraying the Resurrection as occurring after the “three days and three nights” would be over, thereby presenting a fourth calendar day in the sequence, which is on par with the phrase “after three days”. The “three days and three nights” is described as the period of time in which the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ is described as being in “the heart of the Earth”. According to this interpretation, that takes us to the end of the third calendar day and then the Resurrection is described as occurring on the fourth calendar day along with the rising of the sun after the third night is over. According to this interpretation, the third night would come to an end and so the “three days and three nights” would come to an end and then the Resurrection occurs along with the rising of the sun so that none of the fourth calendar day occurs before the Resurrection and the Resurrection does not occur before the fourth calendar day begins. In other words, the Resurrection is being portrayed as occurring at the very beginning of the fourth calendar day so that the time-period in which the physical body of the

physical appearance of Christ is described as being in “the heart of the Earth” ends before the fourth calendar day begins while the Resurrection occurs on the fourth calendar day after the third night comes to an end. So even if one were to consider the first calendar day to include both the first day and the first night, a fourth calendar day would still be involved in the portrayal of the sequence of days spanning from the Crucifixion to the Resurrection according to the “three days and three nights” that Matthew 12:40 describes.

As we can see, regardless of how the three days and three nights are counted, four calendar days would be involved. That interpretation matches the phrase “after three days” that is in the other verses previously examined. Both “three days and three nights” as well as “after three days” refer to four calendar days. In both cases, the reference to three is used to refer to a time-period before the Resurrection and the Resurrection is portrayed as happening after that time-period. That portrays the Resurrection as happening after that three-day time-period, which would be the fourth day of a four-day sequence.

Matthew 12:40 is a part of a narrative in the Gospel of Matthew that talks about what miraculous sign will be given.

Matthew 12:38-40

*Then some of the Pharisees and teachers of the law said to him, “Teacher, we want to see a miraculous sign from you.”*

*He answered, “A wicked and adulterous generation asks for a miraculous sign! But none will be given it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of a huge fish, so the Son of Man will be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.”*

All four Gospels include a narrative that talks about what miraculous sign will be given, but they all include their own unique version. If we take a look at the narrative in the Gospel of John and then move to the narrative in the Gospel of Mark, we can see an example of the Gospel of Mark responding to information contained in the Gospel of John and doing so specifically with the intention of responding to the three days described in the narrative in the Gospel of John.

John 2:18-21

*Then the Jews demanded of him, “What miraculous sign can you show us to prove your authority to do all this?”*

*Jesus answered them, “Destroy this temple, and I will raise it again in three days.”*

*The Jews replied, “It has taken forty-six years to build this temple and you are going to raise it in three days?” But the temple he had spoken of was his body.*

In John 2:18-21, it is described that the Resurrection would occur in three days in relation to the Crucifixion and that is described through the claim that Christ’s Temple would be rebuilt in three days. The Greek word “meta” is not used in relation to the three days described in John 2:18-21, so John appears to present a three-day sequence in contrast to the four-day sequence presented in Mark and Matthew. As we turn to the Gospel of Mark, we can see that Mark changes the narrative from the Gospel of John and then elsewhere specifically claims that information described in John 2:18-21 is false testimony.

Mark 8:11-12

*The Pharisees came and began to question Jesus. To test him, they asked him for a sign from heaven. He sighed deeply and said, "Why does this generation ask for a miraculous sign? I tell you the truth, no sign will be given to it."*

Mark 14:55-58

*The chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin were looking for evidence against Jesus so that they could put him to death, but they did not find any. Many testified falsely against him but their statements did not agree. Then some stood up and gave this false testimony against him: "We heard him say, 'I will destroy this manmade temple and in three days will build another not made by man.'"*

Mark 8:11-12 represent a similar scenario as John 2:18-21 but claim that no sign will be given, which is ridiculous because that excludes the Resurrection. Additionally, both John and Matthew specifically refer to the Resurrection as that sign in their respective narratives. So the Gospel of Mark obviously seems to skip a beat in relation to this narrative. That's evidence that the author of the Gospel of Mark didn't really understand what the narrative was about and was instead focused on disputing information contained in the Gospel of John. Mark 14:55-58 then doubles down on that by specifically claiming that the information about the claim that Christ's Temple would be rebuilt in three days is false testimony.

The Gospel of Mark portrays the Resurrection as having occurred on the fourth day of a four-day sequence that begins with the day of the Crucifixion. That portrayal contradicts the information contained in John 2:18-21, and therefore John 2:18-21 would have presented an issue for the Gospel of Mark. It had already been shown that the Gospel of Mark seems to contain responses to information contained in the Gospel of John, and we can see yet another example of that with John 2:18-21 and these narratives from the Gospel of Mark. In combination, the two narratives shown from the Gospel of Mark claim that no miraculous sign will be given and that priests accused Christ of having claimed that Christ would build a temple in three days, and that accusation is specifically described as false testimony. So the Gospel of Mark rejects that any miraculous sign will be given and specifically claims that the accusation that Christ expressed that Christ would build a temple in three days is false testimony. So John 2:18-21 would have caused an issue for the Gospel of Mark, the Gospel of Mark goes against John 2:18-21 by expressing that no miraculous sign will be given, and the Gospel of Mark specifically claims that information contained in John 2:18-21 is false testimony. The Gospel of Mark is obviously responding to the issue that John 2:18-21 causes for it. The Gospel of Mark is specifically responding to that information by expressing that no miraculous sign will be given and that such information is false. The Gospel of Matthew then seems to address the problem left by the Gospel of Mark expressing that no miraculous sign will be given by inserting the verses about the sign of Jonah. The Gospel of Matthew takes care of that problem but still portrays that information contained in John 2:18-21 as false and still portrays the Resurrection as having occurred on the fourth day of a four-day sequence beginning with the day of the Crucifixion.

Matthew 12:38-40

*Then some of the Pharisees and teachers of the law said to him, "Teacher, we want to see a miraculous sign from you."*

*He answered, "A wicked and adulterous generation asks for a miraculous sign! But none will be given it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of a huge fish, so the Son of Man will be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."*

Matthew 26:60-61

*The chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin were looking for false evidence against Jesus so that they could put him to death. But they did not find any, though many false witnesses came forward. Finally two came forward and declared, "This fellow said, 'I am able to destroy the temple of God and rebuild it in three days.' "*

So both Mark and Matthew dispute information contained in John 2:18-21 in relation to the three-day sequence described in those verses, which shows further evidence that Mark and Matthew describe a four-day sequence instead of a three-day sequence.

When we compare the narratives in Matthew and Luke that talk about what miraculous sign will be given, we can see that there seems to be a response in Luke to information contained in Matthew.

Matthew 12:38-40

*Then some of the Pharisees and teachers of the law said to him, "Teacher, we want to see a miraculous sign from you."*

*He answered, "A wicked and adulterous generation asks for a miraculous sign! But none will be given it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of a huge fish, so the Son of Man will be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."*

Luke 11:29-30

*As the crowds increased, Jesus said, "This is a wicked generation. It asks for a miraculous sign, but none will be given it except the sign of Jonah. For as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so also will the Son of Man be to this generation."*

As will be shown in Part 5, the author of the Gospel of Luke seems to have had some version of the other three Gospels and changed certain information to better fit in the Gospel of Luke. Additionally, as already shown, Luke refers to a three-day sequence and Matthew 12:38-40 refer to a four-day sequence because three days and three nights as presented in the Gospel of Matthew would involve four calendar days. Therefore, the three days and three nights in the sign of Jonah narrative in Matthew would have been in contradiction with the timeline set up in the Gospel of Luke. Meanwhile, Luke contains a narrative about the sign of Jonah, and is the only other Gospel that does, but leaves out the part about three days and three nights. That shows clear evidence that Matthew refers to a four-day sequence and Luke refers to a three-day sequence.

For further evidence, we should analyze the details that Mark and Matthew each provide about that four-day sequence. We will first take a look at Mark and then move on to Matthew.

Mark 15:42-43

*It was Preparation Day, that is, the day before the Sabbath. So as evening approached, Joseph of Arimathea, a prominent member of the Council, who was himself waiting for the kingdom of God, went boldly to Pilate and asked for Jesus' body.*

Mark 16:1

*When the Sabbath was over, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices so that they might go to anoint Jesus' body.*

Mark 16:2

*Very early on the first day of the week, just after sunrise, they were on their way to the tomb.*

As shown in Part 3, the Crucifixion appears to have happened on the fourteenth day of Nisan, and Mark 15:42-43 are consistent with that. In Mark, the first day of the four-day sequence would be the fourteenth day of Nisan and Mark 15:42-43 are representative of that. Mark 16:1 refers to a day after a Sabbath day. So in Mark, the fourteenth day of Nisan was the first day, and then there's a Sabbath day, and then Mark 16:1 would represent the third day. That interpretation is in line with popular tradition. However, contrary to popular tradition, Mark 16:2 seems to refer to a different day than Mark 16:1 does. We've already discussed how the phrase "the first day of the week" is an incorrect translation and the text should really be translated as either "one of the Sabbaths" or "one from the Sabbath"; and it will be shown shortly that the context in Mark shows that it should be translated as "one of the Sabbaths" and it will also be shown that Mark portrays two Sabbaths occurring in the four day-sequence, one of which presumably represents the first day of the week of unleavened bread. Although, regardless of which phrase applies in Mark, both "one of the Sabbaths" and "one from the Sabbath" would represent an introduction to the day. Verse 16:2 begins by identifying which day is being described by using either "one of the Sabbaths" or "one from the Sabbath". That wouldn't likely be the case if verse 16:2 described the same day that verse 16:1 does. If they described the same day, the identification of that day would likely only be in verse 16:1 instead of there being a second introduction in verse 16:2 that is entirely separate from the introduction in verse 16:1, and that is the case because the nature of what an introduction is only leaves the need for one introduction. It doesn't make sense for there to be two different introductions that are entirely separate from each other. An introduction is a single continuous piece of writing regardless of how short or long it is rather than multiple pieces that are separated from each other by other text that is not a part of an introduction. There are also the phrases "very early" and "just after sunrise". The phrase "very early" comes from the Greek words *λίαν* ("lian") *πρωῖ* ("proi"), which is appropriately translated as "very early". The phrase "just after sunrise" is translated from the Greek words *ἀνατείλαντος* ("anateilantos") *τοῦ* ("tou") *ἡλίου* ("heliou"), which can be translated as "having arisen the sun", and with "very early" at the beginning of the sentence, it is appropriately translated as "just after sunrise". So the setting of Mark 16:2 is very early on that day, just after sunrise. If verse 16:1 and verse 16:2 referred to the same day, then verse 16:2 probably wouldn't start off by describing that it was very early on that day, just after sunrise. Such a description would be more appropriately placed at the beginning of verse 16:1 if verse 16:2 refers to the same day. "Very early" and "just after sunrise" are introductory descriptions of what happened on that day. It doesn't make sense for such introductory descriptions to appear after the same day has already been described in the previous verse.

Additionally, if verse 16:2 referred to the same day as verse 16:1, then it would be portrayed that spices were bought very early and just after sunrise, but that is not described in verse 16:1. Instead, those descriptions hold off until verse 16:2. Furthermore, it's not realistic that spices were available for sale right after sunrise. In Jewish tradition, the day began with sunrise, so if spices were described as having been bought as soon as the day began, then the narrative would be portraying someone selling spices before the new day even began. Instead, the buying of spices as described in verse 16:1 is portrayed as having happened on the day before the day that is portrayed in verse 16:2 so that the descriptions in verse 16:2 don't apply to the day that the buying of spices is portrayed as having happened on as described in verse 16:1. Within verse 16:1, the only timing that is described is that the day was after a Sabbath. There isn't any description of what time of day the spices are described as having been bought. So there would

only be an issue in relation to the description of buying spices if verse 16:1 referred to the same day as verse 16:2, but that doesn't appear to be the case.

Very defining evidence that verse 16:2 refers to a different day than verse 16:1 is the use of the singular form of σαββάτου ("sabbatou") in verse 16:1 and the plural form of σαββάτων ("sabbaton") in verse 16:2. Verse 16:1 refers to a Sabbath having just passed, and since the Crucifixion is portrayed as having happened on the fourteenth day of Nisan, the Sabbath that is portrayed as having just passed would presumably be the first day of the week of unleavened bread on the fifteenth day of Nisan, the day after the Crucifixion. So the singular form of "sabbatou" seems to be correctly used to refer to the Sabbath day that is the first day of the week of unleavened bread, which was the day after the Crucifixion. The distinction between the singular form of "sabbatou" in verse 16:1 and the plural form of "sabbaton" in verse 16:2 specifically shows that verse 16:1 refers to only one Sabbath and verse 16:2 refers to the presence of multiple Sabbaths, which shows that the correct translation of verse 16:2 would show the phrase "one of the Sabbaths". As we will go into more detail on later, the plural form of "sabbaton" was incorrectly used by Christian writers in a singular way, and we will see that in the Gospel of Matthew. However, that is not the case in the Gospel of Mark because Mark specifically differentiates between the singular form of "sabbatou" and the plural form of "sabbaton", which shows that the plural form of "sabbaton" appears to correctly refer to the presence of multiple Sabbaths and gives way to the meaning of "one of the Sabbaths". So the distinction between the singular form of "sabbatou" and the plural form of "sabbaton" shows defining evidence that verse 16:2 is referring to a different day than verse 16:1 because verse 16:1 is specifically referring to a day after a Sabbath while verse 16:2 specifically refers to a Sabbath day. Not only does this show that verse 16:2 refers to a different day than verse 16:1 does, but it also shows that verse 16:2 portrays the Resurrection as having occurred on a Sabbath day. So verse 16:1 refers to the third day of a four-day sequence and verse 16:2 refers to the fourth day of that four-day sequence. Furthermore, it had already been shown that Mark appears to refer to a four-day sequence, so it makes sense that a fourth day is described in Mark 16:2.

In Mark, the first day of the four-day sequence appears to be portrayed as the fourteenth day of Nisan, the second day is implied to have been a Sabbath day, the third day would be the day after that Sabbath day, and the fourth day would then be the day after that. Therefore, the fourth day would then be two days removed from the Sabbath day that is described as having been immediately before the day on which the spices are described as having been bought. Just based on that, it wouldn't make sense for "mia ton sabbaton" in Mark to be translated as "one from the Sabbath", and so "mia ton sabbaton" in Mark would mean "one of the Sabbaths". Additionally, it has already been shown that the distinction between the singular form of "sabbatou" in verse 16:1 and the plural form of "sabbaton" in verse 16:2 shows that verse 16:2 specifically refers to the presence of multiple Sabbaths and therefore gives way to the meaning of "one of the Sabbaths". That means that the Gospel of Mark refers to the day of the Resurrection as a Sabbath day. That also means that the Gospel of Mark describes two Sabbath days in the four-day sequence described: day two and day four.

As we turn to Matthew, we will see something different with the four-day sequence described.

Matthew 27:62

*The next day, the one after Preparation Day, the chief priests and the Pharisees went to Pilate.*

Matthew 28:1

*After the Sabbath, at dawn on the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went to look at the tomb.*

Matthew 27:62 states “the next day, the one after Preparation Day”. That implies that the Crucifixion occurred on a preparation day, which is in line with the belief that the Crucifixion occurred on the fourteenth day of Nisan. That also shows that Matthew 27:62 doesn’t describe the day after the preparation day as a Sabbath day. The fourteenth day of Nisan is the preparation day for the very next day, the first day of the week of unleavened bread, which is an annual Sabbath day. It’s incredibly strange that Matthew 27:62 avoids describing that day as a Sabbath day. It’s so strange that it seems that Matthew 27:62 seems to describe a day that for some reason doesn’t represent a Sabbath day within that narrative. There are five other pieces of evidence to show that Matthew 27:62 is describing a day that is represented as not having been a Sabbath day. One is that Matthew 28:1 specifically refers to “the Sabbath” and does so even though it is describing a day that is described as having been after the Sabbath. So in a verse that refers to a day that is not a Sabbath, a Sabbath is still mentioned and is specifically used to identify the day after. Meanwhile, Matthew 27:62 doesn’t include any reference to “the Sabbath” even though the day after the preparation day should be a Sabbath. Therefore, Matthew 27:62 should be referring to a Sabbath and so it’s strange that it doesn’t specifically identify that day as a Sabbath. The second is that Mark 15:42 specifically identifies the preparation day as the day before the Sabbath. So Mark identifies the day before a Sabbath by describing it in relation to that Sabbath, and Matthew identifies the day after a Sabbath by describing it in relation to that Sabbath. However, Matthew 27:62 doesn’t include any reference to any Sabbath when describing a day that comes after the preparation day, a day that should be described as a Sabbath day. That shows evidence that Matthew 27:62 does not describe a Sabbath day. That in turn shows evidence that the Gospel of Matthew describes a fake day and places it in between the fourteenth day of Nisan and the Sabbath that followed. The third piece of evidence is the fact that Matthew 27:62 not only avoids describing that day as a Sabbath day but also specifically describes that day in relation to the preparation day. We’ve already seen examples of the preparation day being described in relation to the Sabbath day. That alone shows the authority of the Sabbath day in relation to the preparation day. A preparation day is often described in relation to a Sabbath day, but it’s strange for a Sabbath day to be described in relation to a preparation day. Preparation days are designated as such because of the importance of Sabbath days. Their purpose in that regard is to prepare for a Sabbath day. So when Matthew 27:62 not only avoids describing that day as a Sabbath day but also specifically describes that day in relation to the preparation day, that relation to the preparation day is evidence that the day being described in Matthew 27:62 is not a Sabbath day. The fourth piece of evidence is the fact that the narrative that Matthew 27:62 is a part of describes the priests as doing “work”, which would have been against Jewish law on a Sabbath day. So that shows even further that Matthew 27:62 refers to a fake day and places it in between the fourteenth day of Nisan and what should be the fifteenth day of Nisan. The fifth piece of evidence is the fact that the Gospel of Matthew seems to refer to a four-day sequence when using the phrase “after three days”, so it would make sense if four days are described leading up to the narratives about the Resurrection.

Matthew 28:1 then includes the phrase “after the Sabbath”, which implies the passing of another day to bring us to the day that the Gospel of Matthew describes as the day of the Resurrection. So in this case, the Sabbath would represent the third day and the day after would be the fourth day. In Mark, there were two Sabbaths described, one on the second day and then another on the fourth day. In Matthew, only one Sabbath is described and it is presented as the third day.

As we take a closer look at Matthew 28:1, we can see that there seems to be redundant language. First, the phrase “after the Sabbath” is presented. Then, the phrase “the first day of the week” is presented, which, as shown earlier, comes from the Greek phrase “mian sabbaton” and should be translated as either “one of the Sabbaths” or “one from the Sabbath”. Since the phrase “after the Sabbath” is used, “mian sabbaton” in Matthew 28:1 probably shouldn’t be translated as “one of the Sabbaths”. Therefore, “mian sabbaton” in Matthew 28:1 should probably be translated as “one from the Sabbath”. That shows a shift from the conclusion that we reached about the Gospel of Mark. The reason for that shift is also probably the reason for the redundancy in Matthew 28:1. That redundancy is presented to us now that we can interpret “mian sabbaton” as “one from the Sabbath”. There doesn’t seem to be much need to use both “after the Sabbath” and “one from the Sabbath”. Because there doesn’t seem to be much need to use both phrases, it seems that “after the Sabbath” was added to provide clarification on how to interpret “mian sabbaton”. Such clarification probably wouldn’t have been needed if “mia ton sabbaton” in the Gospel of Mark wasn’t previously interpreted as “one of the Sabbaths”. The redundancy in Matthew 28:1 that seems to provide clarification shows further evidence that the interpretation of “mia ton sabbaton” in the Gospel of Mark should be “one of the Sabbaths”. The likely motivation to change the interpretation is probably related to Jewish law in relation to observing a Sabbath day. The Resurrection having occurred on a Sabbath day would have likely caused a serious problem within the Jewish population. There is to be no work on a Sabbath day, and both the Resurrection and anyone having been at the tomb would have likely been considered “work”. Chapter 1 of Genesis describes God as having rested on the seventh day. So the Resurrection having occurred on a Sabbath day would have likely caused a serious religious issue for Jews. Furthermore, the Gospel of Matthew is much more connected with Jewish law than the Gospel of Mark is. There is a very clear difference between them in relation to Judaism, and more specifically, Jewish law. The Gospel of Matthew is the most connected with Jewish law than any of the four Gospels. The Resurrection having occurred on a Sabbath day would have likely caused a serious religious issue for Jews and that seems to be the reason for the shift from “one of the Sabbaths” in the Gospel of Mark to “one from the Sabbath” in the Gospel of Matthew.

Just based on writing in the Gospel of Mark, the interpretation of “mia ton sabbaton” in Mark should be “one of the Sabbaths”. That interpretation is further solidified by the use of “after the Sabbath” in Matthew 28:1 because that phrase in that verse is redundant, such redundancy likely wouldn’t be there unless it provided clarification, and such clarification likely wouldn’t have been needed if people didn’t previously believe that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day. All of this shows that the Gospel of Mark was produced to portray the Resurrection as having occurred on a Sabbath day, people believed that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day, and the Gospel of Matthew was produced to specifically disagree with the belief that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day. Furthermore, it was previously shown that the likely motivation for disputing that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day was that such a belief would cause a serious religious issue among the Jewish population.

As will be shown in Part 5, some of the same people that were involved in the production of the Gospel of Mark were also apparently involved with the production of the Gospel of Matthew, and this group of people seem to have advanced in their knowledge of Judaism over time. The shift from “one of the Sabbaths” in the Gospel of Mark to “one from the Sabbath” in the Gospel of Matthew is representative of all of that, and the redundancy of the use of “after the Sabbath” in Matthew 28:1 is specific evidence that there was an effort to change information to better align with Judaism.



Further evidence can be seen by the incorrect use of the word “sabbaton” in a singular way. “Sabbaton” is a plural word and should really be translated as the plural word “Sabbaths” rather than the singular word “Sabbath”, which supports the assertion that the Gospel of Mark says “one of the Sabbaths” and shows further that something unique and strange seems to be going on with the use of “one from the Sabbath” in the Gospel of Matthew. It was shown earlier that the Didache, which seems to have been produced in the second century, uses the word “sabbaton” to refer to days of the week and therefore uses that word in a singular way. So the Didache shows that “sabbaton” was used in a singular way by certain literate Christians. However, that is linguistically incorrect. “Sabbaton” is really a plural word and so should not be used in a singular way. Therefore, a person who was both Jewish and literate who knew both Judaism and the Greek language well would realistically probably not have incorrectly used a plural word in a singular way like “sabbaton” has been used. But there is some reason why literate Christians later used “sabbaton” in a singular way. Certain literate Christians came to identify “sabbaton” as a singular word even though it’s not. Therefore, there seems to be a difference between how many literate Jewish writers would have understood “sabbaton” versus how certain literate Christians understood it. There is some reason why certain literate Christians viewed “sabbaton” as a singular word. Meanwhile, the Gospel of Matthew uses “sabbaton” as a singular word, which is a shift from the earlier produced Gospel of Mark that uses “sabbaton” as a plural word. So it was likely the Gospel of Matthew that began the incorrect use of “sabbaton” as a singular word. The Gospel of Matthew presumably being the introduction to the incorrect use of “sabbaton” as a singular word shows that the Gospel of Matthew seems to have taken information that was already circulating and changed it to try to convince people of a different belief. The Gospel of Mark simply took a plural word from the Greek language and used it in a plural way. That’s not what’s going on in the Gospel of Matthew. Otherwise, the Gospel of Matthew would have likely taken the singular form to use in a singular way. Instead, the Gospel of Matthew ended up taking the same word that is used in the Gospel of Mark, which, in combination with the use of “after the Sabbath”, shows evidence that a deliberate effort was made to change information that came from the Gospel of Mark.

There seems to be two incorrect results produced by Matthew 28:1: the use of “sabbaton” as a singular word and the belief that the Resurrection occurred on a day that wasn’t a Sabbath day. The belief that the Resurrection occurred on a day that wasn’t a Sabbath day seems to be incorrect because it seems that such a belief only spread to better align with Judaism, which indicates that such a belief probably did not arise from truth. That provides evidence that the Resurrection likely occurred on a Sabbath day and that later on people who identified as Christian-Jews specifically disputed that to better align with Judaism after advancing in their knowledge of Judaism.

The Gospel of Luke continues the tradition from the Gospel of Matthew and shows us even more evidence that Jewish law was a concern.

Luke 23:56

*Then they went home and prepared spices and perfumes. But they rested on the Sabbath in obedience to the commandment.*

Luke 23:56 shows the specific desire to describe rest having occurred on the Sabbath day that is referenced.

As has been shown and as will be shown in more detail in Part 5, the Gospel of Mark appears to have been produced before Matthew and Luke. Mark is much more basic than Matthew and Luke. Matthew

and Luke are much more extravagant. Mark seems to represent an earlier time-period in the development of Gospel narratives. As a result, it seems that Mark describes the Resurrection as having happened on a Sabbath day while Matthew and Luke both give priority to the Jewish law about rest on a Sabbath day.

As we turn to the Gospel of John, we should think about the description in Mark about the Resurrection having occurred on a Sabbath day and the descriptions in Matthew and Luke about the Resurrection having occurred on a Tuesday.

Since Matthew and Luke shift away from Mark by not describing the Resurrection as having occurred on a Sabbath day, we can see that it seems unlikely that Mark would describe the Resurrection as having occurred on a Sabbath day unless that were true. There would have been a very serious religious problem among Jews if the Resurrection was described as having occurred on a Sabbath day. So it seems unlikely that the Gospel of Mark would include a description of the Resurrection having occurred on a Sabbath day unless the Resurrection really did occur on a Sabbath day. The evidence that shows that Matthew and Luke shift away from that belief to better align with Judaism shows evidence that the belief that the Resurrection occurred on a day that wasn't a Sabbath day came from fraudulent origins. Additionally, the redundant language and the incorrect singular use of the plural word "sabbaton" in Matthew 28:1 show even further evidence that much of the Christian population believed that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day, and that belief likely wouldn't have spread like that if it didn't come from truth because it would have been a serious issue in relation to Jewish law. Therefore, it is justified to believe that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day, and that Matthew and Luke fraudulently describe the Resurrection as not having occurred on a Sabbath day to appeal to Jewish law.

Since there doesn't seem to be much motivation for describing the Resurrection as having occurred on a Tuesday, it does seem likely that the apparent references in Matthew and Luke to Tuesday indicate that the Resurrection probably occurred on a Tuesday. That assertion is important in two main ways other than identifying the specific day of the week. One is that it shows that the Resurrection probably didn't occur on a Sunday. The other is that the Resurrection probably didn't occur on a weekly Sabbath day, and therefore probably occurred on the first or seventh day of the week of unleavened bread. The seventh day of the week of unleavened bread is too far removed from the fourteenth day of Nisan to be considered a realistic possibility. Therefore, the Resurrection probably occurred on the first day of the week of unleavened bread, which appears to have been the day after the Crucifixion. That conclusion is so far dependent within this analysis on the belief that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day and on a Tuesday. We will see more evidence shortly that the Resurrection probably occurred on a Sabbath day and on a Tuesday. For now, we will analyze the Gospel of John with the belief that the Resurrection occurred on the first day of the week of unleavened bread.

Additionally, there isn't any text in between the burial narrative and the first Resurrection narrative in the Gospel of John. That suggests that the Resurrection probably occurred on the day after the Crucifixion, which is consistent with the conclusion already reached that the Resurrection probably occurred on the first day of the week of unleavened bread. The Gospel of Luke also doesn't include any text in between the burial narrative and the first Resurrection narrative, however, the Gospel of Luke specifically includes the phrase "after the Sabbath" and the Gospel of John does not.

Why would multiple days pass going from the Crucifixion to the Resurrection? Why wouldn't the Resurrection have occurred on the day after the Crucifixion? It actually seems to make a lot more sense

for the Resurrection to have occurred on the day after the Crucifixion than for multiple days to have passed. It's unclear exactly why the Gospel of John refers to a three-day sequence. It could relate to the common use of the number 3 or it could simply relate to that ancient Jewish tradition that expressed that a person could rise within three days. The authors of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew chose to add one day to that tradition. Maybe an author who contributed to the Gospel of John decided to just keep it at three based on that tradition. Regardless of the exact reason for why a three-day sequence is presented in the Gospel of John, the evidence shows that the Resurrection probably occurred on the fifteenth day of the week of unleavened bread, which presumably was the day after the Crucifixion, and it does seem to make a lot more sense for the Resurrection to have occurred on the day after the Crucifixion rather than multiple days later.

The conclusions reached so far about the dating of the Resurrection are that the Resurrection likely occurred on a Tuesday, on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan, and on the day after the Crucifixion. We can now move forward with trying to find the specific date of the Resurrection. Multiple analyses will be shown that lead to the same date. One of them will use the Gospel of John and two of them will use the Gospel of Luke. All three of those analyses will relate back to the conclusions already reached about the Resurrection likely having occurred on a Tuesday, on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan, and on the day after the Crucifixion.

John 2:20

*The Jews replied, "It has taken forty-six years to build this temple, and you are going to raise it in three days?"*

The temple was renovated during Herod's reign. It seems to have been basically rebuilt, however, functioning supposedly never stopped so it is still considered the second temple, not the third. If we can date the beginning of this construction, we should be able to use John 2:20 to date the setting described in John 2:20.

The following is writing by Josephus, a Jewish-Roman historian who lived in the first century.

The Antiquities of the Jews, 15.380

*And now Herod, in the eighteenth year of his reign, and after the acts already mentioned, undertook a very great work, that is, to build of himself the temple of God, and make it larger in compass, and to raise it to a most magnificent altitude, as esteeming it to be the most glorious of all his actions, as it really was, to bring it to perfection; and that this would be sufficient for an everlasting memorial of him.*

The Antiquities of the Jews, 20.250

*Accordingly, the number of the high priests, from the days of Herod until the day when Titus took the temple and the City, and burnt them, were in all twenty-eight; the time also that belonged to them was a hundred and seven years.*

Josephus describes the beginning of the construction as having begun in the 18<sup>th</sup> year of Herod's reign. He also describes 107 years from the beginning of the reign of Herod until the destruction of the temple in 70 CE ("from the days of Herod" includes the days of Herod). Using inclusive counting, that would bring the beginning of Herod's reign to 37 BCE and the beginning of the construction to 20 BCE. There is also other evidence that Herod's reign began in 37 BCE. Again using inclusive counting, 46 years from 20 BCE, with 20 BCE counted as year 1, would bring year 46 to 26 CE. Based on that, the first Passover

described in the Gospel of John seems to be portrayed as having occurred in 26. Given that there are three Passovers described in the Gospel of John, the Crucifixion and the Resurrection seem to be portrayed in the Gospel of John as having occurred in 28. There will also be more evidence shown later that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection likely occurred in 28.

As we analyze 28 to try to date the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, we need to gain an understanding for the religious Jewish calendar and how it applies to 28. There are twelve months in the religious Jewish calendar and their lengths depended on the lunar calendar (moon phase calendar). The moon phase cycle is between 29 and 30 days long and so each month would typically be 29 or 30 days long. A year that was not a leap year would have been 353-355 days long depending on the specific year. To account for the difference of days between the Jewish calendar year and Earth's orbit around the Sun, which is between 365 and 366 days long, there would sometimes be a leap year that included an extra month. A leap year would have been 383-385 days long. The first month of the year is called Nisan and usually begins in March or April. The twelfth month of the year is called Adar and usually ends in February or March. The thirteenth month in a leap year is referred to as a second Adar and usually ends in March or April.

There has been debate about what the considerations were in the first century regarding whether to add a second Adar to a given year. According to the Bible, the main consideration is the ripening of barley. Additionally, there is writing that has been dated to the fourth century that places importance on the spring equinox. Many have asserted that Passover must fall after the spring equinox. It is not known how much of a factor that consideration was in the first century. Ultimately, we do not know what the most important consideration was in the first century regarding whether to add a second Adar to a given year. The Bible emphasizes the ripening of barley and later writings emphasize the spring equinox.

We do not know what specific observations would have been made in 28 regarding the ripening of barley, but we can use the scheduled spring equinox in 28 and other considerations to come to a conclusion about when Nisan likely began in 28. Once we obtain a date for when Nisan likely began in 28, we can then come to a conclusion about what day the Resurrection likely occurred on.

The beginning of a month would usually be associated with the sighting of a sliver of the moon after a new moon (the moon isn't visible when there's a new moon). The first day of a month would often occur on the day after a new moon. Given that Adar usually ended in February or March, given that a second Adar usually ended in March or April, and given that Nisan usually began in March or April, we should analyze the new moons that are scheduled to have occurred in the months of February, March, and April in 28 to assess when Nisan likely began in 28.

In 28, the new moon in February is scheduled to have occurred on February 14<sup>th</sup>, the new moon in March is scheduled to have occurred on March 15<sup>th</sup>, and the new moon in April is scheduled to have occurred on April 13<sup>th</sup>. The first observation that should be made about these dates is that they all occur around the middle of their respective months. If Adar ended in February, then it would likely have ended towards the end of February rather than the beginning or middle of February. If Nisan began in April, then it would likely have begun towards the beginning of April rather than the middle or end of April. So February 14<sup>th</sup> was unlikely to have been the end of Adar and April 13<sup>th</sup> was unlikely to have been the beginning of Nisan. If Adar didn't end in February, then it probably ended in March; and if Nisan didn't begin in April, then it probably began in March. Therefore, it already appears probable that both the end of Adar and the

beginning of Nisan occurred in March in 28. That conclusion also shows that there probably wasn't a second Adar in 28.

That same conclusion can be reached through an analysis of the spring equinoxes in 27 and 28. Although the spring equinox may not have been a main factor in determining the scheduling of the Jewish calendar in the first century, the spring equinox can still be used as a general indicator. The rule that was written after the first century, which may or may not have been present in the first century, is that Passover must fall after the spring equinox. Even if that rule wasn't present in the first century, we can still apply that rule to see what conclusion it produces.

The spring equinox in 27 is scheduled to have occurred on March 23<sup>rd</sup> in the early morning. So if the 14<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan occurred after the spring equinox in 27, then the earliest date that Passover would have occurred on would appear to have been March 23<sup>rd</sup>, and the beginning of Nisan would appear to have been no earlier than March 10<sup>th</sup>. The shortest amount of days for a Jewish year is 353 days. If March 10<sup>th</sup> is used as a start date in 27 and 353 days are used as the length of the year, then the 353<sup>rd</sup> day of that year would have been February 25<sup>th</sup> in 28. That shows that February 14<sup>th</sup> was likely too early of a date for the end of Adar in 28. Therefore, the end of Adar in 28 probably occurred in March.

The new moon in March of 28 is scheduled to have occurred on March 15<sup>th</sup> and so that is the likely date that Adar ended in 28. The spring equinox in 28 is scheduled to have occurred on March 22<sup>nd</sup> in the morning. If Nisan in 28 began on March 16<sup>th</sup>, then the spring equinox would appear to have occurred on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan and would then have been before the Passover. Therefore, if the rule that stated that Passover must fall after the spring equinox was applied to 28, then a second Adar would likely not have been added and so the beginning of Nisan would likely have been correlated with the new moon in March.

A third path to conclude that Nisan in 28 probably began in March is by assessing which month appears to have placed the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan on a Tuesday.

If Nisan in 28 began on February 15<sup>th</sup>, then the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan would have been February 29<sup>th</sup> (28 was a leap year according to the Julian calendar), which was a Sunday. Therefore, if Nisan in 28 began in February, then the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan probably wouldn't have been a Tuesday. Potentially, if a sliver of the moon wasn't seen on February 15<sup>th</sup> or February 16<sup>th</sup>, then the next month could have begun on February 17<sup>th</sup>, which would have then made the 15<sup>th</sup> day of that month a Tuesday. However, that would require two additional days of not seeing a sliver of the moon. Furthermore, as previously stated, the middle of February would have probably been too early for Adar to have ended. Even if Adar did end that early, it would still probably have been too early for Nisan to have begun and so then a second Adar would probably have been added, in which case Nisan would not have begun in February.

If Nisan in 28 began on April 14<sup>th</sup>, then the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan would have been April 28<sup>th</sup>, which was a Wednesday. If anything, the start of a new month would likely be pushed forward rather than backwards and so the Tuesday that would have occurred on the day before would not likely have been the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan. Therefore, if Nisan in 28 began in April, then the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan probably wouldn't have been a Tuesday.

On the other hand, if Nisan in 28 began on March 16<sup>th</sup>, then the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan would have been March 30<sup>th</sup>, which was a Tuesday.

There have now been three different paths that lead to the conclusion that Nisan in 28 probably began in March. The next question then becomes about whether Nisan in 28 would have likely begun specifically on March 16<sup>th</sup>.

The new moon that is scheduled to have occurred on March 15<sup>th</sup>, 28 is scheduled to have occurred 27 minutes past midnight using the universal time zone. The time zone in Israel is three hours ahead of the universal time zone. So the new moon on March 15<sup>th</sup> is scheduled to have occurred at 3:27 a.m. in Israel. A sliver of the moon is not likely to be seen within 24 hours of the new moon. So a sliver of the moon was not likely seen before 3:27 a.m. on March 16<sup>th</sup>. Most people were probably sleeping at that time and then the sun would have presumably risen within a few hours of that. So a sliver of the moon was not likely seen on March 15<sup>th</sup> or in the early morning of March 16<sup>th</sup>. By 4:30 p.m. on March 16<sup>th</sup>, about 36 hours would have passed since the scheduled time of the new moon. So a sliver of the moon would have likely been seen by the night of March 16<sup>th</sup>. Therefore, it is justified to believe that the first day of Nisan in 28 was March 16<sup>th</sup>. As previously shown, if March 16<sup>th</sup> was the first day of Nisan in 28, then the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan in 28 would have been March 30<sup>th</sup>. As also previously shown, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28 was a Tuesday.

It is justified to believe that the Resurrection occurred on Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28. It is then also justified to believe that the Crucifixion occurred on Monday, March 29<sup>th</sup>, 28 and that Christ's arrest occurred late on Sunday, March 28<sup>th</sup>, or early on Monday, March 29<sup>th</sup>.

There are also other ways to get to March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28 as the date of the Resurrection. Our first analysis was largely through the Gospel of John. Our other analyses will be largely through the Gospel of Luke. Although the Gospel of Luke has been shown to appear to be largely fraudulent, the timing of certain historical events described in the Gospel of Luke can still be relied upon to a certain extent. If a historical event does in fact occur in reality and then that historical event is written about, the presence of any false details don't take away the fact that a real historical event is being represented. So while the Gospel of Luke appears to be largely fraudulent, certain information can still be used. The following verses provide the starting point of our next analysis.

Luke 3:1-2

*In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar – when Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea, Herod tetrarch of Galilee, his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea and Tracontitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene – during the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came to John son of Zechariah in the desert.*

Luke 3:1-2 describe the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist as having occurred in the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius. According to archaeological and other historical evidence, it appears that Tiberius became co-emperor in 11 CE or 12 CE, and became sole emperor in 14 CE. We don't know if the author of the Gospel of Luke would have considered the beginning of Tiberius' reign to have been when he began co-reigning or when he became sole emperor. Since we don't know which of those years the Gospel of Luke is referring to, we will initially consider all three of those years. Given 11, 12, and 14 as the possible first year, the 15<sup>th</sup> year would seem to have been 25, 26, or 28. So it appears that the

Gospel of Luke views the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist as having occurred in the time-period of 25-28.

Moving forward from the narrative about the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius and the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist, there is then the narrative about the beginning of Christ's Ministry later in chapter 3. There isn't any defining details that tell us how much time the Gospel of Luke is portraying as having passed between the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist and the beginning of Christ's Ministry. It could easily be proposed that the beginning of Christ's Ministry is being portrayed as having occurred in the same year as the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist. That's certainly possible. However, there isn't any other mention of a specific year throughout the entire Gospel of Luke and it claims to cover over 30 years. Therefore, the absence of a description of what year it was when Christ's Ministry began is not necessarily an indication that the Gospel of Luke is portraying the beginning of Christ's Ministry as having occurred in the same year as the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist. Additionally, the narrative about John the Baptist concludes with a description of his arrest, and so that narrative extends past the time-frame described in the narrative about the beginning of Christ's Ministry and so does not lead into the time-frame described in the narrative about the beginning of Christ's Ministry.

From here, there are three different ways that we can arrive at the same date. The first is to begin with the premise that the Gospel of Luke portrays less than one year as having passed from the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist to the beginning of Christ's Ministry. We don't know if that is really the case, and as mentioned before, the absence of a description of what year Christ's Ministry began in is not necessarily an indication of anything. However, one approach is to consider the premise that the Gospel of Luke portrays less than one year as having passed. In addition to that, all of the Synoptic Gospels describe only one Passover as having occurred from the beginning of Christ's Ministry to the Resurrection, which appears to present the duration allocated to Christ's Ministry as one year or less than one year. That then gives us two different time-periods that appear to be portrayed as one year or less than one year: from the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist to the beginning of Christ's Ministry and from the beginning of Christ's Ministry to the Resurrection, which combined together could be as much as almost two years. From that perspective, the Resurrection could be portrayed as having occurred as much as two years after the description of the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist. It was previously shown that the Gospel of Luke appears to portray the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist as having occurred in the time-period of 25-28. So adding two more years gives us a time-period of 25-30.

Given a time-period of 25-30, the evidence showing that the Gospel of Luke seems to view the Resurrection as having occurred on a Tuesday, and the evidence showing that the Resurrection likely occurred on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan, an appropriate dating of the Resurrection through this path would bring us to a year in the time-period of 25-30 in which the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan was a Tuesday. The only years in the time-period of 25-30 in which the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan was a Tuesday are 25 and 28. It was previously asserted that 25 is the earliest year that the Gospel of Luke could realistically view as the year in which the ministry of John the Baptist began. If that is accurate and if the Resurrection occurred in 25, then the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist, the beginning of Christ's Ministry, and the Resurrection would have all occurred within about three months. That seems very unrealistic, so we should eliminate 25 from consideration. Therefore, this path leads us to 28 in dating the Resurrection. As previously

shown, if the Resurrection occurred in 28, then the Resurrection likely occurred on Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28.

Another approach is to be less conservative and more exact when it comes to assessing the reference to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius. If the first year of the reign of Tiberius was considered to be the first year that he was sole emperor, then that would specifically exclude years in which Tiberius was an emperor. Even as a co-emperor, he was still an emperor. He didn't begin ruling when he first became sole emperor. He had already been ruling for a few years before that. For that reason, it seems unrealistic that the author would specifically exclude the years in which Tiberius was co-emperor, and therefore, the author of Luke seems to have considered the first year of the reign of Tiberius to be the first year in which he was an emperor, which means the first year in which he was co-emperor.

Additionally, in the very same narrative that refers to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius, the author of Luke also portrayed two different people as reigning as high priest in Jerusalem. Annas and Caiaphas are both named as high priests. Annas was older and on his way out of the priesthood. Caiaphas was younger and was really the new high priest. The situation with Annas and Caiaphas having their reigns as high priest portrayed as overlapping is very similar to the situation with Augustus and Tiberius having their reigns overlap. Since the author of Luke considered two different people to be reigning as high priest at the same time, that provides further evidence that the author of Luke considered Tiberius' reign to include the years that overlapped with the reign of Augustus.

There is debate about which year is the first year in which Tiberius first became co-emperor. 11 and 12 CE seem to have the most support. So the author of Luke seems to have considered 11 or 12 to be the first year of the reign of Tiberius, which would make the 15<sup>th</sup> year either 25 or 26. Therefore, it seems that the author of Luke viewed the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius to be 25 or 26. Adding two years to 25-26 would bring us to 25-28 for the year in which the Gospel of Luke portrays the Resurrection as having occurred.

A third avenue is to consider the possibility that the reference to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius is connected to the reference in the Gospel of John about the temple having been under construction for 46 years. As will be shown in more detail in Part 5, the Gospel of Luke appears to respond to the Gospel of John in several different ways. It will also be shown that the author of Luke appears to have had some version of John, Mark, and Matthew in the process of obtaining information for the Gospel of Luke, and therefore the author of Luke was probably aware of the reference in the Gospel of John about the temple having been under construction for 46 years. Furthermore, that reference in the Gospel of John and the reference to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius in the Gospel of Luke are the only two references to a specific year throughout all four Gospels, which adds reason to believe that the reference to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius in the Gospel of Luke may be a response to the reference in the Gospel of John about the temple having been under construction for 46 years. So as we take a closer look at the reference to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius, we can see that there is at least a good possibility that the Gospel of Luke responds to the reference in the Gospel of John about the temple having been under construction for 46 years. As previously shown, that reference in the Gospel of John appears to refer to 26 CE, so it appears that the reference to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius is likely a reference to 26 CE.

The first piece of evidence that shows that the reference to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius is responding to the Gospel of John is that such a reference is the only one of its kind in the Gospel of Luke.



Luke is the most extravagant of all of the Gospels in terms of the volume of narratives. The Gospel of Luke is the most extravagant in terms of narratives about the supposed physical “birth” of the physical appearance of Christ, the supposed physical “childhood” of the physical appearance of Christ, and the birth of John the Baptist. The Gospel of Luke even claims that Christ and John the Baptist are biological cousins. Nowhere in any of those narratives is a year given. It’s not until the narrative about the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist that a specific year is given. Additionally, there isn’t even a specific year given for the beginning of Christ’s Ministry or the Resurrection. The Gospel of Luke gives a year for the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist but not for the beginning of Christ’s Ministry or the Resurrection. That’s incredibly telling. One objection could be that the narrative about John the Baptist might lead into the narrative about the beginning of Christ’s Ministry and so the mentioning of the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius might apply to the beginning of Christ’s Ministry as well. However, the narrative about John the Baptist concludes with a description of his arrest, and so that narrative extends past the time-frame described in the narrative about the beginning of Christ’s Ministry and so does not lead into the time-frame described in the narrative about the beginning of Christ’s Ministry. Therefore, there doesn’t seem to be any other realistic reason why the narrative about the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist would be the only narrative to reference a specific year other than because it is responding to the Gospel of John. The second piece of evidence that shows that the reference to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius is responding to the Gospel of John is that the narrative that refers to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius also refers to both Annas and Caiaphas as high priests, which is the only place in the Gospels outside of the Gospel of John that Annas is named. The Gospel of Luke doesn’t even name Annas in later narratives involving the arrest of Christ or the questioning of Christ by the Sanhedrin. So his presence in that narrative provides further evidence that the Gospel of John was being responded to.

One could then argue that the dating in Luke is not independent from the dating in John because Luke seems to be responding to John. However, Luke also seems to be specifically disagreeing with John because John seems to describe that year as the year in which Christ’s Ministry began and Luke describes that year as the year in which the ministry of John the Baptist began. Meanwhile, Luke may very well be portraying 27 as the year in which Christ’s Ministry began, which would disagree with John seeming to portray 26 as that year. If the dating in Luke wasn’t independent from the dating in John, then Luke would be in complete agreement with John. Instead, Luke seems to specifically disagree with John. John seems to be describing the year 26 CE as a part of Christ’s Ministry while Luke seems to describe that year as the year in which the ministry of John the Baptist began. So Luke represents disagreeing information in comparison to John and therefore represents an independent dating.

It was previously shown that Luke appears to portray the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius as 25 or 26. It has also been shown that the reference about the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius in Luke appears to respond to the reference in John about the temple being under construction for 46 years and that the reference about the temple being under construction for 46 years appears to be a reference to 26 CE. Therefore, the reference to the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the reign of Tiberius appears to be a reference to 26 CE. Adding two years to 26 gives us a time-period of 26-28 in which the Gospel of Luke appears to portray the Resurrection as having occurred. Furthermore, since the Gospel of John appears to allocate about two years to Christ’s Ministry and since the Gospel of Luke seems to respond to the reference in the Gospel of John about the temple having been under construction for 46 years and also appears to specifically disagree with what happened that year, it’s very likely that the Gospel of Luke specifically portrays the

same amount of time as the Gospel of John, two years, but does so to represent the time-period from the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist to the Resurrection, in which case, the Gospel of Luke would appear to specifically portray the Resurrection as having occurred in 28.

We've produced three different ranges for when the Gospel of Luke appears to portray the dating of the Resurrection: 25-30, 25-28, and 26-28, with 26-28 being the most precise. For the ranges 25-30 and 25-28, 25 and 28 are the only years in which the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan appears to have been a Tuesday and 25 appears to be far too unrealistic to even consider, leaving only 28. For the range 26-28, 28 is the only year. So our analysis of the Gospel of Luke, which includes three different avenues, definitively takes us to the year 28. Therefore, through all of the evidence in the Gospel of Luke, we are led to Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28 for the dating of the Resurrection.

We have now established multiple analyses that all conclude that the Resurrection likely occurred on Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28. Having multiple paths to that conclusion shows very strong evidence that the Resurrection did actually occur on that day. Since these paths involve different Gospels that contradict each other in many ways and involve different historical evidence outside of the Bible as well, but yet bring us to the same exact day, arriving at that exact day in those different ways is very strong evidence that the Resurrection narratives in the Gospels are based on a real historical event. That shows evidence that the Resurrection is a real historical event. If the Resurrection never happened, then it would have been incredibly unlikely that we would have arrived at the same exact date through such different paths. One path involves the Gospel of John and writing from Josephus that describes King Herod's reign and construction of the Jewish temple. The other paths involve the Gospel of Luke and historical evidence about the reign of Tiberius. The Gospel of John combined with Josephus' writing about King Herod's reign and construction of the Jewish temple brings us to the same exact date as the Gospel of Luke combined with historical evidence about the reign of Tiberius in multiple ways. For the same exact date to be produced through such different paths shows incredible evidence that the Resurrection is a real historical event.

The evidence that shows that the Gospel of Luke appears to specifically disagree with the Gospel of John about when Christ's Ministry began but appears to agree about when the Resurrection occurred is very specific evidence that the Resurrection is a real historical event. Agreement among disagreeing sources is very reliable evidence because those sources show a willingness to disagree and yet still come to agreement.

The evidence that shows that the Gospels of Matthew and Luke appear to describe the Resurrection as having occurred on a Tuesday is further evidence that the Resurrection is a real historical event. There doesn't seem to be any obvious motivation to fraudulently choose Tuesday over all other days. Therefore, the choosing of Tuesday was probably based on a real historical event.

The Gospels of Matthew and Luke appear to describe the Resurrection as having occurred on a Tuesday and the conclusion that the Resurrection occurred on a Tuesday is supported through our analysis of the Gospel of John and Josephus' writing. The fact that Matthew and Luke specifically state "the third day", the evidence that shows that "the third day" refers to Tuesday, and the fact that an independent analysis using a different Gospel brings us to Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28 is additional evidence that the Resurrection really did occur on a Tuesday and that the Resurrection is a real historical event.

Also, the evidence that shows that the Resurrection occurred on the day after the Crucifixion is evidence that shows that the original account of the Resurrection portrayed the Resurrection as having occurred on the day after the Crucifixion, which is further evidence that the Resurrection did actually occur because that likely wouldn't be the case with a fraudulent account. Given the ancient Jewish tradition that a human being could rise in three days, the presence in John and Luke of a three-day timeline, and the presence in Mark and Matthew of a four-day timeline showing the desire to surpass a three-day timeline, a fraudulent account would probably include more than one day in the time-frame spanning from the death described to the supposed resurrection described in that fraudulent account. While the Gospels appear to include many fraudulent details, the evidence that shows that the original account of the Resurrection portrayed the Resurrection as having occurred on the day after the Crucifixion is further evidence that the Resurrection did actually occur.

A real account of an alleged resurrection that is presumably fraudulent is a narrative called "Gabriel's Revelation". It is engraved on a stone tablet and has been dated to the first century BCE and the first century CE. The translation of the narrative is debated but the narrative seems to tell a story of a supposed messianic figure who was commanded by an angel named Gabriel to rise in three days. There were multiple revolts in and around Israel against the Roman government. One figure that is associated with a revolt is Simon of Peraea, who seems to have been a Jewish rebel who was killed by the Roman government in 4 BCE. Some believe that "Gabriel's Revelation" was written about Simon of Peraea. There were many people who tried to appear to be messianic. "Gabriel's Revelation" is just one example of that kind of narrative. The main takeaway from "Gabriel's Revelation" is that it appears to be a fraudulent account about a false messianic figure that involves a time-frame of three days. As previously asserted, a fraudulent account of a resurrection was likely to include more than one day in the time-frame spanning from the death described to the supposed resurrection described in that fraudulent account. "Gabriel's Revelation" provides a real example of that. So the evidence that shows that the Resurrection occurred on the day after the Crucifixion is evidence that the Resurrection really did occur.

### **Summary of the Case**

A power-house like the Roman Empire would probably not have wanted to adopt Christianity as the state religion of the Roman Empire if Christianity wasn't already spread throughout the Roman Empire. Someone already in power would probably not have wanted to describe the one true God as having been crucified because that would suggest that an emperor could be crucified.

A political revolution would have probably required the use of violence. The Jewish-Roman war in the first century is a good example of what a political revolution looked like in the first century. That war led to the destruction of the temple in 70. The early spreading of Christianity does not seem to represent anything like that. Power does not seem to have been a motive for the people who were spreading true Christianity in the first century.

The disorganization and confusion described among the male "disciples" show that they don't seem to have been organized or sophisticated enough to carry out such an elaborate plan that would lead to Christianity spreading throughout the Roman Empire.

A false religion wouldn't likely cover up female leadership while leaving a woman in the narrative about the Resurrection. If female leadership was to be covered up in a false religion, then the presence of women would probably be entirely removed from every Resurrection narrative.

The presence in the Gospels of any of "the disciples" having turned away from Christ shows further evidence that truthful history is represented in the Gospels. If a false religion were being formed, that religion wouldn't likely include narratives about disciples having lost faith.

It is unlikely that someone was mistaken about the Resurrection and that such a mistake led to information about the Resurrection having spread throughout the Roman Empire.

We can further see the validity of Christianity when we analyze the teachings in the Gospel of John on a metaphysical level. As previously shown, John 1:1 is a variation of the most fundamental truth of existence, and there are other verses in the Gospel of John that are consistent with fundamental truths of existence.

The contradictions between the Gospels show even further that the disorganized and confused group of people described wouldn't have likely led to the spreading of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire. There was likely someone else, someone who was expressing truth, who was instrumental in the spreading of Christianity for the spreading to have been so successful.

The targeting of the lower class shows evidence that Christianity is the true religion. If someone was forming a false religion, they likely would not target the lower class in such a way. The specific teachings of Christianity and how they relate to sacrifice, not sacrifice just for a human-formed institution but sacrifice for God, is evidence of the validity of Christianity.

The spreading of Christianity through teachings of a woman in the first century is evidence of the validity of Christianity. It would have been so incredibly challenging for a woman who was not wealthy to spread a religion in the first century that the success of spreading Christianity in the first century is evidence that Mariam had knowledge of the true religion. For Mariam to have been as successful as she seems to have been, she appears to have had knowledge of the true religion. The combination of the early success of spreading Christianity, the evidence that shows that Mariam is the true human leader of Christianity, and the incredibly challenging societal constraints on women in the first century show evidence that Christianity is the true religion.

The evidence in the Gospels of the Revolution that Mariam spread can also show evidence for the Resurrection, and therefore that Christianity is the true religion. The evidence that shows the cover-up of the Revolution shows that the Revolution really was spreading. Not only that, it also shows that the Revolution was spreading information about Mariam being the top disciple and that the Revolution was so widely spread that those who opposed it had to address it. They weren't able to ignore it. So the Gospels show evidence that the Revolution was spreading, that it had been widely spread, and that it spread information about Mariam being the top disciple. Evidence of the Revolution can also be found in the Gnostic Gospels, which show evidence that the Revolution spread information about Mariam being the top disciple into the second century and maybe into the third and fourth centuries and so on. In the sixth century, Pope Gregory labeled Mariam as a prostitute. Such a disgusting attack is evidence that the pope felt the need to combat the fame of Mariam. Therefore, it appears that the Revolution spread

information about Mariam being the top disciple into the sixth century. That shows that the Revolution appears to have spread information about Mariam being the top disciple for over half a millennium.

Since it seems to have been Christ's teachings that allowed Mariam to be so successful, then it seems that a man could have done the same. Mariam was at a disadvantage in the first century because she was a woman. Additionally, she was likely poor. A man would have been at a much greater advantage than a woman in the process of spreading a false religion. Since Christ's teachings appear to have been the catalyst for the successful spread of Christianity, then it seems that a man could have been successful at spreading the teachings. Hypothetically, if Christ was merely a man, in other words, if Christianity was a false religion, Christianity could have still been successful just based on the evidence that shows that the teachings were the catalyst for the successful spread of Christianity. If Christ was merely a man and Christianity was a false religion, then it wouldn't seem to make much sense that the spreading of the religion was so successful after the Crucifixion rather than before the Crucifixion. One objection to that is that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection convinced people to believe in Christianity. However, there were plenty of religions in ancient times that involved a description of a death and a resurrection. One example is the ancient Egyptian myth of Isis and Osiris about the death and resurrection of Osiris. There also seems to have been a group of people who spread information about Simon of Peraea, who seems to have been a man who was crucified who this group claimed was the Messiah, but that group wasn't very successful. So it wasn't simply expressing that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection occurred that allowed Mariam to be so successful. It was more specifically the teachings of Christ. As a result, it seems that Christianity could have been successfully spread before the Crucifixion; but there seems to have been a shift after Mariam began spreading Christianity.

So it seems that Christianity could have been spread as successfully before the Crucifixion as afterwards, but that success was instead delayed until afterwards. That shows evidence that Christ deliberately chose to pass Christianity to Mariam so that she could lead the Revolution. That in turn shows evidence of the Foreknowledge of Christ. The evidence that shows the Foreknowledge of Christ in turn shows evidence that Christ is God.

One objection could be that the reason why the Revolution spread to less people before the Crucifixion was because there wasn't as much time from the beginning of Christ's Ministry until the Crucifixion as there was for Mariam after the Crucifixion. In other words, more time led to a larger spread. So it could be argued that the Revolution wasn't deliberately given to Mariam but was instead simply left for her taking after the Teacher was crucified, and she had more time that led to more success. However, the different results of Christ having been crucified versus Mariam leading the Revolution combined with Mariam having been taught by Christ shows that Mariam was taught to take a certain path that would lead to a different result. As previously shown, Mariam's success can be attributed to the teachings of Christ. If Christ was able to teach Mariam in a way that led to such success, then Christ knew how to be that successful, and yet Christ was crucified while someone who Christ taught led the Revolution. A student follows the example of their teacher, and Mariam took a different path than Christ, which shows that she was taught to take a different path. That shows evidence that Christ deliberately took a path that led to the Crucifixion and deliberately gave Christianity to Mariam for her to lead the Revolution. Christ gave Christianity to Mariam and she in turn gave Christianity to the rest of the world.

John 20:16 probably represents real eyewitness testimony of the Resurrection of Christ. John 20:16 is very defining evidence that the Resurrection of Christ did actually happen.

The Gospel of John combined with Josephus' writing about King Herod's reign and construction of the Jewish temple brings us to the same exact date as the Gospel of Luke combined with historical evidence about the reign of Tiberius in multiple ways. For the same exact date to be produced through such different paths shows incredible evidence that the Resurrection is a real historical event.

The evidence that shows that the Gospel of Luke appears to specifically disagree with the Gospel of John about when Christ's Ministry began but appears to agree about when the Resurrection occurred is very specific evidence that the Resurrection is a real historical event. Agreement among disagreeing sources is very reliable evidence because those sources show a willingness to disagree and yet still come to agreement.

The evidence that shows that the Gospels of Matthew and Luke appear to describe the Resurrection as having occurred on a Tuesday is further evidence that the Resurrection is a real historical event. There doesn't seem to be any obvious motivation to fraudulently choose Tuesday over all other days. Therefore, the choosing of Tuesday was probably based on a real historical event.

The Gospels of Matthew and Luke appear to describe the Resurrection as having occurred on a Tuesday and the conclusion that the Resurrection occurred on a Tuesday is supported through our analysis of the Gospel of John and Josephus' writing. The fact that Matthew and Luke specifically state "the third day", the evidence that shows that "the third day" refers to Tuesday, and the fact that an independent analysis using a different Gospel brings us to Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28 is additional evidence that the Resurrection really did occur on a Tuesday and that the Resurrection is a real historical event.

The evidence that shows that the Resurrection occurred on the day after the Crucifixion is evidence that shows that the original account of the Resurrection portrayed the Resurrection as having occurred on the day after the Crucifixion, which is further evidence that the Resurrection did actually occur because that likely wouldn't be the case with a fraudulent account. Given the ancient Jewish tradition that a human being could rise in three days, the presence in John and Luke of a three-day timeline, and the presence in Mark and Matthew of a four-day timeline showing the desire to surpass a three-day timeline, a fraudulent account would probably include more than one day in the time-frame spanning from the death described to the supposed resurrection described in that fraudulent account. While the Gospels appear to include many fraudulent details, the evidence that shows that the original account of the Resurrection portrayed the Resurrection as having occurred on the day after the Crucifixion is further evidence that the Resurrection did actually occur.

It is justified to believe that the origin within Creation of information about Christianity is Christ and that Christ is God. In Part 3, Judaism was shown to be a fraudulent religion. It has been shown here in Part 4 that it is justified to believe that the origin within Creation of information about Islam is fraudulent and came from human beings who sought to form a false religion to gain power. It is justified to believe that Christianity is the true religion, and that Judaism and Islam are false religions.

Through this investigation so far, there has been a wide range of fraud that has been exposed. You may be wondering why God would allow human beings to corrupt religious text. The same question can be asked about the allowance of evil behavior in general. As we will go into more detail on later here in Part 4, the possibility of evil naturally exists with the existence of the human race. Evil comes from human beings. Any suffering that is felt as a result of evil behavior is an indication that human beings can be harmful to themselves and to others. We are harmful to ourselves and to others because of our perspectives. Our perspectives encompass all of our being. Our lives are experienced by us from our own perspectives and so our behavior is a result of our perspectives. The corruption of religious text is also a result of perspective. The corruption of religious text serves as an example of what the human race is capable of. The human race can be harmful and that is one of the lessons to be learned through the discovery of fraudulent religious text. Free-will has been given to human beings and one of the results of that is the production of fraudulent religious text. For human beings to live with free-will, the possibility of evil naturally exists. The discovery of fraudulent religious text serves as an example of evil behavior of human beings and what the human race is capable of.

Additionally, the discovery of fraudulent religious text serves as evidence of the true religion. Through analysis of fraud, we have been led to truth. The Bible was made in just a way that a puzzle was left for us. The discovery of fraud is an avenue for that puzzle to be put together, and when it is, truth is revealed. Human beings corrupted the text of the documents in the Bible, but it was all done in a way that we could find truth in it after all of these years. The fraudulent text in the Bible helps us find truth. The fraudulent text in the Bible helps us find the true religion. Evil acts of those who corrupted the Bible were used to shape the Bible in a way that we could piece together truth after all of these years through deep investigation and analysis. The discovery of fraudulent religious text serves as evidence of the true religion.

The discovery of fraudulent religious text also shows us some of the story of Mariam. She was the top disciple and best student of Christ in the first century; and people criticized her, insulted her, and concealed information about her, and she has been described as a prostitute for nearly 1,500 years if not longer than that. Mariam set an examples for us. Mariam was faced with incredible challenges and continued to spread Christianity. That serves as an example for us about how we should move forward in the midst of any challenge that we face. Regardless of any challenge that we are faced with, we should continue to move forward on the path of discipleship. Our discipleship is our mission. Our discipleship will always be our mission, and we should continue to move forward on the path of discipleship regardless of any challenge that we are faced with. The examples that Mariam set for us show us that, and we have discovered examples that Mariam set for us through the discovery of fraudulent religious text.

The discovery of fraudulent religious text shows us a puzzle, or a code, in the Bible. There is information that can be decoded. Putting together the pieces of information in the Bible allows us to decode real history. Human beings can produce corruption and we have seen that play out in our investigation so far. The discovery of fraudulent religious text has helped us find information about the true religion, has served us with an example of evil behavior of human beings and what the human race is capable of, and has shown us some of the story of Mariam, and the story of Mariam provides examples for us about how we should move forward in the midst of any challenge that we face. The discovery of fraudulent religious text has provided a path for truth to be revealed after thousands of years of corruption.

## God is One

As originally asked in Part 1: Is Christ the Creator of the world or the Son of the Creator of the world?

The belief that Christ is “the Son of God” comes from writing like the following.

Psalm 2:1-12

*Why do the nations conspire and the peoples plot in vain. The kings of the earth take their stand and the rulers gather together against the Lord and against his Anointed One. “Let us break their chains”, they say, “and throw off their letters”.*

*The One enthroned in heaven laughs; the Lord scoffs at them. Then he rebukes them in his anger and terrifies them in his wrath, saying, “I have installed my King on Zion, my holy hill.”*

*I will proclaim the decree of the Lord:*

*He said to me, “You are my Son; today I have become your Father. Ask of me, and I will make the nations your inheritance, the ends of the earth your possession. You will rule them with an iron scepter, you will dash them to pieces of pottery.”*

*Therefore, you kings, be wise; be warned, you rulers of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry and you be destroyed in your way, for his wrath can flare up in a moment. Blessed are all who take refuge in him.*

Psalm 2:1-12 make reference to an alleged messianic figure with the reference to the “Anointed One”. The reference to the “King on Zion” is a reference to a king reigning from Jerusalem. Just from that, we can derive the conclusion that these verses are portraying a human king as a messianic figure. We previously saw in Part 3 that Isaiah 7:14 appears to have been a fraudulent attempt to portray King Hezekiah as a messianic figure. Psalm 2:1-12 appear to follow a similar path. Kings in Jerusalem were anointed, so if there is a reference to a king, then that reference would be a reference to a king who was anointed. So then, if there is also a reference to the “Anointed One” and an anointed king is a part of the scene, then that king would inherently be portrayed as the “Anointed One” unless there is some specific indication otherwise. Additionally, the person who directed the production of these verses referred to themselves as the “Son” of God. They said “He said to me, ‘You are my Son’”. So they were talking about themselves when they used the titles “Anointed One” and “King on Zion”. They then go on to express that the whole world will be in their possession. They portrayed themselves as the Messiah and portrayed the Messiah as a king ruling from Jerusalem. So it appears that Psalm 2:1-12 are fraudulent and were directed by a king in Jerusalem who portrayed themselves as the Messiah.

Verses like Psalm 2:1-12 are the foundation for a Jewish understanding of the Messiah as “the Son of God”, but Psalm 2:1-12 appear to be fraudulent and appear to have been directed by a human king.

There are many other verses that contributed to the belief that the Messiah would be “the Son of God”, such as the following.

2 Samuel 7:12-14

*“When your days are over and you rest with your fathers, I will raise up your offspring to succeed you, who will come from your own body, and I will establish his kingdom. He is the one who will build a house for my Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he will be my son. When he does wrong, I will punish him with the rod of men, with floggings inflicted by men.”*



2 Samuel 7:12-14 describe a supposed prophecy about the offspring of the so-called King David. These verses describe that there would be a man who is biologically related to David, who would be a “Son of God”, and who would reign over a kingdom that would supposedly be established by God forever. This king who is being portrayed as someone who would reign over this supposed everlasting kingdom is obviously being portrayed as the coming Messiah. This supposed everlasting kingdom is the one people were waiting for back in ancient times. Furthermore, Christ is described in the Gospels as “Son of David” and “the Son of God”, and both of those descriptions are consistent with 2 Samuel 7:12-14. Jews believed that the coming Messiah would be biologically related to David, would be “the Son of God”, and would reign over an everlasting kingdom. As shown in Part 3, the Gospels of Matthew and Luke even present a genealogy that includes David. As also shown in Part 3, the kingdom of David doesn’t appear to have really existed in the way that the Bible describes. Any prophecy about the coming Messiah being like David or being “Son of David” would appear to be obviously fraudulent.

Psalms 2:1-12 and 2 Samuel 7:12-14 allege that the coming Messiah would be “the Son of God” and 2 Samuel 7:12-14 also allege that the coming Messiah would be a “Son of David”. 2 Samuel 7:12-14 appear to be fraudulent just based on the fact that those verses are about David and Psalm 2:1-12 appear to be fraudulent based on those verses appearing to be about a human king who was attempting to be seen as a messianic figure. It’s fraudulent verses like Psalm 2:1-12 and 2 Samuel 7:12-14 that set a foundation for the Jewish belief that the coming Messiah would be “the Son of God”. So heading into the first century, the expectation that the coming Messiah would be “the Son of God” came from fraudulent writing. Meanwhile, as shown in Part 3, all of the narratives about the supposed physical “birth” and the supposed physical “childhood” of the physical appearance of Christ appear to be fraudulent.

Putting aside any descriptions of Christ as “the Son of God” and considering the descriptions in the Gospel of John of Christ as God, we now need to assess whether Christ is God or merely a human being. Many Christians argue that Christ is both God and human. However, that concept is really just based on the combination of all of the descriptions about Christ in the Gospels, many of which are fraudulent. So is Christ God, merely human, or a combination of divine and human?

God necessarily and inherently encompasses all of existence. The Mind of God encompasses all of existence. Therefore, any conscious being who doesn’t encompass all of existence is not God.

Only God is infinite. Therefore, any conscious being who doesn’t encompass all of existence is finite.

God encompasses all of existence. Therefore, every finite being exists within the Mind of God.

In summary, any conscious being who doesn’t encompass all of existence is not God, but is finite and exists within the Mind of God. Therefore, it is impossible for Christ to be some combination of divine and human. To be divine is to be God. The belief that Christ is some combination of divine and human separates the identity of Christ from the identity of God by saying that Christ is different than God by being human. The belief that a being who is human and has a separate identity from the identity of God is also divine would be a polytheistic belief. So the belief that Christ is human and has a separate identity from the identity of God but is also divine is a polytheistic belief. To be divine is to be God and God encompasses all of existence. Either Christ is God and encompasses all of existence or Christ does not encompass all of existence and is merely human. The physical appearance of Christ in the first century

was a finite appearance, but we are not simply talking about the physical appearance of Christ. We are talking about the Mind of Christ. The Mind of Christ is either the Mind of God or merely a human mind.

Every finite being is subordinate to God and less than God because God is infinite and encompasses all of existence. Therefore, Christ is either God or subordinate to God and less than God. If Christ is not God, then Christ would be finite and less than God just like human beings are.

Regardless of the different specific beliefs people have about the nature of Christ, Christianity is based on the concept of Christ being one with God. To be absolutely one with God is to be in absolute union with God. If a being is finite, then God exists beyond that being. If God exists beyond a given being, then that being does not exist in the same way as God and therefore can't be in absolute union with God because they can't be in union with all of God since God exists beyond them. Therefore, to be absolutely one with God is to be identical to God. God encompasses all of existence, so to be absolutely one with God is to be absolutely one with all of existence. So a being would need to encompass all of existence to be absolutely one with God. Therefore, it is impossible for a finite being to be absolutely one with God. Christ would not be absolutely one with God if Christ is finite and less than God.

It has already been shown that Christianity is the true religion, that Christ had foreknowledge, and that Christ knew how God's Plan would result. Just based on that, it would be most reasonable to believe that Christ is God and that the physical appearance of Christ is the physical representation of God.

One could argue that Christ could be one with God in a different way than being identical to God. In other words, Christ could have had foreknowledge of God's Plan without being God if God communicated that. That would be to portray Christ as a prophet. If Christ is merely a prophet, then Christ would merely be human. For Christ to have had foreknowledge of the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, and the Revolution spread by Mariam, it seems very unrealistic to believe that Christ is merely a prophet. Instead, it's much more realistic to believe that Christ is God.

There are three additional pieces of evidence that show that Christ is God. One is the anointing of Christ in Bethany by Mariam. There is God and there is the human race and there isn't any intermediary between God and any given human being. God lives within every conscious being and every conscious being lives within God. There isn't any human being who is between another human being and God. Therefore, human beings should not try to perform an act that in and of itself would exalt a human being above all other human beings. If Christ was merely human, then the anointing of Christ in and of itself would have exalted a human being above all other human beings and would have been a form of worship of a human being. But such an act performed for a human being would be a form of idolatry. No human being should be idolized in such a way and no human being should be worshipped. We should only worship God. The anointing of Christ did not just exalt Christ, but was also an act of worship. If Christ was merely human, then such an act would have been one of worshipping a being who is not God. Mariam is exalted as the top disciple of Christ, but that is because of her actions as a disciple of God. Such exaltation of Mariam is not worship. Such exaltation only comes because of her service as a disciple of God. The anointing of Christ, on the other hand, was an act of worship. It was additionally exaltation in and of itself. Mariam is naturally exalted because of her discipleship. The exaltation of Mariam simply comes from recognizing truth. The anointing of Christ exalted Christ through an action. It represented a specific decision to exalt Christ. The anointing of Christ was an act of worship and human beings should

only worship God. Therefore, the anointing of Christ serves as evidence that the top disciple of Christ was recognizing that Christ is God.

Similar to the point made about the anointing of Christ, John 20:16 shows further exaltation of Christ that should only be for God.

John 20:16

*Jesus said to her, "Mary."*

*She turned toward him and cried out in Aramaic, "Rabboni!", which means Teacher.*

Evidence was shown in Part 2 that John 20:16 probably represents real eyewitness testimony from Mariam and this verse describes Mariam as calling Christ "Rabboni", which means Teacher. As will be shown later here in Part 4, discipleship is about both learning as well as teaching. We need to learn but we should also teach others. To truly be a disciple, one must spread Christianity, not just learn Christianity for themselves. As students, we can and should learn from other human beings. However, we shouldn't only look at another human being as simply a teacher. All human beings should be a student and a teacher. So while we can recognize another human being as a teacher, all human beings are still students. To only look at another human being as a teacher rather than as a student and a teacher is to exalt them beyond the degree that they really should be. If Christ was merely human, then Christ would also be a student, a student of God. As students of God, we should teach others how to be teachers. As we teach others, we should not hold them to only being students, they should instead be taught how to be teachers. As a disciple, we should give others what they need so that they can know what we know. In that way, we should not remain as only a teacher to a given person. We ourselves should be both a student and a teacher and we should teach others to be the same, in which case we should also be students of those we are teachers to. We should teach each other and we should learn from each other. Anyone who is a teacher in the way that they should be should also be able to learn from those they teach. Furthermore, as previously stated, no human being is between another human being and God. So if you teach someone about God, they should then possess that knowledge and no longer depend on you for that particular knowledge, and you should also be able to learn from them so that you are teachers to each other and students of each other. If Christ was merely human and a disciple of God, then Christ could have been a student as well and then Mariam shouldn't have only viewed Christ as the Teacher. God is the Teacher. For the top disciple of Christ to view Christ as the Teacher and not as a student is to view Christ as God.

With the anointing of Christ and the view of Christ as the Teacher, Christ is portrayed as God. Meanwhile, the Resurrection serves as additional evidence that Christ is God and not merely human. If Christ was merely human, then the Resurrection would have exalted a human being above the rest of the human race but not through their own actions. As previously explained, Mariam is exalted because of her own actions as a disciple of God. However, if Christ was merely human, then the Resurrection would not be the result of a decision made by Christ. The Resurrection is a decision that was made by God and could only be a decision made by Christ if Christ is God. If Christ is merely human and therefore the Resurrection was not a decision made by Christ, then an occurrence that was not a human's own decision would exalt that human above the rest of the human race. A human being should only be exalted through their actions. So for a human being to not be exalted above the rest of human race through the Resurrection, Christ would not merely be human. Therefore, the Resurrection serves as defining evidence that Christ is God.

This now brings us to the concept of the Trinity. Since Christ is God and not “the Son of God”, the concept of the Trinity can easily be seen as fraudulent. First, there was the incorrect distinction between “the Father” and “the Son”, and then the Spirit was portrayed as a third “person” of God. The concept of the Trinity is a fraudulent and polytheistic concept that contradicts the oneness of God. Christ is God, the Spirit is God’s Spirit, and God is one.

As shown in Part 3, all of the narratives in the Gospels related to the supposed physical “birth” of the physical appearance of Christ involving Mother Mariam appear to be fraudulent. As shown here in Part 4, Christ is God and God encompasses all of existence. John 1:1 describes existence before Creation and then chapter 1 of the Gospel of John goes on to describe Christ having appeared in the physical world. There isn’t any description in the Gospel of John that refers to a physical “birth” of the physical appearance of Christ involving Mother Mariam. There isn’t any description in the Gospel of John of any kind of physical “childhood” of the physical appearance of Christ. There isn’t any indication in the Gospel of John of what Christ did while physically appearing in this world before Mariam became a disciple. Since we know about Christianity through the Testimony of Mariam, we don’t know what Christ did while physically appearing in this world before Mariam became a disciple of Christ. We don’t know anything about a physical “birth” or anything about a physical “childhood”. John 1:1 describes existence before Creation and then we know of a narrative that appears to describe Mariam having become a disciple of Christ. Based on what we seem to know from the Testimony of Mariam, we don’t have any kind of reliable information about anything like a physical “birth” of the physical appearance of Christ involving Mother Mariam. Furthermore, as shown here in Part 4, Christ is God and God encompasses all of existence. Therefore, it is justified to believe that the physical appearance of Christ was represented by an appearance that looked like an adult man when Christ first physically appeared in this world in the first century, and that the tradition of Christmas is based on false and fraudulent information. There seems to have been some kind of relationship between Christ and Mother Mariam, but we don’t know what that relationship was like.

Mother Mariam is described as having had a special relationship with Christ. Additionally, she is apparently described as Mariam’s mother in John 19:26-27. The description of Mother Mariam as Mariam’s mother shows that such a relationship was not a biological one. Mariam does not seem to have been the biological daughter of Mother Mariam. So the term “mother” takes on a different meaning than that of a biological mother. Such a relationship would likely involve one person helping to take care of the other person. A mother could take care of a son or daughter, or a son or daughter could take care of a mother. Considering that Christ is God, Christ likely took care of Mother Mariam; and considering Mariam was the top disciple of Christ, Mariam also probably took care of Mother Mariam. The men who are described as Mother Mariam’s sons (men named James, Joseph, Judas, and Simon) are not portrayed as having taken care of Mother Mariam and they are portrayed in the Gospels as people who did not believe in Christ. As a result, it seems that they may not have supported Mother Mariam, in which case there may have been a need for her to be taken care of. Christ may have taken care of her during Christ’s Ministry and Mariam may have taken care of her after the Crucifixion. Later on, Mother Mariam was described as the biological mother of Christ and men described as her sons were described as biological brothers of Christ. However, that information appears to be fraudulent.

## **The Crucifixion**

We should now turn to another misunderstanding about Christ. The misunderstanding of Christ as a sacrificial lamb does not just relate to the narrative in the Gospel of John about the supposed identification of Christ by John the Baptist, it also relates to how Christians view Christ and what Christianity is really about. It is widely believed that Christ was the unblemished sacrifice and that all of our sins are forgiven because Christ was crucified. First and foremost, there are two separate aspects to those beliefs. There is the Crucifixion and there is the forgiveness of sins. The Crucifixion represents one decision by God and forgiveness of sins represents another decision by God. The Crucifixion is not the forgiveness of sins and the forgiveness of sins is not the Crucifixion. The Crucifixion and the forgiveness of sins represent two different decisions by God. So if they are to be connected to each other, then that connection represents a third decision by God. With that having been expressed, the Crucifixion could only represent the forgiveness of sins in a symbolic way. God can forgive without there being a blood sacrifice. Forgiveness by God would come directly from God. The Crucifixion is not necessary for God to forgive us. God could still forgive us even if the Crucifixion hadn't happened, so forgiveness is not a direct result of the Crucifixion. Therefore, the Crucifixion could only represent forgiveness in a symbolic way. There isn't anything about the Crucifixion that directly results in forgiveness. God could forgive even if the Crucifixion hadn't happened. If one were to think that Christ was sacrificed for our forgiveness in the way that so many people today believe, then that represents the belief that God was sacrificed to God, which doesn't make sense.

The main theological viewpoint that is used to try to rationalize believing that Christ was a sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins is that justice must be served in some way. From that perspective, people believe that Christ took our punishment for us. That is a product of human thinking. Human beings have decided that justice should be served through punishment. However, that is really up to God. If Christ took our punishment for us to serve justice and to give us forgiveness, then that would mean that God punished God for the sins of human beings. That doesn't make sense. That would actually defeat the purpose of punishment. There doesn't necessarily have to be punishment for someone's mistake; but if there is punishment for a mistake, that punishment is only really punishment for that mistake if it is brought upon the person who committed that mistake. If God gives the punishment and receives the punishment, what has really been accomplished? If the punishment is God's decision, what purpose does the punishment serve if God receives that punishment? Such punishment would not resolve the sins of the human race. God can forgive without giving punishment, and the sins of the human race would either be resolved or unresolved regardless of such punishment. If the punishment doesn't directly relate to the sinner, then there is no direct result of that punishment that relates to any of their sin. So again, the Crucifixion could only represent forgiveness in a symbolic way.

The idea that the Crucifixion represents a sacrifice for the forgiveness of our sins really appears to have come from the wide-spread ancient tradition of making blood sacrifices. Israelites often slaughtered animals for forgiveness of their sins. This ancient tradition didn't begin with Judaism though. Blood sacrifices were practiced by pagans all over the world. The Roman Empire engaged in blood sacrifices and there was even a law mandated by the Roman government making blood sacrifices a legal requirement to show loyalty to the Roman emperor. Such a law eventually became problematic for the Christian population because blood sacrifices are specifically against Christian teachings. So it was unbecoming of a Christian to make a blood sacrifice and it was illegal according to the Roman Empire to

not make blood sacrifices. Further east, blood sacrifices were made in places like India, China, and Japan. Populations in the Western Hemisphere made blood sacrifices as well. The Mayans, Aztecs, and Incas all made blood sacrifices. Populations throughout the world made blood sacrifices and many of them made human sacrifices. The ancient world depended heavily on blood sacrifices. Such a dependency was the result of faulty human observation of the world. Slaughtering creations of God would not be an offering to God. One cannot reconcile their own mistakes by trying to destroy a creation of God. If God creates a lamb and a human being slaughters that lamb, that human being has simply slaughtered a creation of God and has not offered anything to God. This system of blood sacrifices for forgiveness is simply a product of faulty human thinking. Such an illogical way of thinking was extended for thousands of years, maybe millions of years or more, before eventually going into the first century. People were already influenced by this faulty system of blood sacrifices for forgiveness, and then on top of that, many people didn't understand how the Messiah could have been crucified. So naturally, some people described the Crucifixion as a sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins.

Not only were blood sacrifices mainstream in the ancient world, but more specifically, Jewish theology seems to be front and center in the belief that the Crucifixion was a blood sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins. The book of Daniel claims that the Messiah would bring an end to sacrifice and offering. It was believed that people needed to make sacrifices for their sins and that they would no longer need to after the Messiah came. Before the Crucifixion, Jews believed that they needed to make blood sacrifices. After the Crucifixion, "Christian-Jews" believed that the Crucifixion was the blood sacrifice that ended the need for blood sacrifices moving forward. Therefore, the theology that expresses that the Crucifixion was a blood sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins appears to be a direct result of Jewish theology that expresses that people need to make blood sacrifices for their sins and that the Messiah would end the need for blood sacrifices. So for a person to believe that the Crucifixion was a blood sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins, they would apparently need to condone and advocate for the belief that people needed to make blood sacrifices before the Crucifixion, which further shows that we're dealing with fraudulent theology.

Additionally, we can turn to the narratives in the Gospels that mention Barabbas as well as to the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament for further evidence of how the Crucifixion was ever thought to be a blood sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins.

Mark 15:6-7

*Now it was the custom at the Feast to release a prisoner whom the people requested. A man called Barabbas was in prison with the insurrectionists who had committed murder in the uprising.*

Mark 15:15

*Wanting to satisfy the crowd, Pilate released Barabbas to them. He had Jesus flogged, and handed him over to be crucified.*

Matthew 27:15-16

*Now it was the governor's custom at the Feast to release a prisoner chosen by the crowd. At that time they had a notorious prisoner called Barabbas.*

Matthew 27:26

*Then he released Barabbas to them. But he had Jesus flogged, and handed him over to be crucified.*

Luke 23:18-19

*With one voice they cried out, "Away with this man! Release Barabbas to us!" Barabbas had been thrown into prison for an insurrection in the city, and for murder.*

Luke 23:25

*He released the man who had been thrown into prison for insurrection and murder, the one they asked for, and surrendered Jesus to their will.*

John 18:39-40

*"But it is your custom for me to release to you one prisoner at the time of the Passover. Do you want me to release 'the king of the Jews'?"*

*They shouted back, "No, not him! Give us Barabbas!" Now Barabbas had taken part in a rebellion.*

All of these verses are from narratives that describe an alleged custom to release a prisoner at the time of Passover. First and foremost, such a custom was probably never in place. The Roman government was vicious and brutal in their execution of security and defense. There is evidence that shows that the Roman government would leave bodies hanging on crosses outside of the Jewish temple around Passover so that Jews traveling to the temple would see them as a warning to abide by Roman laws. The Roman government certainly didn't allow for much leniency, and it seems incredibly unrealistic that the Roman government would release anyone who was convicted of a crime without punishment just to please Jews, especially someone who is described as a murderer and an insurrectionist. Such a person would have likely been crucified rather than released. Pontius Pilate was there to enforce Roman law, not to release a prisoner who broke Roman law. So we can already see that these narratives about Barabbas appear to be fraudulent.

As we move deeper into our analysis of the character called Barabbas, a closer examination of this character's name can allow us to see why such a character is described in the Gospels. The name Barabbas comes from the Greek word Βαραββᾶς ("Barabbas"). That Greek word can be split into two words: Βαρ ("bar") and ἄββᾶ ("abba"). The part of "Barabbas" that gets translated as "bar" comes from a Hebrew word that means "son", and the part that gets translated as "abba" comes from a Hebrew word that means "father". So the name "Barabbas" can be viewed as "son of father". The Gospels portray Christ as "the Son of the Father" and portray a character who is described as having been released by Pontius Pilate as "son of father". We can now turn to the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament for insight into why that is the case.

The following verses relate to the Day of Atonement, which is called Yom Kippur.

Leviticus 16:5-10

*"From the Israelite community he is to take two male goats for a sin offering and a ram for a burnt offering."*

*"Aaron is to offer the bull for his own sin offering to make atonement for himself and his household. Then he is to take the two goats and present them before the Lord at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting. He is to cast lots for the two goats – one lot for the Lord and the other for the scapegoat. Aaron shall bring the goat whose lot falls to the Lord and sacrifice it for a sin offering. But the goat chosen by lot as the scapegoat shall be presented alive before the Lord to be used for making atonement by sending it into the desert as a scapegoat."*

Leviticus 16:15-17

*“He shall then slaughter the goat for the sin offering for the people and take its blood behind the curtain and do with it as he did with the bull’s blood. He shall sprinkle it on the atonement cover and in front of it. In this way he will make atonement for the Most Holy Place because of the uncleanness and rebellion of the Israelites, whatever their sins have been. He is to do the same for the Tent of Meeting, which is among them in the midst of their uncleanness. No one is to be in the Tent of Meeting from the time Aaron goes in to make atonement in the Most Holy Place until he comes out, having made atonement for himself, his household, and the whole community of Israel.”*

Leviticus 16:20-22

*“When Aaron has finished making atonement for the Most Holy Place, the Tent of Meeting, and the altar, he shall bring forward the live goat. He is to lay both hands on the head of the live goat and confess over it all the wickedness and rebellion of the Israelites – all their sins – and put them on the goat’s head. He shall send the goat away into the desert in the care of a man appointed for the task. The goat will carry on itself all their sins to a solitary place; and the man shall release it in the desert.”*

These verses describe alleged instructions given to Moses about the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur). Aaron, the character portrayed as Moses’ brother, is described as being instructed to take two goats and have one of them slaughtered and have one of them released out into the desert. The goat that was to be slaughtered is the blood sacrifice. The one that was to be released out into the desert was to have all of the sins of Israel cast on it before it was released. As previously discussed, making blood sacrifices for forgiveness was a common practice among Jews as well as pagans all over the world. Blood sacrifices were a common practice through much of the world where the human race inhabited. The Day of Atonement adds another element though. That added element is the second goat that has all of the sins of Israel cast on them.

As we can see from the tradition of the Day of Atonement, Judaism allowed for an annual mass forgiveness of sins. Then as we turn to the New Testament, we see theology that portrays Christ as a sacrificial lamb and portrays the Crucifixion as a blood sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins. That theology is shared with the theology involved with the Day of Atonement, except the Day of Atonement is only for a year and the Crucifixion is portrayed as granting forgiveness forever.

If we take the theology involved with the Day of Atonement and we use that as the context for the theology involved with the portrayal of Christ as a sacrificial lamb and the portrayal of the Crucifixion as a blood sacrifice, we can then see what role Barabbas plays in the Gospels. Christ is portrayed as a sacrificial lamb and Barabbas is described as being released into the crowd, much like the Day of Atonement involves one goat as a blood sacrifice and the other goat as having the sins of Israel cast on them and being released into the desert. Meanwhile, Christ is portrayed as “the Son of the Father” and Barabbas’ name means “son of father”. The meaning of Barabbas’ name shows that such a name is to be compared in some manner to the portrayal of Christ as “the Son of the Father”. Barabbas, the alleged murderer and insurrectionist, is presented as “the sinner” who is released into the wild (the crowd), and then afterwards, Christ is described as having been crucified and the Crucifixion is portrayed as a blood sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins. Christ has been portrayed as a blood sacrifice and Barabbas is portrayed as “the scapegoat” who had the sins of Israel cast on them and was sent out into the wild.



The theology involved with viewing the Crucifixion as a blood sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins can be seen to have come from the theology involved with the Day of Atonement, and Barabbas' involvement in the Gospels goes a long way in showing that. That shows evidence that such theology is fraudulent. That in turn shows further evidence that the main teaching of the Crucifixion is not about forgiveness of sins.

We are not forgiven for our sins because of the Crucifixion. Our forgiveness is not dependent on the Crucifixion. God decided for there to have been the Crucifixion and any forgiveness is an entirely separate decision of God's. The Crucifixion was instead about setting an example for us. The example that has been set for us is about teaching in the face of persecution. Christ taught Christianity and then Christ was crucified. That is the example that has been set for us by the Crucifixion. Even if we face the possibility of being crucified, our mission is to practice and teach Christianity.

The Crucifixion set an example for us. The Crucifixion shows us that we should be willing to sacrifice ourselves for God. The Resurrection set an example for us as well. The Crucifixion and the Resurrection show us that we should be willing to sacrifice ourselves for God and that we will live after we die. Christ teaching people and taking care of Mother Mariam both set an example for us as well. Christ teaching people, Christ taking care of Mother Mariam, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection all set an example for us. We should teach others, we should take care of others, we should be willing to suffer and die to teach and take care of others, and we will live after we die.

Christ is our Teacher. Any teacher who is a real teacher sets an example for their students. Christ as our Teacher set examples for us. Christ taught people, Christ took care of people, Christ was crucified, and Christ will live forever. We should follow Christ's examples because Christ is our Teacher. That means that we should teach others, we should take care of others, we should be willing to suffer and die to teach and take care of others, and we will live forever. Those are examples that have been set for us through Christ's Ministry, Christ taking care of Mother Mariam, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection.

## **The Teacher**

With that understanding of the Crucifixion, we can now better analyze the name "Jesus".

Matthew 1:21-23

*"She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins."*

*All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet: "The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel" – which means, "God with us".*

First, the Gospel of Matthew, and particularly chapter 1, has been shown to appear to be fraudulent. Second, these verses refer to Isaiah 7:14 regarding the name "Immanuel" and Isaiah 7:14 has been shown to apparently be a fraudulent attempt to portray King Hezekiah as a messianic figure. So Matthew 1:21-23 use a fraudulent verse from the book of Isaiah to describe a name for Christ. Third, "Immanuel" and "Jesus" have two different meanings. "Immanuel" refers to the phrase "God with us" and "Jesus" refers to saving. So regardless of Isaiah 7:14 being fraudulent, the explanation that the name "Jesus" came about because of the name "Immanuel" doesn't make any sense and so would still appear to be fraudulent even if Isaiah 7:14 wasn't fraudulent. Fourth, given the understanding of the Crucifixion just previously

established, we can see that the idea that the name “Jesus” should be used in reference to Christ specifically to represent the concept of saving people from their sins appears to have originated from fraudulent Jewish theology, much like the concept that the Crucifixion was for people to be forgiven for their sins.

The name “Jesus” is an English name that derives from the Greek name “Lesous”; and “Lesous” derives from the Hebrew name “Yeshua”, which is often translated to English as “Joshua”. “Yeshua” is a name that refers to saving. First off, even if Christ was called “Yeshua” in the first century, “Yeshua” is a different pronunciation than “Jesus”. Christ was not likely ever called “Jesus” in the first century, even if Christ was called “Yeshua”.

Given that Matthew 1:21-23 appear to be fraudulent and appear to use fraudulent Jewish theology for the basis for the use of the name “Yeshua”, we must question whether “Yeshua” is the right name to use in reference to Christ. The first point against using the name “Yeshua” in reference to Christ is that fraudulent Jewish theology seems to be the basis for that use. The second is that “Yeshua” was a name that was used for human beings. It doesn’t seem appropriate to use a name for Christ that is used for humans. The third is that Christ is God and any name used to refer to Christ should also refer to God. For example, we can turn to Exodus for some clarity.

Exodus 3:13-14

*Moses said to God, “Suppose I go to the Israelites and say to them, ‘The God of your fathers has sent me to you’, and they ask me, ‘What is his name?’ Then what shall I tell them?”*

*God said to Moses, “I am who I am. This is what you are to say to the Israelites, ‘I am has sent me to you’ ”*

The phrase “I am” comes from the Hebrew word  $\text{אֲנִי}$  (“eh-yeh”). “Eh-yeh” is apparently the basis for the name “Yahweh”. In Exodus 3:14, after Moses is described as having asked what name to call God, God is described as expressing that God exists. While the book of Exodus appears to be a fraudulent production, there is still some truth expressed in Exodus 3:14. Likewise, while Judaism is a fraudulent religion, Yahwism likely has a truthful origin given that the name “Yahweh” appears to derive from a phrase that means “I am”. God encompasses all of existence, so a fundamental way to refer to God is to refer to existence, which is what happens with the phrase “I am”. The name “Yahweh” appears to derive from the most fundamental principle of all of existence: God necessarily and inherently exists. Therefore, Yahwism likely has a truthful origin.

Going back to the name “Yeshua”, the point being made about Exodus 3:14 shows that it doesn’t seem appropriate to refer to God with a name that is limited like the name “Yeshua”. “Yeshua” is a name that was used for human beings and simply refers to saving. On the other hand, the name “Yahweh” refers to existence, which is fundamental and encompassing.

In conclusion, while some people in the first century seem to have called Christ “Yeshua” or the Greek version “Lesous”, neither of those names seems to be appropriate, which shows that those people who used those names were probably incorrect in doing so.

For further insight, we should turn to the top disciple of Christ.

John 20:16

*Jesus said to her, "Mary."*

*She turned toward him and cried out in Aramaic, "Rabboni!", which means Teacher.*

John 20:16 describes Mariam speaking to Christ and calling Christ a name that means "Teacher". It was previously shown that Christ is our Teacher, and as our Teacher, Christ set examples for us. Christ is the Teacher.

## **Evil and Suffering**

With the understanding of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection previously established, we can better understand the existence of evil and suffering. Many people are concerned about why there is evil and suffering. Why would God allow the existence of evil and suffering? Not knowing the answer to that question can lead a person to not believe in God. There are people who have suffered greatly in this world and have lost their faith because of their suffering. Regardless of any evil or suffering, there is logical proof of God's existence. It is justified to believe that God exists and it is unjustifiable not to, but a person may not know why there is evil and suffering. We need to reconcile the existence of evil and suffering with God's existence. Nobody should reject the belief in God's existence because of evil or suffering. God exists and so do evil and suffering. So we must reconcile the existence of evil and suffering with God's existence.

Evil is not really a separate entity in the way that a lot of people think. Evil is the result of free-will of finite beings. Individual human beings carry out evil acts and that is where evil comes from. There isn't an evil force that permeates throughout the world. The presence of evil is simply the result of human beings making selfish decisions. Evil stems from selfishness. So the presence of evil exists in individual human beings. Evil is a natural by-product of free-will of finite beings. The elimination of the possibility of evil would require the elimination of free-will of human beings, which would mean the elimination of our lives as we know them. So for human beings to exist as free thinkers able to make decisions, the possibility of evil must naturally exist as well. Evil is not a collective force but an individual force that can be built up collectively through the presence of multiple individuals.

Given that evil comes from free-will of human beings, it's easy to see how ridiculous the concept of Satan is. But even if we didn't have that reasoning, we can still come to that same conclusion because the concept of Satan doesn't make sense. The idea that God created a being for the sole purpose of being evil and the idea that some fallen angel somehow gained control over a portion of existence are some of the most outrageous ideas that have ever been thought of. Those ideas are products of the human race making up stories.

The concept of hell doesn't make sense either. God knows all. It doesn't make sense to create a human being with the intent on leading them to damnation forever. What would be the point of that? Instead, the most realistic possibility is that everyone lives forever. Hypothetically, if that weren't true, the next most realistic possibility would be that some people live forever and some people cease to exist. Either way, the concept of hell doesn't seem to factor into the equation.

If a human being is given consciousness, then they are given a path. Even if someone has evil inside of them, it would still be better for them to become a disciple of God than to cease to exist. If they become a

disciple of God, then there is one more disciple of God. If they cease to exist, then there is one less disciple of God than there otherwise could be. So the two alternatives would be one more disciple of God or one less disciple of God. It is better for there to be more disciples of God than less disciples of God. Given that reasoning, it is justified to believe that everyone lives forever and that our purpose is to become disciples of God. Furthermore, as shown before, the Resurrection confirms the understanding that we will live forever. So we can arrive at the conclusion that we will live forever in two different ways: fundamental analysis of what makes sense and confirmation of the conclusion of that analysis through the Resurrection.

We should also explore the concept of original sin. It has already been shown that chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis appear to be fraudulent; but even if they weren't fraudulent, the concept of original sin is not mentioned a single time in those chapters. Additionally, the concept of original sin contradicts fundamental truths of existence. God encompasses all of knowledge, so there wouldn't be an occurrence that would change God's thinking. The first sin would not have caused God to do anything. God gives way to all causes. So even if Eve was a real person who really did take an apple from a tree, God would have known that would have happened before it happened, just as God already knows all of the mistakes that we will ever make. God knows all. The imperfection of finite beings is inherent in the existence of finite beings, and the grabbing of an apple or any other action committed by a human being wouldn't have caused a change in the Plan of God. Furthermore, it doesn't make sense for a human being to be punished for another human being's mistake. The concept of original sin doesn't make sense.

As previously mentioned, with the understanding of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection that we have established so far, we can better understand the existence of evil and suffering. We have discussed the existence of evil, the concept of Satan, the concept of hell, and the concept of original sin. There is still the existence of suffering that we need to examine further.

The retribution principle represents the belief that the righteous will prosper and the wicked will suffer, and that each will prosper or suffer in proportion to the degree of their righteousness or wickedness. Many people, whether they recognize it or not, think along these lines. But it is often the case that an underserving person prospers and that an innocent person suffers. What a person goes through in life is not necessarily a direct result of judgment on their past actions. Prosperity isn't necessarily the result of righteousness and suffering isn't necessarily the result of wickedness. There are wicked people who prosper and there are righteous people who suffer. A person's prosperity or suffering is not necessarily experienced based what they deserve.

The path that Creation moves on is given by God for purposes that are decided on by God. All of Creation moves according to the Path designed by God. Reasons and results give way to more reasons and results. Any occurrence could have a lasting effect forever if God allows. We are finite beings and do not possess all knowledge. God possesses all knowledge. We may not know why a particular result occurred but we know that all results occur for a reason. That which never has a reason to occur will never occur because there wouldn't ever be a reason that would bring that occurrence into existence. For everything that happens, there is a reason for all.

The human race has suffered since the human race came into existence. Despite all of that suffering, Creation continues to move forward on the Path designed by God. All of Creation moves as one. That movement includes suffering. Whatever the reason is for a particular result to occur, everyone should

always have faith in God. Regardless of anything, everyone should always have faith in the eternal Mind. If there is ever anyone who does not have faith in the eternal Mind, that person's beliefs are illogical on the most fundamental level. No matter how much you suffer, always stay focused on the Path designed by the eternal Mind, the Path designed by God.

Focusing on the eternal Path allows human beings to better understand life after death. There are people who have suffered who have continued to live, who have continued to move forward on their path. The past matters, the past will never go away, but moving forward will get you to where you are going. Passing away means passing on to the next chapter of your life after death. You will awake after you pass away. Always remember that. The Crucifixion and the Resurrection set an example for us. After we die, we will resurrect. All of existence is reconciled because God encompasses all of existence. No matter how much evil you witness or how much you suffer, always know that all of existence is encompassed by God, that you are within God and God is within you, and that you will live after you die.

There is a letter that was discovered that has been dated to the second century that is believed to be from Pliny the Younger, a Roman governor, and it is addressed to the Roman emperor at the time, Trajan. The letter details trials against Christians. Pliny expressed that he had not witnessed trials against Christians before and wanted to verify with Trajan if he had handled the trials appropriately. Pliny expressed that he inquired of Christians if they were Christian. When they responded that they were, Pliny then repeated the question while explaining that capital punishment would be brought against them. After they continued to claim to be Christian, Pliny had them executed. The part about Pliny repeating the question while explaining that capital punishment would be brought against them appears to be an attempt by Pliny to give those Christians an opportunity to renounce Christianity, make a sacrifice to "the gods", and pledge allegiance to the Roman Empire. Christianity appeared as a problem to the Roman Empire because making sacrifices to "the gods" and pledging allegiance to the Roman Empire opposes Christianity. So it appears that some Christians would have been able to escape capital punishment if they had renounced Christianity, made sacrifices to "the gods", and pledged allegiance to the Roman Empire. That appears to have been the case with the trials that Pliny described. However, it appears that at least some of those Christians did not renounce Christianity even with the knowledge that they could've escaped execution if they had renounced Christianity.

This letter also describes the torture of two female slaves who were identified as Christian deaconesses. That writing is important for two different reasons. One is that it shows Christians keeping their faith through torture. The second is that it shows that female slaves were apparently deaconesses. That supports the assertion made earlier that Christianity spread widely through the lower class, and that also shows further evidence that women were Christian leaders. As far as becoming a disciple of God, it does not matter if someone is a slave or whether someone is male or female. In early Christianity, there were apparently female slaves who were Christian leaders. Not only were they described as deaconesses, but also, any Christian who is persecuted for their faith in Christianity is a Christian leader.

This writing that appears to be from Pliny the Younger to Trajan demonstrates what a Christian who follows the teachings of Christ should be willing to do, and this writing shows that regardless of whether it's authentic. Nothing should take you away from your faith. Nothing should take you away from being a disciple of God.

People are imprisoned, enslaved, raped, tortured, and murdered on a regular basis all over the world. No matter how much suffering one endures, Christ's teachings are always true, we will pass away, and we will live forever.

The Christians described as having been executed by Pliny the Younger appear to have been disciples of God. The female slaves described as having been tortured by Pliny the Younger appear to have been disciples of God as well as Christian leaders even before they were persecuted. All of us can be disciples of God, and discipleship should always endure.

### **The Framework of Discipleship**

Christ set examples for us through teaching people, taking care of people, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection. Mariam set examples for us by learning from Christ, maintaining her faith during and after the Crucifixion, being with Christ through her faith, giving us her Testimony, and spreading Christianity in the face of fierce opposition.

Christ set four main examples that show us the following: we should teach others, we should take care of others, we should be willing to suffer and die to teach and take care of others, and we will live forever. Mariam followed those four examples and set two additional main examples that show us the following: we should learn and we should have faith. These six examples show us the following framework: we should learn, we should have faith, we should teach others, we should take care of others, we should be willing to suffer and die to teach and take care of others, and we will live forever.

We should not celebrate the Crucifixion as if the main purpose of the Crucifixion was a release from our sins. We should instead observe the examples set for us, and be willing to suffer and die for our discipleship.

We should not celebrate the Crucifixion as if Christ was a sacrificial lamb and as if we were granted forgiveness because of the Crucifixion. The Crucifixion set an example for us. The Cross has become the apparent main symbol of Christianity. That is because people believe that Christ died for our sins and believe that is why we are forgiven for all of our sins. That is not true. We are not forgiven for our sins because of the Crucifixion. The Crucifixion set an example for us. We should not view Christ as an offering to God for the forgiveness of our sins in the way that Jews viewed the slaughtering of lambs as an offering to God for forgiveness of their sins. That is not what the Crucifixion was about. That is fraudulent ancient Jewish thinking. Christ is God and the Crucifixion set an example for us. The Crucifixion should not be celebrated as if the main purpose of the Crucifixion was a release from our sins, and the Cross should not be celebrated as if it mainly represents our forgiveness. The Crucifixion set an example for us, and the Cross represents that example that has been set for us and also represents betrayal of God by human beings.

Thinking about the Crucifixion as the reason for our forgiveness is viewing the relationship between the Crucifixion and forgiveness as an exchange, as a transaction. That's another fundamental misunderstanding about the Crucifixion. The Crucifixion is not about a transaction for human beings to be given forgiveness. There does not need to be a transaction for there to be forgiveness. Similar thinking should be applied to confessions made to priests. Additionally, human beings do not have the power to grant you forgiveness by God. It is important to remember fundamentals about human existence. Priests are not an intermediary between other human beings and God. Priests should not be exalted in that way. We all are human beings and the teachings of Christ are for everybody. You can be forgiven for your sins, but it wouldn't be because of the Crucifixion or because of a confession made to a priest. The Crucifixion set an example for us, forgiveness is not about an exchange, and priests should not be exalted as if they are an intermediary between other human beings and God.

### **Prophecies about the Coming Messiah**

This now brings us to the prophecies in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament about the coming Messiah and the prophecies in the New Testament about the second coming of Christ. If we should be willing to suffer and die for our discipleship, then we should be focused on loving others and being willing to suffer and die for others. However, the prophecies in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament about the coming Messiah and the prophecies in the New Testament about the second coming of Christ focus on looking forward to a new kind of world rather than focusing on discipleship and sacrifice. As we examine those prophecies, we will also specifically examine the relationship between sacrifice and looking forward to a new kind of world.

The prophecies about the coming Messiah in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament gave people a sense that change was coming. People back then looked forward to the coming Messiah just as people today look forward to the second coming of Christ. The prophecies about the coming Messiah gave people hope. They hoped for a new kingdom, similar to how people believe that new order will come after the second coming of Christ.

Isaiah 7:14

*"Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son and will call him Immanuel."*

Isaiah 9:6-7

*For to us a child is born, to us a son is given, and the government will be on his shoulders. And he will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there will be no end. He will reign on David's throne and over his kingdom, establishing and upholding it with justice and righteousness from that time on and forever. The zeal of the Lord Almighty will accomplish this.*

Isaiah 42:1

*"Here is my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen one in whom I delight; I will put my Spirit on him and he will bring justice to the nations."*

Daniel 7:13-14

*“In my vision at night I looked, and there before me was one like a son of man, coming with the clouds of heaven. He approached the Ancient of Days and was led into his presence. He was given authority, glory, and sovereign power; all peoples, nations, and men of every language worshiped him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that will not pass away, and his kingdom is one that will never be destroyed.”*

Daniel 9:25-27

*“Know and understand this: From the issuing of the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the Anointed One, the ruler, comes, there will be seven ‘sevens’, and sixty-two ‘sevens’. It will be rebuilt with streets and a trench, but in times of trouble. After the sixty-two ‘sevens’, the Anointed One will be cut off and have nothing. The people of the ruler who will come will destroy the city and the sanctuary. The end will come like a flood: War will continue until the end, and desolations have been decreed. He will confirm a covenant with many for one ‘seven’. In the middle of the ‘seven’ he will put an end to sacrifice and offering. And on a wing of the temple he will set up an abomination that causes desolation, until the end that is decreed is poured out on him.”*

Isaiah 7:14 describes a child being named “Immanuel”. As shown in Part 3, that translation should instead show two words: “Immanu” and “El”. “Immanu” means “with us”. As also shown in Part 3, the name “El” was originally used as a name for the chief Canaanite “god” but is used here to refer to God. So “Immanuel” should really be translated as “God with us”. Isaiah 9:6-7 describe a child being born and reigning on David’s throne and over his kingdom. Isaiah 42:1 describes a chosen servant of God who the Spirit of God will be put on and who will bring justice to the nations. Daniel 7:13-14 describe a son of man being given authority and having a kingdom that will never be destroyed. Daniel 9:25-27 describe the “Anointed One” being a ruler who will give way to the destruction of the city and the sanctuary, and put an end to sacrifice and offering. These verses combined together present a view of the coming Messiah as a chosen servant of God who will bring justice, reign on David’s throne and over his kingdom, destroy the city and the sanctuary, and put an end to sacrifice and offering.

That view gave way to many Israelites in the first century having had a different expectation of the coming Messiah than how Christ appeared to people back then. People were expecting a king who would bring a new kingdom, a new world order. They were expecting a physical kingdom much like how the kingdom of David is described as. They were expecting a new world order like new leadership that would do away with evil powers and bring what they thought of as justice. Instead, people were given teachings by Christ and Christ was crucified. People expected more than teachings, and people did not expect the coming Messiah to be crucified. So there was a difference between what actually happened in the first century and what many people in the first century were expecting from the coming Messiah.

It’s easy to see how people could misinterpret religious text, especially hundreds of years after it was first recorded. Also, religious text can be interpreted allegorically, giving way to different kinds of interpretations. So many people in modern times have not been troubled that there was a difference between what actually happened in the first century and what many people in the first century were expecting from the coming Messiah. For example, there are multiple ways to interpret what a new kingdom means. A new kingdom could be like how the kingdom of David is described as or a new kingdom could be the receiving of teachings. So it’s not necessarily problematic that people in the first century interpreted the prophecies about the coming Messiah differently. But what did the people who first recorded these prophecies believe? What did Isaiah and Daniel believe? Were they expecting a



kingdom like the kingdom of David or were they expecting teachings? What did they believe as they first recorded these prophecies?

Isaiah 8:9-10

*Raise the war cry, you nations, and be shattered! Listen, all you distant lands. Prepare for battle, and be shattered! Devise your strategy, but it will be thwarted; propose your plan, but it will not stand, for God is with us.*

Isaiah 11:1-3

*A shoot will come up from the stump of Jesse; from his roots a Branch will bear fruit. The Spirit of the Lord will rest on him – the Spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the Spirit of counsel and of power, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord – and he will delight in the fear of the Lord. He will not judge by what he sees with his eyes, or decide by what he hears with his ears; but with righteousness he will judge the needy, with justice he will give decision for the poor of the earth. He will strike the earth with the rod of his mouth; with the breath of his lips he will slay the wicked. Righteousness will be his belt and faithfulness the sash around his waist.*

Isaiah 22:20-22

*“In that day I will summon my servant, Eliakim son of Hilkiyah. I will clothe him with your robe and fasten your sash around him and hand your authority over to him. He will be a father to those who live in Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. I will place on his shoulder the key to the house of David; what he opens no one can shut, and what he shuts no one can open.”*

Isaiah 37:35

*“I will defend this city and save it, for my sake and for the sake of David my servant!”*

Isaiah 41:8-10

*“But you, O Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen, you descendants of Abraham my friend, I took you from the ends of the earth, from its farthest corners I called you. I said, ‘You are my servant’; I have chosen you and have not rejected you. So do not fear, for I am with you; do not be dismayed, for I am your God. I will strengthen you and help you; I will uphold you with my righteous right hand.”*

Isaiah 44:1-3

*“But now listen, O Jacob, my servant, Israel, whom I have chosen. This is what the Lord says – he who made you, who formed you in the womb, and who will help you: Do not be afraid, O Jacob, my servant, Jeshurun, whom I have chosen. For I will pour water on the thirsty land, and streams on the dry ground; I will pour out my Spirit on your offspring, and my blessing on our descendants.”*

Isaiah 45:3-4

*“I will give you the treasures of darkness, riches stored in secret places, so that you may know that I am the Lord, the God of Israel, who summons you by name. For the sake of Jacob, my servant of Israel, my chosen, I summon you by name and bestow on you a title of honor, though you do not acknowledge me.”*

Ezekiel 37:24-28

*“My servant David will be king over them, and they all have one shepherd. They will follow my laws and be careful to keep my decrees. They will live in the land I gave to my servant Jacob, the land where your fathers lived. They and their children and their children’s children will live there forever, and David my*

*servant will be their prince forever. I will make a covenant of peace with them; it will be an everlasting covenant. I will establish them and increase their numbers, and I will put my sanctuary among them forever. My dwelling place will be with them; I will be their God, and they will be my people. Then the nations will know that I the Lord make Israel holy, when my sanctuary is among them forever.”*

Isaiah 8:9-10 make the statement “God is with us”, which is similar to Isaiah 7:14. Isaiah 7:14 describes the coming Messiah as one who will be called “God with us”. Many Christians believe that “God with us” as represented in Isaiah 7:14 means that the coming Messiah would be divine. However, Isaiah 8:9-10 show a different interpretation. Isaiah 8:9-10 refer to God being with human beings as they prepare for battle in a way that proposes that God supported them as they battled. In that case, “God is with us” refers to being supported by God rather than describing the coming Messiah as divine. Therefore, “God with us” as represented in Isaiah 7:14 doesn’t appear to be a description of the coming Messiah as divine. As will be shown, the prophecies about the coming Messiah seem to have been referring to a human king; not just appearing with a physical appearance that looks like a man, but actually being a human being rather than being divine. Isaiah 11:1-3 describe the coming Messiah as one who will fear God, which is in contrast to the belief that the Messiah would be divine. So Isaiah 11:1-3 seem to describe the Messiah specifically as human. Therefore, the description in Isaiah 11:1-3 of the Spirit being placed on the Messiah doesn’t appear to be a reference to the Messiah being divine. Instead, it seems to be similar to the use of “God is with us”, meaning that it refers to being supported by God. So when Isaiah 42:1 describes the Spirit being put on the Messiah, that verse seems to be referring simply to a human being who would be supported by God.

Isaiah 9:6-7 view the Messiah as one who will reign on David’s throne and over his kingdom. That alone is enough to show that Isaiah 9:6-7 describe the Messiah as a human being. Additionally, Isaiah 22:20-22 specifically describe a human being, someone named “Eliakim son of Hilkiah”, who was to be given the “key to the house of David”. That shows that a human being was to reign on David’s throne and over his kingdom. So Isaiah 9:6-7 seem to view the coming Messiah as a human king. In step with that is Isaiah 37:35, which refers to David, a human being, as God’s servant, which can be compared to the coming Messiah being described as God’s servant. The comparison to David, a human being, shows that descriptions of God’s servants seem to refer to human beings. Isaiah 41:8-10, Isaiah 44:1-3, and Isaiah 45:3-4 describe Israel, a community of human beings, as a chosen servant, which presents chosen servants as human beings. Ezekiel 37:24-28 describe David as a servant who will be king forever, which would mean that a human being would be king forever.

Those verses show that the prophecies themselves were what led to confusion and misunderstanding. It wasn’t just the people misunderstanding or hundreds of years having passed, it was the prophecies themselves. There seems to have been confusion and misunderstanding from the very beginning of the recording of these prophecies. That would show that Isaiah and Daniel appear to have not understood their own prophecies. If a prophet does not understand a prophecy and they wrote it down wrong, then how can it be considered a true prophecy? A true prophecy wouldn’t originally come from a prophet, it would be given to a prophet. If a prophet misinterpreted a prophecy and wrote it down wrong, then that writing wouldn’t represent a true prophecy, it would represent inaccurate information.

If Isaiah and Daniel didn’t record accurate prophecies, then the prophecies in the books of Isaiah and Daniel are false. One may think that maybe there was just a simple misunderstanding or the prophecies

can be interpreted in a certain way, and that the prophecies still represent true prophecies. However, the specificity of these prophecies shows the detail of their inaccuracies. There isn't a just a slight misunderstanding. These prophecies are extremely different than how Christ appeared in the first century. There seems to have been an obsession with kings and kingdoms, specifically about David. Such extreme attention on a human king shows that these prophecies are not just slightly inaccurate, but that they are extremely different than how Christ appeared in the first century. Christ is God and there are prophecies that relate to what seems like an obsession with David. David is not Christ, and Christ is not a descendant of David. Christ is God and the character of David represents a human character. Prophecies about the coming Messiah that emphasize David or any human king are obviously probably fraudulent. Additionally, it was shown in Part 3 that the kingdom of David probably didn't exist as the Bible describes, which shows further evidence that any prophecy that emphasizes David is fraudulent.

Also shown in Part 3, Isaiah 7:14 seems to have been fraudulently produced during the reign of King Hezekiah to portray Hezekiah as a messiah. Additionally, as shown earlier here in Part 4, Psalm 2:1-12 seem to have been directed by a king of Judah who wanted to be portrayed as a messiah and even specifically as "the Son of God". Those verses even go as far as to say that this king of Judah would rule the entire world. Isaiah 7:14 as well as Psalm 2:1-12 are prime examples of what the concept of a messiah meant to the kings of Judah and what the real intentions were behind the production of these supposed prophecies.

The concept of a messiah as laid out in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament comes from the tradition of a king being anointed by a Jewish priest with a physical substance such as oil. The Hebrew word that gets translated to "messiah" refers to an actual anointing with a physical substance. Kings were viewed as anointed and were actually anointed with a physical substance. That is the context in which the concept of a messiah developed; and as we can see specifically in Isaiah 7:14 and Psalm 2:1-12, prophecies were made up to portray a king as a messiah. Given that Jews viewed kings as anointed and that's what gave way to the concept of a messiah, many of the prophecies about a coming messiah appear to have been fraudulently produced to portray a king as a messiah; and Isaiah 7:14 and Psalm 2:1-12 are specific examples of that.

When we look at the book of Isaiah as a whole, we can see that there seems to have been multiple authors. However, the book of Isaiah is proposed to have been entirely written by one person named Isaiah. So if there were multiple authors, then at least some of the book of Isaiah is fraudulent. We already saw in Part 3 that Isaiah 7:14-17 seem to have been copied from chapter 8 of the book of Isaiah. Not only does that show evidence that Isaiah 7:14-17 are fraudulent, but that also specifically shows the presence of multiple authors. Second, some narratives are written in first-person reference and some are written in third-person reference, and that difference shows the likely presence of multiple authors. Third, some of the third-person references are simple like "Isaiah" and others are more official like "Isaiah son of Amoz", which shows the likely presence of multiple authors. Fourth, different words are used to refer to God. In Isaiah 1:10, a Hebrew word pronounced as "Elohehu" is used and translated as "God". In Isaiah 1:24, a Hebrew word pronounced as "Ha-a-down" is used and translated as "the Lord", and there are Hebrew words used that translate to "Yahweh of hosts" and are commonly shown in the Bible as "the Lord Almighty". The word "hosts" in the phrase "Yahweh of hosts" is a polytheistic reference. The word "hosts" refers to supposed divine beings. Isaiah 8:10 refers to God as "El". Isaiah 17:1 refers to God as "Elohe". Isaiah 45:21 refers to God as "Elohim". Isaiah 45:22 refers to God as "El", and the part of that

verse that translates to “I am God” can be translated as “I am El”. The wide range of different words used to refer to God shows that different authors seem to have contributed to the book of Isaiah. Fifth, both Assyria and Babylon are mentioned several times. That shows the likelihood that some narratives were written in response to the attack by the Assyrian Empire and some narratives were written in response to the attack by the Babylonian Empire. Each of those sets of narratives was likely written by different authors in different time-periods. All of this evidence that shows that there were multiple authors who contributed to the book of Isaiah shows that major portions of the book of Isaiah are fraudulent.

Another piece of evidence that shows fraud in the book of Isaiah is the claim that Cyrus, the Persian king who let the Israelites out of the Exile, was the Messiah.

Isaiah 45:1

*“This is what the Lord says to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I take hold of to subdue nations before him and to strip kings of their armor, to open doors before him so that gates will not be shut.”*

The Hebrew word מָשִׁיחַ (“mashíakh”), which means “anointed” and is the Hebrew word that gets translated to “messiah” in other verses, is included in what gets translated as “to his anointed”. The original meaning of “messiah” comes from the title of “anointed one”. Isaiah 45:1 refers to Cyrus as God’s “anointed”, and that is an example of how the Hebrew word “mashíakh”, which gets translated elsewhere as “messiah”, was used in fraudulent ways. Additionally, since this verse refers to Cyrus, it was obviously written long after the book of Isaiah is proposed to have been written. Isaiah 45:1 is clearly a later addition to the book of Isaiah, and that shows that there were fraudulent contributions to the book of Isaiah.

We can also see a change in the prophecies as we move from the book of Isaiah to the book of Daniel. The book of Isaiah focuses more on a kingdom being ruled by the Messiah as a king forever. The book of Daniel focuses more on a kingdom being ruled by a committee of saints, and the Messiah coming at the end of days to destroy the city and the sanctuary and to end sacrifice and offering. That change seems to be representative of the difference between writing that was produced before the Exile and writing that was produced after the Exile or towards the end of the Exile. The probable scenario is that once the priests were released from the Babylonian Empire and in control of Jerusalem, they didn’t want another king to take control. That is probably why the book of Daniel describes a kingdom ruled by saints instead of by a king, and describes the coming Messiah as coming at the end of days. The Persian Empire was in control of Jerusalem, but the priests were able to have a certain level of control and self-governance, and that position was much more favorable for them without a king. The book of Daniel describes a kingdom ruled by saints, not one king, until the end of days, and the coming Messiah as not coming until the end of days. Hypothetically, that would have put Jewish priests in charge until the end of days, which shows the likely motivation to add such presumably fraudulent verses.

So there is a shift in the content of the prophecies going from the book of Isaiah to the book of Daniel. That shift is representative of a rise in the power of the priests. The book of Isaiah describes a messiah reigning on David’s throne and over his kingdom. The book of Daniel goes further by describing the end of the world and giving power to priests until the end of the world. So this shift obviously favors the priests and that is clear evidence that priests directed the production of at least those portions of the book of Daniel. The book of Daniel not only gives power to the priests but also makes it a lot more challenging for anyone to try to appear to be a messiah. The book of Daniel describes the Messiah as not coming until

the end of the world and describes the Messiah as suffering. It would be very challenging for anyone to try to appear to be a messiah under those circumstances. As we turn back to the book of Isaiah, we can see something similar. While there are supposed prophecies that describe a messiah reigning on David's throne and over his kingdom, there are also supposed prophecies about a messiah suffering. Supposed prophecies about a messiah suffering are characteristic of the style of the book of Daniel. There are two different styles of supposed prophecies in the book of Isaiah and therefore there seems to be at least two sources represented among the supposed prophecies in the book of Isaiah. One source seems to have been associated with King Hezekiah. Another source took a similar strategy as the book of Daniel, which gives power to the priests and makes it very challenging for anyone to try to appear to be a messiah, which shows that those supposed prophecies were likely added after the Babylonian Exile. So there seems to be some supposed prophecies in the book of Isaiah that exalt a king that were produced before the Exile and other supposed prophecies in the book of Isaiah that exalt priests that were produced after the Exile, similar to the supposed prophecies in the book of Daniel. The comparison to the book of Daniel shows additional evidence that many of the supposed prophecies in the book of Isaiah are fraudulent.

Some biblical scholars date the original production of the book of Daniel to the second century BCE, which was four centuries after it claims to have been written, which was during the Babylonian Exile. Others argue against that dating and defend a more traditional dating of during the Babylonian Exile. There are three main reasons to believe a dating of after the Babylonian Exile. The first is the control that the book of Daniel gives to the priests. As previously stated, there is a shift in the prophecies from the book of Isaiah to the book of Daniel. That shift represents a shift of power to the priests, which would be representative of motivations that would have likely existed after the Exile and after the second temple was built. The second is that there are historical inaccuracies about the Babylonian kings and those inaccuracies seem to be an indication that the author was not familiar enough with the Babylonian Empire, which shows that the author probably wasn't in Babylon during the Exile. If Daniel really existed and really wrote the book of Daniel during the Babylonian Exile, then those inaccuracies probably wouldn't be there. The historical inaccuracies indicate that that book of Daniel was probably produced after the Babylonian Exile, probably at least one generation later and probably multiple generations later. The third is that it seems that some of the book of Daniel was originally produced in Aramaic, which was a language that was more commonly used in Israel after the Babylonian Exile.

Regardless of the exact dating of the book of Daniel, regardless of whether it dates to the second century BCE, the main point is that it was probably originally produced at least two centuries after the Babylonian Exile. The Babylonian Exile was during the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE. Even if the second century BCE is too late of a dating for the book of Daniel, it was still probably originally produced no earlier than the fourth century BCE, two centuries after the Babylonian Exile.

When we look even closer we can understand exactly what the book of Daniel is doing. The following verses describe the coming of the Messiah during the end of days.

Daniel 9:24-27

*“Seventy sevens are decreed for your people and your holy city to finish transgression to put an end to sin, to atone for wickedness, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy.”*

*“Know and understand this: From the issuing of the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until the Anointed One, the ruler, comes, there will be seven sevens, and sixty-two sevens. It will be rebuilt with streets and a trench, but in times of trouble. After the sixty-two sevens, the Anointed One will be cut off and will have nothing. The people of the ruler who will come will destroy the city and the sanctuary. The end will come like a flood: War will continue until the end, and desolations have been decreed. He will confirm a covenant with many for one seven. In the middle of the seven, he will put an end to sacrifice and offering. And on a wing of the temple he will set up an abomination that causes desolation, until the end that is decreed is poured out on him.”*

These verses are saying that there will be 70 “sevens” and split those 70 “sevens” into 3 categories: 7 “sevens”, 62 “sevens”, and the final “seven”. The verses describe the Messiah as coming after the 62 “sevens”, which presumably happen after the first 7 “sevens”, so these verses seem to describe the Messiah as coming after 69 “sevens”, and therefore during the final “seven”. The 70 “sevens” are described as beginning with the issuance of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem. Since the book of Daniel is written from a perspective of during the Babylonian Exile, the rebuilding of Jerusalem seems to refer to the rebuilding that gave way to the second temple period, which began shortly after the Babylonian Exile in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE. So the 70 “sevens” are described as beginning before the second temple was built because they are described as beginning with the issuance of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem. The issuance of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem would have occurred before the second temple was built. So at the onset of the second temple period, the 70 “sevens” had supposedly already begun.

The 70 “sevens” are portrayed as the process of the end of days. In the final “seven”, the Messiah would come, sacrifice and offering would end, the temple and the rest of Jerusalem would be destroyed, and war would continue until the end. According to the book of Daniel, the process of the end of days had begun before the second temple was built. More evidence of that can be found in the conclusion of the book of Daniel.

Daniel 12:4

*“But you, Daniel, close up and seal the words of the scroll until the time of the end. Many will go here and there to increase knowledge.”*

Daniel 12:4 proposes that the book of Daniel was supposed to be sealed until the “time of the end”. So the public circulation of the book of Daniel would supposedly indicate that the process of the end of days had begun; and as previously shown, Daniel 9:24-27 portray the 70 “sevens” as having begun before the second temple was built. Additionally, Daniel 12:4 seems to suggest that Daniel would be the one to open the scroll. Although that is not specifically stated, it is specifically stated that Daniel should “close up and seal the words of the scroll until the time of the end”; so presumably Daniel would be the one to unseal the scroll, in which case the scroll would be unsealed around the end of the Babylonian Exile when there were plans to rebuild Jerusalem. Even if Daniel 12:4 doesn’t mean to express that, Daniel 12:4 still seems to indicate that the public circulation of the book of Daniel would occur after the process of the end of days had begun. Therefore, the 70 “sevens” supposedly began around the end of the Babylonian Exile when there were plans to rebuild Jerusalem, and then the second temple was built after that.

In terms of the timing of the sequence of the 70 “sevens”, we need to better understand the Hebrew word that is being translated as “sevens”. The Hebrew word that is translated as the number 70 is שְׁבַעִים (‘‘sibim’’) and the Hebrew word that is translated as ‘‘sevens’’ is שֶׁבַע (‘‘sabuim’’). Both words use the

same Hebrew letters but each word is pronounced differently, which is indicated by the markings above and below the letters. Therefore, despite using the same letters, these are two separate words with different meanings, although those two meanings may be similar. The Hebrew word that actually means the number 7 is שִׁבְעָה (“sibah”), and that is shown in the phrase that describes the first 7 “sevens”. That phrase is translated from the Hebrew phrase “sabuim sibah”. Additionally, the Hebrew word that means “week” (period of 7 days) is שַׁבּוּעַ (“sabua”). So “sibah” means the number 7, “sabua” means a period of 7 days, “sibim” means the number 70, and “sabuim” is so far unidentified.

In the Hebrew language, the plural form of a number means that number multiplied by 10. So “sibim” (the number 70) is the plural form of “sibah” (the number 7). The singular form has a suffix of “ah” and the plural form has a suffix of “im”. Also, going from the number 7 (“sibah”) to a period of 7 days (“sabua”), there is a change from the suffix of “ah” to a suffix of “ua”. So “ah” to “im” is singular to plural, and “ah” to “ua” is a number by itself (7) to a meaning that uses that number as an amount that represents a unit of time (7 days).

As we analyze the word that gets translated as “sevens” (“sabuim”), we could use the word for week “sabua” or the word for the number 70 “sibim” as a starting point. If we take “sabua” as a starting point, then “sabuim” could be viewed as the plural form (“a” to “im”), in which case “sabuim” could mean “weeks” (multiple periods of 7 days). Alternatively, if we take “sibim” as a starting point, “sabuim” could be viewed as a unit of time that uses the number 70 as an amount (“im” to “uim”), in which case “sabuim” could mean 70 days or some other unit of time that uses the number 70 as an amount. So the possibilities so far for the meaning of “sabuim” are the following: multiple periods of 7 days, multiple periods of 70 days, multiple periods of 70 of some other unit of time, or some unit of time that is so far completely unidentified.

First, the Hebrew word that actually means “weeks” (multiple periods of 7 days) is שְׁבוּעוֹת “shavuot”. So already we can see that “sabuim” probably doesn’t refer to multiple periods of 7 days. One objection is that a period of 7 days is referred to in verse 9:27 when a covenant is described. That verse says that a covenant will be confirmed for one week. The English word “seven” is shown but that is a mistranslation. The word “sabua” (“week”) is used in that verse instead of “sibah” (the number 7). So some argue that “sabuim” is the plural form of “sabua”, but as previously shown the plural form of “sabua” is “shavuot”. In the final “seven”, there is a period of 7 days described, but that period of 7 days is described as within the final “seven” but not necessarily encompassing the entire final “seven”. Furthermore, if “sabuim” did refer to periods of 7 days, then 70 “sabuim” would mean 70 weeks, which is only 490 days. The second temple probably wasn’t even built within 490 days. That’s obviously too short of a timeline and so “sabuim” obviously refers to a much larger unit of time.

If “sabuim” referred to multiple periods of 70 days, then 70 “sabuim” would mean 70 periods of 70 days, which is only 4,900 days. 4,900 days is just over 13 years. That’s also obviously too short of a timeline.

Using the number 70 but applying a unit of time other than days would be arbitrary. Hypothetically, we could be dealing with months, years, centuries, and so on. It’s anybody’s guess what “sabuim” means, and that seems to be the point. “Sabuim” seems to be a made up word that doesn’t have any known meaning, so the use of the word “sabuim” seems to set up an ambiguous timeline. Additionally, if that weren’t the case, then this writing would be setting Judaism up for failure because then people could pinpoint the date predicted and see that date pass by.

Some people argue that the 70 “sabuim” don’t represent a continuous duration, in which case it could be argued that the 70 “sabuim” are still ongoing. If the 70 “sabuim” don’t represent a continuous duration, then we’re definitely dealing with an ambiguous timeline. So regardless of what anyone wants to hypothesize as to the meaning of “sabuim” or whether or not the 70 “sabuim” represent a continuous duration, we’re dealing with an ambiguous timeline that can be extended on an ongoing basis with no end in sight.

The book of Daniel was presumably first produced sometime during the second temple period, and the book of Daniel seems to express that the process of the end of days had already begun before the second temple was built. So when the book of Daniel was in public circulation, the perception would have been that the process of the end of days had already begun. That would have been effective in instilling fear into the people. Meanwhile, the process of the end of days, according to the book of Daniel, would continue on until sometime after sacrifice and offering ended and the temple was destroyed. Until then, the Jewish priests were in control; and with people thinking that the process of the end of days had already begun, atonement and sacrificing at the temple was an even greater priority for the people, which gave that much more power to the priests of the temple.

The book of Daniel was an effective strategy to instill fear into the people and to extend an ambiguous timeline on an ongoing basis that kept the people continuously waiting for the Messiah generation after generation thereby maintaining an increased level of power for the priests of the temple generation after generation. All of this shows that the book of Daniel is fraudulent and was produced with the specific intentions of shifting expectations about the coming Messiah, instilling fear into the people, and increasing the power of the priests of the temple.

There are two other reasons to believe that prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent. One is that there are prophecies that describe exile as punishment. As shown earlier, punishment is probably a fraudulent concept in religion. The second is about the fundamental misunderstanding of prioritizing a future event over the possession of teachings. Being a disciple of the true religion means knowing the teachings of the true religion. If you know the teachings of the true religion, then you have the true religion. There shouldn’t be a future event that takes priority over having knowledge of the teachings of the true religion. Looking forward to the coming Messiah teaches people that they will get what they need in the future as if they don’t already have what they need. We need the true religion. If we have the true religion, then we have what we need. The true religion is more about possessing knowledge of truth rather than looking forward to a future event that is supposedly going to bring justice.

So far, there have been several different kinds of evidence presented that show that prophecies about the coming Messiah in the books of Isaiah and Daniel are fraudulent. This has been shown through the inaccuracy of the prophecies, their focus on human kings, their specific focus on David, the evidence that shows that the kingdom of David didn’t exist as a real kingdom in the way that the Bible describes, the evidence that shows that Isaiah 7:14 is a fraudulent attempt by King Hezekiah to appear to be a messianic figure, the evidence that shows that Psalm 2:1-12 are a fraudulent attempt by a king of Judah to appear to be a messianic figure and “the Son of God”, the evidence that shows that there were multiple authors of the book of Isaiah, the evidence that shows that Isaiah 7:14-17 were copied from Isaiah 8:1-3, the description of Cyrus as God’s “anointed”, the presence of Cyrus at all in the book of Isaiah being a later addition, the change in the content of the prophecies from the book of Isaiah to the book of Daniel, the



control that the book of Daniel gave to Jewish priests, the descriptions in the book of Daniel of the coming Messiah as not coming until the end of days, the presence in the book of Daniel of an ambiguous timeline related to descriptions about when the Messiah would come, the presence in both the book of Isaiah and the book of Daniel of attempts to make it challenging for anyone to appear to be a messiah, the evidence that shows that the book of Daniel was produced long after it claims to have been written, the narratives about exile and punishment, and the fundamental misunderstanding that exists about looking forward to a future event that will supposedly bring justice as if that is more important than possessing knowledge of the true religion.

The validation of supposed prophecies is not needed to show that Christianity is the true religion. If all of the prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent, that does nothing to damage the case already established that Christianity is the true religion. None of that case mentioned prophecies at all. The probable scenario is that all of the prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent and God appeared as Christ in the first century. The probable scenario is that God fulfilled fraudulent prophecies and in a different way than the authors had imagined, which gave way to the Messiah being very different than what people were expecting. That would explain why expectations about the coming Messiah were so different than how Christ appeared in the first century.

Have you heard the phrase “Be careful what you wish for”? It appears that fraudulent prophecies were used to try to control the people and then God fulfilled those fraudulent prophecies. It’s not as important that prophecies were apparently fulfilled as it is important that fraudulent prophecies assisted in setting the stage heading into the first century. Corrupt human beings produced fraudulent prophecies about a messiah to try to control the people, and so the people were expecting a messiah, and then God gave the people the Messiah.

Everything that has ever occurred and will ever occur is a part of God’s Plan. It is justified to believe that those prophecies are fraudulent and that fraudulent prophecies were a part of God’s Plan. It is justified to believe that people had different expectations than how Christ appeared in the first century because of fraudulent prophecies that were fulfilled by God in a different way than the authors had imagined. Fraudulent prophecies seem to have provided an avenue for a part of God’s Plan. These fraudulent prophecies helped to set the stage heading into the first century. With the people expecting the coming Messiah, the stage was set for God to physically appear in the world in the first century. We will also see another way in which these fraudulent prophecies were used as a part of God’s Plan.

Thousands of years ago, fraudulent prophecies were made up about a messiah by corrupt people, and today, we have Christianity. Those fraudulent prophecies appear to have been a part of God’s Plan, and today, we have Christianity.

To see how fraudulent prophecies were a part of God’s Plan, we will analyze why these fraudulent prophecies were first produced and then we will move on to an analysis of what happened with these prophecies in the first century.

As we discussed in Part 3, King Hezekiah and King Josiah seem to have put in place serious religious reforms and may have been at the helm of the production of fraudulent narratives about supposed prophecies, Moses, King David, the law, Passover, and the week of unleavened bread. More specifically, King Hezekiah seems to have been at the helm of the production of Isaiah 7:14 and King Josiah seems to

have been at the helm of the production of a fraudulent prophecy about the destruction of the golden calves. They both seem to have wanted to appear to be the fulfillment of those respective fraudulent prophecies. It's then of course possible that they were involved with the production of other fraudulent prophecies as well. It's also possible that any other king could have been involved with the production of fraudulent prophecies. It seems that King Hezekiah, King Josiah, and/or some other king ordered the production of fraudulent prophecies; then after or towards the end of the Babylonian Exile, Cyrus was described as a messiah; and then a few hundred years after that, the book of Daniel was produced, which claims to give power to Jewish priests until the end of days.

### **Why They Wanted Christ Crucified**

We can now move on to analyzing what happened with these prophecies in the first century. The first question is: Why did Jewish priests want Christ crucified?

Mark 11:18

*The chief priests and the teachers of the law heard this and began looking for a way to kill him, for they feared him, because the whole crowd was amazed at his teaching.*

Mark 12:12

*Then they looked for a way to arrest him because they knew he had spoken the parable against them. But they were afraid of the crowd; so they left him and went away.*

Matthew 21:45-46

*When the chief priests and the Pharisees heard Jesus' parables, they knew he was talking about them. They looked for a way to arrest him, but they were afraid of the crowd because the people held that he was a prophet.*

Matthew 26:3-5

*Then the chief priests and the elders of the people assembled in the palace of the high priest, whose name was Caiaphas, and they plotted to arrest Jesus in some sly way and kill him. "But not during the Feast", they said, "or there may be a riot among the people."*

Luke 19:47-48

*Every day he was teaching at the temple. But the chief priests, the teachers of the law, and the leaders among the people were trying to kill him. Yet they could not find any way to do it, because all the people hung on his words.*

Luke 20:19

*The teachers of the law and the chief priests looked for a way to arrest him immediately, because they knew he had spoken this parable against them. But they were afraid of the people.*

John 11:48-50

*"If we let him go on like this, everyone will believe in him, and then the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation."*

*Then one of them, named Caiaphas, who was high priest that year, spoke up, "You know nothing at all! You do not realize that it is better for you that one man die for the people than that the whole nation perish."*

John 12:9-11

*Meanwhile a large crowd of Jews found out that Jesus was there and came, not only because of him, but also to see Lazarus, whom he had raised from the dead. So the chief priests made plans to kill Lazarus as well, for on account of him many of the Jews were going over to Jesus and putting their faith in him.*

The Synoptic Gospels portray Jewish priests as having wanted Christ crucified because of what Christ is described as having said against them, and the Synoptic Gospels also portray Jewish priests as having feared Christ because of the popularity of Christ among the people. The Gospel of John, on the other hand, portrays Jewish priests as having wanted Christ crucified because they feared that the Roman government would destroy the temple and take away Judea as the Jewish nation, and the Gospel of John also portrays Jewish priests as having feared that the popularity of Christ among the people would influence that to happen. So we have one version that tells us that Jewish priests wanted Christ crucified because of what Christ said about them, and we have another version that tells us that Jewish priests wanted Christ crucified because of fear that the Roman government would destroy the temple and take away the Jewish nation. Both versions refer to the priests fearing the popularity of Christ, but the Synoptic Gospels simply describe that the priests feared the popularity of Christ while the Gospel of John specifically relates the popularity of Christ to the priests' fear of the Roman government. Additionally, all of the Gospels portray the priests as having charged Christ with claiming to be the Messiah. Only the Gospels of Mark and Matthew specifically describe a charge of blasphemy but all of the Gospels charge Christ with claiming to be the Messiah, which is realistically equivalent to a charge of blasphemy from the perspective of those priests.

Mark 14:61-64

*But Jesus remained silent and gave no answer.*

*Again the high priest asked him, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?"*

*"I am", said Jesus. "And you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Mighty One and coming on the clouds of heaven."*

*The high priest tore his clothes. "Why do we need anymore witnesses?" he asked. "You have heard the blasphemy. What do you think?"*

*They all condemned him as worthy of death.*

Matthew 26:63-66

*But Jesus remained silent.*

*The high priest said to him, "I charge you under oath by the living God: Tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God."*

*"Yes, it is as you say", Jesus replied. "But I say to all of you: In the future you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Mighty One and coming on the clouds of heaven."*

*Then the high priest tore his clothes and said, "He has spoken blasphemy! Why do we need any more witnesses? Look, now you have heard the blasphemy. What do you think?"*

*"He is worthy of death," they answered.*

Luke 23:70-71

*They all asked, "Are you then the Son of God?"*

*He replied, "You are right in saying I am."*

*Then they said, "Why do we need any more testimony? We have heard it from his own lips."*

John 19:7

*The Jews insisted, "We have a law, and according to that law he must die, because he claimed to be the Son of God."*

So the reasons put forth by the Gospels as to why Jewish priests wanted Christ crucified relate to supposed blasphemy, Christ supposedly speaking against the priests, the supposed popularity of Christ, and fear that the Roman government would destroy the temple and take away Judea as a Jewish nation.

Mark and Matthew both present the supposed charge of blasphemy as simply the official charge for the death penalty and present the priests as having already wanted Christ crucified before that charge supposedly materialized.

Mark 14:55-61

*The chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin were looking for evidence against Jesus so that they could put him to death, but they did not find any. Many testified falsely against him, but their statements did not agree.*

*Then some stood up and gave this false testimony against him: "We heard him say, 'I will destroy this manmade temple and in three days will build another, not made by man.' " Yet even then their testimony did not agree.*

*Then the high priest stood up before them and asked Jesus, "Are you not going to answer? What is this testimony that these men are bringing against you?" But Jesus remained silent and gave no answer.*

*Again the high priest asked him, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?"*

Matthew 26:59-63

*The chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin were looking for false evidence against Jesus so that they could put him to death. But they did not find any, though many false witnesses came forward.*

*Finally two came forward and declared, "This fellow said, 'I am able to destroy the temple of God and rebuild it in three days.' "*

*Then the high priest stood up and said to Jesus, "Are you not going to answer? What is this testimony that these men are bringing against you?" But Jesus remained silent.*

*The high priest said to him, "I charge you under oath by the living God: Tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God."*

So while Mark and Matthew specifically describe a charge of blasphemy, that supposed charge is not presented as the real reason why the priests wanted Christ crucified. It simply serves as an official charge, but they already wanted Christ crucified. According to Mark and Matthew, they were only looking for an official charge. So from that perspective, even if there was a charge of blasphemy, that's not the real source of the priests' desire for Christ to be crucified. Additionally, the Gospel of John suggests that there wasn't any specific crime that the priests tried to charge Christ with.

John 18:28-31

*Then the Jews led Jesus from Caiaphas to the palace of the Roman governor. By now it was early morning, and to avoid ceremonial uncleanness the Jews did not enter the palace; they wanted to be able to eat the Passover.*

*So Pilate came out to them and asked, "What charges are you bringing against this man?"*

*"If he were not a criminal", they replied, "we would not have handed him over to you."*

*Pilate said, "Take him yourselves and judge him by our own law."*

*"But we have no right to execute anyone", the Jews objected.*

Pilate is described as having asked what charges were brought against Christ. The Jews replied in a way that avoided his question. They accused Christ of being a criminal, but there is no mention of any specific charge. Obviously Pilate could see that the Jews thought that Christ was a criminal. That's why he asked about the charge. The Jews' reply to Pilate's question shows that there probably wasn't a charge. Pilate then suggests that they judge Christ by their own law, which would have been a socially acceptable action to have taken in first century Judea. Pilate's suggestion would have been an obvious one. But the Jews respond by expressing that they have no right to execute anyone. There are multiple references in the Bible to stoning for the charge of blasphemy. There is a description of stones having been thrown at Christ for the accusation of blasphemy. If the Jews had actually charged Christ with blasphemy, then they likely would have proceeded in that way. That shows further evidence that there probably wasn't a charge. Even if someone wants to argue that the priests could have taken Christ to Pilate because they feared the popularity of Christ and didn't want to be blamed by the people, the main point still stands that there probably wasn't a charge.

Supporting evidence can be found that Christ probably wasn't charged with blasphemy when we analyze how people understood the concept of the Messiah. While Christ is the Messiah, Christ probably didn't explicitly claim to be the Messiah to anyone who had certain serious misconceptions about the concept of the Messiah because of how the concept of the Messiah was misunderstood by human beings. The Messiah was thought to be a warrior king. If Christ explicitly claimed to be the Messiah to a person who believed that the Messiah was to be a warrior king, then such a claim would have been of a warrior king in the mind of that person who heard that claim. "Messiah" is a word in a language, and words are defined by languages. If Jews misunderstood the Messiah to be a warrior king, then communication to a Jew who believed that about the Messiah would involve the misunderstanding of that communication to be of a warrior king. Christ is God and God knows how a human being will receive a communication. Since God would know how a communication would be received by a human being, however that person would receive that communication would be God's intention. So if Jews thought that the Messiah would be a warrior king and Christ explicitly claimed to be the Messiah to them, then Christ would have knowingly given them the idea that the warrior king that they were waiting for had arrived. Given the misconceptions that people had about the concept of the Messiah, it is justified to believe that Christ did not explicitly claim to be the Messiah to anyone who had certain serious misconceptions about who the Messiah is. Therefore, Christ likely was not charged with blasphemy because Christ likely did not explicitly claim to be the Messiah when the Sanhedrin questioned Christ after the arrest. Additionally, if Christ had explicitly claimed to be the Messiah when the Sanhedrin questioned Christ after the arrest, then Jewish priests likely would have charged Christ with blasphemy; and if they had charged Christ with blasphemy, then they likely would have followed their own law rather than having gone to Pontius Pilate. In conclusion, Christ likely did not explicitly claim to be the Messiah when the Sanhedrin questioned Christ after the arrest, and Jewish priests likely did not charge Christ with blasphemy.

The law of Israel gave Jewish priests power. Their law gave them power and they abided by their law. They had an organized structure that worked for them. The socially acceptable action to have taken from the perspective of the priests would have been to judge a person by their law. However, the priests don't seem to have used their law in their case against Christ. They instead took Christ to Pilate and there appears to have not been a specific charge. Again, even if someone wants to argue that the priests could have taken Christ to Pilate because they feared the popularity of Christ and didn't want to be blamed by the people, the main point still stands that there probably wasn't a charge. There not having been a specific charge is probably why they took Christ to Pilate, hence the response by the Jews "But we have no right to execute anyone". The priests seem to have taken Christ to Pilate because they hadn't charged Christ with any crime. Therefore, there doesn't seem to have been a specific charge that caused the priests to want Christ crucified.

Moving aside the supposed charge of blasphemy, the Synoptic Gospels state that the reason why the priests wanted to arrest Christ in the first place was because Christ supposedly spoke out against them. The Synoptic Gospels also add to that by presenting the priests as fearing the supposed popularity of Christ.

In terms of speaking out against the priests, the Jewish population in the first century was very divided. First off, there were the two main sects that are mentioned in the New Testament: the Sadducees and the Pharisees. The Sanhedrin in Jerusalem consisted of Sadducees and Pharisees. There were also the Zealots, who were a rebel group, and the Essenes, many of whom seem to have lived in a more secluded community. There was also division related to wealth and politics. There were some who had more wealth and were more diplomatic in relations with the Roman government, and there were others who were relatively poor and wanted to rebel against the Roman government. There was division in relation to religion, politics, power, and wealth. In such a divided society, many people were speaking out against many people. There were also plenty of revolts that were led by political and/or religious leaders. There was apparently a revolt that took place around 6 BCE that was led by a Jew who has been called "Judas the Galilean". There has been evidence found of someone called "Simon of Peraea" who apparently had led a movement and was crucified. There was apparently a revolt led by someone called "Theudas" around 45 CE. There was also apparently someone who has been called "Anthronges" who led a revolt either in the first century BCE or the first century CE. In 66 CE, the Jewish-Roman War began; and in 70, the temple was destroyed by the Roman Empire. With all of the division, conflict, and violence that took place in and around the first century, there was obviously a much more specific reason why the priests wanted Christ crucified than simply some statements spoken against the priests. There were probably plenty of people who had spoken out against Jewish priests. There were a lot of beliefs flying around as a result of tension and hostility. There was a more specific reason why the priests wanted Christ crucified.

All of the different religious and political groups and all of the revolts show that popularity probably wouldn't be a main reason for the priests to want Christ crucified. With all of the movements and revolts that took place, there were plenty of popular figures. There was obviously a more specific reason why the priests wanted Christ crucified. In addition to the movements and revolts already mentioned, we can also turn to John the Baptist for an example of a popular figure in the first century. John the Baptist seems to have been quite a local celebrity in the first century. So even if there were a lot of people following Christ, there still would seem to be a much more specific reason why the priests wanted Christ crucified.

Of the main reasons presented by the Gospels for why the priests wanted Christ crucified, the only one left to discuss is fear of the Roman government. If the priests really thought that someone was a threat to the stability that the Roman government wanted, then the priests could have simply communicated that concern to Roman officials. If there was any fear about Christ in relation to what the Roman government might do, then the priests could have simply expressed that concern to the Roman government. Instead, the priests apparently arrested Christ in the middle of the night, delivered Christ to the Roman government, and pleaded with the Roman government to crucify Christ. If there was a real threat to the Roman government that the priests could identify, then they could have simply relayed that to the Roman government and Roman soldiers would have handled the arrest. Since Jews seem to have specifically wanted to arrest Christ and specifically wanted Christ to be crucified, the arrest and the insistence that Christ be crucified seems to have been mostly driven by Jews rather than the Roman government, which shows that there doesn't seem to have been a specific threat identified to the Roman government. If there wasn't a specific threat that was identified that could be communicated to Roman officials, then the fear that the priests had doesn't seem to have been related to any action that might have been taken by the Roman government.

So why did Jewish priests want Christ crucified?

To understand why Jewish priests wanted Christ crucified, we must take into account the path of Judaism leading up to the first century. It was established in Part 3 that the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis appear to have been produced during the Babylonian Exile, the Garden of Eden appears to allegorically represent the first temple in Jerusalem, and the exile from the Garden of Eden appears to allegorically represent the destruction of the first temple and the Babylonian Exile. The destruction of the first temple and the Babylonian Exile were not just important historical events but also affected the theology of Judaism. The theology of Judaism seems to have been affected so much that one of the most fundamental stories, the one about the creation of the first human beings and the first sin ever committed, was based on the destruction of the first temple and the Babylonian Exile. So coming out of the Exile, redemption and preservation of the temple were top priorities for Jewish priests of the temple.

We can see through the Gospels and other historical evidence that Jewish priests seem to have had a certain political relationship with the Roman government. There was a long line of managing political relationships beginning long before the Roman Empire took over Israel. Both the kingdoms of Israel and Judah seem to have been vassals of the Assyrian Empire, and Judea was a vassal of the Persian Empire after the Babylonian Exile. When the Roman Empire took over Judea in the first century BCE, the man who became known as "King Herod the Great" stepped up and managed diplomatic relations between the Roman Empire and the Jewish population in Judea. Such diplomatic relations went a long way in the survival of Judea as a Jewish state. Judea was not an independent state, but the Jewish population there was able to experience at least some sort of national identity apart from the Roman Empire even though Judea was really under the control of the Roman Empire. At the center of the Jewish nation was of course the temple. Maintaining diplomatic relations not only allowed for some sort of national Jewish identity, but more specifically prevented the temple from being destroyed before it was destroyed in 70 CE. The destruction of the temple in 70 CE shows the realization of consequences that Jewish priests feared. They knew that the Roman Empire could devastate their organized structure. As a result, they carefully managed their relationship with the Roman government.

The other side of maintaining Judea was managing people's expectations about the coming Messiah. As previously shown, the book of Daniel was probably originally produced in the time-period of 400-100 BCE. The book of Daniel shows a major shift in expectations about the coming Messiah. There are prophecies about the Messiah reigning over David's kingdom and then there is the book of Daniel that describes the Messiah as coming at the end of an ambiguous timeline. The book of Daniel not only shifts expectations about the coming Messiah and uses the concept of the end of days to do so, but uses the concept of the destruction of the second temple to do so as well. Such an important shift and the use of the concept of the end of days and the concept of the destruction of the second temple to create such a shift shows that there seems to have been a strong desire to shift people's expectations about the coming Messiah. Such a desire would not have likely existed if people's expectations about the coming Messiah weren't a problem for Jewish priests.

It seems that Jewish priests' solution included describing the Messiah as not coming until the end of an ambiguous timeline and not until the temple was about to be destroyed and the world was coming to an end. That made it a lot harder for someone to try to appear to be the Messiah. This shows that not only were people expecting the Messiah to come, but also that priests didn't want people to expect the Messiah to come. If priests didn't want people to expect the Messiah to come and were willing to put forth fraudulent prophecies about the coming Messiah, then priests were probably aware that other prophecies about the coming Messiah that had already been produced are fraudulent. If they had been unaware of that, then they probably would have taken those prophecies more seriously and then the book of Daniel probably wouldn't have been produced in the way that it was. The fraudulent production of the book of Daniel shows a desire to offset people's expectations about the coming Messiah, which strongly suggests that there was awareness that older prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent. The fraudulent production of the book of Daniel also shows a disregard for authenticity in relation to prophecies about the coming Messiah, and such a disregard probably wouldn't have existed in that way if there wasn't awareness that older prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent. Therefore, it is justified to believe that the priests of the temple were aware that prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent.

Additionally, the priests of the temple probably would have followed a different procedure in relation to Christ if they had actually believed in the prophecies about the coming Messiah. The way that the arrest and the Crucifixion were handled is evidence that the priests of the temple were not expecting the Messiah to come. One objection to that could be that there were many people who pretended to be the Messiah so the priests were accustomed to rejecting such claims. However, even if they had reason to not believe that Christ is the Messiah based on the abundance of people claiming to be the Messiah, that still wouldn't explain why the priests wanted Christ crucified. They could have simply dismissed the claims that Christ is the Messiah. Instead, they wanted Christ crucified. The Crucifixion of Christ shows evidence that the priests of the temple weren't expecting the Messiah to come. That in turn shows evidence that they knew that the prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent.

The book of Daniel seems to have been received by the public incredibly well. The New Testament is riddled with references to it. The book of Revelation and the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels all reference the book of Daniel. That shows that from the first century CE all of the way to now, the book of Daniel has had a major influence on Christians. Additionally, the Dead Sea Scrolls, which are Jewish manuscripts that have been dated to the first century BCE and/or the first century CE, show the popularity of the book of Daniel. Of all of the material found, the book of Daniel seems to have the



strongest presence among those documents. That shows the popularity of the book of Daniel leading up to the first century CE, and the Synoptic Gospels and the book of Revelation show the popularity of the book of Daniel from the first century CE all of the way to now. People were expecting the Messiah to come, and when the book of Daniel came out, people paid attention.

So the setting as we enter the first century CE seems to have been the following: the destruction of the first temple and the Babylonian Exile were two of the most important pieces of Jewish history and theology, the people expected a king-like messiah based on fraudulent prophecies, Jewish priests knew that prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent, Jewish priests didn't want people to expect the Messiah to come because they wanted to maintain the status quo, the book of Daniel was fraudulently produced to change people's expectations about the coming Messiah and for Jewish priests to claim power until the end of the world, the book of Daniel was very popular and accepted by the public, and then people expected the Messiah to come during the end of days when the supposed new kingdom of God supposedly would bring justice and the dead supposedly would rise.

The priests worked to manage diplomatic relationships with the Roman government and worked to manage people's expectations about the coming Messiah. They even went as far as to require the destruction of the temple for anyone to appear to be the Messiah. So if there was anyone who was trying to appear to be a messiah or anyone who showed miraculous powers, then the destruction of the temple could be coming according to the book of Daniel.

There were several figures who people thought could have been a messiah. Ultimately, the prophecies wouldn't be completely fulfilled unless the temple was destroyed. So it would have been incredibly difficult for any human being to appear to be a messiah. If the temple remained, then it would appear that the book of Daniel would not be fulfilled. So the priests of the temple had a very secure protection plan on their power. However, if they saw evidence of miraculous powers, they might then fear that such miraculous powers could destroy the temple. Raising someone from the dead would show defining evidence of miraculous powers. The raising of Lazarus would likely have been sufficient in confirming the deepest fears of the priests of the temple. Therefore, as we go back to why Jewish priests wanted Christ crucified, we can narrow down the fear of the priests specifically to their fear of Christ bringing on the destruction of the temple.

That conclusion can be further confirmed by the timing of the arrest of Christ. The arrest occurred during the night before the sacrificing of lambs on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan. Daniel 9:25-27 express that sacrifice and offering will end during the final "sabuim", which is also the same "sabuim" in which the temple supposedly would be destroyed. So fear of the destruction of the temple would be attached to a fear of any possible end to sacrifice and offering. If the priests feared what could happen around Passover and the week of unleavened bread and they feared that Christ could destroy the temple, then they would also fear any possible stoppage of the sacrificing of lambs on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan. There was specific reason for priests of the temple to fear that the sacrificing of lambs could be stopped, and then Christ was arrested on the night before the sacrificing of lambs.

During the reign of the kingdom of Judah and/or during the Babylonian Exile, some fraudulent prophecies were made up. After Israelites were released from Babylon and at home in Israel, Jewish priests no longer wanted people to look forward to the coming Messiah. As a result, they made up more fraudulent prophecies about the coming Messiah, but this time, they were very different. In the first century, it

appears that God fulfilled those fraudulent prophecies. Jewish priests in the first century seem to have known that the prophecies are fraudulent. After Christ became known to them, they feared the destruction of the temple. After the raising of Lazarus, on the night before the sacrificing of lambs, Jewish priests moved forward with the arrest of Christ. There doesn't seem to have been any charge brought against Christ, so Jewish priests brought Christ to Pontius Pilate to crucify Christ. The Resurrection seems to have occurred on the next day, and Mariam began her mission to spread Christianity. Today, we have fragments of the Testimony of Mariam in the Gospel of John.

### **Prophecies about the Second Coming of Christ**

Daniel 9:25-27 were very important to Jewish priests. Those verses helped allow Jewish priests to have control of the temple, Judea, and the Jewish population. Meanwhile, the people waited for the coming Messiah to bring a new kingdom, destroy the temple, and end sacrifice and offering. Daniel 9:25-27 were not only important to Jewish priests but were also important in debates about the validity of Christianity, which we will see shortly. People believed that the coming Messiah was going to fulfill prophecies, some of those being in Daniel 9:25-27. If the temple was not destroyed, then Jewish priests or anyone else who wanted to oppose believing in Christianity had a fairly strong argument against Christianity. With that in mind, we should now turn to the end of ages narratives in the New Testament.

The following verses all refer to the temple being destroyed

Mark 13:1-2

*As he was leaving the temple, one of his disciples said to him, "Look, Teacher! What massive stones! What magnificent buildings!"*

*"Do you see all these great buildings?" replied Jesus. "Not one stone here will be left on another; every one will be thrown down."*

Matthew 24:1-2

*Jesus left the temple and was walking away when his disciples came up to him to call his attention to its buildings. "Do you see all these things?" he asked. "I tell you the truth, not one stone here will be left on another; every one will be thrown down."*

Luke 21:5-6

*Some of his disciples were remarking about how the temple was adorned with beautiful stones and with gifts dedicated to God. But Jesus said, "As for what you see here, the time will come when not one stone will be left on another; every one of them will be thrown down."*

The following verses refer to nations and kingdoms fighting each other, earthquakes, and famines.

Mark 13:8

*"Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. There will be earthquakes in various places, and famines, These are the beginning of birth pains."*

Matthew 24:7-8

*“Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. There will be famines and earthquakes in various places. All these are the beginning of birth pains.”*

Luke 21:10-11

*Then he said to them: “Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. There will be great earthquakes, famines, and pestilences in various places, and fearful events and great signs from heaven.”*

The following verses from Mark and Matthew describe “the abomination that causes desolation”, which is a reference to Daniel 9:27, which refers to “the end times” and the destruction of the temple; and the following verse from Luke is similar.

Mark 13:14

*“When you see ‘the abomination that causes desolation’ standing where it does not belong let the reader understand then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains.”*

Matthew 24:15-16

*“So when you see standing in the holy place ‘the abomination that causes desolation’, spoken of through the prophet Daniel let the reader understand then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains.”*

Luke 21:20

*“When you see Jerusalem being surrounded by armies, you will know that its desolation is near.”*

The following verses from Mark and Matthew claim that what is described in these narratives will be the worst time since the world was created and will never be equaled again.

Mark 13:18-19

*“Pray that this will not take place in winter, because those will be days of distress unequalled from the beginning, when God created the world, until now – and never to be equaled again.”*

Matthew 24:20-21

*“Pray that your flight will not take place in winter or on the Sabbath. For then there will be great distress, unequalled from the beginning of the world until now – and never again.”*

The following verses from Mark and Matthew claim that the sun will be darkened, that light will not reflect from the moon, that stars will fall from the sky, and that “the heavenly bodies” will be shaken; and the following verse from Luke is similar.

Mark 13:24-25

*“But in those days, following that distress, ‘the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light; the stars will fall from the sky, and the heavenly bodies will be shaken.’ ”*

Matthew 24:29

*“Immediately after the distress of those days ‘the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light; the stars will fall from the sky, and the heavenly bodies will be shaken.’ ”*

Luke 21:25-26

*“There will be signs in the sun, moon, and stars. On the earth, nations will be in anguish and perplexity at the roaring and tossing of the sea. Men will faint from terror, apprehensive of what is coming on the world, for the heavenly bodies will be shaken.”*

The following verses, which reference Daniel 7:13-14, claim that Christ would physically appear during the time-period described by these narratives.

Mark 13:26

*“At that time men will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory.”*

Matthew 24:30

*“At that time the sign of the Son of Man will appear in the sky, and all the nations of the earth will mourn. They will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of the sky, with power and great glory.”*

Luke 21:27

*“At that time they will see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.”*

The following verses claim that everything described in these narratives was supposed to happen during that generation; in other words, during the first century. As shown in Part 3, the Greek word “genea” that gets translated to “generation” is correctly translated as “generation”, and therefore refers to the first century.

Mark 13:30

*“I tell you the truth, this generation will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened.”*

Matthew 24:34

*“I tell you the truth, this generation will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened.”*

Luke 21:32

*“I tell you the truth, this generation will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened.”*

Additionally, regardless of the end of ages narratives showing that these events were supposed to happen back in the first century, simply judging by the fact that the temple was actually destroyed in 70 clearly shows that the rest of the events described in the end of ages narratives were supposed to have happened around that time as well. More specifically, Mark and Matthew express that “the end times” would be cut short so that there would be survivors, which indicates that “the end times” were supposed to entirely occur within one generation. Furthermore, all of the Synoptic Gospels reference the book of Daniel in the end of ages narratives and the book of Daniel gives specific counts of days that only span a total of a few years. So according to the Synoptic Gospels as well as the timeline set up by the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament, all of the other events described in the end of ages narratives were supposed to happen around the same time as the destruction of the temple. Meanwhile, the actual destruction of the temple occurred in 70. Therefore, the other events described in the end of ages narratives obviously were supposed to have occurred back in the first century.

In addition to the temple being destroyed, all three Synoptic Gospels claim that Christ would physically appear again during a later time-period, nations and kingdoms would fight each other, there would be earthquakes, there would be famines, and “the heavenly bodies” would be shaken. Additionally, Mark and

Matthew claim that the sun would be darkened, light would not reflect from the moon, and stars would fall from the sky; and Luke claims that there would be signs from the sun, moon, and stars. Mark and Matthew both specifically claim that these times would be the worst since the beginning of the world and would never be equaled.

As expressed in Part 3, as far as we know, there wasn't any second coming of the physical appearance of Christ in the first century after the Resurrection. As also expressed in Part 3, it doesn't appear that the sun darkened, that light would not reflect from the moon, that stars fell from the sky, or that "the heavenly bodies" were shaken; and it would be unrealistic for anyone to believe that anything that happened in the first century after the Resurrection represents the worst times since the beginning of the world and would never be equaled again. Therefore, as already explained in Part 3, the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels are obviously fraudulent.

Moving further in the analysis of these narratives, we can see why they were produced. The following verses are supposed prophecies in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament about "the end times".

Isaiah 13:10

*The stars of heaven and their constellations will not show their light. The rising sun will be darkened and the moon will not give its light.*

Isaiah 34:4

*All the stars of the heavens will be dissolved and the sky rolled up like a scroll; all the starry host will fall like withered leaves from the vine, like shriveled figs from the fig tree.*

Isaiah 29:6

*The Lord Almighty will come with thunder and earthquake and great noise, with windstorm and tempest and flames of a devouring fire.*

Ezekiel 38:19

*"In my zeal and fiery wrath I declare that at that time there shall be a great earthquake in the land of Israel."*

Daniel 9:27

*"He will confirm a covenant with many for one 'seven'. In the middle of the 'seven' he will put an end to sacrifice and offering. And on a wing of the temple he will set up an abomination that causes desolation, until the end that is decreed is poured out on him."*

Daniel 11:31

*"His armed forces will rise up to desecrate the temple fortress and will abolish the daily sacrifice. Then they will set up the abomination that causes desolation."*

Daniel 12:11

*"From the time that the daily sacrifice is abolished and the abomination that causes desolation is set up, there will be 1,290 days."*

Daniel 7:13-14

*“In my vision at night I looked, and there before me was one like a son of man, coming with the clouds of heaven. He approached the Ancient of Days and was led in to his presence. He was given authority, glory, and sovereign power; all peoples, nations, and men of every language worshipped him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that will not pass away, and his kingdom is one that will never be destroyed.”*

The end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels reference the books of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. Mark 13:8, Matthew 24:7-8, and Luke 21:10-11 refer to earthquakes and famines, which is similar to Isaiah 29:6 and Ezekiel 38:19. Mark 13:14 and Matthew 24:15-16 refer to “the abomination that causes desolation” and Luke 21:20 refers to “desolation”, which is similar to Daniel 9:27, 11:31, and 12:11. Luke 21:20 refers to “Jerusalem being surrounded by armies” and Daniel 11:31 states “His armed forces will rise up to desecrate the temple fortress”. Mark 13:24-25 and Matthew 24:29 claim that the sun will be darkened, light would not reflect from the moon, stars would fall, and “the heavenly bodies” will be shaken, and Luke 21:25-26 claims that there would be signs in the sun, moon, and stars and that “the heavenly bodies will be shaken; and Isaiah 13:10 claims that “the stars of heaven and their constellations will not show their light”, “the sun will be darkened”, and “the moon will not give its light”, and Isaiah 34:4 claims that “all the stars of heaven will be dissolved and the sky rolled up like a scroll” and that “all the starry host will fall”. Mark 13:26, Matthew 24:30, and Luke 21:27 refer to “the Son of Man” arriving amongst a cloud or clouds, which obviously appears to have come from Daniel 7:13-14.

The Synoptic Gospels were obviously influenced by the books of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. Many people believe that the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels were written after the destruction of the temple in 70. However, given the influence of the books of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, it would appear that those narratives were written before the destruction of the temple in 70. People believe that they were written afterwards because they reference a destruction of the temple. So people think that the destruction of the temple in 70 influenced those narratives to have been produced. But if that were the case, then they would have likely not depended on writings that were produced hundreds of years before then. If the destruction of the temple in 70 had already occurred, then the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels would probably have been more focused on what happened in 70 rather than writings that were produced hundreds of years before then.

The supposed prophecies from the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament that are in the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels refer to “the Son of Man” arriving amongst a cloud or clouds, the sun darkening, light not reflecting from the moon, stars falling, “the heavenly bodies” being shaken, earthquakes, and famines. Those descriptions don’t really seem to match what actually happened in 70. More specifically, those descriptions are incredibly far removed from what seems to have happened in 70. It doesn’t seem that Christ physically appeared amongst clouds, that the sun darkened, that light would not reflect from the moon, that stars fell from the sky, that “the heavenly bodies” were shaken, that there were earthquakes, or that there were famines. It doesn’t appear that any of that happened in 70 as described. Aside from those supposed prophecies, it also doesn’t seem that anything that happened in the first century after the Resurrection would represent the worst times since the beginning of the world and would never be equaled again. Realistically, if the end of ages narratives were written after the destruction of the temple in 70, then none of these descriptions would have been included because they are so incredibly far removed from the reality of what occurred back then. Therefore, the end of ages narratives

in the Synoptic Gospels were obviously appear to have been produced before the destruction of the temple in 70.

Assuming that the end of ages narratives were produced before the destruction of the temple in 70, the evidence that shows how far removed those narratives are from what really happened in 70 shows further evidence that those narratives are fraudulent. Hypothetically, if the end of ages narratives were authentic, then they would represent true prophecies; but if that were the case, then the actual destruction of the temple would need to have mirrored the descriptions in those narratives. Since that's not the case, we can see that those narratives don't represent true prophecies and are therefore fraudulent.

The use of those supposed prophecies from the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament about "the end times" and their use before the actual destruction of the temple in 70 shows that it appears that the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels were produced in response to those supposed prophecies. Given the importance that the priests and the people saw in these supposed prophecies and their influence on the Synoptic Gospels in relation to the end of ages narratives, it seems that questions remained after the Resurrection about the destruction of the temple. The prophecies called for the destruction of the temple; so any claim that the Messiah had come without the temple having been destroyed would cause a serious issue for anyone trying to be in line with Judaism, which is what authors of the Synoptic Gospels were trying to do. According to Judaism, the claim that the Messiah had come should be accompanied by the destruction of the temple. Christianity was spreading, but the temple had not been destroyed yet. The end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels seem to be responses to that apparent dilemma. Authors of the Synoptic Gospels seem to have felt a need to explain why the Jewish temple had not been destroyed yet and that it would be destroyed in the future. That then seems to have led to the end of ages narratives and the belief that Christ would return in physical form during the end of ages and there would then be the destruction of the Jewish temple. As a result, the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels were produced; and for almost 2,000 years, people have believed that Christ will return in physical form during the end of ages. But it wasn't just the end of ages narratives that led to such a conclusion.

The book of Revelation in the New Testament is very popular among Christians. We have already seen that the concept of the second coming of Christ in physical form appears to have come from a misunderstanding that Daniel 9:25-27 still had to be fulfilled. That goes a long way in showing that the book of Revelation in the New Testament is probably fraudulent, and there are plenty of other reasons to believe that it is.

The first is that Christ is referred to as "the Lamb" over and over again. The second is that Christ is described as the "offspring of David". The third is that the first verse of the book of Revelation in the New Testament describes a revelation being given to Christ by God so that Christ could give that revelation to servants. That shows separation between God and Christ. The fourth is that an angel is described as having been sent to John. That is characteristic of Elohist writings in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament, and of certain narratives in the Synoptic Gospels. The fifth is that the Word of God and the Testimony of Christ are described as separate from each other. The sixth is that it is described that "the time is near", which is characteristic of end of ages narratives in the Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and the Synoptic Gospels. The seventh is that John is given particular importance, which, as will be shown in more detail in Part 5, seems to be characteristic of fraudulent writing. The eighth is that seven churches near the western border of modern-day Turkey are given specific focus over all other

churches. That shows some sort of territorial attitude. If the supposed prophecies contained in this book were true, then they probably wouldn't be specifically directed to only seven churches. The ninth is that a lot of the language is very similar to that of the book of Daniel, which has been shown to appear to be fraudulent. The tenth is that Christ is described as having said "I am the Alpha and the Omega", which can be interpreted as "I am the first and the last". The inclusion of "the last" shows the presence of false theology. A reference to a last is a reference to an end. There will never be an end to existence. As shown, many biblical authors, both Old and New Testament, seem to have been obsessed with the concept of the end of ages. The inclusion of "the last" is in step with that and shows further evidence that the book of Revelation in the New Testament is fraudulent. The eleventh is that there is a focus on judgment and punishment. The twelfth is that there is a reference to the "four corners" of the world. In ancient times, people believed that the world was a flat square. As a result, people believed that there were four corners of the world. We know today that the world isn't flat and is a globe. So the mention of four corners of the world shows false human thinking, and therefore serves as evidence that the book of Revelation in the New Testament is fraudulent. The thirteenth is that there are warnings to stay away from Babylon. The references to Babylon are probably references to Rome. It is believed that it became common to refer to Rome as Babylon after the Roman Empire destroyed the second temple in Jerusalem in 70, similar to how the Babylonian Empire seems to have destroyed the first temple in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE. As will be shown in more detail in Part 5 and Part 6, the Christian community in Rome was probably the strongest Christian community during parts of the forties, fifties, and sixties of the first century. One main piece of evidence is the list of greetings in Paul's letter to the Romans. It is by far the largest and most extravagant list of greetings of any letter in the New Testament. Furthermore, it appears that when Paul wrote that letter, he hadn't even been to Rome yet. So the largest and most extravagant list of greetings of any letter in the New Testament was written to a community that the author had not even visited yet. That is evidence that such a list of greetings is probably largely a result of the Christian community in Rome having been the strongest Christian community during that time-period. There will be more evidence of that shown in Part 5 and Part 6. For now, it is important to recognize that it's strange for John to apparently have warned people to not go to the city where there was probably the strongest Christian community. That is likely representative of the division that existed back then, which will be examined and explained in more detail later. That division is probably why there are only seven churches that are specifically addressed in the book of Revelation in the New Testament. The fourteenth is that there is specific attention given to Jerusalem. God encompasses all of existence and the teachings of God should be spread to all who are willing to learn. So the focus on Jerusalem in the book of Revelation in the New Testament appears to be representative of fraudulent writing. The fifteenth is the focus on the concept of the second coming of Christ in physical form. The concept of the second coming of Christ in physical form is about new order coming to the world. True Christianity is not about the second coming of Christ in physical form. True Christianity is about recognizing the presence of God within us, sacrificing, loving, and resurrecting after we leave this chapter of our lives. The sixteenth point, and maybe the most obvious point, is that the world has not come to an end yet. The book of Revelation in the New Testament calls for the end of days and it is addressed to seven specific churches that existed in the first century. Nearly 2,000 years later, long after those seven specific churches received these apparently fraudulent prophecies about the end of the world, the world has still not come to an end, which is incredibly defining evidence that the book of Revelation in the New Testament is fraudulent. Seven specific churches near the western border of modern-day Turkey in the first century seem to have received this writing about the end of the world; and meanwhile, this writing was apparently not intended for any other church and the end of days still hasn't



happened nearly 2,000 years later. The specific focus on seven churches in such an isolated area as well as the enormous amount of time that has passed since this writing was produced shows that the book of Revelation in the New Testament is obviously fraudulent. If the book of Revelation in the New Testament was truthful, then it likely wouldn't have only been intended for seven specific churches in such an isolated area, and such supposed prophecies would have likely been fulfilled during that generation or at least sometime much sooner than now.

The concept of the second coming of Christ in physical form represents two fundamental misunderstandings of Christianity. One is that it turns away from the teachings of Christ. People look forward to the second coming of Christ in physical form. People look forward to the second coming of Christ in physical form as if they haven't already been given what they need. We should be focused on the teachings of Christ, not a final reconciling event. The second is that people view the second coming of Christ in physical form as a final reconciling event as if the struggle of finite existence won't continue forever. As finite beings, we will never be perfect. We will always struggle. We already have what we need and we will continue to struggle. We should not be looking forward to a final reconciling event as if we don't already have what we need and as if our struggle won't continue.

So we can now see that it is justified to believe that the prophecies about the coming Messiah in the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel are all fraudulent; God fulfilled some of those fraudulent prophecies and appeared in physical form in the first century; and then afterwards, people began to believe that Christ would return in physical form during the end of ages based on fraudulent prophecies in the New Testament that were based on fraudulent prophecies in the Hebrew Bible.

Along with those fraudulent prophecies was the idea of a physical kingdom that was going to bring justice and end oppression. That tradition began when these fraudulent prophecies were first thought of and continued on into the first century. Generations of people believed in those fraudulent prophecies because the tradition of believing in those fraudulent prophecies was passed on through those generations. The belief in the second coming of Christ in physical form is another tradition that has been passed on through generations. The way that the human race has treated religion has given way to religious traditions that do not appropriately align with the true religion, and we can see that when we analyze people's misconceptions about the coming Messiah and the second coming of Christ.

The scheduling of Easter is another tradition that has been incorrectly passed on. Easter is celebrated on a Sunday. As previously shown, the Resurrection probably occurred on a Tuesday, not a Sunday. That shows that the scheduling of Easter seems to have been wrong for nearly 2,000 years.

As shown in Part 3, all of the narratives in the Gospels related to the supposed physical "birth" of the physical appearance of Christ involving Mother Mariam appear to be fraudulent. As shown here in Part 4, Christ is God and God encompasses all of existence. John 1:1 describes existence before Creation and then chapter 1 of the Gospel of John goes on to describe Christ having appeared in the physical world. There isn't any description in the Gospel of John that refers to a physical "birth" of the physical appearance of Christ involving Mother Mariam. There isn't any description in the Gospel of John of any

kind of physical “childhood” of the physical appearance of Christ. There isn’t any indication in the Gospel of John of what Christ did while physically appearing in this world before Mariam became a disciple. Since we know about Christianity through the Testimony of Mariam, we don’t know what Christ did while physically appearing in this world before Mariam became a disciple of Christ. We don’t know anything about a physical “birth” or anything about a physical “childhood”. John 1:1 describes existence before Creation and then we know of a narrative that appears to describe Mariam having become a disciple of Christ. Based on what we seem to know from the Testimony of Mariam, we don’t have any kind of reliable information about anything like a physical “birth” of the physical appearance of Christ involving Mother Mariam. So, based on what we seem to know from the Testimony of Mariam, we don’t have any kind of reliable information that should lead to there being a holiday like Christmas. Furthermore, as shown here in Part 4, Christ is God and God encompasses all of existence. Therefore, it is justified to believe that the physical appearance of Christ was represented by an appearance that looked like an adult man when Christ first physically appeared in this world in the first century, and that the tradition of Christmas is based on false and fraudulent information.

It was mentioned before that Lent is based on the temptation of Christ narratives, which, as has been shown, obviously appear to be fraudulent. That means that the tradition of Lent appears to be based on fraudulent narratives.

The tradition of communion appears to be based on false narratives as well. The Synoptic Gospels focus on the physical consumption of bread and wine for the remembrance of Christ. Christ is always within us. We only need to recognize that. The physical consumption of bread and wine has nothing to do with receiving Christ.

Along with not focusing on physical consumption, we should not idolize physical churches. We are within God and God is within us. We do not need to go to a physical building to be in the real Church. God is the real Church, and we are within God and God is within us. We are always in the real Church.

The practice of baptizing is another tradition that arose from misguided focus on the physical world. The physical act of going into water and coming out is simply a physical act. Anything that you feel within your consciousness is a result of what you feel within you and is not a result of any physical act with water. Furthermore, a conscious mind is not “born again” in the way that baptisms are so often associated with. Once a path begins, that same path continues on. The past never goes away. The past led to the present moment. How you live today came from how you lived before. Once your path began, you began evolving. That evolution within your own mind does not skip a step so that you can be “born again” as a different version of yourself. You will always be the same person that you have been. It’s just that you evolve. That evolution springs forward from the path that you have been on. Your evolution is not separate from the past. Your evolution began in the past, brought you to the present moment, and will bring you into each succeeding moment that comes to you. We begin new chapters of our lives, but our lives are one continuous path. You can start a new chapter of your life, but it’s not as appropriate to view that as being “born again” in the way that baptisms are so often associated with. Additionally, since the concept of original sin appears to be fraudulent, baptisms shouldn’t be used as a tradition associated with original sin.

We also need to be careful about idolizing other human beings. We are all imperfect and we all make mistakes. No human being is beyond that. There is only one God. The most common risk is that of the

designation of saints. The designation of saints is similar to how some biblical authors wrote about the “divine council”. Again, there is only one God. Regardless of any praise given to any human being, it is always important to remember that there is only one true God and that we are within God and God is within us.

So far we have identified Mariam as chosen by God to be a leader of the true religion. There is evidence in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament of another female leader.

Genesis 35:8

*Now Deborah, Rebekah’s nurse, died and was buried under the oak below Bethel. So it was named Allon Bacuth.*

Judges 4:4-5

*Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lappidoth, was leading Israel at that time. She held court under the Palm of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in the hill country of Ephraim, and the Israelites came to her to have their disputes decided.*

Genesis 35:8 is a very mysterious verse. All of a sudden someone named Deborah enters the scene and her having passed away is described. This person not having been named up until Genesis 35:8 shows that something is going on that is probably not connected to the main storyline. Certain information was shoved into the story and we don’t know why. Genesis 35:8 describes Deborah and mentions an oak tree. Then as we turn to Judges 4:4-5, a prophetess named Deborah who led Israel is described and a palm tree is mentioned. Obviously the name Deborah makes a connection; but also, there are the mentions of an oak tree in Genesis 35:8 and a palm tree in Judges 4:4-5, and both mention Bethel. So it seems like Genesis 35:8 and Judges 4:4-5 share some common information. Deborah is described as someone who was a prophetess who led all of Israel. It would appear strange for that information to have ended up in the Bible if that information is not true. If that information isn’t true, then it probably wouldn’t have ended up in the Bible. So there appears to be truth expressed in that information. If that information is true, then we can better understand what is going on with Genesis 35:8. Genesis has been shown to appear to be largely fraudulent but has also been shown to probably contain fragments of truth represented in an allegorical way. With that information having been presented, the description of Deborah in Genesis 35:8 may show us that there really was someone with a name similar to Deborah, but she is probably allegorically portrayed as Rebekah’s nurse. If Rebekah is an allegorical character that represents Israel along with her supposed husband Isaac, then Deborah being mentioned as Rebekah’s nurse probably represents Deborah having been the “nurse” of a religious community, or the leader of a religious community. We have very little information to go off of, but there seems to have been a supposed prophetess with a name similar to Deborah who led a religious community.

Genesis 35:8 describes Deborah’s burial place as in Bethel. Judges 4:4-5 describe Bethel as a place near where Deborah led Israel from. Genesis describes Bethel with a lot of importance.

Genesis 28:16-22

*When Jacob awoke from his sleep, he thought, “Surely the Lord is in this place, and I was not aware of it.” He was afraid and said, “How awesome is this place! This is none other than the house of God; this is the gate of heaven.” Early the next morning Jacob took the stone he had placed under his head and set it up as a pillar and poured oil on top of it. He called that place Bethel, though the city used to be called*

*Luz. Then Jacob made a vow saying, "If God will be with me and will watch over me on this journey I am taking and will give me food to eat and clothes to wear so that I return safely to my father's house, then the Lord will be my God and this stone that I have set up as a pillar will be God's house, and of all that you give me I will give you a tenth."*

Genesis 35:6

*Jacob and all the people with him came to Luz (that is, Bethel) in the land of Canaan. There he built an altar, and he called the place El Bethel, because it was there that God revealed himself to him when he was fleeing from his brother.*

Genesis 35:14

*Jacob set up a stone pillar at the place where God had talked with him, and he poured out a drink offering on it, he also poured oil on it. Jacob called the place where God had talked with him Bethel.*

Genesis obviously places a lot of importance on Bethel, which is described as the house of God. This place that is apparently so important and is called the house of God is described in Genesis 35:8 as the place where Deborah's burial was and is described in Judges 4:4-5 as a place near where Deborah led Israel from. Again, we have very little information to go off of. Nevertheless, there seems to have been a supposed prophetess with a name similar to Deborah who led a religious community and who seems to be connected to a place that was called the house of God.

Deborah seems to have been a supposed prophetess who led a religious community. In the first century, Mariam seems to have been chosen by God to be God's witness; the witness of Christ's Ministry, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection. Today, we have Christianity.

Many believe that Christianity was originally a continuation of Judaism with some changes and certain Jewish prophecies fulfilled, and that the early spreading of Christianity was a Jewish movement. The Synoptic Gospels go a long way in influencing people to believe that. However, as previously shown, the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament are filled with fraudulent writing. Long before the first century, the main religion practiced by the Israelites was a fraudulent religion. We don't know how monotheism and other Yahwist beliefs arose. There seems to have been truthful origins of a monotheistic religion thousands of years ago. However, over time, false beliefs were introduced; and eventually, Judaism developed. Judaism is a false religion. Christianity is not a continuation of Judaism and the early spreading of true Christianity was not a Jewish movement. Fraudulent prophecies had been made up and God seems to have fulfilled some of those fraudulent prophecies. There was a monotheistic religion and certain supposed human "authority" corrupted religious information that was given to the people. God appeared in physical form in the first century, seemingly fulfilling fraudulent prophecies. Those prophecies being fraudulent seem to have in part led to the Crucifixion. The supposedly chosen nation of Israel was dishonest with the people about religious information and then requested the Crucifixion of God.

Christianity is a clear break from Judaism. Judaism is a false religion and Christianity is the true religion. However, how people view Christianity has become corrupted over the last nearly 2,000 years. Additionally, Islam, Mormonism, and other false religions were formed. People who believe in false religions are mistaken, but so are many Christians. We not only need to recognize that Christianity is the true religion, we also need to understand Christianity. If a person does not understand true Christianity,

then they do not practice the true religion. Just because someone calls themselves a “Christian” doesn’t necessarily mean that they are practicing true Christianity. The word “Christian” is just a word. A true Christian needs knowledge of true Christian teachings to actually be a true Christian.

As has been shown plenty of times through this book so far, the Gospel of John represents a different religion than the Synoptic Gospels. The Gospel of John describes Christ as God and the Synoptic Gospels describe Christ as “the Son of God” and as separate from God. The Gospel of John focuses on us being within God and God being within us, and the Synoptic Gospels focus on the physical world and the end of days. The Gospel of John focuses on separating from Judaism and the Synoptic Gospels focus on aligning with Judaism.

Even the descriptions about the timing of the Last Supper, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection are different between the Gospel of John and the Synoptic Gospels. The Synoptic Gospels, which are focused on Judaism, describe the Last Supper as a Passover Seder, which is a Jewish feast.

The Gospel of John describes Mariam as having been at the tomb by herself, and the Synoptic Gospels describe Mariam as having been at the tomb with at least one other person.

That Jewish movement that people think was early Christianity is represented in the Synoptic Gospels. The Testimony of the top disciple of Christ is represented in fragments contained in the Gospel of John.

The metaphysical foundation laid out in this book shows that God is the reason for existence and that God necessarily and inherently encompasses all of existence. Certain teachings in the Gospel of John are consistent with that metaphysical foundation. Metaphysics shows us that the Gospel of John is valid in those ways. Human beings observe an external reality. The Synoptic Gospels focus on this external reality, which is the physical world. The Synoptic Gospels are consistent with how human beings typically view their lives and the physical world. Certain fragments of the Gospel of John, on the other hand, are consistent with metaphysics, fundamental truths of existence. The Gospel of John focuses on the Spirit and the Synoptic Gospels focus on the physical world.

In the Bible, the Synoptic Gospels overshadow teachings in the Gospel of John. The “orthodox church” overshadowed teachings in the Gospel of John. The Catholic Church overshadowed teachings in the Gospel of John and still does today. First there was misunderstanding and then there was also corruption, and with that came a focused effort on moving away from those teachings in the Gospel of John. The Synoptic Gospels were produced out of misunderstanding and corruption, and religious establishments focused on their physical church rather than the presence of God. Religious establishments wanted people to think that they needed priests and the physical church. That gave religious establishments power. The metaphysically valid teachings of the Gospel of John were suppressed, and still today, people feel a need to go to a physical church and to exalt priests. We are within God and God is within us. The real Church is everywhere. The real Church is within us. There are so many people who do not know that teaching because human society has suppressed that teaching; and now, that teaching seems foreign to people when they learn of it. As a result, some people reject that teaching. A true Christian needs to understand that God is the Logic, Christ is God, and we are within God and God is within us.

Both the Old Testament and the New Testament appear to be mostly fraudulent. The Bible as a whole is mostly fraudulent. We should look to fundamental truths and fragments of the Gospel of John to know the

true religion. Evidence that fragments of the Gospel of John should replace the Bible as a whole can be found in a comparison of the very first verse in the Bible and the first verse in the Gospel of John.

Genesis 1:1

*In the beginning Elohim created the heavens and the earth.*

John 1:1

*In the beginning was the Logic, and the Logic was with God, and the Logic was God.*

Genesis 1:1 and John 1:1 both refer to “the beginning”. They both start in the same way: “In the beginning”. Genesis 1:1 focuses on the creation of the physical world while John 1:1 focuses on the Logic. Genesis 1:1 focuses on the beginning of Creation and John 1:1 focuses on before Creation. Genesis 1:1 is representative of typical human thinking, much like the Synoptic Gospels. John 1:1 represents the most fundamental truth of existence. Genesis 1:1 has already been shown to appear to be fraudulent. It uses the word “Elohim”, shows polytheistic beliefs, focuses on the physical world, and focuses on the beginning of Creation rather than the necessary and inherent existence of God. Given that John 1:1 represents the most fundamental truth of existence and starts with “in the beginning” similar to Genesis 1:1, it seems that John 1:1 is supposed to replace Genesis 1:1. It seems that the first verse in the Gospel of John should replace the very first verse in the Bible. That provides evidence that fragments of the Gospel of John should replace the Bible as a whole.

Religious information related to Christianity was corrupted very early on in the history of Christianity. The people have been deprived of the true religion. This is what the human race does. The evil that you view in the world is a product of the existence of the human race. The true religion needs to be given back to the people.

God gives us life and we need God to save us. We need God to save us from ourselves. Evil and suffering exist. People are imprisoned, enslaved, raped, tortured, and murdered. Regardless of what happens to you, if you have the true religion, then you know God. You can live forever, but do you know God? Do you know the true religion? Do you know the true teachings of Christ? Are you really a true Christian? That is what real salvation is about. Real salvation is about possession of the true religion, the way to know God and our relationship with God.

Human beings are broken. We are all imperfect. We are all flawed. We are all asymmetrical. We all struggle. We are all broken. We all need God. We are nothing without God. God gives us our existence and we cannot exist without God. We need God to save us. We need God to rescue us. We need God to heal us. We need God.

In the first century, people expected the coming Messiah to bring a new kingdom, one that would end oppression and bring justice. Human beings perceive an external reality and focus on the physical world, which is characteristic of the Synoptic Gospels. The Testimony of Mariam can show us the true religion. We must look within ourselves. We must obtain knowledge of the true religion.

Christ set examples for us through teaching, taking care of people, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection. Mariam set examples for us by learning from Christ, maintaining her faith during and after the Crucifixion, being with Christ through her faith, giving us her Testimony, and spreading Christianity in the face of fierce opposition.

Christ set four main examples that show us the following: we should teach others, we should take care of others, we should be willing to suffer and die to teach and take care of others, and we will live forever. Mariam followed those four examples and set two additional main examples that show us the following: we should learn and we should have faith. These six examples show us the following framework: we should learn, we should have faith, we should teach others, we should take care of others, we should be willing to suffer and die to teach and take care of others, and we will live forever.

We are within God and God is within us. We should recognize who we are and be willing to sacrifice for our discipleship. We can live forever, all the while being within God and God being within us. We should be disciples of God. Being a disciple of God means spreading the teachings of God. We should commit our lives to our discipleship and we should do that forever.

## Part 5 – The Dividing Line

We have discovered that Mariam was the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century, the Gospel of John seems to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, the Gospel of John fraudulently conceals information about Mariam, and the Synoptic Gospels are massively fraudulent and unreliable. So what happened that all of this came about? Many believe that documents were produced much later on; but as will be shown, problems arose much sooner.

The popular tradition of the first century after the Resurrection is something like the following.

After the Resurrection, Peter stood out as a leader among the disciples. The disciples stayed in Jerusalem for a while and were scared of persecution. Paul was a Pharisee and a Christian persecutor during that time-period before converting to Christianity. Eventually, the disciples branched out beyond Jerusalem. Peter was based in Jerusalem but he and the other disciples traveled around. At some point, Paul was blinded and had an encounter with Christ. When he regained his sight, he converted to Christianity and began his ministry. Peter and Paul are remembered as the two giants. Peter is thought of as the most important disciple of Christ during Christ's Ministry and shortly after the Resurrection, and Paul is thought of as the one person who really spread Christianity far and away. James son of Mother Mariam is also a part of the scene. He doubted Christ before the Resurrection but ended up becoming a Christian afterwards. Peter and James son of Mother Mariam are connected as both having been based in Jerusalem, and there is one mention of John in Paul's letter to the Galatians that describes him as one of the "pillars" along with Peter and James son of Mother Mariam. Some believe that Peter was the leader during this time-period and some believe that James son of Mother Mariam may have taken the top spot at some point. There is limited evidence to go off of, which leads to debate. Regardless, many view Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John as having been the three "pillars", and Peter and/or James son of Mother Mariam as having held the top leadership position. Paul was someone who went on his own mission and tried to get along with Peter and James son of Mother Mariam, but they were in opposition for a large portion of their interactions. Their main argument was about circumcision. Jewish law requires all Jewish men to be circumcised. However, Paul didn't want gentiles who convert to Christianity to have to be circumcised. So it was decided that Peter was in charge of spreading Christianity to Jews (circumcised) and Paul was in charge of spreading Christianity to gentiles (uncircumcised). Paul went on to travel to many places and spread Christianity to gentiles. Paul is thought of as the person who contributed the most to the spreading of Christianity. Paul was eventually arrested in Jerusalem; and because he was a Roman citizen, he was allowed to appeal his case to Caesar. Such an appeal launched him on a journey to Rome, traveling as a prisoner and awaiting trial. Little is known about what happened next but many believe that Paul was beheaded in Rome sometime in the sixties. Many believe that Peter eventually made it to Rome and that he was crucified upside down sometime in the sixties. In a work by Josephus, a first century Jewish-Roman historian, there is a reference that some believe is a reference to James having been stoned to death in Jerusalem in 62. There is very little known about what happened to the other "apostles". Stephen, a disciple who is not mentioned in the Gospels, is described in the Book of Acts of the Apostles (commonly known as "Acts") as having been stoned to death. James son of Zebedee, John's brother, is also described in Acts as having been executed. Stephen and James son of Zebedee are the only two people of this group described in Acts as having been executed. There are legends that all of the other



“apostles” were executed except maybe John. There are legends that John drank poison and didn’t die. John is believed to have been the last of the “apostles” to have passed away. Many believe that the Gospel of John, the three letters attributed to the name “John”, and/or the book of Revelation in the New Testament may have come from John later in the first century when he was the only “apostle” left. Most of Paul’s letters are commonly thought to have been written in the fifties or early sixties. The Gospels are commonly thought to have been written in the time-period of 70-110. Evidence has been shown that they were written much sooner than that, but the popular belief is that they were written in the time-period of 70-110.

The accounts in the New Testament of early Christianity after the Resurrection contain a combination of truth and fraud. Most of this information comes from Acts and Paul’s letters. They tell a story of what happened after the Resurrection, but not all of it is true and there is a lot missing. We need to gain a better understanding of what happened in the first century. By studying the Gospels, we have so far uncovered a lot of fraud and revealed a lot of truth that is not of common belief among the general public. Most of that pertains to a time-period that was during Christ’s Ministry, but the accounts in the Gospels that we have today about what happened during Christ’s Ministry were produced after the Resurrection. So what happened in the process of producing these documents that resulted in so much fraud and deception?

Again, we have discovered that Mariam was the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century, the Gospel of John seems to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, the Gospel of John fraudulently conceals information about Mariam, and the Synoptic Gospels are massively fraudulent and unreliable. We should keep this information in focus as we proceed.

Part 5 gives a lot of attention to the Gospel of Luke and Acts in an effort to show what happened in the first century. It is believed by many that Luke and Acts were written by the same author. The introductions in each of them give way to that belief. So the Gospel of Luke and Acts are looked upon by many as a two-volume production. Volume 1 is the Gospel of Luke and volume 2 is Acts, which covers a time-period after the Resurrection. The Gospel of Luke and Acts have a very particular relationship with the Gospel of John and Paul’s letters. An analysis comparing all of these pieces of work as well as the Gospels of Mark and Matthew provides insight into what happened in the first century.

## **The Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts**

First, we should begin by breaking down the different components of Luke and Acts. As mentioned, the introductions in Luke and Acts influence many to believe that the same author wrote both. They both appear to address “Theophilus”.

Luke 1:1-4

*Many have undertaken to draw up an account of the things that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed down to us by those who from the first were eyewitnesses and servants of the word. Therefore, since I myself have carefully investigated everything from the beginning, it seemed good also to me to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, so that you may know the certainty of the things you have been taught.*

Acts 1:1-2

*In my former book, Theophilus, I wrote about all that Jesus began to do and to teach until the day he was taken up to heaven, after giving instructions through the Holy Spirit to the apostles he had chosen.*

“Theophilus” could refer to an individual person and represent that person’s name. Theophilus is known to have been used as a name. There was a high priest named Theophilus ben Ananus who seems to have served from 37 to 41. There was also a high priest named Mattathias ben Theophilus who seems to have served from 65 to 66. With both of these people having been priests in Jerusalem, however, it is unlikely that they are the Theophilus referred to in Luke and Acts. As we will see, the author of Luke and Acts probably came from somewhere outside of Jerusalem. There was also Theophilus of Antioch who seems to have been an early Christian bishop in the second century. As we will see, the original productions of Luke and Acts appear to have taken place in the first century. So Theophilus of Antioch who seems to have lived in the second century was probably not the person who Luke and Acts are addressed to. There could very well have been someone else named Theophilus who Luke and Acts are addressed to.

There is one Coptic tradition (tradition of the Coptic Orthodox Church of Alexandria, Egypt) that claims that Theophilus was someone from Alexandria. In the eighteenth century, John Wesley, who led a movement in England known as Methodism, noted that an ancient tradition was that Theophilus was “a person of eminent quality at Alexandria”. Theophilus could be someone from Alexandria, but it is only a tradition and only a tradition in a certain area. While it’s certainly possible, it’s really a highly speculative conclusion; although, as we will see later, there might be good reason to believe such a tradition or something like it.

The word “Theophilus” comes from the Greek word Θεόφιλε (“Theophile”), which derives from the combination of the Greek words θεός (“Theos”), which can refer to God; and φιλία (“filia”), which can refer to friendship, love, or affection. So the Greek word that is translated into “Theophilus” can also mean “friend of God”. If that is the way that the author intended to use that word, then “Theophilus” could refer to a specific individual or may have been used in a more general sense to address a general population of people who might read what the author wrote.

Theophilus could be a specific individual, in which case Theophilus could represent a person’s name or represent a description such as “friend of God”. On the other hand, Theophilus could be a general reference rather than a reference to a specific individual regardless of whether or not it was intended to mean “friend of God”.

Additionally, in the Gospel of Luke, the phrase “most excellent” is placed before “Theophilus”. That could potentially indicate some sort of formal position held by the person who this work was written to. On the other hand, it doesn’t necessarily represent that and the introduction in Acts does not include that phrase. Acts uses that Greek word later on. Acts 24:3 refers to “most excellent Felix”, which is a reference to the Roman procurator of Judea seemingly from 52 to 59 or 60. Acts 26:25 refers to “most excellent Festus”, which is a reference to the successor of Felix who was the Roman procurator of Judea seemingly from 59 or 60 to 62. So many believe that Theophilus was a Roman official. That is certainly a possibility. It’s also possible that the Greek word that “most excellent” comes from, κράτιστε (“kratiste”), could mean an elevated status for someone who was not a Roman official, for example, a prominent person from Alexandria. Regardless of whether “most excellent” refers to a Roman official or not, it serves as strong evidence that the Theophilus who is referred to in Luke and Acts is probably a specific individual person.

The introduction in Luke includes the phrases “Many have undertaken to draw up an account” and “I myself have carefully investigated everything from the beginning”. These phrases give us important evidence in two different ways. The author asserts that there have been many accounts drawn up by the time that the Gospel of Luke was produced. The author also asserts that they have conducted a careful investigation. So it appears that the author of Luke and Acts sought to find out information about Christianity and produced a report of their findings. If the introductions in Luke and Acts are authentic, then Luke and Acts would appear to represent real first century investigative reports. That doesn’t necessarily mean that the information that the author obtained was accurate; but regardless of accuracy, what remains useful in our own investigation is the apparent intent of the author. If the author’s intended mission was to investigate Christianity and produce a report of their findings, then Luke and Acts represent a general survey of information that was circulating during that time-period that became available to the author in their investigation of Christianity. Whether that information is truthful or not is another matter. Nevertheless, Luke and Acts were probably produced by the author having collected information from external sources that were available at the time of production, even if some of that information isn’t truthful.

Although there has already been quite an effort in this book to discredit the Gospel of Luke, it is still justified to believe that the introduction in the Gospel of Luke is authentic. It’s unlikely that someone trying to produce a fraudulent gospel would start off by addressing someone specific. Even if Theophilus isn’t a specific person, the phrase “so that you may know the certainty of the things you have been taught” is likely intended to address someone who already learned about Christianity. So the Gospel of Luke describes itself as being additional support rather than a part of initial learning to whoever the recipient was. If someone was fraudulently producing a gospel, they would likely want the finished product to appear to be authoritative rather than additional support for someone who has already learned about Christianity. Additionally, it seems unlikely that someone who was trying to produce a fraudulent gospel would write an introduction that seems like it was written like a letter. If the Gospel of Luke is addressed to a specific individual, then it’s basically a letter. Even if it’s not addressed to a specific individual, the description of someone going to find out more information would likely make the document seem less authoritative. We must remember how much people view religious text as authoritative. Some people believe that the Bible is the Word of God and is entirely correct. From that perspective, it would seem strange to write an introduction like the one in the Gospel of Luke if one were trying to produce the appearance of authoritative text. Therefore, it is justified to believe that the introduction in the Gospel of Luke is authentic, that there really was someone who went on a journey to investigate Christianity, and that they produced a report of their findings that in part resulted in the Gospel of Luke.

Additionally, further evidence that Luke and Acts are connected is provided by the comparison of Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:4, which seem to provide overlapping information in relation to each other.

Luke 24:49

*“I am going to send you what my Father has promised; but stay in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high.”*

Acts 1:4

*On one occasion, while he was eating with them, he gave them this command: “Do not leave Jerusalem, but wait for the gift my Father promised, which you have heard me speak about.”*

Those instructions are not provided anywhere else in the entire New Testament. Only Luke and Acts provide that information, which shows that the same person probably wrote both Luke and Acts. So the overlap of those instructions is in step with the similarities in the introductions, and both show that it is likely that the same person wrote both Luke and Acts.

Additionally, Luke and Acts are the only books in the entire New Testament that name John before his brother James when listing them next to each other, which is strange because James was older than John and is listed before John in every other instance in the New Testament that lists them next to each other. We'll be going into more detail shortly about why John would be placed before his brother at all and why Luke sometimes places John after his brother. It will be shown that this is a result of how Luke and Acts were produced, that they were investigative reports in which some previously existing narratives were included and combined with newly added information gathered during the author's investigation. Before getting into those specific details, we can already see that simply the placement of John before his brother only happening in Luke and Acts provides even further evidence that the same person probably wrote both.

Also, Luke and Acts are the only books in the entire New Testament that name "Judas son of James" (a different Judas than Judas Iscariot) as one of "the Twelve" (or "the eleven" in the case of Acts since Judas Iscariot was no longer there). Mark and Matthew both name Thaddaeus instead Judas son of James while Luke and Acts both exclude Thaddaeus.

Luke 6:13-16

*When morning came, he called his disciples to him and chose twelve of them, whom he also designated apostles: Simon (whom he named Peter), his brother Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James son of Alphaeus, Simon who was called the Zealot, Judas son of James, and Judas Iscariot, who became a traitor.*

Acts 1:13

*When they arrived, they went upstairs to the room where they were staying. Those present were Peter, John, James and Andrew; Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew; James son of Alphaeus and Simon the Zealot, and Judas son of James.*

These two lists both diverging from the Gospels of Mark and Matthew and showing Judas son of James instead of Thaddaeus clearly shows a unique connection between the Gospel of Luke and Acts. That unique connection shows that the two main possibilities are either the same person wrote both or each was written by a different author and the author of Acts copied from the Gospel of Luke. If there were two different authors and the author of Acts copied from the Gospel of Luke, then the orders of the names would likely have been exactly the same. However, there are multiple differences between the lists, including Luke naming James son of Zebedee before his brother John and Acts naming John before James. So it doesn't appear that there are two different authors and the author of Acts copied from the Gospel of Luke. Therefore, through process of elimination, we can easily conclude that it is most likely that the same person wrote both Luke and Acts.

Again, John being placed before his brother some of the time but not all of the time will be examined in more detail later and it will be shown that it has to do with Luke and Acts being investigative reports in which some previously existing narratives were included and combined with newly added information

gathered during the author's investigation. For now, we can see that the naming of John before his brother at all and the mentioning of Judas son of James as one of "the Twelve" or "the eleven" both only happening in Luke and Acts shows evidence that the same person wrote both Luke and Acts; and we can also see that Luke and Acts both naming Judas son of James in a list of "the Twelve" or "the eleven" while the lists in each differ in multiple ways shows that most likely one was not copied from the other and therefore that the same person wrote both. Additionally, as previously shown, the introductions to Luke and Acts, particularly the mentioning of "Theophilus", as well as the same kind of instructions appearing both at the end of Luke and at the beginning of Acts also show evidence that Luke and Acts were written by the same person. More evidence will be shown that the same person wrote both Luke and Acts, but we can already see that it is probable that that the same person wrote both.

It is justified to believe that the introductions in Luke and Acts are authentic and that Luke and Acts represent an honest attempt to obtain information. However, it is also justified to believe that such an honest attempt resulted in some fraudulent information having been passed along to the author from at least one source.

While the introductions and other material connect Luke to Acts, Acts contains different information and was produced in a different way. Luke is about Christ's Ministry, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection. Acts is about Christianity after the Resurrection. Since the introduction in Luke suggests that the author had some prior knowledge about Christianity before embarking on their journey, it's justified to believe that this journey began after the Resurrection. Therefore, the Gospel of Luke appears to represent all second-hand information. Acts, however, leads us along a different path. At least a part of Acts seems to be eyewitness testimony. There are certain verses which show a very subtle transition into a first-person account through the use of the words "we" and/or "us". Acts 16:10 is the first of them.

Acts 16:10

*After Paul had seen the vision, we got ready at once to leave for Macedonia, concluding that God had called us to preach the gospel to them.*

These explicit first-person references in Acts occur in chapters 16, 20, 21, 27, and 28. So unless Acts is a fraudulent production all together or a scribe other than the original author later altered these accounts in such a way, the original author, intentionally or not, implied that they were an eyewitness to at least some of what was reported in their investigative findings. It is justified to believe that all of Luke and most of Acts represent second-hand information. However, there is some information in Acts that seems to represent eyewitness testimony.

It is a popular belief that the author of Luke and Acts was a traveling companion of Paul's. It is in part these first-person references that give way to that belief. These first-person references are all associated with experiences described to have been with Paul. There has been debate about whether we should trust these first-person references. There are different theories about them. Are they authentic or are they fraudulent? The answer to that question can shape how we view Acts. Evidence will be presented that shows that these first-person references are authentic. We will begin by assessing the first-person references specifically and then we will go into a deeper analysis that will examine other parts of Luke and Acts.

The amount of first-person references is low in quantity. Additionally, each transition into a first-person account is very subtle. There isn't a single description throughout all of Acts of the author joining Paul. It seems that the author never announces themselves other than through the use of the words "we" and "us". Such subtle representations of eyewitness testimony in Acts do not appear to likely be associated with any attempt to deceive. Writers in ancient times were typically very creative and often falsified narratives. If someone in ancient times was trying to deceive their audience, they likely would have made a much stronger and more elaborate attempt. Although that is not necessarily the case and we should not assume it to be the case, it is nevertheless a strong point in favor of the argument that the first-person references are probably authentic.

The next question is about whether a fraudulent alteration would likely have been made in more recent times. Such subtle references could be characteristic of more recent fraudulent alterations. In response to such a question, we can look to Greek New Testament manuscripts. Papyrus 45, which has been dated to the first quarter of the third century, contains a part of Acts 16:16. The Greek symbols transcribed show δε ("de") πορευομενων ("poreuomenon") ημων ("hemon") εις ("eis"), which can be translated as "now going of us to the". The Greek word ημων ("hemon") can be translated as "us". If the dating of this document is at least relatively close to being accurate, then this first-person reference was in circulation by the third century. Therefore, it appears that the first-person references in Acts were not recent alterations.

So based on the text of Papyrus 45, the first-person references in Acts were probably first produced within the first few centuries. That time-period often gave way to much stronger and more elaborate attempts to deceive. So the subtleness of those first-person references provides evidence that Acts probably represents real eyewitness testimony in chapters 16, 20, 21, 27, and 28.

Furthermore, as previously alluded to, the mere fact that the first-person references are in such low quantity by itself shows that these references are probably authentic. If someone wanted to fraudulently produce writing to appear to be eyewitness testimony, such an effort would likely be more prevalent instead of being so scarce. There are 28 chapters in Acts and only five of them contain a first-person reference. If there was a desire to fraudulently portray eyewitness testimony in a production that spans 28 chapters, such an effort would have likely gone much further than just involving five of 28 chapters. In addition to that, the writing in Acts switches between first-person and third-person accounts, which reflects that the author was only present on certain occasions and obtained second-hand information for the rest. If Acts was a fraudulent production all together, there would likely be a more consistent strategy, and so there would likely be a lot more of the text written in first-person reference. Instead, the presence of the combination of first-person and third-person accounts is reflective of the author's travels in that they traveled with Paul for some of the time represented in Acts and also obtained second-hand information for other parts.

The following verses provide further evidence that Acts probably contains real eyewitness testimony.

Acts 21:18

*The next day Paul and the rest of us went to see James, and all the elders were present.*

Acts 24:1

*Five days later the high priest Ananias went down to Caesarea with some of the elders and a lawyer named Tertullus, and they brought their charges against Paul before the governor.*

Acts 27:2

*We boarded a ship from Adramyttium about to sail for ports along the coast of the province of Asia, and we put out to sea. Aristarchus, a Macedonian from Thessalonica, was with us.*

Acts 21:18 describes James son of Mother Mariam but not Peter as having been in Jerusalem. If that verse was fraudulent, then Peter would have probably been named. The absence of Peter's name is probably a product of a real in-person observation. Acts 24:1 describes a lawyer named Tertullus. Such a name wouldn't likely be present if there wasn't a real lawyer named Tertullus who the author encountered during what is described in that narrative. Of course it's not impossible for someone to make up a name; however, the specific naming of this lawyer still seems to likely be a product of a real in-person observation. Similarly, Acts 27:2 also names someone specific. This time the name is Aristarchus. Not much is said about him other than that he was a Macedonian from Thessalonica. The presence of a specific name along with not much being said about this person is evidence that someone named Aristarchus probably really traveled with them because there isn't any other information being supplied that would have contributed any motivation to fraudulently add the presence of this person to the text.

For more evidence, we will now go into a deeper analysis that will examine other parts of Luke and Acts. As previously mentioned, chapter 16 of Acts contains the first instance of a first-person account. It just so happens that the preceding chapter is a narrative about the council at Jerusalem and some of what happened shortly afterwards. The council at Jerusalem and some of what happened shortly afterwards is also described in Paul's letter to the Galatians. As shown in Part 2, the accounts in Acts and Paul's letter to the Galatians are very different from each other.

Acts 15:1-2

*Some men came down from Judea to Antioch and were teaching the brothers: "Unless you are circumcised, according to the custom taught by Moses, you cannot be saved." This brought Paul and Barnabas into sharp dispute and debate with them. So Paul and Barnabas were appointed, along with some other believers, to go up to Jerusalem to see the apostles and elders about this question.*

Galatians 2:1-5

*Fourteen years later I went up again to Jerusalem, this time with Barnabas. I took Titus along also. I went in response to a revelation and set before them the gospel that I preach among the Gentiles. But I did this privately to those who seemed to be leaders, for fear that I was running or had run my race in vain. Yet not even Titus, who was with me, was compelled to be circumcised, even though he was a Greek. This matter arose because some false brothers had infiltrated our ranks to spy on the freedom we have in Christ Jesus and to make us slaves. We did not give in to them for a moment, so that the truth of the gospel might remain with you.*

Acts 15:1-2 describe Paul and Barnabas being in disagreement with people teaching about circumcision and also claim that Paul and Barnabas were "appointed" "along with some other believers" to go to Jerusalem to meet with "the apostles and elders". Acts 15:1-2 use the word "appointed" as if Paul didn't make the decision to go to Jerusalem all on his own and use the phrase "along with some other believers" as if Paul and Barnabas were accompanied by multiple people who were also "appointed" along with

them. Acts 15:1-2 also use the phrase “the apostles and elders” as if the leadership in Jerusalem was above Paul in some sort of hierarchy. In contrast, Galatians describes Paul making a decision himself to go to Jerusalem “in response to a revelation” and to set before them the gospel that Paul preached to the gentiles. Galatians then goes on to describe the people who were teaching about circumcision as “false brothers” who had “infiltrated” their “ranks” to “spy” on them. Also, Galatians describes Paul going to Jerusalem in private, not being “appointed”, and describes Titus as the only other person to go with Paul and Barnabas rather than there being “some other believers”.

Acts 15:22

*Then the apostles and elders, with the whole church, decided to choose some of their own men and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas. They chose Judas (called Barsabbas) and Silas, two men who were leaders among the brothers.*

Acts 15:29

*You are to abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals, and from sexual immorality. You will do well to avoid these things.*

Acts 15:30-34

*The men were sent off and went down to Antioch, where they gathered the church together and delivered the letter. The people read it and were glad for its encouraging message. Judas and Silas, who themselves were prophets, said much to encourage and strengthen the brothers. After spending some time there, they were sent off by the brothers with the blessing of peace to return to those who had sent them.*

Acts 15:36-40

*Some time later Paul said to Barnabas, “Let us go back and visit the brothers in all the towns where we preached the word of the Lord and see how they are doing.” Barnabas wanted to take John, also called Mark, with them, but Paul did not think it was wise to take him, because he had deserted them in Pamphylia and had not continued with them in the work. They had such a sharp disagreement that they parted company. Barnabas took Mark and sailed for Cyprus, but Paul chose Silas and left, commended by the brothers to the grace of the Lord.*

Galatians 2:10

*All they asked was that we should continue to remember the poor, the very thing I was eager to do.*

Galatians 2:11-14

*When Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he was clearly in the wrong. Before certain men came from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they arrived, he began to draw back and separate himself from the Gentiles because he was afraid of those who belong to the circumcision group. The other Jews joined him in his hypocrisy, so that by their hypocrisy even Barnabas was led astray. When I saw that they were not acting in line with the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter in front of them all, “You are a Jew, yet you live like a Gentile and not like a Jew. How is it, then, that you force Gentiles to follow Jewish customs?”*

The account in Acts describes people accompanying Paul and Barnabas after the council at Jerusalem and delivering a letter. The account in Galatians describes the conclusion of the council at Jerusalem and then goes on to describe an interaction at a later time after Peter had traveled to where Paul was. Acts describes



that people in Jerusalem demanded that the gentiles abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals, and from sexual immorality. Galatians describes that those people in Jerusalem only requested that people remember the poor. Acts describes the letter as being received well. Galatians describes Paul becoming upset and “opposing” Peter “to his face”. Acts describes Paul and Barnabas parting ways over a disagreement about Mark. Galatians describes Paul and Barnabas parting ways because Barnabas was led astray by the hypocrisy of Peter and some other Jews.

Acts and Galatians provide very different accounts from each other. Given that the author of Acts appears to have been conducting an investigative report, there doesn't seem to be much motivation for the author of Acts to have been dishonest. The emotions expressed in Paul's account serve as evidence that Paul's account is probably authentic. So it seems unlikely that the author of Acts or Paul were dishonest, or that someone other than Paul altered that part of his letter. What is more likely is that either someone was dishonest when providing information to the author of Acts or the account in Acts was later fraudulently altered. So we have two scenarios that are the two most likely to have been the case and both include some form of fraud. The first scenario is that dishonest information was given to the author of Acts during the original production. The second scenario is that Acts was fraudulently altered sometime after the original production. It could also be the case that both scenarios apply.

In the first scenario, the differences shown between Acts and Galatians in relation to the council at Jerusalem and some of what happened shortly afterwards would indicate that the author of Acts probably wasn't present at the council at Jerusalem and probably wasn't present during the encounter that is described as having happened afterwards. In combination with that, the first-person references beginning in the very next chapter indicate that the author of Acts probably joined Paul sometime after the council at Jerusalem and after the encounter that is described as having happened afterwards.

In the second scenario, we wouldn't have much evidence to assess whether the author of Acts was likely present at the council at Jerusalem or during the encounter afterwards. If the work of the author of Acts was fraudulently altered by someone else, then those narratives may not accurately reflect the view of the original author, in which case the text doesn't serve as good evidence to assess whether the author of Acts was likely present at the council at Jerusalem or during the encounter afterwards. Nevertheless, there are still the first-person references that appear in chapter 16. So regardless of what happened before the author of Acts joined Paul, it seems that chapter 16 shows good evidence that the author of Acts was with Paul during some of the time-period described in chapter 16.

Regardless of which scenario actually applies, or even if both of them apply, given the nature of the council at Jerusalem, it's unlikely that an outsider would have been present. So it's justified to believe that the author of Acts was probably not at the council at Jerusalem. Therefore, chapter 15 of Acts probably represents second-hand information. Meanwhile, chapter 16 represents the first instance that is written as a first-person account. That shows that there seems to be a natural divide between Acts 1-15 and Acts 16-28. Acts 1-15 seem to represent all second-hand information, and Acts 16-28 seem to represent some second-hand information as well as some eyewitness testimony. Furthermore, Acts 1-15 is a lot about Peter and Jerusalem while Acts 16-28 is a lot about Paul and his travels. So the content of information being provided also shows that there seems to be a natural divide between Acts 1-15 and Acts 16-28.

Since we can divide Acts into two parts, we now have three pieces to analyze separately: the Gospel of Luke, Acts 1-15, and Acts 16-28. Luke and Acts 1-15 both seem to represent all second-hand information. Additionally, it seems that the author joined Paul at some point and provided testimony to some of what they observed. Paul was probably a source of some information in Acts 16-28 and there is also apparent eyewitness testimony in Acts 16-28. Paul may have been the source of some information in Acts 1-15, particularly some of the information in chapters 13 and 14, but it appears that almost all of the other information in Acts 1-15 came from someone else. Therefore, it appears that there was at least one source who was not Paul who contributed to the information in Acts 1-15. Additionally, all of the information in the Gospel of Luke appears to have come from at least one source who was not Paul. Paul and the author's own in-person observations presumably didn't provide any of the information in the Gospel of Luke. The information in the Gospel of Luke seems to have derived from elsewhere.

We can see further how Acts resulted with such different information from Paul when we examine more verses from his letter to the Galatians.

Galatians 1:15-24

*But when God, who set me apart from birth and called me by his grace, was pleased to reveal his Son in me so that I might preach him among the Gentiles, I did not consult any man, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to see those who were apostles before I was, but I went immediately into Arabia and later returned to Damascus.*

*Then after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to get acquainted with Peter and stayed with him fifteen days. I saw none of the other apostles – only James, the Lord's brother. I assure you before God that what I am writing you is no lie. Later I went to Syria and Cilicia. I was personally unknown to the churches of Judea that are in Christ. They only heard the report: "The man who formerly persecuted us is now preaching the faith he once tried to destroy." And they praised God because of me.*

These verses present a sequence in which Paul converted to Christianity, traveled to Arabia, traveled back to Damascus, then traveled to Jerusalem three years after his conversion where he spent 15 days with Peter and the only other "apostle" he saw was James son of Mother Mariam, and then he traveled to Syria and Cilicia. Paul also specifically said "I assure you before God that what I am writing you is no lie." A statement like that seems to be in response to information that contradicts Paul's account. It wouldn't seem necessary to make such a statement, especially when simply describing a travel path, unless Paul had learned that contradicting information had been communicated amongst others. Furthermore, the descriptions of this travel path seem entirely unnecessary all together unless Paul was trying to combat contradicting information. Meanwhile, we've already seen other examples of how Acts contradicts Paul's letter to the Galatians, and we've also seen that the author of Luke and Acts appears to have joined Paul at some point in his travels. So from evidence previously presented, it appears that the author of Luke and Acts obtained information from someone other than Paul that contradicts information from Paul's letter to the Galatians and then went to go travel with Paul. Just from that, it seems obvious that Paul would have seen the information that the author of Luke and Acts had obtained from someone else, and Paul's letter to the Galatians seems to be a response to that information. We should now examine verses from Acts that contradict the information in Galatians 1:15-24.

Acts 7:59-8:1

*While they were stoning him, Stephen prayed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Then he fell on his knees and cried out, "Lord, do not hold this sin against them." When he had said this, he fell asleep. And Saul was there, giving approval to his death.*

Acts 9:1-2

*Meanwhile, Saul was still breathing out murderous threats against the Lord's disciples. He went to the high priest and asked him for letters to the synagogues in Damascus, so that if he found any there who belonged to the Way, whether men or women, he might take them as prisoners to Jerusalem.*

Acts 9:3-10

*As he neared Damascus on his journey, suddenly a light from heaven flashed around him. He fell to the ground and heard a voice say to him, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?"*

*"Who are you, Lord?" Saul asked.*

*"I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting", he replied.*

*"Now get up and go into the city, and you will be told what you must do."*

*The men traveling with Saul stood there speechless; they heard the sound but did not see anyone. Saul got up from the ground, but when he opened his eyes he could see nothing. So they led him by the hand into Damascus. For three days he was blind, and did not eat or drink anything.*

Acts 9:17-20

*Then Ananias went to the house and entered it. Placing his hands on Saul, he said, "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus, who appeared to you on the road as you were coming here, has sent me so that you may see again and be filled with the Holy Spirit." Immediately, something like scales fell from Saul's eyes, and he could see again. He got up and was baptized, and after taking some food, he regained his strength.*

*Saul spent several days with the disciples in Damascus. At once he began to preach in the synagogues that Jesus is the Son of God.*

Acts 9:23-25

*After many days had gone by, the Jews conspired to kill him, but Saul learned of their plan. Day and night they kept close watch on the city gates in order to kill him. But his followers took him by night and lowered him in a basket through an opening in the wall.*

Acts 9:26-28

*When he came to Jerusalem, he tried to join the disciples, but they were all afraid of him, not believing that he really was a disciple. But Barnabas took him and brought him to the apostles. He told them how Saul on his journey had seen the Lord and that the Lord had spoken to him, and how in Damascus he had preached fearlessly in the name of Jesus. So Saul stayed with them and moved about freely in Jerusalem, speaking boldly in the name of the Lord.*

Acts 9:29-31

*He talked and debated with the Grecian Jews, but they tried to kill him. When the brothers learned of this, they took him down to Caesarea and sent him to Tarsus.*

*Then the church throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria enjoyed a time of peace. It was strengthened; and encouraged by the Holy Spirit, it grew in numbers, living in the fear of the Lord.*

Acts 11:19-20

*Now those who had been scattered by the persecution in connection with Stephen traveled as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, telling the message only to Jews. Some of them, however, men from Cyprus and Cyrene, went to Antioch and began to speak to Greeks also, telling them the good news about the Lord Jesus.*

Acts 11:22

*News of this reached the ears of the church at Jerusalem, and they sent Barnabas to Antioch.*

Acts 11:25-26

*Then Barnabas went to Tarsus to look for Saul, and when he found him, he brought him to Antioch. So for a whole year Barnabas and Saul met with the church and taught great numbers of people. The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.*

Acts 13:1-3

*In the church at Antioch there were prophets and teachers: Barnabas, Simeon called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen (who had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch), and Saul. While they were worshipping the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said, "Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them." So after they had fasted and prayed, they placed their hands on them and sent them off.*

These verses from Acts present the following sequence: Stephen was stoned to death in Jerusalem, Paul ("Saul") was there in Jerusalem "giving approval to his death", Paul went to the high priest in Jerusalem to get letters to synagogues in Damascus so that he could take Christians as prisoners to Jerusalem, Paul began traveling to Damascus, Christ spoke to Paul, Paul was blinded for three days before being able to see again, Paul converted to Christianity, Paul preached in Damascus, there were assassination attempts on Paul in Damascus, Paul went to Jerusalem and joined "the disciples", Paul preached in Jerusalem, there were assassination attempts on Paul in Jerusalem, "the brothers" sent Paul to Tarsus, "the church" enjoyed peace as soon as Paul was gone thereby implying that they only experienced danger because of Paul, Christianity was spread to gentiles in Antioch by "men from Cyprus and Cyrene" (not Paul), "the church in Jerusalem" sent Barnabas to Antioch, Barnabas went to Tarsus to get Paul and bring him to Antioch, Paul and Barnabas taught in Antioch for a year, and then Paul and Barnabas were sent off to other places.

That sequence is extremely different than what Paul expressed in his letter to the Galatians and there are some particularly dramatic details in the accounts in Acts. According to Acts, Paul went to Jerusalem shortly after his conversion and joined "the disciples" there, then he was sent off to Tarsus by "the brothers", and then he was brought to Antioch by Barnabas. It appears that the author of Luke and Acts obtained this information from someone other than Paul and then joined Paul in his travels; and then Paul responded to this information by saying that he first went to Arabia and then back to Damascus, he didn't go to Jerusalem until three years after his conversion, the only "apostles" he saw there were Peter and James son of Mother Mariam and only spent 15 days with Peter, and then left and went to Syria (where Antioch is located) and Cilicia, and then he said "I assure you before God that what I am writing you is no lie." Providing a travel path seems unnecessary all together except that Acts provides a contradicting account. So Paul simply providing a travel path shows that he was responding to the information in Acts, and then he also provides a very contradicting travel path and assures the Galatians that he wasn't lying. There are also all of the other contradictions previously shown between Acts and Paul's letter to the

Galatians. So it seems very obvious that Paul was responding to the information contained in Acts. In the rest of the letter to the Galatians, Paul proceeded to accuse people of being spies, criticize Peter and James son of Mother Mariam, claim that what they were doesn't matter to him, and then went on to tell a story of a time that he opposed Peter to his face and accused him of being a hypocrite by forcing gentiles to follow Jewish customs that he didn't even follow himself. Paul's letter to the Galatians is an explosive piece of writing that shows very definitively the spreading of different information and the conflict between Paul and the group in Jerusalem that included Peter and James son of Mother Mariam. This evidence that shows that Paul responded in his letter to the Galatians to information in Acts provides further evidence that the author of Luke and Acts actually did travel with Paul.

Evidence has been shown that the same person wrote both Luke and Acts, that they obtained second-hand information from someone other than Paul, that they joined Paul in his travels, that they obtained information from Paul, and that they wrote about some of their own in-person observations while traveling with Paul. Evidence has also been shown that Paul saw the information about him that the author of Luke and Acts had obtained from someone else and responded in his letter to the Galatians disputing much of the information about him in Acts.

We'll proceed from here by further analyzing Acts 1-15. Peter's name is mentioned 70 times in Acts 1-15, Paul's name is mentioned 50 times, and Barnabas' name is mentioned 29 times. Peter, Paul, and Barnabas are the top three people who are mentioned by name the most in Acts 1-15. What is striking is that among the people who are mentioned in the Gospels, the person who is mentioned by name the second most in Acts 1-15 is mentioned by name less than a fourth as much as Peter. Philip's name appears 16 times and John's name (one of the sons of Zebedee, not John the Baptist) appears 14 times. Peter, Philip, and John are the top three people who are mentioned in the Gospels who are mentioned by name the most in Acts 1-15. There seems to be an incredible focus on Peter and that focus begins very early on in Acts.

Acts 1:15

*In those days Peter stood up among the believers (a group numbering about a hundred and twenty) and said, "Brothers, the Scripture had to be fulfilled which the Holy Spirit spoke long ago through the mouth of David concerning Judas, who served as guide for those who arrested Jesus – he was one of our number and shared in this ministry."*

Acts 2:14

*Then Peter stood up with the Eleven, raised his voice, and addressed the crowd: "Fellow Jews and all of you who live in Jerusalem, let me explain this to you; listen carefully to what I say."*

There is also a heavy focus on Jerusalem, which is strange because the mission of the disciples was to spread Christianity. It doesn't make much sense to focus on one city and not put enough focus on other areas. Also, since the mission was to spread Christianity, why is there so much emphasis on Peter and not much on anyone else who was mentioned in the Gospels? What was going on with everyone else? The narratives about Paul give us the most detailed accounts of anybody spreading Christianity. However, there were several people mentioned in the Gospels who aren't given much attention in Acts, and there are several people mentioned in the Gospels who aren't given any attention at all in Acts. Furthermore, Mariam, the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century, is not named a single time in all of Acts. The heavy focus on Peter was suspicious enough, but then there is also the suspicious focus on Jerusalem

as well as the suspicious absence of a single mention of the name of the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century.

The focus shouldn't be on any one person and the focus shouldn't be on any one area. The mission was to spread Christianity and that mission was for all of the disciples. We should have more information about who traveled where, what challenges they faced, and what successes they had. Instead, we're left with a bunch of heroic narratives about Peter in Jerusalem. That's so strange. Why does it matter so much what Peter was up to in Jerusalem? It's not that it's not important at all. It's just that there's a lot of information about that and not enough information about much else. There's not much information about more important matters, like spreading Christianity beyond Jerusalem. Acts 1-15 is pretty much a biography of Peter in Jerusalem with some information about Philip in Samaria, a decent amount of information about Paul, and then the occasional mention of someone else or some other place. We can see a pattern developing as we turn our attention to the Gospel of Luke.

Luke 5:3

*He got into one of the boats, the one belonging to Simon, and asked him to put out a little from shore. Then he sat down and taught the people from the boat.*

Luke 5:8

*When Simon Peter saw this, he fell at Jesus' knees and said, "Go away from me, Lord; I am a sinful man!"*

Luke 24:9-12

*When they came back from the tomb, they told all these things to the Eleven and to all the others. It was Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, and the others with them who told this to the apostles. But they did not believe the women, because their words seemed to them like nonsense. Peter, however, got up and ran to the tomb. Bending over, he saw the strips of linen lying by themselves, and he went away, wondering to himself what had happened.*

In Luke 5:3, Christ is described as having taught people from Peter's boat. In Luke 5:8, there's a dramatic scene that puts Peter at center stage. Luke 5:8 actually describes Peter as having told Christ to "go away" and describes Peter as having admitted that he is a "sinful man". This scene is so dramatic that it's hard to believe that it's true. No other Gospel describes Christ as having taught people from Peter's boat. No other Gospel describes Peter as having told Christ to "go away". No other Gospel describes Peter as having admitted to being a "sinful man". Additionally, the name "Simon" (Peter's other name) appears five times in this narrative, but John and James are mentioned by name only once and they are immediately identified as Peter's partners. As for Luke 24:9-12, the Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that describes Peter as having run to the tomb alone. So we can see that there seems to be a particular level of attention given to Peter in the Gospel of Luke, even more so than in the other Synoptic Gospels. Since the Gospel of Luke gives that much more attention to Peter than Mark and Matthew, we can see that the attention Peter receives in Luke goes far beyond just simply taking narratives from Mark and Matthew. If Luke simply copied information from Mark and Matthew, then there wouldn't be that much of a difference in the attention that Peter receives. Instead, there is a substantial difference going from Mark and Matthew to Luke. That difference is evident of the author of Luke receiving information that exalts Peter that wasn't in Mark or Matthew.

There is also quite a focus on Jerusalem and the temple.

Luke 2:23-24

*On the eighth day, when it was time to circumcise him, he was named Jesus, the name the angel had given him before he had been conceived. When the time of their purification according to the Law of Moses had been completed, Joseph and Mary took him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord (as it is written in the Law of the Lord, "Every firstborn male is to be consecrated to the Lord"), and to offer a sacrifice in keeping with what is said in the Law of the Lord: "a pair of doves or two young pigeons."*

Luke 2:36-37

*There was also a prophetess, Anna, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher. She was very old; she had lived with her husband seven years after her marriage, and then was a widow until she was eighty-four. She never left the temple but worshiped night and day, fasting and praying.*

Luke 2:43-50

*After the Feast was over, while his parents were returning home, the boy Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem, but they were unaware of it. Thinking he was in their company, they traveled on for a day. Then they began looking for him among their relatives and friends. When they did not find him, they went back to Jerusalem to look for him. After three days they found him in the temple courts, sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions. Everyone who heard him was amazed at his understanding and his answers. When his parents saw him, they were astonished. His mother said to him, "Son, why have you treated us like this? Your father and I have been anxiously searching for you." "Why were you searching for me?" he asked. "Didn't you know I had to be in my Father's house?" But they did not understand what he was saying to them.*

Luke 24:46-47

*He told them, "This is what is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and repentance and forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning with Jerusalem."*

Luke 24:49

*"I am going to send you what my Father has promised; but stay in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high."*

Luke 24:52-53

*Then they worshiped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy. And they stayed continually at the temple, praising God.*

There seems to be a common theme with both Luke and Acts 1-15: that Peter and Jerusalem are important. It makes sense that there's a common theme since it appears that the same person wrote both. However, why did Peter and Jerusalem receive so much attention? It seems obvious that the author probably received information directly from a source who wanted Peter exalted. Additionally, the heavy emphasis on Jerusalem and the heavy emphasis specifically on the temple show evidence that this source was probably based in Jerusalem. An objection to that theory is that Jerusalem and the temple were both important to Jewish society. Another objection is that Christ went to Jerusalem and the temple. In response to those objections, it's not just that Jerusalem and the temple are given special attention; it's the

specific level of attention and the specific way that they are given attention. Towards the beginning of the Gospel of Luke, Christ is described as having been in the temple as a baby, and is described as having wandered off to stay near the temple as a young boy. These narratives aren't found anywhere else in the New Testament. The Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that describes Christ as having been in the temple as a baby or as a young boy. The Gospel of Luke also contains a narrative about a woman who "never left the temple but worshiped night and day, fasting and praying". So the Gospel of Luke promotes never leaving the temple. The Gospel of Luke also describes instructions having been given by Christ to the "disciples" to stay in Jerusalem until they "have been clothed with power from on high". In addition to all of that, the Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that contains the phrase "repentance and forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning with Jerusalem" or the phrase "they stayed continually at the temple".

The Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that describes Christ as having been in the temple as a baby. The Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that describes Christ as having been in the temple as a young boy. The Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that contains a narrative about someone having "never left the temple". The Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that describes that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached "beginning with Jerusalem". The Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that describes instructions having been given by Christ to the "disciples" to stay in Jerusalem until they "have been clothed with power from on high". The Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that describes the "disciples" as having "stayed continually at the temple". The Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that refers to the temple in the very last sentence, and that sentence describes the "disciples" as having "stayed continually at the temple". That's how the Gospel of Luke ends, with a sentence that refers to the "disciples" as having "stayed continually at the temple". While the other Gospels certainly give plenty of attention to Jerusalem and the temple, no other Gospel does so in the way that the Gospel of Luke does.

More specifically, any source that describes the "disciples" as having "stayed continually at the temple" would seem to be hypocritical if they weren't in Jerusalem themselves. It would be very strange for someone to assert that people should stay continually at the temple if they themselves didn't live near the temple. Anyone who suggested that people should stay continually at the temple would most likely have been a resident of Jerusalem or at least Judea. So it's not just the particularly extreme level of attention that Jerusalem and the temple get in the Gospel of Luke, it's also the specific statements that would likely have come from someone who lived near the temple.

In addition to all of the evidence presented so far, Paul's letter to the Galatians provides an example of someone traveling to Jerusalem to find out more about Christianity. Paul's letter to the Galatians describes Paul as having gone to Jerusalem and having spent 15 days with Peter. For someone who thought that Peter was the leader, and the author of Luke and Acts obviously appears to have thought that, Jerusalem would obviously be the place to travel to for a first century investigation into Christianity.

The heavy emphasis on Peter and Jerusalem in Luke and Acts would make much more sense if there was information given to the author directly from a source who wanted Peter exalted and if that source was based in Jerusalem while the Gospel of Luke was originally produced. So the likely scenario is that this source was based in Jerusalem and they wanted Peter exalted. The author, however, was probably not from Jerusalem. Given that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection occurred in Jerusalem, the author was probably writing to someone who did not live in Jerusalem. If the person who was being written to lived



in Jerusalem, then such writing would not likely have to be written to them because they would already have been in the location where the Crucifixion and the Resurrection occurred. Additionally, the robustness of the Gospel of Luke shows a lack of strictness that would likely be present if someone who lived in Jerusalem had produced the Gospel of Luke. The Gospel of Luke is the most robust of any of the Synoptic Gospels. Someone from Jerusalem would have likely been much more restrictive when compiling narratives. Also, a comparison of Luke to Matthew can provide more insight. Matthew focuses a lot more on Jewish customs and Jewish law than the other Synoptic Gospels. There are a lot of references to the Hebrew Bible, and Jewish customs and Jewish law seem to have been major influences. Matthew includes narratives about the fulfillment of the law, murder, adultery, oaths, an eye for an eye, prayer, fasting, and treasures in heaven that aren't in any other Gospel. Luke, on the other hand, does not appear to focus as much on Jewish customs and Jewish law. The lesser degree of focus on Jewish customs and Jewish law despite having a more robust volume of narratives suggests that the author was not from Jerusalem.

The author would probably not have been writing to someone who lived in Jerusalem because the Crucifixion and the Resurrection occurred in Jerusalem and so such writing would not likely have been needed if that person lived in Jerusalem; and additionally, the robust volume of narratives and the lack of emphasis on Jewish customs and Jewish law show that the author was probably not from Jerusalem. The heavy emphasis on Peter, Jerusalem, and the temple shows evidence that the author of Luke and Acts likely obtained information from at least one source in Jerusalem who wanted Peter exalted. If the author did not live in Jerusalem but obtained information from a source there, then the author traveled to Jerusalem. The likelihood that the person who the author was writing to was not from Jerusalem, the robust volume of narratives, and the lack of emphasis on Jewish customs and Jewish law combined with the heavy emphasis on Peter, Jerusalem, and the temple show evidence that the author of Luke and Acts most likely lived outside of Jerusalem, and also outside of Israel, traveled to Jerusalem to investigate Christianity, and obtained information there from a source who wanted Peter exalted.

There is evidence to show that the author of Luke and Acts sought to investigate Christianity and produce a report of their findings. There is evidence to show that the first-person references in Acts are authentic, which shows that the author appears to have traveled with Paul. Additionally, Luke and Acts seem to have a common theme between them in that they both give particularly special and unique attention to Peter, Jerusalem, and the temple, which shows that the author appears to have obtained information from at least one source in Jerusalem who wanted Peter exalted. There is also reason to believe that the author did not live in Jerusalem, which means that they probably traveled to Jerusalem. So the probable scenario is that someone who lived outside of Jerusalem took upon the mission to investigate Christianity, traveled to Jerusalem and obtained information there from at least one source who wanted Peter exalted, and then traveled with Paul and obtained information from him, and also wrote about some of their own in-person observations while traveling with Paul. We will go deeper into the analysis and continue to discover more evidence, but the setting of the stage is already well under way.

We have the information that is contained in Luke and Acts and we have seen evidence that the author of Luke and Acts lived outside of Jerusalem, traveled to Jerusalem, and then traveled with Paul. The next question is: when did all of this happen?

First off, the heavy emphasis on Jerusalem and the temple indicates that the production of Luke and Acts occurred before the destruction of the temple in 70. Furthermore, as mentioned in Part 4, all of the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels show evidence that all of the Synoptic Gospels were produced before the destruction of the temple. Additionally, there are other narratives that show evidence that all of the Synoptic Gospels were produced before the destruction of the temple. Examples can be seen in any of the narratives that reference the temple tax. Such narratives would likely not have been written after the destruction of the temple. Also, it is likely that a trip to Jerusalem would have occurred before the Jewish-Roman War, which began in 66. Furthermore, related to the progression leading up to the Jewish-Roman War, there were the riots of Jerusalem in 66. So while it's certainly not impossible for someone to have traveled to Jerusalem during the time-period of 66-70, it's probably the case that the author went there sometime before the riots in 66 and the Jewish-Roman War. There are also the references in Acts to Felix and Festus, both of whom seem to have been Roman procurators of Judea. These references take place after Paul is described as having been arrested in Jerusalem. Acts describes Paul as having been imprisoned for two years before his trial with Festus.

Acts 24:27

*When two years had passed, Felix was succeeded by Porcius Festus, but because Felix wanted to grant a favor to the Jews, he left Paul in prison.*

Archeological evidence shows that the transition from Felix to Festus seems to have occurred around 60 (probably 59-60). So it seems that Paul was probably arrested in Jerusalem sometime around 57-58. There is a first-person reference in Acts 21:17 that shows evidence that the author of Acts was with Paul leading up to his arrest. So there is evidence that the author of Acts was likely with Paul in the mid fifties and/or the late fifties. Acts 18:2-3 provide even further evidence for dating.

Acts 18:2-3

*There he met a Jew named Aquila, a native of Pontus, who had recently come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because Claudius had ordered all the Jews to leave Rome. Paul went to see them, and because he was a tentmaker as they were, he stayed and worked with them.*

There is a reference to Claudius who is believed to have stayed in power as the Roman emperor until 54 and who expelled Jews from Rome. So Acts 18:2-3 likely describe a time-period that was at the latest 54. There are first-person references that precede chapter 18, so the author of Luke and Acts appears to have joined Paul by 54, and likely sooner than that. Given the introductions in Luke and Acts, it seems that Luke was produced and sent to Theophilus before Acts was produced. Additionally, since Luke appears to have derived from information from a source in Jerusalem rather than from Paul, Luke appears to have been produced before the author joined Paul. Given the span of time that Acts covers, there may have been several years in between the two productions. If the author joined Paul by 54 and produced Luke before they joined Paul, then Luke would have been produced sometime by the early fifties at the latest, and maybe much sooner than that.

The upper limit of the time-period in which the Gospel of Luke was probably written has been established as 54. We can look to Galatians for the lower limit.

Galatians 1:18

*Then after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to get acquainted with Peter and stayed with him fifteen days.*

Galatians 2:1

*Fourteen years later I went up again to Jerusalem, this time with Barnabas. I took Titus along also.*

Galatians 2:1 refers to 14 years after Paul's trip to Jerusalem that is described as 3 years after his conversion as portrayed in verse 1:18. There is debate about exactly how many years are being described with the combination of verses 1:18 and 2:1. The Greek word "meta" is used in verse 1:18 so that verse could be referring to a fourth year. In other words, the year of Paul's conversion would be year 1 and then there were two other years for a total of three years, and then the use of "meta" brings us to the completion of the third year and onto a fourth year. Alternatively, given that we're talking about years instead of days, it's possible that "after three years" simply refers to the third year rather than a fourth year. Counting years is different than counting days because days are the most basic unit of time measurement according to the orbit of Earth. According to the orbit of Earth, we experience day and night and a cycle of days that extends over a year. With days being the most basic unit, the use of the word "meta" would simply refer to something occurring after a given day is completed. With a year, there is variability with the use of the word "meta" because a year is made up of smaller units that are days. To say "after three days" is to simply refer to something that occurs after three days. However, to say "after three years" wouldn't necessarily refer to each of those three years being completed because a year can be further broken down into units of days. Years are not simply units in and of themselves, they are also sets of smaller units. So there could be a large amount of days that get included or excluded depending on the counting of years when treating years as whole units in and of themselves. Therefore, in counting the duration of years, it's not necessarily the case that each year must be completed when using the word "meta". So the phrase "after three years" could refer to three or four years.

The next period of time is described in Galatians 2:1 and refers to 14 years. The phrase "fourteen years later" uses the Greek word "dia" instead of "meta". "Dia" can also mean "after". So the description of 14 years could refer to a 15<sup>th</sup> year. However, since we're dealing with years rather than days, it may be the case that the 14<sup>th</sup> year is referred to rather than the 15<sup>th</sup> year. Therefore, the 14 years described in Galatians 2:1 is either referring to the 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> year in relation to the timeline described in chapter 1.

So there is a period of time of 3-4 years and then a time period of 14-15 years. There's then the question of whether the last year of the 3-4 years is the same as the first year of the 14-15 years. Technically, with inclusive counting, there would be an overlap. However, it's not clear if that is the intended interpretation. So the lower limit for the time-period from Paul's conversion to the council at Jerusalem would be 16 years (3 years and 14 years with an overlap of 1 year). The upper limit would be 19 years (4 years and 15 years without any overlap). So the time-period that Paul describes in his letter to the Galatians appears to cover 16-19 years.

Since we're analyzing the lower limit of a time-period in which the Gospel of Luke was likely produced, we should use the earlier alternative of 16 years. The earliest year that Paul could have converted would have been the same year in which the Crucifixion and the Resurrection occurred. So it seems that the earliest year in which there was the council at Jerusalem would be 43 using inclusive counting starting from 28. It was previously shown that the author of Luke and Acts probably joined Paul by 54 and after

the council at Jerusalem. So a wide range for when the council at Jerusalem probably occurred is 43-54.

The author of Luke and Acts having joined Paul would probably have also occurred in the time-frame of 43-54 given that they probably met after the council at Jerusalem and probably by 54. Also, as has been shown, the author of Luke and Acts appears to have obtained information directly from a source in Jerusalem sometime after the council at Jerusalem and before joining Paul. So the author of Luke and Acts likely obtained information for the Gospel of Luke and Acts 1-15 in the time-period of 43-54 and then went to join Paul afterwards sometime in that same time-period. Therefore, the council at Jerusalem, the author of Luke and Acts having obtained information directly from a source in Jerusalem who wanted Peter exalted, and the author of Luke and Acts having joined Paul all likely occurred in the time-period of 43-54.

One objection to such a dating represents the belief by some that all four Gospels were originally produced sometime after the destruction of the temple in 70. Many people believe that because of the references to the temple being destroyed. However, it has already been shown that those references appear to have been produced before the destruction of the temple in 70 and probably don't refer the destruction of the temple in 70. John 11:48, however, might reflect information that is similar to the destruction of the temple in 70.

John 11:48

*"If we let him go on like this, everyone will believe in him, and then the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation."*

John 11:48 refers to Romans taking away the place and nation of the Jews. The destruction of the temple in 70 occurred in the midst of the Jewish-Roman war. John 11:48 could be reflecting that, but not necessarily. As mentioned in Part 4, there was consistent fear among the Jewish priests that their power could be taken from them by the Roman Empire. They tried to maintain some sort of political relationship with the Roman Empire. So John 11:48 seems to be simply referring to that consistent fear of losing their nation and the temple. Even if John 11:48 is referring to the destruction of the temple in 70, that does not mean that all of the information in the Gospel of John was written after the destruction of the temple. Scribes often tailored copies of the Gospels to present certain information. The Gospel of John was probably revised over and over again over hundreds of years. The current form of John 11:48 may have derived from text that was originally produced in 70 or after. However, there is evidence that other information in the Gospel of John was circulating by the early fifties and probably much sooner than that, as early as Mariam's first proclamation that Christ had risen.

As mentioned earlier and as will be shown in more detail soon, the Gospel of Luke likely contains responses to information contained in the Gospel of John, which means, based on the dating of the Gospel of Luke, that such information in the Gospel of John was likely circulating well before the early fifties. Additionally, it has been shown that chapter 21 of the Gospel of John appears to have been a later addition. That is evidence that different pieces of information were added at different times. So even if a particular verse was formed in 70 or after, there appears to have been other pieces of information circulating long before then. Furthermore, given that the Gospel of John seems to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, there is good reason to believe that at least some of the information in the

Gospel of John was being communicated to people, whether orally or in written form, shortly after the Resurrection, as early as Mariam's first proclamation that Christ had risen.

Only John 11:48 is somewhat of a candidate to be a reference to the destruction of the temple in 70 and it seems as though John 11:48 probably doesn't refer to the destruction of the temple in 70; but even so, John 11:48 shouldn't be used to date all of the Gospel of John anyway. As has been shown, many alterations seem to have been made to the Gospel of John through hundreds of years of editing, so a single verse should not be used to date all of the Gospel of John. Nevertheless, none of the Synoptic Gospels seem to make a specific reference to the actual destruction of the temple in 70. They instead refer to text from the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. There is evidence that the Gospel of Luke was probably produced in the time-period of 43-54 and we have dismissed the main objection to that assertion. So we should proceed with the belief that the writing contained in the Gospel of Luke was likely produced in the time-period of 43-54.

The way that Luke and Acts appear to have been produced is strong evidence that as the popularity of Christianity grew, the demand for more information grew as well. That demand was met with supply. The demand that the author of Luke and Acts had was met with the supply of information. That information was then used to produce Luke and Acts. There appears to have been a lot of different information flying around back then. The New Testament alludes to a lot of people saying different things. The introduction in the Gospel of Luke refers to people writing different accounts about Christ. Paul's letters and some other letters refer to false teachers. So there is evidence in the New Testament that there was widespread disagreement and confusion about Christianity. Additionally, the introduction in the Gospel of Luke shows evidence that Christianity was relatively widespread by the time of the original production by describing that multiple accounts have been written. Furthermore, it appears that the author traveled extensively to find out information about Christianity. This person even seems to have traveled on a boat that was transporting Roman prisoners to be with Paul and/or to see the Christian community in Rome. So it is justified to believe that Christianity became widespread within 25 years of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, and that different sources were spreading different information. Since the Gospel of John seems to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, it is justified to believe that some of the information in the Gospel of John originally came from Mariam. Although the vast majority of the Gospel of John seems to have come from someone else, certain important parts of it seem to have come from the Testimony of Mariam. The rest of it seems to be a compilation of different testimonies, truthful or not. We will go into more detail later about whose testimonies seem to be contained within the Gospel of John and how the Gospel of John took on the form that it did. As for the Synoptic Gospels, any of them could be a compilation of different narratives that were circulating back then. The Gospel of Luke certainly appears that way.

Mark, Matthew, and Luke contain a lot of the same information. There is information that is common among all three of them, there is information that is common among Mark and Matthew that is not in Luke, there is information that is common among Mark and Luke that is not in Matthew, and there is information that is common among Matthew and Luke that is not in Mark. A common theory is that there was what has been called a "Q source" that supplied some of the information that is common in more than one Synoptic Gospel but that is not common among all three of them. Such a theory about only one other source is too simplified and general. The truth is much more complicated.

The original production of the Gospel of Luke can be dated to 43-54, which shows that a lot of the information that is contained in the Gospel of Luke was likely circulating by that time. Some of the information could have been recently produced and so may have begun circulating during that time-period. Other information was likely circulating well before then. The Gospel of Luke represents a survey of information that became available to the author. Since the author was seeking information, some of that information could have been produced at the time of this person's quest. But that information that the Gospel of Luke has in common with at least one other Gospel was probably circulating before that time-period. It seems unlikely that information that the Gospel of Luke has in common with at least one other Gospel was originally produced in the process of producing the Gospel of Luke. If that information was strong enough to appear in a separate and independently produced New Testament Gospel, then that information was probably established before the Gospel of Luke was produced. That of course is not necessarily the case. However, we are referring to a time-period that was probably about 20 years after the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. So it is justified to believe that there was plenty of information established by the time that the Gospel of Luke was produced. Again, the introduction in the Gospel of Luke refers to many different accounts about Christianity having already been produced. Given the way that the Gospel of Luke appears to have been produced (after many accounts had already been written someone traveled to obtain information and sent it back to "Theophilus"), it seems that the information that was new only came about through this particular process and would not have been so widespread that it would have been in a separate and independently produced New Testament Gospel. Additionally, as alluded to earlier in this book and as will be shown in more detail later, Luke seems to have been originally produced after Mark and Matthew, which shows that the information that Luke has in common with Mark and Matthew seems to have been already established before the original production of the Gospel of Luke. Furthermore, as also alluded to earlier in this book and as also will be shown in more detail later, there is information that is common among Luke and John that seems to have been established before Luke was originally produced. So it seems that most of the information that the Gospel of Luke has in common with at least one other Gospel was already established by the time that the Gospel of Luke was originally produced. The information that is common among all three Synoptic Gospels, the information that is only common among Mark and Luke, and the information that is only common among Matthew and Luke was all likely circulating before the early fifties.

Mark is the most basic of all of the Synoptic Gospels. The general structure of Mark is pretty much entirely included within Matthew and Luke. So it's easy to derive the belief that Mark was produced before Matthew and Luke. Additionally, the way that the original version of Mark seems to have ended without a single description of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection shows further evidence that Mark was probably produced before Matthew and Luke. The robustness of Luke and the process in which Luke was produced suggests that it was probably the last to be produced out of all of the Synoptic Gospels. The order in which the Synoptic Gospels were produced was probably the following: Mark, Matthew, and then Luke; and more evidence will be shown later to support that conclusion.

So the probable scenario is that sometime in the time-period of 43-54, the author of Luke and Acts traveled to Jerusalem and obtained information there from at least one source who wanted Peter exalted; Mark, Matthew, and some version of John were already in circulation by then and maybe well before then; and during the forties, the fifties, and/or the sixties, the author of Luke and Acts traveled with Paul, including during Paul's transportation to Rome as a prisoner, which was likely in the late fifties or the early sixties.

We should also relate the emphasis on Peter and Jerusalem in Luke and Acts 1-15 to the account in Galatians that describes Paul as not having seen any other “apostles” in Jerusalem besides Peter and James son of Mother Mariam when Paul went there three years after his conversion. It has been reported in Galatians that Peter was one of only two “apostles” who Paul saw when he went to Jerusalem three years after his conversion, and both Peter and Jerusalem are given particular attention in Luke and Acts 1-15. We should also relate the emphasis on Peter and Jerusalem in Luke and Acts 1-15 to the accounts of the council at Jerusalem in Acts and Galatians. In Acts, Peter and James son of Mother Mariam are specifically mentioned. In Galatians, Paul refers to Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John as “pillars”. As previously stated, the council at Jerusalem likely occurred in the time-period of 43-54. Also, Paul describes the council at Jerusalem as having happened 16-19 years after his conversion. Since the council at Jerusalem probably occurred by 54 and was probably 16-19 years after Paul’s conversion, the latest year of the likely time-period for when Paul’s conversion happened is 39 counting backwards 16 years inclusively from 54. If Paul’s conversion was in the time-period of 28-39, then Paul’s trip to Jerusalem three years after his conversion likely occurred in the time-period of 30-41. Previously, we examined how Paul’s description of “after three years” in Galatians 1:18 could refer to three or four years. Using three years, we came to a lower limit of 16 years for the time-period spanning from Paul’s conversion to the council at Jerusalem. If four years is used instead, then the lower limit would be 17 years (counting backwards inclusively from 54), in which case 38 would be the latest year of the likely time-period for when Paul’s conversion happened; but then four years instead of three years would be counted starting with 38 to still arrive at 41 for the latest year of the likely time-period in which Paul’s first trip to Jerusalem after his conversion occurred. So Paul’s conversion appears to have occurred in the time-period of 28-39 and his first trip to Jerusalem after his conversion appears to have occurred in the time-period of 30-41, at which time the only “apostles” Paul saw in Jerusalem were Peter and James son of Mother Mariam. In conclusion, it appears that during the late twenties, the thirties, and/or the early forties, there weren’t many Christians in Jerusalem.

Both Peter and James son of Mother Mariam seem to have been in Jerusalem three years after Paul’s conversion, likely in the thirties; and seem to have also been there for the council at Jerusalem, likely in the mid-forties, the late forties, or the early fifties. Furthermore, James son of Mother Mariam is mentioned in Acts as having been in Jerusalem shortly before Paul was arrested there, which was probably in the late fifties. The description in Galatians of Peter and James son of Mother Mariam having been the only “apostles” who Paul saw in Jerusalem three years after Paul’s conversion is enough to believe that Peter and James son of Mother Mariam were based in Jerusalem. If Paul had knowledge that “apostles” were in Jerusalem, then Jerusalem seems to have been the home base for someone; and Peter and James son of Mother Mariam are the only ones who are mentioned as having been seen by Paul when he went there three years after his conversion. So that is enough to believe that Peter and James son of Mother Mariam made Jerusalem their home. In addition to that, there are the accounts of the council at Jerusalem and the description in Acts of James son of Mother Mariam having been in Jerusalem shortly before Paul’s arrest. So there seems to have been multiple sightings of Peter and James son of Mother Mariam in Jerusalem over about a thirty-year period, and specifically in a way that suggests that Jerusalem was their home during that time-period. Even if they traveled, Jerusalem was probably where they were based a lot of the time and was apparently where they made their homes. Meanwhile, the author of Luke and Acts seems to have obtained information from a source in Jerusalem who wanted Peter

exalted, and more specifically, seems to have done so during a time-period in which Peter's home was in Jerusalem.

It seems that Peter and James son of Mother Mariam were based in Jerusalem during the thirties, the forties, and the fifties. Additionally, there is evidence that shows that the author of Luke and Acts appears to have traveled to Jerusalem in the early fifties or earlier and obtained information there from at least one source who wanted Peter exalted. If Peter and James son of Mother Mariam were based in Jerusalem, and the author of Luke and Acts traveled to Jerusalem and obtained information there from a source who wanted Peter exalted, then that source was probably Peter and/or James son of Mother Mariam.

The description in 1 Corinthians of who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection can provide further insight.

1 Corinthians 15:3-8

*For what I received I passed on to you as of first importance: that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures, and that he appeared to Peter, and then to the Twelve. After that, he appeared to more than five hundred of the brothers at the same time, most of whom are still living, though some have fallen asleep. Then he appeared to James, then to all the apostles, and last of all he appeared to me also, as to one abnormally born.*

This account of who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection is different than every account given in the Gospels. First off, Peter is listed as the first person who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection, which contradicts three of the Gospels. Furthermore, the one Gospel that isn't in contradiction with that is still contradicted by 1 Corinthians because Luke describes Cleopas and an unnamed person as also seeing Christ after the Resurrection and 1 Corinthians doesn't make any mention of that. Therefore, this account in 1 Corinthians contradicts all four Gospels. The letter then goes on to describe that Christ appeared after the Resurrection to more than 500 people, which isn't described in any of the Gospels. It would be incredibly strange for none of the Gospels to include the mentioning of Christ having appeared after the Resurrection to more than 500 people if that were true. There is also the mentioning of James son of Mother Mariam as having been someone who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection, which is also not in any of the Gospels.

The placement of Peter's name at the beginning of the list, which contradicts three of the Gospels, shows that this account is probably fraudulent. The description of Christ having appeared after the Resurrection to more than 500 people, which is not described in any of the four Gospels, is further evidence that this account appears to be fraudulent and it also shows that there is more going on with this account than just the exaltation of Peter. It's possible that Paul was dishonest, that someone was dishonest to Paul, or that someone altered a copy of the letter later on. It would seem strange for Paul to have been dishonest about who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection. On the other hand, it's easy to see the motivation for someone to have been dishonest to Paul or someone to have altered a copy of the letter later on.

The description of James son of Mother Mariam having been one of the people who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection, which is also not described in any of the four Gospels, indicates that there is a good possibility that this information came from James son of Mother Mariam. There are four points that should be looked at when assessing whether James son of Mother Mariam was dishonest to Paul about



who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection or was involved in altering a later copy of the letter. The first is that the description of Christ having appeared to James son of Mother Mariam after the Resurrection is not in any of the four Gospels. The second is that Peter and James son of Mother Mariam seem to have been at odds with Paul. The third is that James son of Mother Mariam seems to have tried to be a leader above Paul and Peter when he sent people to Antioch, which was a breaking point that led to Paul's outburst towards Peter as described in Galatians. The fourth is that James son of Mother Mariam is included in this list while Mother Mariam and James' siblings are not. Why would Christ appear to James son of Mother Mariam but not to Mother Mariam or any of James' siblings? Given all four of those points, it is justified to believe that there is a good possibility that James son of Mother Mariam was dishonest to Paul or was involved in altering a later copy of the letter. Regardless of what exactly happened, and even if James son of Mother Mariam wasn't involved, obviously something is amiss. In relation to information about the Resurrection, Peter is exalted in a way not seen in three of the Gospels and James son of Mother Mariam is exalted in a way not seen in any of the Gospels, and there are more than 500 unnamed witnesses of the Resurrection that are not mentioned at all in any of the Gospels. Obviously, something is wrong.

John was also named by Paul as a "pillar" along with Peter and James son of Mother Mariam. So it seems that in the forties and the fifties, James son of Mother Mariam, Peter, and John were considered to be the leaders in Jerusalem. Many Christians view John as one of the most important "apostles". So it may not be surprising that he is given a decent amount of attention in the Synoptic Gospels and in Acts 1-15. What is striking about the attention that he receives in Luke and in Acts 1-15 is that he is sometimes named before his brother, James son of Zebedee. Neither Mark nor Matthew ever does that. Additionally, chapter 12 of Acts describes the execution of James son of Zebedee, which by itself shows that he had already been executed by the time that Luke and Acts 1-15 were produced, which would also help explain why he was not listed in Galatians as one of the "pillars". So James son of Zebedee was apparently executed before the author of Luke and Acts traveled to Jerusalem, and then Luke and Acts were produced with John sometimes listed before his brother. That is important because John is presented as the younger brother and is sometimes described as if he is less important than his older brother. Then all of a sudden, John skips his brother in the order and is listed right after Peter. With that happening only in Luke and Acts, with the evidence that shows that Luke and Acts were written by the same author, and with the evidence that shows that the author of Luke and Acts traveled to Jerusalem and obtained information from a source there, it seems that the author of Luke and Acts obtained certain information directly from John.

The increased level of exaltation that John receives in Luke and Acts is much more than just being named before his brother. The verses below show John being grouped with Peter without any mention of James son of Zebedee.

Acts 3:1

*One day Peter and John were going up to the temple at the time of prayer – at three in the afternoon.*

Acts 3:4

*Peter looked straight at him, as did John.*

Acts 3:11

*While the beggar held on to Peter and John, all the people were astonished and came running to them in the place called Solomon's Colonnade.*

Acts 4:3

*They seized Peter and John, and because it was evening they put them in jail until the next day.*

Acts 4:7

*They had Peter and John brought before them and began to question them: "By what power or what name did you do this?"*

Acts 4:13

*When they saw the courage of Peter and John and realized that they were unschooled, ordinary men, they were astonished and they took note that these men had been with Jesus.*

Acts 4:19

*But Peter and John replied, "Judge for yourselves whether it is right in God's sight to obey you rather than God."*

Acts 4:23

*On their release, Peter and John went back to their own people and reported all that the chief priests and elders had said to them.*

Acts 8:14

*When the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had accepted the word of God, they sent Peter and John to them.*

Acts 8:17

*Then Peter and John placed their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit.*

Acts 8:25

*When they had testified and proclaimed the word of the Lord, Peter and John returned to Jerusalem, preaching the gospel in many Samaritan villages.*

These verses clearly show John as the number two right behind Peter. Even though James son of Zebedee appears to have been executed before Acts was produced, Acts up until chapter 12 describes a time-period that was before he was executed, so James son of Zebedee should be presented right along with Peter. However, if the author of Luke and Acts received information directly from John or at least in the presence of John, then that would explain why John is so aggressively pushed as the number two right behind Peter while James son of Zebedee seems to have been forgotten in most of these narratives. In fact, James son of Zebedee is only named twice in Acts, once towards the beginning in the first list that names all of "the eleven" and in the verse about his death. For James son of Zebedee to only be named twice and for the only other instance outside of the original list that names "the eleven" to be in the verse that describes his death while his younger brother is consistently named alone with Peter clearly shows that John was being exalted far beyond his older brother.

The verse about the death of James son of Zebedee further confirms the shift of importance to John by describing James in relation to his younger brother John.

Acts 12:2

*He had James, the brother of John, put to death with the sword.*

Not only is this the only instance in which James son of Zebedee is named in Acts outside the original list that names “the eleven”, but he is also described in relation to his younger brother.

The default position would be that of the Gospels in which James son of Zebedee is number two and John is number three. For there to be a pivot from that shows that there were certain dynamics that changed the view of the author, which shows evidence that John presented himself as number two to Peter. Additionally, as we will go into more detail on later, John never really seemed to get into the top two. After the death of James son of Zebedee, it seems that James son of Mother Mariam rose into a top position. That is evidenced by the following verse in Paul’s letter to the Galatians.

Galatians 2:9

*James, Peter, and John, those reputed to be pillars, gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship when they recognized the grace given to me. They agreed that we should go to the gentiles, and they to the Jews.*

This verse not only puts James son of Mother Mariam above John, it also put him above Peter. Both before as well as after the death of James son of Zebedee, it appears that John consistently played the third wheel. However, Luke and Acts would have us believe differently. The contrast between Luke and Acts compared to all of the other evidence shows that John appears to have exalted himself to the author of Luke and Acts or at least he was in the presence of the author as they gathered information so that the author at least observed John acting like he was number two.

The Gospel of Luke was probably produced in the time-period of 43-54; Acts was probably produced in the forties, the fifties, and/or the sixties; and both Luke and Acts give a lot of attention to Peter, John, and Jerusalem. Paul named Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John as “pillars”; and Paul probably did that in the forties or the fifties, about the same time-period in which the Gospel of Luke was likely produced. The author of Luke and Acts seems to have obtained information from at least one source in Jerusalem who wanted Peter exalted, and Peter and James son of Mother Mariam were apparently based in Jerusalem. So it seems that during a time-frame in which Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John were considered by Paul to have been “pillars”, and Peter and James son of Mother Mariam lived in Jerusalem, the author of Luke and Acts traveled to Jerusalem and obtained information there from a source who wanted Peter exalted. If the author of Luke and Acts traveled to Jerusalem to obtain information about Christianity, then they would have likely obtained information from people who lived in Jerusalem who were thought of as “pillars”. That shows that the source in Jerusalem who seems to have provided information to the author of Luke and Acts was probably Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and/or John. If Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John were “pillars”, then they likely would have directed information that ended up in certain Gospels. Since Peter is given such special attention, Peter likely directed that information. Since Jerusalem is given such special attention, that information was probably directed by “pillars” who lived in Jerusalem; and Peter and James son of Mother Mariam seem to have been considered to have been “pillars” by Paul and seem to have lived in Jerusalem. Also, John is sometimes listed before his brother James son of Zebedee in Luke and Acts 1-15, which seems to have been influenced by John. For those reasons, it is justified to believe that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and/or John spread fraudulent information that ended up in the Gospel of Luke and in Acts 1-15. Additionally, it seems that James son of Mother Mariam may have been involved in giving Paul false information or in altering a later copy of 1 Corinthians.

It appears that the Gospel of Luke was produced in the time-period of 43-54 and was largely influenced by Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and/or John. We should now look closer into Mark and Matthew to show how Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and/or John appear to have influenced those Gospels.

### **Authorship and Dating of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew**

First and foremost, the Synoptic Gospels all share a lot of common information among them, which shows that a lot of the information contained in those Gospels likely came from the same original source. That alone can show that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and/or John were probably involved with the productions of Mark and Matthew. If the author of Luke obtained information from Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and/or John in Jerusalem sometime by the early fifties, and a lot of the information in Luke matches information in Mark and Matthew, then it is likely that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and/or John were involved with the productions of Mark and Matthew. Additionally, all of the Synoptic Gospels exalt Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John. The specific attention that they get suggests that they were involved with putting that information out there. Furthermore, “the Twelve” and their supposed appointment are given incredible importance. The stories presented in the Synoptic Gospels placing importance on a group of supposed disciples in the way that they do is evidence of probable fraud, particularly because those supposed disciples apparently abandoned Christ and the most faithful disciple doesn’t get much attention. Specifically about Peter, Capernaum seems to get a lot of attention in the Synoptic Gospels and it seems that Peter was from Capernaum. For those reasons, it is justified to believe that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and/or John were involved with the productions of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew. Additionally, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and/or John seem to have provided information to the author of Luke and Acts, and James son of Zebedee had apparently been executed by then.

The attention that “the Twelve” receive in Mark and Matthew is very key to understanding their productions. Even if someone wanted to argue that someone other than Peter exalted Peter, the exaltation of “the Twelve”, and more specifically James son of Zebedee and John, shows that at least some of “the Twelve” were probably actually involved with the productions of Mark and Matthew. This is a group of men who apparently abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified. It’s not likely that anyone would have exalted this group of people unless they were already exalted or unless they were one of those people.

Since Peter had been exalted as the supposed top disciple, the bishops were able to align themselves with that and gain power from it by being a bishop of the “orthodox church”. However, who would have first exalted Peter? Probably Peter himself. There doesn’t seem to be much reason for anyone other than Peter to exalt Peter unless Peter had already been exalted. The only person who would have likely been the first person to exalt Peter is Peter. The supposed “appointing” of “the Twelve” is a ridiculous kind of narrative that appears to be the product of human beings exalting themselves. That is also evidence that “the Twelve” are actually real people. The odd focus on the brothers James son of Zebedee and John also only makes much sense if they were involved in exalting themselves. Even if someone wanted to dismiss the strangeness of the exaltation of Peter and “the Twelve”, still, why would James son of Zebedee and John be placed specifically as numbers 2 and 3 on the list right behind Peter? There are numerous narratives that only list Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John as disciples. There are narratives that describe those

three as the only ones to have been with Christ in certain narratives. Christianity is about Christ and these men abandoned Christ. Meanwhile, Mariam was the most faithful disciple of Christ. So the exaltation of all of these men is a very clear indication that some of them appear to have been involved with the productions of Mark and Matthew.

With the belief that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John were at the helm of spreading false narratives through the Synoptic Gospels, we can better understand why those Gospels took the shapes that they did.

Mark 3:14-15

*He appointed twelve designating them apostles that they might be with him and that he might send them out to preach and to have authority to drive out demons.*

Mark 6:7

*Calling the Twelve to him, he sent them out two by two and gave them authority over evil spirits.*

Mark 4:11

*He told them, "The secret of the kingdom of God has been given to you. But to those on the outside everything is said in parables."*

Mark 4:34

*He did not say anything to them without using a parable. But when he was alone with his own disciples, he explained everything.*

Mark 3:12

*But he gave them strict orders not to tell who he was.*

Mark 5:43

*He gave strict orders not to let anyone know about this, and told them to give her something to eat.*

Mark 7:36

*Jesus commanded them not to tell anyone. But the more he did so the more they kept talking about it.*

Mark 8:29-30

*"But what about you?" he asked. "Who do you say I am?"*

*Peter answered, "You are the Christ."*

*Jesus warned them not to tell anyone about him.*

Mark 9:9

*As they were coming down the mountain, Jesus gave them orders not to tell anyone what they had seen until the Son of Man had risen from the dead. They kept the matter to themselves, discussing what "rising from the dead" meant.*

Mark 5:37

*He did not let anyone follow him except Peter, James, and John the brother of James.*

With these verses, we can see that Mark claims that "the Twelve" were given authority against demons and evil, describes Christ as secretive, describes Christ as having wanted initially only "the Twelve" to

understand Christianity, and implies that Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John are the three most important people. Additionally, Mark 2:1 describes Capernaum as the location of Christ's home.

Mark 2:1

*A few days later, when Jesus again entered Capernaum, the people heard that he had come home.*

The specific mention of Capernaum as the location of the home of Christ is a very clear indication that Peter appears to have been involved in the production of the Gospel of Mark. It's so ridiculous that Capernaum is described as the location of the home of Christ and that realistically wouldn't have happened except that Peter appears to have been from Capernaum. Furthermore, the Gospel of Mark in verse 1:39 describes Christ as traveling specifically within Galilee and there is no description of leaving Galilee between verse 1:39 and 2:1, so it doesn't seem to be the case that the narrative is portraying Galilee in general as the location of Christ's home as if Christ was previously outside of Galilee. Instead, it seems to be the case that Mark 2:1 is specifically portraying Capernaum as the location of Christ's home, which is a very clear indication that Peter appears to have been involved in the production of the Gospel of Mark.

Another point that shows that Peter and some others of "the Twelve" were involved with the production of the Gospel of Mark is that Mark 9:1 tries to influence people to believe that Christ would return during the first generation after the Resurrection.

Mark 9:1

*And he said to them, "I tell you the truth, some who are standing here will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God come with power."*

Mark 9:1 shows that at least some of "the Twelve" had apparently not passed away yet by the time of the production of that verse. Otherwise, Mark 9:1 would have been produced after all of "the Twelve" had passed away but would be claiming that the supposed physical kingdom as described in supposed prophecies would come before all of the "the Twelve" pass away, which would inherently display Mark 9:1 as incorrect. Mark 9:1 would only make sense if it was produced while at least some of "the Twelve" had not passed away yet, and therefore Mark 9:1 serves as further evidence that at least some of "the Twelve" seem to have been involved in the production of the Gospel of Mark.

We can something similar when we turn to the Gospel of Matthew.

Matthew 9:30

*And their sight was restored. Jesus warned them sternly, "See that no one knows about this."*

Matthew 12:15-16

*Aware of this, Jesus withdrew from that place. Many followed him, and he healed all their sick, warning them not to tell who he was.*

Matthew 13:10-11

*The disciples came to him and asked, "Why do you speak to the people in parables?"*

*He replied, "The knowledge of the secrets of the kingdom of heaven has been given to you, but not to them."*

Matthew 10:5-6

*These twelve Jesus sent out with the following instructions: "Do not go among the Gentiles or enter any town of the Samaritans. Go rather to the lost sheep of Israel."*

Matthew 15:24

*He answered, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel."*

Matthew 14:28-29

*"Lord, if it's you", Peter replied, "tell me to come to you on the water."*

*"Come", he said.*

*Then Peter got down out of the boat, walked on the water, and came toward Jesus.*

Matthew 16:15-20

*"But what about you?" he asked. "Who do you say I am?"*

*Simon Peter answered, "You are the Christ, the son of the living God."*

*Jesus replied, "Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah, for this was not revealed to you by man, but by my Father in heaven. And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven. Then he warned his disciples not to tell anyone that he was the Christ."*

Matthew 4:13

*Leaving Nazareth, he went and lived in Capernaum, which was by the lake in the area of Zebulun and Naphtali.*

Matthew has a lot of similarities with Mark in that it describes Christ as secretive and as having wanted initially only "the Twelve" to understand Christianity. Matthew goes a step further and describes the spreading of Christianity as only for the "lost sheep of Israel". Matthew also goes further when describing Christ as having walked on water and Peter's supposed proclamation of his faith. Mark doesn't specifically refer to Peter when describing Christ as having walked on water and Mark doesn't include any description of Christ's Church being built on a rock that represents Peter. Peter is even more exalted in Matthew than he is in Mark. Matthew even describes Peter as walking on water and as the rock that Christ's Church will be built on. All of that despite Peter supposedly having disowned Christ three times and having apparently abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified. It seems obvious that Peter was largely involved with the production of Matthew as well. Additionally, Matthew 4:13 actually describes Christ as having left Nazareth to live in Capernaum. That verse doesn't just say that Christ went to Capernaum, but that Christ "lived" in Capernaum. So Matthew 4:13, like the Gospel of Mark, claims that Christ's home was located in Capernaum; but the Gospel of Matthew seems to go even further than the Gospel of Mark. There are some other verses that support that assertion.

Matthew 8:23

*Then he got into the boat and his disciples followed him.*

Matthew 8:28

*When he arrived at the other side in the region of the Gadarenes, two-demon possessed men coming from the tombs met him. They were so violent that no one could pass that way.*

Matthew 9:1

*Jesus stepped into a boat, crossed over and came to his own town.*

These verses describe Christ as having gotten into a boat, as having crossed over to the region of the Gadarenes, and then having crossed back over to Christ's "own town". The Gadarenes seems to have been on the east side of the Sea of Galilee. So when Christ is described as crossing back over to Christ's "own town", Christ's supposed "own town" would likely have been a town that was on the west coast of the Sea of Galilee, which Capernaum was and Nazareth was not. So Matthew 4:13 describes Christ as leaving Nazareth to "live" in Capernaum and Matthew 9:1 seems to describe a town on the west coast of the Sea of Galilee, which Capernaum was and Nazareth was not.

Capernaum gets a lot of attention in Mark, which serves as evidence that Peter was involved with the production of Mark. If Matthew gave the same level of attention to Capernaum as Mark did, then one could argue that Matthew simply copied from Mark. But Matthew not only continues the tradition that Christ made Capernaum home, but does so in two different narratives, which shows that Matthew does not just simply copy from Mark. Matthew gives an elevated level of attention to Capernaum by describing Christ as leaving Nazareth to "live" in Capernaum and seemingly describing Capernaum as Christ's "own town". Furthermore, as has already been shown, Matthew gives an elevated level of attention to Peter as well, even more than Mark. The increased level of attention on Peter and Peter's apparent hometown shows evidence that Peter was also involved in the production of the Gospel of Matthew.

Another point that shows that some of "the Twelve" were involved with the production of the Gospel of Matthew is similar to the point made about Mark 9:1: that Matthew 10:23 tries to influence people to believe that Christ would return during the first generation after the Resurrection.

Matthew 10:23

*"When you are persecuted in one place, flee to another. I tell you the truth, you will not finish going through the cities of Israel before the Son of Man comes."*

Similar to Mark 9:1, Matthew 10:23 shows that at least some of "the Twelve" had apparently not passed away yet by the time of the production of that verse. Otherwise, Matthew 10:23 would have been produced after all of "the Twelve" had passed away but would be claiming that Christ would return before all of the "the Twelve" pass away, which would inherently display Matthew 10:23 as incorrect. Matthew 10:23 would only make sense if it was produced while at least some of "the Twelve" had not passed away yet, and therefore Matthew 10:23 serves as further evidence that at least some of "the Twelve" seem to have been involved in the production of the Gospel of Matthew.

More evidence can be found when we analyze the narratives about the empty tomb.

Mark 16:3-4

*And they asked each other, "Who will roll the stone away from the entrance of the tomb?"  
But when they looked up, they saw that the stone, which was very large, had already been rolled away.*

Matthew 27:65-66

*"Take a guard", Pilate answered. "Go, make the tomb as secure as you know how." So they went and made the tomb secure by putting a seal on the stone and posting the guard."*



Matthew 28:2

*There was a violent earthquake, for an angel of the Lord came down from heaven and, going to the tomb, rolled back the stone and sat on it.*

Matthew 28:11-15

*While the women were on their way, some of the guards went into the city and reported to the chief priests everything that had happened. When the chief priests had met with the elders and devised a plan, they gave the soldiers a large sum of money, telling them, "You are to say, 'His disciples came during the night and stole him away while we were asleep.' If this report gets to the governor, we will satisfy him and keep you out of trouble." So the soldiers took the money and did as they were instructed. And this story has been widely circulated among the Jews to this very day.*

Mark 16:3-4 refer to the description of Mariam, Mother Mariam, and Salome going to the tomb, describe them wondering about who was going to roll the stone away so that they could go inside the tomb to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ, and then describe the stone as having already been rolled away when they are described as having gotten to the tomb. Matthew 27:65-68 describe Pontius Pilate as having ordered that a guard secure the tomb and describe the tomb being secured and a seal being put on the stone. Matthew 28:2 refers to an "angel of the Lord" having rolled back the stone. Matthew 28:11-15 refer to a rumor that was supposedly circulating about "the disciples" taking away the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ.

In Mark, the women are described as wondering about who was going to roll away the stone as if they wouldn't be able to get in if there wasn't any help. Mark then goes on to describe the stone as having been already rolled away. Matthew goes further by describing Pontius Pilate as being involved and ordering that a guard secure the tomb. Matthew goes further again by describing a narrative about a rumor spreading about "the disciples" taking away the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ. In both Mark and Matthew, there is obviously importance being placed on the stone and the security of the tomb. Why would the stone and the security of the tomb be so important on the day of the Resurrection?

The focus on the supposed security of the tomb is evidence that these details were important to the people who influenced them. However, belief in Christianity is dependent on belief in the Resurrection, not the security of the tomb. It's one thing to simply describe the empty tomb, but it's another to obsess over the supposed security of the tomb.

The fact that such a stone is even mentioned is evidence that the Gospels contain fraudulent attempts to show supposed security of the tomb. In reality, there's a good possibility, and it's maybe probable, that there wasn't such a large stone readily available. There is a good possibility that the tomb was covered by many smaller stones rather than one large stone. So the mention of one stone is likely evidence not only of fraud but also of an attempt to show a false presence of security of the tomb.

Evidence has been shown that the Resurrection occurred on the day after the Crucifixion, that Mariam expected the Resurrection, and that "the eleven" didn't see Christ after the Resurrection. The evidence that shows that Mariam expected the Resurrection shows evidence that she wouldn't have been troubled by an empty tomb on the day of the Resurrection like the Gospels describe. So just from that, the descriptions in all four Gospels relating to her supposedly being troubled by the supposed discovery of the empty tomb all appear to be fraudulent. That shows evidence that the concern about the empty tomb

did not originate from her, and since belief in Christianity is dependent on the Resurrection rather than the empty tomb, nobody else would have realistically cared so much about the supposed security of the empty tomb except Peter and others who were around shortly after Mariam first proclaimed the Resurrection. Since Peter and the rest of “the eleven” apparently didn’t see Christ after the Resurrection but learned about the Resurrection from Mariam and some of them doubted her Testimony, it appears that the empty tomb became a main focus of their experience after Mariam proclaimed the Resurrection. They didn’t see Christ, so it seems that they were left with what Mariam told them and the empty tomb. That would then realistically lead them to use their observation of the empty tomb to help validate for them what Mariam told them. If their belief hinged so much on the tomb being empty, that would explain why there is such an obsession about the security of the tomb. It’s not that they required security of the tomb to believe in the Resurrection, especially since the tomb obviously probably wasn’t secured as described in the Gospels. It’s that they inherently were focused on the empty tomb in the midst of doubting Mariam’s Testimony and that naturally affected what they thought was important as they formed narratives about the empty tomb. So the sequence is the Crucifixion, the burial, the Resurrection, Mariam’s proclamation of the Resurrection, and the discovery of the empty tomb by Peter and/or other people in the midst of them doubting Mariam’s Testimony. Therefore, the focus on the supposed security of the tomb is evidence that these narratives were formed by Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and/or John.

Similar to our analysis of the Gospel of Luke, now that we’ve found out some information about who was involved with the productions of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, the next question becomes about when these productions took place.

Mark 6:17-18

*For Herod himself had given orders to have John arrested and he had him bound and put in prison. He did this because of Herodias, his brother Philip’s wife, whom he had married. For John had been saying to Herod, “It is not lawful for you to have your brother’s wife”.*

Matthew 14:3-4

*Now Herod had arrested John and bound him and put him in prison because of Herodias, his brother Philip’s wife, for John had been saying to him: “It is not lawful for you to have her.”*

Mark 6:17-18 and Matthew 14:3-4 reference King Herod’s relationship with his brother Philip’s wife Herodias. Those verses also describe the reason for the execution of John the Baptist to be that he spoke out against King Herod for his marriage to Herodias. It was shown in Part 3 that all of the narratives about John the Baptist are fraudulent. This was shown in a number a number of different ways including the stated reason for why John the Baptist was executed. Josephus explained that Herod Antipas had John the Baptist executed because he feared in uprising because the people seem willing to do anything that John the Baptist said. Also, realistically, the state of a king’s marriage wouldn’t likely be an important topic for John the Baptist to preach to his followers about anyways. In conclusion, the main point is that the narrative that describes the supposed reason for the execution of John the Baptist appears to be fraudulent. Along with that, nothing about what happened with Herod Antipas’ previous marriage, his marriage after that, or the battle that ensued after his divorce should be used to date any of the Gospels.

Instead, these narratives show a different avenue for dating the productions of Mark and Matthew. Herod Antipas and Herodias were reportedly exiled to Gaul in 39, and Mark and Matthew probably wouldn’t be

so open about condemning King Herod until after he was exiled. It would obviously have been an incredible risk to condemn King Herod's marriage in a Gospel unless King Herod was no longer in power. Additionally, we can see that Josephus describes King Herod as having John the Baptist executed because King Herod feared an uprising, which shows that speaking out against King Herod could have led to death. That is additional evidence that Mark and Matthew probably wouldn't so openly condemn King Herod unless King Herod had already been exiled. So we can conclude that the earliest year that the Mark and Matthew were probably produced in is 39.

We can turn to Acts for additional evidence.

Acts 12:1-2

*It was about this time that King Herod arrested some who belonged to the church, intending to persecute them. He had James, the brother of John, put to death with the sword.*

Acts 12:1-2 describe the execution of James son of Zebedee. "King Herod" in those verses seems to refer to Herod Agrippa while "King Herod" who is referred to in the Gospels who was married to Herodias seems to have been Herod Antipas. Herod Antipas was a ruler of Galilee who seems to have reigned from 4 BCE to 39 CE before having been exiled to Gaul in 39. Herod Agrippa was a ruler of Judea who seems to have reigned from 41 CE to 44 CE.

Acts 12:1-2 seem to refer to Herod Agrippa, and therefore, the execution of James son of Zebedee likely occurred in the time-period of 41-44. Furthermore, since Acts refers to the execution of James son of Zebedee, Luke and Acts appear to have been produced after the execution of James son of Zebedee. Additionally, as previously mentioned, Luke and Acts seem to exalt John over his brother James son of Zebedee while Mark and Matthew seem to exalt James son of Zebedee over John. That change is reflective of the assertion that Luke and Acts were produced after James son of Zebedee was executed. We can see the difference in the following verses.

Mark 3:17, Matthew 4:21, and Luke 5:10 relate to the calling of the first disciples

Mark 3:17

*When he had gone a little farther, he saw James son of Zebedee and his brother John in a boat, preparing their nets.*

Matthew 4:21

*Going on from there, he saw two other brothers, James son of Zebedee and his brother John.*

Luke 5:10

*And so were James and John, the sons of Zebedee, Simon's partners.*

Mark 3:16-19, Matthew 10:2-4, and Luke 6:13-16 relate to the naming of "the Twelve".

Mark 3:16-19

*These are the twelve he appointed: Simon (to whom he gave the name Peter); James son of Zebedee and his brother John (to them he gave the name Boanerges, which means Sons of Thunder); Andrew, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James son of Alphaeus, Thaddaeus, Simon the Zealot, and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him.*

Matthew 10:2-4

*These are the names of the twelve apostles: first, Simon (who is called Peter) and his brother Andrew; James son of Zebedee, and his brother John; Philip and Bartholomew; Thomas and Matthew the tax collector; James son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus; Simon the Zealot and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him.*

Luke 6:13-16

*When morning came, he called his disciples to him and chose twelve of them, whom he also designated apostles: Simon (whom he named Peter), his brother Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James son of Alphaeus, Simon who was called the Zealot, Judas son of James, and Judas Iscariot, who became a traitor.*

Mark 9:2, Matthew 17:1, and Luke 9:28 relate to the “transfiguration” narratives.

Mark 9:2

*After six days Jesus took Peter, James, and John with him and led them up a high mountain, where they were all alone. There he was transfigured before them.*

Matthew 17:1

*After six days Jesus took with him Peter, James, and John the brother of James, and led them up a high mountain by themselves.*

Luke 9:28

*About eight days after Jesus said this, he took Peter, John, and James with him and went up onto a mountain to pray.*

As previously shown, Acts 12:1-2 relate to the death of James son of Zebedee.

Acts 12:1-2

*It was about this time that King Herod arrested some who belonged to the church, intending to persecute them. He had James, the brother of John, put to death with the sword.*

In the verses about the calling of the first disciples, Mark and Matthew both specifically identify James and John as “James son of Zebedee and his brother John” while Luke says “James and John, the sons of Zebedee, Simon’s partners”. In Mark and Matthew, James is first identified as a son of Zebedee and then John is simply related to James as his brother, which is reflective of James being the older brother and potentially also of John living in James’ shadow. In Luke, James and John are presented together as equals. Similarly, in the verses about the naming of “the Twelve”, Mark and Matthew both say “James son of Zebedee and his brother John” while Luke just says their names “James” and “John” by themselves. These two examples show a pattern that reflects a promoted status of John in Luke in relation to Mark and Matthew, which is indicative of the assertion that Luke and Acts were produced after the death of James son of Zebedee.

In the verses about the calling of the first disciples and in the verses about the naming of “the Twelve”, we can see that John is being identified simply as “John” in Luke rather than specifically in relation to his brother as is the case in Mark and Matthew. Moving further, there are also times when John is specifically presented ahead of his brother. In the verses about the so-called “transfiguration”, Mark and Matthew as

usual name James before John; but in Luke, John is named before his brother. It's one thing to simply not relate John to his brother and simply refer to him as "John", but it's a major departure from societal norms to name a younger brother before his older brother. The naming of John before his brother is a clear indication that James son of Zebedee had probably already been executed. Furthermore, in Acts 12:1-2, James son of Zebedee is specifically identified as "the brother of John", which is a total reversal of the situation in Mark and Matthew. First, John is placed after his brother in every list in Mark and Matthew that includes both of their names, and John is often specifically identified in relation to his brother in Mark and Matthew. Then, in Luke, John is sometimes named before his older brother; and then in Acts, James is specifically identified in relation to his younger brother John.

Simply the fact that the execution of James son of Zebedee is described in Acts shows that Luke and Acts appear to have been produced after the death of James. Furthermore, the promoted status of John in Luke and Acts furthers that conclusion.

The Gospel of Luke is obviously different than the Gospels of Mark and Matthew. However, there is also quite a difference between Mark and Matthew. The Gospel of Matthew is a more refined Gospel than Mark and includes more narratives than Mark, but that's not all. More specifically, there is a difference in relation to the status of the sons of Zebedee. We've seen a difference in relation to the status of the sons of Zebedee going from Mark and Matthew to Luke, and that difference specifically relates to John's status in relation to James. Going from Mark to Matthew, it's more of a difference in how the brothers are being presented together rather than just how they are presented compared to each other. Before, we were analyzing the promotion of John's status in Luke and Acts. Going from Mark to Matthew, there seems to be a demotion being applied to both brothers overall.

An analysis of the following verses from Mark and Luke and the absence of this kind of information from Matthew gives a good starting outline of the overall movement of the statuses of the sons of Zebedee going from Mark to Matthew to Luke.

Mark 5:37

*He did not let anyone follow him except Peter, James, and John the brother of James.*

Luke 8:51

*When he arrived at the house of Jairus, he did not let anyone go in with him except Peter, John, and James, and the child's father and mother.*

The first point is that Mark names James before John, and Luke names John before James. That is representative of what has already been established, that Luke was produced after the death of James son of Zebedee and presents a promoted status of John. The fact that this information isn't included in Matthew is a part of a pattern that represents a demotion of both of the sons of Zebedee. While there are other narratives that only name Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John, Mark 5:37 and Luke 8:51 are very particular because they specifically say that no one else was allowed to follow Christ except them and, in the case of Luke, "the child's father and mother". Luke includes different narratives compiled from the other three Gospels so it's not as telling that this kind of information is in Luke than it is that this kind of information is missing from Matthew.

Moving on to further evidence, there are two major differences going from Mark to Matthew in relation to the naming of “the Twelve”. One is that Mark names the sons of Zebedee right after Peter and names Andrew fourth while Matthew names Andrew right after Peter and leaves the sons of Zebedee third and fourth on the list. The second is that Mark introduces the sons of Zebedee as “the brothers of thunder” but that information is specifically excluded from Matthew.

Mark 3:16-19

*These are the twelve he appointed: Simon (to whom he gave the name Peter); James son of Zebedee and his brother John (to them he gave the name Boanerges, which means Sons of Thunder); Andrew, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James son of Alphaeus, Thaddaeus, Simon the Zealot, and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him.*

Matthew 10:2-4

*These are the names of the twelve apostles: first, Simon (who is called Peter) and his brother Andrew; James son of Zebedee, and his brother John; Philip and Bartholomew; Thomas and Matthew the tax collector; James son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus; Simon the Zealot and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him.*

Even though it might seem to make sense to place Andrew right after Peter because he is Peter’s brother, it’s still very telling that Andrew originally was not placed above the sons of Zebedee in Mark and then was later placed above them in Matthew. Had Andrew been named second in Mark, this wouldn’t be a big deal. For example, both Mark and Matthew name Andrew before the sons of Zebedee in the calling of the first disciples narratives, but that’s apparently mainly because they are described as fishing and presumably each pair of brothers fished together. Nevertheless, it wouldn’t be a big deal if both Mark and Matthew named Andrew second in the list of “the Twelve”. However, the initial instinct was to place the sons of Zebedee specifically before Andrew in that list. The calling of the first disciples narratives describe these four men as fishing and they are divided into two groups of two brothers, which leaves Andrew being described before the sons of Zebedee; but when it came to simply listing the names of “the Twelve”, the sons of Zebedee were naturally placed before Andrew presumably because they were a part of a special group of three as is shown by several narratives throughout all of the Synoptic Gospels. Certain narratives place Andrew with these three men to make a special group of four, but there are plenty of narratives that exclude Andrew and only name the special group of three of Peter, James of Zebedee, and John. So when the Gospel of Mark was produced, the order of importance seems to have been Peter, James son of Zebedee, John, and Andrew, and in that specific order. Then in Matthew, Andrew is placed before the sons of Zebedee. As we will go into further detail on, that doesn’t seem to be because Andrew became more important but more because the sons of Zebedee were being demoted. The second point about the sons of Zebedee being named “the brothers of thunder” in Mark but not in Matthew furthers that conclusion.

Another way to see that the sons of Zebedee were demoted going from Mark to Matthew is through the fact that Matthew names the sons of Zebedee as “the sons of Zebedee” in narratives that are in Mark in which Mark names them by their individual names.

Mark 10:35

*Then James and John, the sons of Zebedee, came to him. “Teacher”, they said, “we want you to do for us whatever we ask.”*

Matthew 20:20

*Then the mother of Zebedee's sons came to Jesus with her sons and, kneeling down, asked a favor of him.*

Mark 10:41

*When the ten heard about this, they became indignant with James and John.*

Matthew 20:24

*When the ten heard about this, they were indignant with the two brothers.*

Mark 14:33

*He took Peter, James, and John along with him, and he began to be deeply distressed and troubled.*

Matthew 26:37

*He took Peter and the two sons of Zebedee along with him, and he began to be sorrowful and troubled.*

These examples add to the evidence already shown that the sons of Zebedee are specifically prioritized in the Gospel of Mark but then there is less of a personal presentation of them in the Gospel of Matthew. While referring to them as “the sons of Zebedee” rather than “James” and “John” might seem like an insignificant difference, it’s important to recognize the emphasis placed on them in the Gospel of Mark that gets significantly lessened in the Gospel of Matthew. While it’s a subtle change to go from “James” and “John” to “the sons of Zebedee”, that change nevertheless reflects the evolution of the dynamics of the group that produced these Gospels. It has already been shown that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John seem to have been involved in producing Gospel narratives. So even a subtle change is significant especially given the emphasis on the sons of Zebedee in the Gospel of Mark.

Additionally, in the so-called “transfiguration” narratives, Matthew identifies John in relation to his brother while Mark simply identifies him as “John”. There is a change in Mark from consistently identifying John in relation to his brother to consistently identifying him simply as “John”. That change occurs in the “transfiguration” narrative, which is the very next time John is named after the narrative about the death of John the Baptist. Therefore, the identification of John in relation to his brother in Mark seems to be specifically related to John sharing the same name as John the Baptist and so John seems to be specifically related to his brother to differentiate from John the Baptist. The “transfiguration” narrative in Mark is the first instance of the name of John after the narrative about the death of John the Baptist, and in that instance he is not related to his brother but simply identified as “John”. In the “transfiguration” narrative in Matthew, John is related to his brother. In Mark, there is a particular focus on the sons of Zebedee and John is presented as one of the three most important people. The only reason Mark relates John to his brother is apparently because of John the Baptist. After the narrative about the death of John the Baptist, Mark refers to John as just “John” as if the reader should know who that is. For Matthew to not do the same is to show less of a personal relationship with John. Furthermore, Mark introduces John the Baptist as “John” and Matthew introduces him as “John the Baptist”, which shows that John the Baptist was given priority in Mark but not in Matthew in terms of the name “John”. Even with that priority being given to John the Baptist, John son of Zebedee is still simply identified as “John” after the narrative about the death of John the Baptist. In Matthew, that priority is not given to John the Baptist and John son of Zebedee still isn’t ever simply referred to as “John”. Just as Matthew referring to these brothers as “the sons of Zebedee” when Mark refers to them by their names shows less of a personal

relationship with these brothers, relating John to his older brother when Mark doesn't show less of a personal relationship specifically with John. Mark assumes the reader would know who John is while Matthew adds clarification that Mark doesn't. Given that John seems to have been involved in the productions of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, it's strange to go from assuming that John would be known to the reader to adding clarification as if there would be any confusion.

So far, there have been five ways presented that show that the sons of Zebedee were demoted going from Mark to Matthew. One is that Mark includes a narrative that describes the sons of Zebedee along with Peter as being a part of the only group of people who were allowed to follow Christ in a certain scenario and that narrative is not in Matthew. Second, Mark names the sons of Zebedee as "the brothers of thunder" and Matthew doesn't. Third, Mark names the sons of Zebedee as second and third in a list of "the Twelve" and Matthew names them third and fourth. A fourth way is that Matthew names the sons of Zebedee as "the sons of Zebedee" in narratives that are in Mark in which Mark names them by their individual names. Fifth, John is identified in relation to his brother in the so-called "transfiguration" narrative in Matthew but Mark simply identifies him as "John".

We have seen the status of the sons of Zebedee change going from Mark to Matthew to Luke. In Mark, the sons of Zebedee are specifically numbers two and three in a special group of three that includes Peter as number one. In Matthew, they are still a part of a group of three that includes Peter but there is some overall demotion assigned to them in relation to Mark. In Luke, John is sometimes presented with a higher status than his older brother James, which reflects the assertion that James son of Zebedee had been executed before the production of Luke.

The shift that takes place with Luke is easy to see given the execution of James son of Zebedee. The more mysterious change is the demotion of the sons of Zebedee going from Mark to Matthew. Similar to the shift from Mark and Matthew to Luke, the shift going from Mark to Matthew is likely due to the evolution of the dynamics and politics within the group, and more specifically, the status of each individual within the group. In Matthew, the sons of Zebedee are still a part of a special group of three that includes Peter, so it doesn't seem to be the case that Andrew's status rose above theirs. Andrew's placement as second in the list of "the Twelve" seems to be more about the demotion of the sons of Zebedee than any promotion of Andrew. Andrew's place as second in that list seems to have only been considered because he is Peter's brother, and so his place as second does not necessarily indicate that his overall status was number two in the group. The statuses of the sons of Zebedee still seem to have been higher than that of Andrew's given that they are the only ones presented with Peter in certain narratives. So Andrew's place as second seems to have been considered appropriate simply because he is Peter's brother, and the decision to move him to second in that list, which specifically changed the list coming from Mark, seems to be more connected to demoting the statuses of the sons of Zebedee rather than promoting the status of Andrew. In other words, Andrew's placement in that list speaks more to him being a brother of Peter rather than an indication of his specific status relative to the others. Meanwhile, the placement of the sons of Zebedee as third and fourth instead of second and third seems to be a part of a pattern of demoting their statuses.

The statuses of the sons of Zebedee could really only have been demoted if the status of someone else rose up because they would otherwise still be numbers two and three right behind Peter. Additionally, nobody else in "the eleven", including Andrew, seems to have been elevated to a higher status than them.



So it must have been someone outside of “the eleven” whose status was elevated above the sons of Zebedee.

As mentioned before, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John all seem to have been involved in producing Gospel narratives. We’ve been focusing on Peter and the sons of Zebedee. The one person of those four who is outside of “the eleven” is James son of Mother Mariam. According to Paul’s letter to the Galatians, he was not only one of the three “pillars” of the church, but he was also listed first even before Peter.

Galatians 2:9

*James, Peter, and John those reputed to be pillars, gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship when they recognized the grace given to me. They agreed that we should go to the Gentiles, and they to the Jews.*

By the time Paul wrote this letter to the Galatians, James son of Mother Mariam was thought of as number one from Paul’s perspective. As we go back to the Gospel of Mark, we can see James son of Mother Mariam at the other end of the spectrum.

Mark 15:40

*Some women were watching from a distance. Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome.*

The reference to a “Mary” who is the mother of sons named James and Joses is almost certainly a reference to Mother Mariam. Both Mark and Matthew describe Mother Mariam as having sons named James and Joses; and if “Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses” isn’t Mother Mariam, then Mother Mariam wouldn’t be specifically portrayed as having been present during the Crucifixion. So Mother Mariam is almost certainly being referred to in Mark 15:40, which means that “James the younger” is almost certainly James son of Mother Mariam. The reference to him as “James the younger” shows that he is being identified in relation to James son of Zebedee. Since James son of Mother Mariam is identified in relation to James son of Zebedee and James son of Zebedee is not identified in relation to James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee seems to have clearly had a higher status than James son of Mother Mariam within the group. A verse from Acts can further that conclusion.

Acts 1:13-14

*When they arrived, they went upstairs to the room where they were staying. Those present were Peter, John, James, and Andrew; Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew; James son of Alphaeus and Simon the Zealot, and Judas son of James. They all joined together constantly in prayer, along with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brothers.*

While Acts was likely written during a time-period when James son of Mother Mariam was considered one of the top three leaders along with Peter and John, the content of chapter 1 is about a time-period that was relatively shortly after the Resurrection when James son of Mother Mariam seems to have been far removed from being considered a top leader. Initially, “the eleven” are presented as the top twelve, so at the onset of the situation they found themselves in after finding out about the Resurrection, James son of Mother Mariam would likely have been considered outside of the top eleven because “the eleven” were considered the top eleven by this group. Acts 1:13-14 reflect the idea that “the eleven” were the top

eleven even when considering several important people outside of “the eleven”. Acts 1:13-14 list eleven men, and then “the women and Mary the mother of Jesus”, and then lastly “his brothers”. In this list, James son of Mother Mariam isn’t even named and he is included in the last part of the list. That is reflective of the situation that “the eleven” found themselves in after finding out about the Resurrection. At that point, James son of Mother Mariam seems to have been far removed from being considered a top leader.

Another verse from Acts can provide insight into the rise of James son of Mother Mariam. Chapter 12 of Acts describes the execution of James son of Zebedee and Acts refers to James son of Zebedee in relation to his younger brother John. Meanwhile, later in chapter 12 after the description of the execution of James son of Zebedee, James son of Mother Mariam is identified simply as “James”.

Acts 12:2

*He had James, the brother of John, put to death with the sword.*

Acts 12:17

*Peter motioned with his hand for them to be quiet and described how the Lord had brought him out of prison. “Tell James and the brothers about this”, he said, and then he left for another place.*

Acts 12:2 describes James son of Zebedee as “James, the brother of John” while Acts 12:17 describes James son of Mother Mariam as simply “James” and presents him as the only person to be specifically named out of a group of fellow Christians who Peter is described as referring to. Those descriptions, especially appearing within the same chapter, show that James son of Mother Mariam had risen into a top leadership position. The comparison between how James son of Zebedee and James son of Mother Mariam are referred to shows the high status of James son of Mother Mariam because he is the one who is given priority with the name “James”. Furthermore, he appears to have been in a top leadership position because Peter is described as referring to a group of fellow Christians and only James son of Mother Mariam was specifically named, which places him above all of the other fellow Christians who were close to Peter. The indication in chapter 12 of the high status of James son of Mother Mariam is far removed from the description in chapter 1 that presents him with a low status and is far removed from the description of him in the Gospel of Mark that relates him to James son of Zebedee by calling him “James the younger”.

So it would make sense that James son of Mother Mariam wasn’t initially considered a top leader because he wasn’t even a part of “the eleven”, and Acts 1:13-14 seem to accurately reflect that when describing a scenario that was relatively soon after the Resurrection. Additionally, the Gospel of Mark seems to also reflect his lower status. Sometime after that, he was presented first in a list of “pillars”, even above Peter. He went from being less important than eleven other men to being a top leader, at least in the top three, and potentially the number one leader even above Peter. So obviously there was significant change in the status of James son of Mother Mariam.

The death of James son of Zebedee and the change in the status of James son of Mother Mariam help to explain why there was such a shift going from the Gospel of Mark to the Gospel of Matthew. Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John were clearly the top three and they continued to be all of the way up to the production of the Gospel of Mark, which as shown seems to have been produced no earlier than 39. Even if Mark was produced as early as 39, still apparently over a decade would have passed since the

Resurrection. After over a decade, James son of Zebedee and John were considered numbers two and three right behind Peter. Meanwhile, according to Paul's letter to the Galatians, the only other person to crack the top three was James son of Mother Mariam. So it seems that Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John were the main shot callers for over a decade, and then later on, James son of Zebedee was executed and James son of Mother Mariam rose to the top.

The rise of James son of Mother Mariam can be directly connected to the death of James son of Zebedee in two different ways. The first is simply that it was unlikely for the group of Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John to be broken up by anyone. There was obviously a strong bond that brought those three men together for them to have exalted themselves together as a group of three in the way that they did. Furthermore, not even Peter's brother Andrew could crack the top three. James son of Zebedee and John are brothers and both brothers made it into the top three with Peter while Peter's brother was left out. So Peter closely bonded with a pair of brothers while leaving his own brother out. From that perspective, it seems as if Peter cared more about the brotherhood of the sons of Zebedee than he did about his own brotherhood with Andrew. The sons of Zebedee seem to have been closer than Peter and Andrew were, and Peter seems to have been closer to the sons of Zebedee than to his own brother. So this group of three was so strong together that even Peter's brother couldn't interfere. Just from that, it seems unlikely that this group of three would have come undone before the death of James son of Zebedee. Therefore, the rise of James son of Mother Mariam into the top three and the demotion of the sons of Zebedee in the Gospel of Matthew likely both occurred after the death of James son of Zebedee.

Second, Galatians describes Paul only seeing Peter and James son of Mother Mariam in Jerusalem when he went there three years after his conversion. This trip seems to have occurred in the time-period of 30-41. While it's certainly possible that this trip occurred after the production of the Gospel of Mark, most of the time-period of 30-41 occurs before 39, which is the lower limit of the likely time-period in which the Gospel of Mark was produced. The only overlap between the likely time-period in which Paul's trip to Jerusalem three years after his conversion took place and the likely time-period in which the Gospel of Mark was produced is 39-41. So even if Paul's trip took place after the production of the Gospel of Mark, it would have likely been around the same time as the production of the Gospel of Mark give or take a year or two, in which case James son of Zebedee would still appear to have been number two right behind Peter during Paul's trip because that's how he's presented in the Gospel of Mark. So generally speaking, it's safe to believe that James son of Zebedee was still considered number two right behind Peter when Paul went to Jerusalem three years after his conversion. This is significant because it shows that James son of Mother Mariam was alone with Peter in Jerusalem during a time-period when James son of Zebedee was still likely the number two person behind Peter, and therefore, simply being close to and alone with Peter in Jerusalem does not seem to have interfered with the status of the group of three of Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John. That shows further evidence that this group of three was only affected when James son of Zebedee was executed.

So the rise of James son of Mother Mariam into the top three as well as the production of the Gospel of Matthew seem to have both occurred after the death of James son of Zebedee. Since James son of Zebedee seems to have been executed in the time-period of 41-44, the lower limit of the likely time-period in which the Gospel of Matthew was produced is 41. There isn't any clear upper limit other than that for the Gospel of Luke. Since the Gospel of Matthew appears to have been produced before the Gospel of Luke and the Gospel of Luke seems to have been produced by 54, we can at least say that the

Gospel of Matthew seems to have been produced by 54. Therefore, the likely time-period in which the Gospel of Matthew was produced is 41-54.

Additionally, although Matthew and Luke both appear to have been produced after the death of James son of Zebedee, they are still very different from each other in relation to how they each present the sons of Zebedee because they were produced in two different ways. The Gospel of Matthew appears to have been produced through a process that was controlled by Peter and James son of Mother Mariam while the Gospel of Luke appears to have been produced by an outsider who traveled to Jerusalem from somewhere else and interviewed Peter and John. The exaltation of John in Luke and Acts seems to have come about because an outsider was more interested in John than James son of Mother Mariam since John is one of “the Twelve” and that gave an opportunity for John to be exalted to an outsider. Meanwhile, James son of Mother Mariam was able to control much of the process of the production of the Gospel of Matthew, which appears to have resulted in less attention given to the sons of Zebedee. So it’s the two different processes of the productions of Matthew and Luke that gave rise to the differences in how each portrays the sons of Zebedee. Nevertheless, in terms of dating, it appears that both Matthew and Luke were produced after the death of James son of Zebedee.

Since the demotion of the sons of Zebedee in the Gospel of Matthew seems to have occurred after the death of James son of Zebedee and since that demotion comes about going from Mark to Matthew, the Gospel of Mark seems to have been produced before the death of James son of Zebedee. Since James son of Zebedee seems to have been executed in the time-period of 41-44, the upper limit of the likely time-period in which the Gospel of Mark was produced is 44. It was previously shown that the Gospel of Mark was probably produced no earlier than 39. Therefore, the Gospel of Mark was likely produced in the time-period of 39-44.

So the Gospel of Mark appears to have been produced in the time-period of 39-44 before the death of James son of Zebedee. After that, James son of Zebedee was apparently executed in the time-period of 41-44. After that, the Gospel of Matthew was apparently produced in the time-period of 41-54. After that, the Gospel of Luke was apparently produced in the time-period of 43-54.

Now that we can see the change in the dynamics of the group in Jerusalem, we can better understand some of the narratives in the Gospel of Matthew. The Gospel of Mark doesn’t contain any narrative about a supposed physical “birth” of the physical appearance of Christ. Those narratives are only in Matthew and Luke. Mark starts out talking about John the Baptist and that leads right into narratives about Christ’s Ministry. The whole storyline about a supposed physical “birth” doesn’t come around until the production of the Gospel of Matthew, which James son of Mother Mariam seems to have been a major influence on. The narratives about a supposed physical “birth” are largely focused on Mother Mariam, the mother of James son of Mother Mariam. He was a major influence on the Gospel of Matthew and that is when narratives that focus on his mother first appear. That shows clear evidence that he was probably the main influence in forming those narratives.

Another narrative that is unique to the Gospel of Matthew is the one that describes Peter’s name. This narrative describes Peter as “the rock” that Christ’s Church is built on. That obviously puts Peter on a pedestal unlike any narrative throughout all four Gospels.

The Gospel of Matthew clearly shows that Peter was the star of the show and James son of Mother Mariam was pulling strings behind the scene. By the time Paul's letter to the Galatians was written, James son of Mother Mariam was named first ahead of Peter, and then Peter and John were named as numbers two and three. This is how the group that was based in Jerusalem had evolved after the death of James son of Zebedee.

As previously mentioned, the first of the Synoptic Gospels was probably Mark. Mark sets the tone for Matthew and Luke. Mark describes Christ as secretive and only wanting to reveal certain information to Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John. Parables are a big theme in Mark. Those parables go along with the secretiveness shown. As mentioned earlier, Mark specifically describes Christ as expressing that parables are used so that information is only understood by certain people. That secretiveness shows two different aspects. One is the exaltation of Peter, James son of Zebedee, John, and the rest of "the Twelve". The other aspect is that Christ's teachings are described as having been confusing to some people. That is further evidenced by verses that specifically call out that confusion. Meanwhile, all four Gospels portray "the Twelve" as having abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified. "The Twelve" seem to have been a group of men who thought that Christ was secretive, didn't understand many of Christ's teachings, were confused a lot of the time, and abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified. That is what sets the foundation for the secretiveness and confusion represented in the Synoptic Gospels. That secretiveness and confusion seems to have come from the minds of Peter and others close to him, and was first put into the Gospel of Mark before later being duplicated in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

Another important aspect of the Synoptic Gospels is the references to the supposed coming kingdom and the supposed return of Christ. These concepts seem to show the misunderstanding and confusion of Peter and the rest of "the Twelve". Those men seem to have not understood that Christianity is about recognizing the presence of Christ within us. They seem to have still expected a physical kingdom or at least seem to have still spread information about that expectation. Additionally, as shown in Part 4, the concept of the return of Christ in physical form shows a misunderstanding about Daniel 9:25-27 needing to be fulfilled in a certain way. The Gospel of John focuses on the presence of Christ within us while the Synoptic Gospels focus on the physical world. The concepts of the coming kingdom and the return of Christ in physical form are indicative of the Synoptic Gospels' focus on the physical world.

Matthew seems to have been produced sometime after the original production of Mark. This time, the Gospel takes on a fuller shape. With Mark as a starting point for the general structure of the Gospel, Matthew then adds a whole beginning that is not included in Mark and goes on to discuss Jewish customs and Jewish law in a way that Mark doesn't. Matthew includes narratives about Mother Mariam as a young woman before ever having been pregnant and includes narratives about the supposed physical "birth" of the physical appearance of Christ, all of which were shown in Part 3 and Part 4 to appear to be fraudulent. Matthew also includes even further exaltation of Peter. Luke was probably then produced sometime after Matthew and that production resulted in the description of Mariam, the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century, as having been possessed by demons.

We will now proceed with looking further into how information about Paul appears to have been concealed.

Acts 9:23-26

*After many days had gone by, the Jews conspired to kill him, but Saul learned of their plan. Day and night they kept close watch on the city gates in order to kill him. But his followers took him by night and lowered him in a basket through an opening in the wall. When he came to Jerusalem, he tried to join the disciples, but they were all afraid of him, not believing that he really was a disciple.*

Acts 9:28-30

*So Saul stayed with them and moved about freely in Jerusalem, speaking boldly in the name of the Lord. He talked and debated with the Grecian Jews, but they tried to kill him. When the brothers learned of this, they took him down to Caesarea and sent him off to Tarsus.*

Galatians 1:15-18

*But when God, who set me apart from birth and called me by his grace, was pleased to reveal his Son in me so that I might preach him among the Gentiles, I did not consult any man, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to see those who were apostles before I was, but I went immediately into Arabia and later returned to Damascus. Then after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to get acquainted with Peter and stayed with him fifteen days. I saw none of the other apostles – only James, the Lord’s brother. I assure you before God that what I am writing you is no lie. Later I went to Syria and Cilicia.*

Acts describes Paul going to Jerusalem after spending a few days in Damascus after his conversion. Galatians describes Paul going to Arabia after his conversion, then returning to Damascus, and not going to Jerusalem until three years after his conversion. Acts describes Paul speaking boldly and debating in Jerusalem, and that there was a plot to kill Paul. Galatians describes Paul staying with Peter for fifteen days and makes no mention of any bold speaking, any debating, or any plot to kill Paul. Acts describes Paul being sent to Tarsus by “the brothers”. Galatians describes Paul traveling to Syria and Cilicia, and mentions Paul only seeing Peter and James son of Mother Mariam, and no other “apostles”, when he was in Jerusalem.

Galatians also says “I assure you before God that what I am writing you is no lie”. As previously explained, that statement shows that Paul felt the need to strongly assert that he was being honest because he was aware that Peter and others had been dishonest about him since the author of Luke and Acts had obtained that dishonest information and then traveled with Paul. So Paul appears to have learned about information that the author of Luke and Acts had about him wrote his letter to the Galatians with the specific intention of setting the record straight about what really happened.

The description in Acts about the council at Jerusalem could have been communicated to the author of Acts to show order in the early church in Jerusalem. But what motivation would there have been for someone to falsify information about Paul’s travels? Could it have been to try to show that everyone should go to the leadership in Jerusalem before acting on their own? Maybe, but why would Acts describe Paul as having been sent to Tarsus? Someone may have wanted to show order in the early church in

Jerusalem and so they may have lied about Paul going to Jerusalem shortly after his conversion. But why would someone lie about Paul being sent to Tarsus? There are more verses that we should look at.

Acts 11:20-22

*Some of them, however, men from Cyprus and Cyrene, went to Antioch and began to speak to Greeks also, telling them the good news about the Lord Jesus. The Lord's hand was with them, and a great number of people believed and turned to the Lord. News of this reached the ears of the church at Jerusalem, and they sent Barnabas to Antioch.*

Acts 11:25

*Then Barnabas went to Tarsus to look for Saul, and when he found him, he brought him to Antioch. So for a whole year Barnabas and Saul met with the church and taught great numbers of people. The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.*

So we are led to believe by Acts that Paul was sent to Tarsus during the time-period covered in chapter 9 and stayed there until the time-period covered in chapter 11 when Barnabas supposedly brought him to Antioch. Acts seems to describe Paul as adhering to orders given to him by other people, but Galatians describes Paul as traveling around according to his own ambition. Furthermore, Acts describes the development of the church in Antioch while Paul was in Tarsus and describes Paul being brought to Antioch by Barnabas, but Galatians describes Paul as having gone to Syria (where Antioch is located) and makes no mention of Barnabas having gone with him. Galatians 2:1 specifically describes Barnabas traveling with Paul, but the description of Paul going to Syria excludes any description of Barnabas traveling with Paul. Acts gives credit to unnamed "men from Cyprus and Cyrene" who went to Antioch and began to speak to Greeks. We've already seen the instances in which Mariam appears to go unnamed in the Gospels. It's likely the case that the description of unnamed men from Cyprus and Cyrene having gone to Antioch was used to avoid describing Paul as having developed a Christian community in Antioch.

So again, why would someone lie about Paul being sent to Tarsus? That kind of fraud could have affected power and influence during the first century. In fact, Peter is known as the first bishop of Antioch. Whether Peter or Paul was known as the first bishop of Antioch could have affected control over that Christian community. So there was certainly motivation to record history a certain way in relation to who went to Antioch and in what order. Paul has been respected and considered to have been a giant of early Christianity, and that began during the first century; so future generations were unlikely to have concealed information about Paul in the ways that we have just examined. Therefore, the concealment of information about Paul in those ways shows further evidence that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John were involved in spreading fraudulent information.

### **Luke's Responses to John**

It has been mentioned several times in this book that the Synoptic Gospels contain responses to the Gospel of John. We saw one example of that in Part 4 regarding the narratives about what miraculous sign will be given. The Gospel of Luke has some very particular responses to the Gospel of John, even

more so than Mark and Matthew. Some striking examples revolve around Lazarus and his sisters Martha and Mariam of Bethany.

John 11:1-2

*Now a man named Lazarus was sick. He was from Bethany, the village of Mary and her sister Martha. This Mary, whose brother Lazarus now lay sick, was the same one who poured perfume on the Lord and wiped his feet with her hair.*

John 11:3-5

*So the sisters sent word to Jesus, "Lord, the one you love is sick." When he heard this, Jesus said, "This sickness will not end in death. No, it is for God's glory so that God's Son may be glorified through it." Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus.*

John 11:18-21

*Bethany was less than two miles from Jerusalem, and many Jews had come to Martha and Mary to comfort them in the loss of their brother. When Martha heard that Jesus was coming, she went out to meet him, but Mary stayed at home. "Lord", Martha said to Jesus, "if you had been here, my brother would not have died. But I know that even now God will give you whatever you ask."*

John 11:27-29

*"Yes, Lord", she told him, "I believe that you are the Christ, the Son of God, who was to come into the world."*

*And after she had said this, she went back and called her sister Mary aside. "The Teacher is here", she said, "and is asking for you." When Mary heard this, she got up quickly and went to him.*

John 11:32-34

*When Mary reached the place where Jesus was and saw him, she fell at his feet and said, "Lord, if you had been here, my brother would not have died." When Jesus saw her weeping, and the Jews who had come along with her also weeping, he was deeply moved in spirit and troubled.*

John 11:43-44

*When he had said this, Jesus called in a loud voice, "Lazarus, come out!" The dead man came out, his hands and feet wrapped with strips of linen, and a cloth around his face. Jesus said to them, "Take off the grave clothes and let him go."*

John 12:1-3

*Six days before Passover, Jesus arrived at Bethany, where Lazarus lived, whom Jesus had raised from the dead. Here a dinner was given in Jesus' honor. Martha served, while Lazarus was among those reclining at the table with him. Then Mary took about a pint of pure nard, an expensive perfume; she poured it on Jesus' feet and wiped his feet with her hair. And the house was filled with fragrance of the perfume.*

Luke 10:38-41

*As Jesus and his disciples were on their way, he came to a village where a woman named Martha opened her home to him. She had a sister called Mary, who sat at the Lord's feet listening to what he said. But Martha was distracted by all the preparations that had to be made. She came to him and asked, "Lord, don't you care that my sister has left me to do the work by myself? Tell her to help me!"*



*“Martha, Martha”, the Lord answered, “you are worried and upset about many things, but only one thing is needed. Mary has chosen what is better, and it will not be taken away from her.”*

Luke 16:19-22

*“There was a rich man who was dressed in purple and fine linen and lived in luxury every day. At his gate was laid a beggar named Lazarus, covered with sores and longing to eat what fell from the rich man’s table. Even the dogs came and licked his sores. The time came when the beggar died and the angles carried him to Abraham’s side. The rich man also died and was buried.”*

Luke 16:31

*“He asked to him, ‘If they do not listen to Moses and the Prophets, they will not be convinced even if someone rises from the dead.’ ”*

The Gospel of John describes Lazarus as someone who Christ loves and describes Lazarus as having been raised from the dead by Christ. The Gospel of Luke describes Lazarus as a beggar covered with sores that even dogs came and licked. That’s obviously quite a contrast. One could argue that maybe there are two different people named Lazarus. There are three points in response to that. The first is that Lazarus is only mentioned in the Gospels of Luke and John. Neither Mark nor Matthew make any mention of Lazarus, which shows that there is some reason that Lazarus appears in Luke but not in Mark or Matthew. The Synoptic Gospels exclude a major narrative from the Gospel of John about Lazarus having been raised from the dead. There is a reason for that. That reason is also probably why Lazarus does not appear in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew. But then, all of a sudden, we have a mention of Lazarus in the Gospel of Luke. That shows that the reference to Lazarus in the Gospel of Luke is probably because of the reference in the Gospel of John, and therefore Luke and John probably refer to the same Lazarus. The second is that the reference to Lazarus in the Gospel of Luke refers to Lazarus’ death, similar to the Gospel of John. The third is that Luke 16:31 includes a reference to someone rising from the dead, which shows a probable response to the description in the Gospel of John of Lazarus having been raised from the dead. Given those three points, the reference to Lazarus in the Gospel of Luke is probably a reference to the same Lazarus who is referenced in the Gospel of John.

Lazarus’ sisters Martha and Mariam of Bethany are also portrayed differently in Luke than they are in John. The Gospel of John describes Martha and Mariam of Bethany as people who Christ loves and people who knew Christ well enough to send word to Christ about their brother. Martha is described as having claimed her belief that Christ is the Messiah. The Gospel of John also describes Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany as having had dinner with Christ. Additionally, John 12:1-3 describes a day that is not included in chapter 11. So Christ is described as having spent time with Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany on multiple days. However, Luke 10:38-41 concentrates on a narrative that shows division between Martha and Mariam of Bethany. These verses also describe Martha as “distracted”, “worried”, and “upset”. These verses don’t even describe Martha and Mariam of Bethany as the sisters of Lazarus. They are never connected to Lazarus in the Gospel of Luke. Lazarus is described as some beggar and the sisters are never described as being his sisters. Martha is described as opening up her home and cooking, and then is described as getting upset with her sister.

John and Luke are the only two Gospels that mention Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany; but Luke does so in such a different way than John does. So there are two different points that need to be recognized. The first is that Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany are only mentioned in John and

Luke. The second is that Luke differs so much from John and does so in particularly unflattering ways, which shows what appears to be intent to discredit and insult Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany.

Why are the accounts in Luke about Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany so much different than the ones in John? Well, we've already seen attempts to conceal information about Mariam, Mother Mariam, and Paul. Certainly people who are described as being loved by Christ would be a threat to anyone trying to claim a special leadership status. Furthermore, a person who was raised from the dead by Christ would pose an additional threat. It could also be the case that Lazarus having been raised from the dead in four days caused a problem for the Synoptic Gospels about describing the Resurrection as having occurred in four days in relation to the Crucifixion.

There is strong evidence that Peter has been fraudulently exalted and that information has been concealed about Mariam, Mother Mariam, Paul, Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany. Furthermore, some of the information that appears to have been concealed is from the Gospel of John, which seems to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam.

The portrayal of Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany in the Gospel of Luke is very key in beginning to understand what the Gospel of Luke seems to contain. The Gospel of Luke seems to contain responses to questions asked about information obtained elsewhere. There was information circulating both orally and in written form. The introduction of the Gospel of Luke indicates that the recipient of the Gospel of Luke had already learned about Christ and that many accounts about Christ had already been written. So the author seems to have had some previous knowledge about Christianity before seeking more information in the process of producing the Gospel of Luke. It is then very likely that questions were asked about particular matters, which would then prompt certain responses from whoever was being asked questions. Questions having been asked by the author is probably one of the reasons why certain narratives appear in the Gospel of Luke that don't appear in the other two Synoptic Gospels, Mark and Matthew. That would mean that the Gospel of John appears to have been circulating before the Gospel of Luke was produced and appears to have been circulating wherever the author of Luke and Acts was from.

As we take a closer look at how Martha and Mariam of Bethany are described in Luke, we can see that Martha serves while Mariam of Bethany is at the feet of Christ. Such a description is very similar to chapter 12 of the Gospel of John, in which Martha is described as having served and Mariam of Bethany is described as having anointed Christ and having wiped Christ's feet with her hair in Bethany. So it seems that not only are Martha and Mariam of Bethany portrayed in unflattering ways in the Gospel of Luke, but they are also described as acting out some of what is described in chapter 12 of the Gospel of John. So such a narrative in the Gospel of Luke appears to also be a response to chapter 12 of the Gospel of John. It was previously asserted in Part 2 that the person named "Mary" in chapter 12 of the Gospel of John is probably really Mariam, not Mariam of Bethany. Since the Gospel of Luke seems to respond to chapter 12 of the Gospel of John in a way that includes Mariam of Bethany instead of Mariam, the responses to the Gospel of John in the Gospel of Luke appear to be responses to what was an already fraudulently altered version of the Gospel of John.

Another example in the Gospel of Luke related to Lazarus is the narrative about the raising of a widow's son. There are what appear to be three different instances described in the Gospels of Christ raising someone from the dead: Lazarus, a young girl, and a widow's son. However, the account about Lazarus only appears in the Gospel of John and the account about a widow's son only appears in the Gospel of

Luke. Meanwhile, all of the Synoptic Gospels, including Luke, contain a narrative about a young girl rising from the dead. So Luke contains two different narratives that describe Christ raising someone from the dead, neither of which are about Lazarus being raised from the dead. The Gospel of Luke includes a narrative about someone named Lazarus, just like the Gospel of John does; and includes a narrative that isn't in any other Gospel about someone who isn't a young girl rising from the dead, just like the Gospel of John does. However, the Gospel of Luke disconnects Lazarus from that narrative about someone who isn't a young girl rising from the dead. Instead, Lazarus is described as some beggar while someone else who isn't a young girl is described as rising from the dead. So the narrative in the Gospel of John about Lazarus rising from the dead seems to have influenced Lazarus's presence in the Gospel of Luke as well as the narrative about a widow's son rising from the dead. The account about a widow's son even includes a specific reference to crying as does the account about Lazarus in the Gospel of John. However, the account about a widow's son describes Christ as having said "Don't cry" while the Gospel of John describes Christ as having wept. So the inclusion of an additional narrative in Luke that describes Christ raising someone from the dead in addition to the one about a young girl rising from the dead is an indication that the narrative about a widow's son is apparently fraudulent and is probably a response to the narrative in the Gospel of John about the raising of Lazarus. Additionally, since the account about a young girl rising from the dead only appears in the Synoptic Gospels, that account is probably fraudulent. That account appears to describe someone as rising from the dead while avoiding describing that person as Lazarus.

As previously mentioned in Part 2, there is an unnamed disciple in John 20:2-9 who doesn't appear in a similar narrative in Luke 24:12. This provides our next example.

John 20:2-9

*So she came running to Simon Peter and the other disciple, the one Jesus loved, and said, "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb, and we don't know where they have put him!" So Peter and the other disciple started for the tomb. Both were running, but the other disciple outran Peter and reached the tomb first. He bent over and looked in at the strips of linen lying there but did not go in. Then Simon Peter, who was behind him, arrived and went into the tomb. He saw the strips of linen lying there, as well as the burial cloth that had been around Jesus' head. The cloth was folded up by itself, separate from the linen. Finally the other disciple, who had reached the tomb first, also went inside. He saw and believed. They still did not understand from Scripture that Jesus had to rise from the dead.*

Luke 24:12

*Peter, however, got up and ran to the tomb. Bending over, he saw the strips of linen lying by themselves, and he went away, wondering to himself what had happened.*

As will be shown in more detail later here in Part 5, John 20:2-9 appears to have been included in the fraudulent version of the Gospel of John that the author of Luke and Acts had seen; and that provides a sufficient explanation as to why this kind of narrative appears in Luke but not in Mark or Matthew. Additionally, what shows that it is likely a response to information contained in John is how the unnamed disciple is not included in Luke. The same general narrative is included in both John and Luke, but Luke shows a different version of the narrative that excludes the strange and mysterious presence of an unnamed disciple.

Another example of what seems to be a response to information contained in the Gospel of John is about Andrew and the supposed calling of the first disciples.

John 1:40-42

*Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, was one of the two who heard what John had said and who had followed Jesus. The first thing Andrew did was to find his brother Simon and tell him, "We have found the Messiah" (that is, the Christ). And he brought him to Jesus."*

*Jesus looked at him and said, "You are Simon son of John. You will be called Cephas" (which, when translated, is Peter).*

Luke 5:1-11

*One day as Jesus was standing by the Lake of Gennesaret, with the people crowding around him and listening to the word of God, he saw at the water's edge two boats, left there by the fishermen, who were washing their nets. He got into one of the boats, the one belonging to Simon, and asked him to put out a little from shore. Then he sat down and taught the people from the boat.*

*When he had finished speaking, he said to Simon, "Put out into deep water, and let down the nets for a catch."*

*Simon answered, "Master, we've worked hard all night and haven't caught anything. But because you say so, I will let down the nets."*

*When they had done so, they caught such a large number of fish that their nets began to break. So they began to sink.*

*When Simon Peter saw this, he fell at Jesus' knees and said, "Go away from me, Lord; I am a sinful man!" For he and all his companions were astonished at the catch of fish they had taken, and so were James and John, the sons of Zebedee, Simon's partners.*

*Then Jesus said to Simon, "Don't be afraid, from now on you will catch men." So they pulled their boats up on shore, left everything, and followed him.*

The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes Andrew as having become a disciple before Peter. Meanwhile, the Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that excludes Andrew from the first group of disciples described. Mark and Matthew both name Andrew second among a group of four that also includes Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John; but Luke takes Andrew out of the first group and limits the first group to three that only includes Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John. It seems that Luke is responding to the narrative in John that names Andrew before Peter.

We can also see a response to John in Luke in the narrative that names "the Twelve".

Luke 6:14-16

*Simon whom he named Peter, his brother Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James son of Alphaeus, Simon who was called the Zealot, Judas son of James, and Judas Iscariot, who became a traitor.*

As shown earlier here in Part 5, the Gospel of Luke is the only Gospel that names "Judas son of James" as one of "the Twelve" and is the only Synoptic Gospel that doesn't name Thaddeus as one of "the Twelve". Mark and Matthew both name Thaddeus instead of Judas son of James. So there is a shift from Mark and Matthew to Luke that takes out Thaddeus and substitutes in Judas son of James. Meanwhile, the Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes a Judas other than Judas Iscariot speaking to Christ.

John 14:22

*Then Judas (not Judas Iscariot) said, "But, Lord, why do you intend to show yourself to us and not to the world?"*

So it seems that the exclusion of Thaddeus and the inclusion of Judas son of James in the listing of "the Twelve" in the Gospel of Luke is a response to the presence of a second Judas as described in the Gospel of John.

Another example of what seems to be a response to information contained in the Gospel of John is about John the Baptist.

John 1:20

*He did not fail to confess, but confessed freely, "I am not the Christ."*

Luke 3:15

*The people were waiting expectantly and were all wondering in their hearts if John might possibly be the Christ.*

The Gospels of Luke and John are the only two Gospels that refer to the idea that John the Baptist could be the Christ. What shows that the verse in the Gospel of Luke was probably a response to information contained in the Gospel of John is how Luke presents different information but still refers to the idea that John the Baptist could be the Christ. The Gospel of John describes John the Baptist as having explicitly stated that he is not the Christ. However, it is not explained in the Gospel of John that anybody thought that John the Baptist was the Christ. Then the Gospel of Luke fills in that missing gap by referring to people thinking that John the Baptist could be the Christ, but Luke does not include the explicit statement described in the Gospel of John. That shows that the author of Luke and Acts probably asked about that explicit statement, and the likely response to such a question seems to have ended up in Luke 3:15.

We can also see a likely response to John in Luke in narratives about Samaritans.

John 4:4-9

*Now he had to go through Samaria. So he came to a town in Samaria called Sychar, near the plot of ground Jacob had given to his son Joseph. Jacob's well was there, and Jesus, tired as he was from the journey, sat down by the well. It was about the sixth hour.*

*When a Samaritan woman came to draw water, Jesus said to her, "Will you give me a drink?" (His disciples had gone into town to buy food.)*

*The Samaritan woman said to him, "You are a Jew and I am a Samaritan woman. How can you ask me for a drink?" (For Jews do not associate with Samaritans.)*

John 4:39-42

*Many of the Samaritans from that town believed in him because of the woman's testimony, "He told me everything I ever did." So when the Samaritans came to him, they urged him to stay with them, and he stayed two days. And because of his words many more became believers.*

*They said to the woman, "We no longer believe just because of what you said; now we have heard for ourselves, and we know that this man really is the Savior of the world."*

Luke 16:51-55

*As the time approached for him to be taken up to heaven, Jesus resolutely set out for Jerusalem. And he sent messengers on ahead, who went into a Samaritan village to get things ready for him; but the people there did not welcome him because he was heading for Jerusalem. When the disciples James and John saw this, they asked, "Lord, do you want us to call fire down from heaven to destroy them?" But Jesus turned and rebuked them, and they went to another village.*

John 4:4-9 describe Christ as having talked to a Samaritan woman and provide an explanation that relates to the bad relationship between Jews and Samaritans. John 4:39-42 describe Christ as having stayed with Samaritans for two days and many Samaritans as having believed that Christ is the Savior of the world. Luke, on the other hand, describes Christ as not having been welcomed in Samaria and having gone to another village. So one Gospel claims that Christ spent two days with Samaritans and that many Samaritans believed that Christ is the Savior of the world, and another Gospel claims that Christ was not welcomed by Samaritans and went to another village. There is also the consideration that Mark and Matthew don't include any reference to Samaria in that way at all. So the description in Luke of Christ having avoided Samaria seems to be a response to the narrative about Samaria in John. Additionally, the account in Luke doesn't seem to hold much important information to the average reader of the New Testament, which shows further evidence that such an account is in Luke likely because of a response to the Gospel of John. Not only that, but Acts, which was likely written by the same author as Luke, also contains some information related to Samaritans.

Acts 8:5-8

*Philip went down to a city in Samaria and proclaimed the Christ there. When the crowds heard Philip and saw the miraculous signs he did, they all paid close attention to what he said. With shrieks, evil spirits came out of many, and many paralytics and cripples were healed. So there was great joy in that city.*

Acts 8:14

*When the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had accepted the word of God, they sent Peter and John to them. When they arrived, they prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit, because the Holy Spirit had not yet come upon any of them; they had simply been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. Then Peter and John placed their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit.*

Acts 8:25

*When they had testified and proclaimed the word of the Lord, Peter and John returned to Jerusalem, preaching the gospel in many Samaritan villages.*

So both the Gospel of John and Acts describe Christianity having been spread to Samaritans. It's possible that each refers to different Samaritans and that both are true. However, the Gospel of Luke specifically describes Christ as having not been welcomed in Samaria, which contradicts the Gospel of John, and describes Christ as having gone to another village instead of Samaria; and with Christianity being described in Acts as having spread to Samaria, there seems to have been a desire for an explanation for how Christianity spread to Samaria, but such an explanation excludes any description of Christ having gone to Samaria and instead describes Philip as having gone there. So Luke and Acts contain information about Samaria but shift away from the Gospel of John by the Gospel of Luke describing Christ as not having been welcomed in Samaria and Acts describing Philip as having spread Christianity to Samaria. Additionally, the mentioning of Philip as the one who went to Samaria shows evidence of a response to

the Gospel of John. Philip receives a lot of attention in the Gospel of John. So Philip taking the lead role in a narrative in Acts shows evidence that the Gospel of John was likely an influence in the process of obtaining information.

There are two additional points to make about what Acts says about Christianity having been spread to Samaria. The first is that Peter is receiving more attention. The second is about Samaritans receiving the Holy Spirit from Peter and John. Acts 8:14 describes Samaritans as having not yet received the Holy Spirit and that they had simply been baptized into the name of the “Lord Jesus”. That same verse goes on to say “Then Peter and John placed their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit”. Acts 8:14 potentially represents a very dangerous strategy to assert control over people. Peter and John did not have a special ability to give someone else the Holy Spirit. A person doesn’t need to be touched by Peter or John or anyone else to receive the Holy Spirit. We are within God and God is within us. Being touched by Peter or John doesn’t change that truth. Acts 8:14 shows an extreme misunderstanding of Christianity and maybe also represents an attempt to seem powerful.

There has been a lot to say so far about discrimination towards women and the concealment of information about Mariam. It is now time to take a look at one of the most crucial attacks on Mariam.

Luke 8:1-3

*After this, Jesus traveled about from one town and village to another, proclaiming the good news of the kingdom of God. The Twelve were with him, and also some women who had been cured of evil spirits and diseases: Mary (called Magdalene) from whom seven demons had come out; Joanna the wife of Cuza, the manager of Herod’s household; Susanna; and many others. These women were helping to support them out of their own means.*

Here the Gospel of Luke describes Mariam as having been a part of a group of women who had been cured of evil spirits and diseases. This group of women is described as having provided support out of their own means. Mark and Matthew contain similar verses about providing support rather than being disciples.

Mark 15:41

*In Galilee these women had followed him and cared for his needs. Many other women who had come up with him to Jerusalem were also there.*

Matthew 27:55

*Many women were there, watching from a distance. They had followed Jesus from Galilee to care for his needs.*

So women are consistently described in the Synoptic Gospels as generally providing support rather than being disciples. This keeps getting more and more ridiculous. We keep seeing discrimination towards women, the concealment of information about Mariam, and the supposed importance of Peter and the rest of “the Twelve”. But it gets even worse. The Gospel of Luke describes Mariam as someone “whom seven demons had come out”. The only other verse in the entire New Testament that describes Mariam in such a

way is Mark 16:9, the first verse of the later addition to the Gospel of Mark and what appears to be an unauthentic attempt at harmonization with the Gospel of Luke.

Let's remember that there is strong evidence that Mariam was the first disciple of Christ, was present during the Crucifixion, was present during the burial, was the only disciple who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection, and was the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century. The Gospel of Luke attempts to reduce her to someone whom seven demons had come out and who only provided support rather than being a disciple. This discrimination against Mariam combined with the evidence that shows that the author of the Gospel of Luke got information directly from Peter and others in Jerusalem shows that Peter and those who were close to him are responsible for initiating the campaign to try to discredit Mariam. Overall, it should be noted that Acts not once mentions Mariam's name. Again, there is strong evidence that Mariam was the first disciple of Christ, was present during the Crucifixion, was present during the burial, was the only disciple who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection, and was the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century. Despite all of that, she is not mentioned a single time in all of Acts. Compare that point with the 70 times that Peter's name appears in just the first 15 chapters of Acts.

The Gospel of Luke exalts Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John; and appears to suppress information about Mariam, Mother Mariam, Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany. The Gospels of Mark, Matthew, and John appear to have been in circulation before Luke was produced. It appears that the Gospel of John was circulating wherever the author of Luke and Acts was from. It appears that the Gospel of John already contained fraudulent alterations before Luke was produced. Our analysis so far provides justification for believing all of those assertions.

### **Authorship and Dating of the Gospel of John**

We have already identified that the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have been altered, and therefore that there seems to be multiple layers in the Gospel of John. The first place that we should begin with in analyzing those layers is the narrative about the first disciple and the narratives about the supposed callings of Andrew, Peter, Philip, and Nathanael.

John 1:38-39

*Turning around, Jesus saw them following and asked, "What do you want?"*

*They said, "Rabbi", which means Teacher, "where are you staying?"*

*"Come", he replied, "and you will see."*

*So they went and saw where he was staying, and spent that day with him. It was about the tenth hour.*

John 1:40-42

*Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, was one of the two who heard what John had said and who had followed Jesus. The first thing Andrew did was to find his brother Simon and tell him, "We have found the Messiah" (that is, the Christ). And he brought him to Jesus.*

*Jesus looked at him and said, "You are Simon son of John. You will be called Cephas" (which, when translated, is Peter).*

John 1:43-51



*The next day Jesus decided to leave for Galilee. Finding Philip, he said to him, "Follow me."  
Philip, like Andrew and Peter, was from the town of Bethsaida. Philip found Nathanael and told him,  
"We have found the one Moses wrote about in the Law, and about whom the prophets also wrote – Jesus  
of Nazareth, the son of Joseph."  
"Nazareth! Can anything good come from there?" Nathanael asked.  
"Come and see", said Philip.  
When Jesus saw Nathanael approaching, he said of him, "Here is a true Israelite, in whom there is  
nothing false."  
"How do you know me?" Nathanael asked.  
Jesus answered, "I saw you while you were still under the fig tree before Philip called you."  
Then Nathanael declared, "Rabbi, you are the Son of God; you are the King of Israel."  
Jesus said, "You believe because I told you I saw you under the fig tree. You shall see greater things than  
that." He then added, "I tell you the truth, you shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending  
and descending on the Son of Man."*

It has already been shown that John 1:38-39 probably represent real eyewitness testimony that was fraudulently altered. So an earlier form of John 1:38-39 was probably a part of the original version of the Gospel of John, and therefore a part of the first layer.

We can quickly identify John 1:40-42 as a later addition just given the attention that Peter receives. In addition to that, Andrew is strangely identified as the likely fictional second disciple that goes unnamed in the previous narrative. The absence of Andrew's name when this likely fictional second disciple is first described shows evidence that the narrative about a first disciple was a part of an earlier version of the Gospel of John that didn't include Andrew's name because Andrew's name would otherwise have probably been included when first describing this likely fictional second disciple. Also, Andrew is immediately identified as Peter's brother before Peter even enters the scene, which shows further evidence that Peter is being fraudulently exalted.

John 1:43-51 focus mainly on Nathanael and so those verses are not only probably fraudulent but they were also probably produced by a different author than the author of John 1:40-42. Additionally, the mention of Peter and Andrew having been from Bethsaida is another indication that John 1:43-51 were written by a different author. First, Peter and Andrew were probably from Capernaum as indicated by the Synoptic Gospels. So the mention of Peter and Andrew having been from Bethsaida is probably fraudulent, and in addition to that, it shows further evidence that John 1:43-51 were written by a different author than the author of John 1:40-42 because the author of John 1:40-42 likely knew that Peter was from Capernaum given their allegiance to Peter. Furthermore, if John 1:40-42 and John 1:43-51 were written by the same author, then the mentioning of where Peter and Andrew are from would likely have been contained in the narrative about them in John 1:40-42 rather than being delayed and put in John 1:43-51. In addition to all of that, both John 1:40-42 and John 1:43-51 contain a storyline that involves someone going to get someone else. John 1:40-42 describe Andrew getting Peter and John 1:43-51 describe Philip getting Nathanael. So Andrew was used to exalt Peter and Philip was used to exalt Nathanael. John 1:40-42 and John 1:43-51 taking on similar styles in that way combined with John 1:43-51 being more detailed in that way than John 1:40-42 shows that not only were there probably two different authors to these two sets of verses, but also that one author probably copied from the other.

The mention of Peter and Andrew having been from Bethsaida provides evidence that John 1:43-51 were likely produced after John 1:40-42. If John 1:43-51 had been produced before John 1:40-42, then the author of John 1:43-51 would not have likely mentioned Peter or Andrew, in which case the mentioning of Peter and Andrew having been from Bethsaida would have likely been inserted by the author of John 1:40-42; but if the author of John 1:40-42 was going to mention where Peter and Andrew were from, not only would they have likely mentioned Capernaum instead of Bethsaida, but they also would have likely added such a statement within John 1:40-42. So the mentioning of Peter and Andrew having been from Bethsaida was probably originally written along with the rest of John 1:43-51, and the author of John 1:43-51 probably wouldn't have written that if John 1:40-42 hadn't already been produced. Therefore, John 1:43-51 were probably produced after John 1:40-42.

So far, we have identified three different layers in the Gospel of John. The original version of the Gospel of John probably contained some of the information that is contained within John 1:38-39 and then those verses were probably later fraudulently altered. John 1:40-42 were probably produced sometime after the initial production of the original version of the Gospel of John, and John 1:43-51 were probably produced sometime after that.

Given the specific exaltation of Nathanael in John 1:43-51, Nathanael was probably involved in the production of those verses. John 1:43-51 seem to serve the specific purpose of exalting Nathanael and Philip's name seems to have been used to carry out the exaltation of Nathanael. There are two points that can derive from that conclusion. One is that Nathanael was probably involved in the production of John 1:43-51. The other is that Philip was probably already exalted in the Gospel of John before John 1:43-51 were produced and that is probably why Philip's name was used to exalt Nathanael. So Nathanael seems to have obtained a copy of the Gospel of John that contained some version of John 1:40-42 and that exalted Philip to some extent.

We can turn to the narrative in the Gospel of John about the feeding of 5,000 people for more insight.

John 6:5-9

*When Jesus looked up and saw a great crowd coming toward him, he said to Philip, "Where shall we buy bread for these people to eat?" He asked this only to test him, for he already had in mind what he was going to do.*

*Philip answered him, "Eight months wages would not buy enough bread for each one to have a bite!"*

*Another of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, spoke up, "Here is a boy with five small barley loaves and two small fish. But how far will they go among so many?"*

These verses show exaltation of both Philip as well as Andrew. None of the Synoptic Gospels name any of the disciples in their narratives about the feeding of 5,000 people. All of the Gospels contain this kind of narrative, but only the Gospel of John specifically names any of "the Twelve"; and of all of "the Twelve", oddly enough Philip and Andrew are named. That shows evidence that Philip and Andrew were both probably involved with altering the Gospel of John. That is also probably a part of the reason why Andrew gets named in chapter 1 in the narrative about the calling of Peter. It was previously shown that Andrew's name was used to exalt Peter in that narrative. We can now see that the mentioning of Andrew in that narrative does not only seem to be for Peter's exaltation but also for Andrew's as well.

There is a narrative that exalts Philip that also exalts Thomas.

John 14:5-9

*Thomas said to him, "Lord, we don't know where you are going, so how can we know the way?"*

*Jesus answered, "I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me. If you really knew me, you would know my Father as well. From now on, you do know him and have seen him."*

*Philip said, "Lord, show us the Father and that will be enough for us."*

*Jesus answered: "Don't you know me, Philip, even after I have been among you such a long time? Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, 'Show us the Father'?"*

These verses show that Philip and Thomas were probably involved together in altering the Gospel of John. It was previously shown that Philip and Andrew were probably involved together in altering the Gospel of John. So Philip, Andrew, and Thomas were all probably involved together in altering the Gospel of John.

We can also see that there seems to be two different layers that exalt Thomas. John 14:5-9 name Thomas without naming his nickname Didymus. Every other mention of Thomas also provides the name Didymus. The specific distinction that Thomas is called Didymus is evidence that Thomas was probably involved in the production of those verses. The contrast between the mentioning of Thomas as Didymus and the one verse that names Thomas but not as Didymus shows that Thomas seems to have been involved with altering the Gospel of John sometime after he was involved with altering it with Philip and Andrew. The Resurrection narrative about Thomas is the best example.

John 20:24-29

*Now Thomas (called Didymus), one of the Twelve, was not with the disciples when Jesus came. So the other disciples told him, "We have seen the Lord!"*

*But he said to them, "Unless I see the nail marks in his hands and put my finger where the nails were, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe it."*

*A week later his disciples were in the house again, and Thomas was with them. Though the doors were locked, Jesus came and stood among them and said, "Peace be with you!" Then he said to Thomas, "Put your finger here; see my hands. Reach out your hand and put it into my side. Stop doubting and believe."*

*Thomas said to him, "My Lord and my God!"*

*Then Jesus told him, "Because you have seen me, you have believed; blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed."*

John 20:24-29 show a ridiculous narrative that puts Thomas at center stage. Thomas was obviously probably involved with the production of these verses, and Philip and Andrew probably weren't.

So far, we have identified four different layers to the Gospel of John: the original version; a layer that Philip, Andrew, and Thomas were involved with; a layer that Thomas was involved with that neither Philip nor Andrew was involved with; and a layer that Nathanael was involved with. In addition to those four layers, we can now turn to chapter 21 for yet another layer.

John 21:1-2

*Afterward Jesus appeared again to his disciples, by the Sea of Tiberias. It happened this way: Peter, Thomas (called Didymus), Nathanael from Cana in Galilee, the sons of Zebedee, and two other disciples were together.*

John 21:15-19

*When they had finished eating, Jesus said to Simon Peter, "Simon son of John, do you truly love me more than these?"*

*"Yes, Lord", he said, "you know that I love you."*

*Jesus said, "Feed my lambs."*

*Again Jesus said, "Simon son of John, do you truly love me?"*

*He answered, "Yes, Lord, you know that I love you."*

*Jesus said, "Take care of my sheep."*

*The third time he said to him, "Simon son of John, do you love me?"*

*Peter was hurt because Jesus asked him the third time, "Do you love me?" He said, "Lord, you know all things; you know that I love you."*

*Jesus said, "Feed my sheep. I tell you the truth, when you were younger you dressed yourself and went where you wanted; but when you are old you will stretch out your hands, and someone else will dress you and lead you where you do not want to go." Jesus said this to indicate the kind of death by which Peter would glorify God. Then he said to him, "Follow me!"*

John 21:1-2 show a list of names that likely includes names that were copied from a prior version of the Gospel of John. The mentioning of "Nathanael from Cana in Galilee" is an indication of that. Nathanael being described as having been from Cana was probably erroneously gathered by combining information from John 1:43-51 with information contained in chapter 2.

John 2:1

*On the third day a wedding took place at Cana in Galilee. Jesus' mother was there.*

The narrative about the supposed calling of Nathanael ends chapter 1, and then in the very next verse, Cana is mentioned. If it was to be conveyed to the reader that Nathanael was from Cana, then that would have probably been specifically mentioned somewhere before chapter 21 and it would have probably been specifically mentioned in chapter 1 in the narrative about the supposed calling of Nathanael. Instead, there seems to be no indication before chapter 21 that Nathanael was from Cana. So the mentioning of Nathanael as supposedly having been from Cana in chapter 21 is probably fraudulent and was probably erroneously gathered from combining information in chapter 1 with information in chapter 2. That in turn shows that the author of chapter 21 is probably a different author than the author of John 1:43-51. Additionally, the mentioning of Thomas and the mentioning of Thomas as Didymus in chapter 21 was also probably gathered from text that was already a part of the Gospel of John. It has already been shown that the author of chapter 21 seems to have taken preexisting material in the Gospel of John to form the apparently newer material in chapter 21. That alone shows evidence that the inclusion of Thomas in chapter 21 simply came from preexisting material from a prior version of the Gospel of John. In addition to that, the Resurrection narrative about Thomas leads into what seems to be a conclusion to the Gospel of John before getting to chapter 21.

John 20:30-31

*Jesus did many other miraculous signs in the presence of his disciples, which are not recorded in this book. But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name.*

Since verses 30-31 of chapter 20 seem to be a conclusion to an earlier version of the Gospel of John and since verses 24-29 lead into verses 30-31, verses 24-29 were probably originally produced by the time that verses 30-31 were. Meanwhile, since verses 30-31 serve as a conclusion, any writing that is placed after those verses would presumably have been originally produced sometime after verses 30-31 were. Therefore, all of chapter 21 was probably originally produced after verses 30-31 of chapter 20 were. Since verses 24-29 of chapter 20 seem to have been originally produced by the time verses 30-31 were and since all of chapter 21 seems to have been originally produced after verses 30-31 of chapter 20 were, chapter 21 was also probably originally produced after verses 24-29 of chapter 20 were. That shows that the author of chapter 21 is probably a different author than the author who wrote John 20:24-29.

Thomas would have probably exalted himself without Philip's or Andrew's involvement sometime after Philip and Andrew were involved with him. So chapter 21 not only was likely produced after Thomas exalted himself but also likely after Philip and Andrew exalted themselves. Additionally, chapter 21 focuses on Peter and so was probably not a part of the layer that exalted Nathanael. All of that shows that chapter 21 seems to have been written by a different author than all of the other layers that have been previously identified.

So there have now been five different layers identified in the Gospel of John: the original version; a layer that Philip, Andrew, and Thomas were involved with; a layer that Thomas was involved with that neither Philip nor Andrew was involved with; a layer that Nathanael was involved with; and a layer that includes chapter 21.

In Part 2 and Part 4, we identified that the Gospel of Mark seems to contain responses to information contained in the Gospel of John. In terms of dating, that is even more significant than the Gospel of Luke containing responses to information contained in the Gospel of John because Mark was likely produced before Luke was. As we did in Part 4, we can again turn to John 2:18-21 for more evidence that the Gospel of Mark contains responses to information contained in the Gospel of John.

John 2:18-21

*Then the Jews demanded of him, "What miraculous sign can you show us to prove your authority to do all this?"*

*Jesus answered them, "Destroy this temple, and I will raise it again in three days."*

*The Jews replied, "It has taken forty-six years to build this temple and you are going to raise it in three days?" But the temple he had spoken of was his body.*

We can look to some similar narratives in the Synoptic Gospels to further our understanding. The following verses, like John 2:18-21, are about people asking for a miraculous sign.

Mark 8:11-12

*The Pharisees came and began to question Jesus. To test him, they asked him for a sign from heaven. He sighed deeply and said, "Why does this generation ask for a miraculous sign? I tell you the truth, no sign will be given to it."*

Matthew 12:38-40

*Then some of the Pharisees and teachers of the law said to him, "Teacher, we want to see a miraculous sign from you."*

*He answered, "A wicked and adulterous generation asks for a miraculous sign! But none will be given it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of a huge fish, so the Son of Man will be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."*

Matthew 16:1-4

*The Pharisees and Sadducees came to Jesus and tested him by asking him to show them a sign from heaven.*

*He replied, "When evening comes, you say, 'It will be fair weather, for the sky is red', and in the morning, 'Today it will be stormy, for the sky is red and overcast'. You know how to interpret the appearance of the sky, but you cannot interpret the signs of the times. A wicked and adulterous generation looks for a miraculous sign, but none will be given it except the sign of Jonah." Jesus then left them and went away.*

Luke 11:16

*Others tested him by asking for a sign from heaven.*

Luke 11:29-30

*As the crowds increased, Jesus said, "This is a wicked generation. It asks for a miraculous sign, but none will be given it except the sign of Jonah. For as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites so also will the Son of Man be to this generation."*

These narratives describe Christ as having responded to people having asked for a miraculous sign. The Gospel of John describes Christ as having expressed that Christ's Temple would be rebuilt in three days. Mark describes Christ as having expressed that no sign will be given. Matthew describes Christ as having expressed that the sign of Jonah will be given, and the sign of Jonah is described as Jonah being in the belly of a fish for three days and three nights. Luke also describes Christ as having expressed that the sign of Jonah will be given, but Luke simply describes that Christ will be a sign to "this generation" just as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites. All of the Gospels disagree about how Christ supposedly responded. One could argue that each narrative represents a different conversation and that they are all true. However, Mark specifically describes that no sign will be given, so that specifically contradicts all of the other three Gospels. According to Mark, there won't be any sign, so the other three Gospels describing any sign contradict Mark. Additionally, Matthew specifically describes that the sign of Jonah is Jonah being in the belly of a fish for three days and three nights, and Luke simply describes that Christ will be a sign to "this generation" just as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites. So not only does Mark contradict all of the other three Gospels, but also Matthew and Luke contradict each other. Obviously, there is a common theme among the four Gospels within these narratives, but there are also some key differences and there are reasons for those differences.

As was also shown in Part 4, there are some other verses in Mark and Matthew that can shed some light.

Mark 14:55-58

*The chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin were looking for evidence against Jesus so that they could put him to death, but they did not find any. Many testified falsely against him but their statements did not agree. Then some stood up and gave this false testimony against him: "We heard him say, 'I will destroy this manmade temple and in three days will build another not made by man.' "*

Matthew 26:60-61

*The chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin were looking for false evidence against Jesus so that they could put him to death. But they did not find any, though many false witnesses came forward.*

*Finally two came forward and declared, “This fellow said, ‘I am able to destroy the temple of God and rebuild it in three days.’ ”*

These verses describe priests accusing Christ of having threatened to destroy the Jewish temple and having claimed to be able to build a temple in three days. So these verses relate to information contained in John 2:18-21. Meanwhile, John 2:18-21 are the only verses in the entire New Testament that describe Christ as having expressed that Christ would rebuild Christ’s Temple in three days. Mark 14:55-58 and Matthew 26:60-61 describe accusations towards Christ but don’t actually describe Christ as having said that; and meanwhile, John 2:18-21 are the only verses in the entire New Testament that actually describe Christ as having said that. So it appears that Mark 14:55-58 and Matthew 26:60-61 derived information from John 2:18-21.

A comparison of John 2:18-21 and the narratives in the Gospel of Mark can show us more clearly what is going on with all of these narratives.

John 2:18-21

*Then the Jews demanded of him, “What miraculous sign can you show us to prove your authority to do all this?”*

*Jesus answered them, “Destroy this temple, and I will raise it again in three days.”*

*The Jews replied, “It has taken forty-six years to build this temple and you are going to raise it in three days?” But the temple he had spoken of was his body.*

Mark 8:11-12

*The Pharisees came and began to question Jesus. To test him, they asked him for a sign from heaven. He sighed deeply and said, “Why does this generation ask for a miraculous sign? I tell you the truth, no sign will be given to it.”*

Mark 14:55-58

*The chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin were looking for evidence against Jesus so that they could put him to death, but they did not find any. Many testified falsely against him but their statements did not agree. Then some stood up and gave this false testimony against him: “We heard him say, ‘I will destroy this manmade temple and in three days will build another not made by man.’ ”*

John 2:18-21 claim that Christ expressed that Christ would resurrect within three days when supposedly asked about what miraculous sign would be provided. In response to the same question, the Gospel of Mark claims that Christ expressed that no miraculous sign will be given. First and foremost, that can be seen as ridiculous because that excludes the Resurrection. Additionally, both John and Matthew specifically refer to the Resurrection as that sign in their respective narratives. So the Gospel of Mark obviously seems to skip a beat in relation to this narrative. That’s evidence that the author of the Gospel of Mark didn’t really understand what the narrative was about. That in turn shows evidence that their focus was on something beyond this narrative in the Gospel of Mark.

In part 4, we saw that the Gospel of Mark portrays the Resurrection as having occurred on the fourth day of a four-day sequence that begins with the day of the Crucifixion. That portrayal contradicts the information contained in John 2:18-21, and therefore John 2:18-21 would have presented an issue for the Gospel of Mark. It had already been shown that the Gospel of Mark seems to contain responses to information contained in the Gospel of John, and we can see yet another example of that with John 2:18-21 and these narratives from the Gospel of Mark. In combination, the two narratives shown from the Gospel of Mark claim that no miraculous sign will be given and that priests accused Christ of having said that Christ would build a temple in three days. Furthermore, that accusation is specifically described as false testimony. So the Gospel of Mark rejects that any miraculous sign will be given and specifically claims that the accusation that Christ expressed that Christ would build a temple in three days is false testimony. So John 2:18-21 would have caused an issue for the Gospel of Mark, the Gospel of Mark goes against John 2:18-21 by expressing that no miraculous sign will be given, and the Gospel of Mark specifically claims that information contained in John 2:18-21 is false testimony. The Gospel of Mark is obviously responding to the issue that John 2:18-21 causes for it. The Gospel of Mark is specifically responding to that information by expressing that no miraculous sign will be given and that such information is false. The Gospel of Matthew then seems to address the problem left by the Gospel of Mark expressing that no miraculous sign will be given by inserting the verses about the sign of Jonah. The Gospel of Matthew takes care of that problem but still portrays that information contained in John 2:18-21 as false and still portrays the Resurrection as having occurred on the fourth day of a four-day sequence beginning with the day of the Crucifixion.

The Gospel of Mark responds to the Gospel of John because Mark portrays a four-day sequence and John causes an issue for Mark in that way by describing only three days. The Gospel of Matthew then responds to the Gospel of Mark by describing the sign of Jonah being in the belly of a fish for three days and three nights because Mark says that no miraculous sign will be given and that's obviously problematic because that would exclude the Resurrection. The Gospel of Luke then responds to the Gospel of Matthew by changing the description of what the sign of Jonah is because the four-day sequence described in Mark and Matthew causes a problem for the description in Luke of a three-day sequence. As mentioned in Part 4, John and Luke differ from Mark and Matthew by describing three days instead of four. So Mark responds to John, Matthew responds to Mark, and Luke responds to Matthew. That shows that the order of original productions of the Gospels was the following: John, Mark, Matthew, and then Luke.

In terms of dating, this analysis shows that the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have been circulating before any of the Synoptic Gospels were produced.

The following verses provide further evidence that certain parts of the Gospel of John were in circulation before all of the Synoptic Gospels.

John 18:10

*Then Simon Peter, who had a sword, drew it and struck the high priest's servant, cutting off his right ear. The servant's name was Malchus.*

Mark 14:47

*Then one of those standing near drew his sword and struck the servant of the high priest, cutting off his ear.*



Matthew 26:51

*With that, one of Jesus' companions reached for his sword, drew it out, and struck the servant of the high priest, cutting off his ear.*

Luke 22:49-50

*When Jesus' followers saw what was going to happen, they said, "Lord, should we strike with our swords? And one of them struck the servant of the high priest, cutting off his ear."*

All of the Gospels describe someone cutting off an ear of a servant of the high priest. The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that names Peter as that person while all of the Synoptic Gospels leave that person unnamed. The Synoptic Gospels all indicate, either explicitly or implicitly, that this person was a follower of Christ. Mark simply says "one of those standing near", Matthew says "one of Jesus' companions", and Luke says "Jesus' followers" and "one of them". So the Synoptic Gospels appear to be portraying this person as a follower of Christ, which means that they could have easily been named but go unnamed for some mysterious reason. When we turn back to John 18:10 and see that this person is specifically identified as Peter, we can easily see that the reason why this person goes unnamed is apparently to avoid identifying Peter as committing an act of violence. Additionally, John 18:10 also names the servant of the high priest as "Malchus". The specific naming of Peter and Malchus shows evidence that John 18:10 likely represents real eyewitness testimony. Meanwhile, the Synoptic Gospels respond to John 18:10 by describing someone cutting off the ear of Malchus while entirely avoiding identifying that person as Peter. The mere fact that this person goes unnamed in the Synoptic Gospels rather than being named as someone other than Peter shows clear evidence that Peter was the person who cut off the ear of Malchus. All of this shows evidence that all of the Synoptic Gospels are responding to John 18:10, and therefore that John 18:10 was in circulation before any of the Synoptic Gospels were produced.

Going deeper into the narrative in the Gospel of Mark about the arrest of Christ provides even further evidence.

Mark 14:51-54

*A young man, wearing nothing but a linen garment, was following Jesus. When they seized him, he fled naked leaving his garment behind.*

*They took Jesus to the high priest, and all the chief priests came together. Peter followed him at a distance, right into the courtyard of the high priest. There he sat with the guards and warmed himself at the fire.*

The first two sentences of Mark 14:51-54 are very strange to say the least. First, we yet again are presented with an unnamed person who is described as a witness to the arrest of Christ. In addition to that, this person is described as initially "wearing nothing but a linen garment" and then is described as being "naked" and "leaving his garment behind". So these verses describe an unnamed naked man who followed Christ. Obviously, something strange is happening with these verses; and we can see what is going on when we turn to the Gospel of John.

John 18:15

*Simon Peter and another disciple were following Jesus. Because this disciple was known to the high priest, he went with Jesus into the high priest's courtyard.*

The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes another person along with Peter as having followed Christ after Christ's arrest. At least one person, and maybe several people, who fraudulently altered the Gospel of John obviously seems to have favored Peter and so they were unlikely to add another person to the narrative, especially considering that the Synoptic Gospels only name Peter as having followed after Christ's arrest. A pro-Peter person would not likely have added the presence of a second person, especially a mysteriously unnamed second person. In John 18:15, the presence of an unnamed disciple takes attention away from Peter. This can be seen by how the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels only describe Peter as having followed after Christ was arrested. So the presence of a second person in John 18:15 takes attention away from Peter in relation to the versions in the Synoptic Gospels. So a pro-Peter person would not likely have added the presence of a second person in John 18:15. On the other hand, if there was someone else described in the narrative in the original version of the Gospel of John, a person who later fraudulently altered the Gospel of John could have had plenty of motivation to simply conceal that person's identity. Much like John 1:38-39 and John 19:26-27, it seems that someone's presence in the original version of the Gospel of John remained as the Gospel of John was fraudulently altered, it's just that their identity was concealed.

So the original version of the Gospel of John likely described someone other than Peter as having followed Christ after Christ was arrested, and then the Gospel of John seems to have been fraudulently altered to conceal that person's identity and the Gospel of Mark was produced with the presence of a naked man running away after Christ was arrested. Given this evidence, the unnamed disciple in John 18:15 probably originally represented Mariam.

The narrative in the Gospel of John goes on to describe the unnamed disciple as having been well-known to the high priest. That was probably a fraudulent addition. The Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes Peter as having been initially prohibited from entering the high priest's courtyard. All of the Synoptic Gospels describe Peter as having been initially allowed to enter. The Gospel of John is also the only Gospel that describes Peter as having been the person who cut off the ear of one of the high priest's servants. All of the Synoptic Gospels leave that person unnamed. So the description in the Gospel of John of Peter not having been able to enter the high priest's courtyard may be connected to the description in the Gospel of John of Peter having cut off the ear of one of the high priest's servants. It may be true that Peter cut off the ear of one of the high priest's servants and then wasn't allowed to enter the high priest's courtyard because of that. We of course don't know exactly what happened that night, but the description of the unnamed disciple having been well-known to the high priest is probably fraudulent and was probably added in response to Peter being described as having been initially prohibited from entering the high priest's courtyard.

The fact that the Gospel of Mark describes an additional person but leaves them unnamed and strangely describes them in an embarrassing way by describing them as naked shows evidence that the Gospel of Mark responds to the presence of someone other than Peter in the narrative in the Gospel of John, and therefore that the original version of the Gospel of John was circulating before the Gospel of Mark was produced.

Yet even further evidence that the original version of the Gospel of John was circulating before all of the Synoptic Gospels can be seen by the narratives about the anointing of Christ.

Mark 14:3

*While he was in Bethany, reclining at the table in the home of a man known as Simon the Leper, a woman came with an alabaster jar of very expensive perfume, made of pure nard. She broke the jar and poured the perfume on his head.*

Matthew 26:6-7

*While Jesus was in Bethany in the home of a man known as Simon the Leper, a woman came to him with an alabaster jar of very expensive perfume, which she poured on his head as he was reclining at the table.*

Luke 7:36-38

*Now one of the Pharisees invited Jesus to have dinner with him, so he went to the Pharisee's house and reclined at the table. When a woman who had lived a sinful life in that town learned that Jesus was eating at the Pharisee's house, she brought an alabaster jar of perfume, and as she stood behind him at his feet weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears. Then she wiped them with her hair, kissed them, and poured perfume on them.*

These verses from the Synoptic Gospels all describe the anointing of Christ but do so very differently than the Gospel of John. While the modern version of the Gospel of John does not specifically identify Mariam as the person who anointed Christ, the Gospel of John at least presents the name "Mary". Meanwhile, the Synoptic Gospels all leave the person who anointed Christ unnamed. Furthermore, Mark and Matthew specifically describe their respective narratives as taking place in Bethany, which is where the Gospel of John describes the anointing of Christ as well. All of this shows that the Synoptic Gospels are responding to the narrative in the Gospel of John about the anointing of Christ and that Mark and Matthew are specifically responding to the presence of Bethany in that narrative as well.

The original version of the Gospel of John seems to have been circulating before any of the other three Gospels were produced. Therefore, the original version of the Gospel of John appears to have been produced no later than 44 since that is the upper limit of the likely time-period in which the Gospel of Mark was produced. Furthermore, we don't really have a lower limit other than the year of the Resurrection. So the likely time-period in which the original version of the Gospel of John was produced is 28-44. Additionally, especially given the apparent involvement of at least some of "the eleven" in the productions of the Synoptic Gospels and the fraudulent altering of the Gospel of John, there is an important question that now arises: who produced the original version of the Gospel of John?

We can now turn to the narrative in the Gospel of Mark that describes the calling of the supposed tax collector Levi.

Mark 2:13-17

*Once again Jesus went out beside the lake. A large crowd came to him, and he began to teach them. As he walked along, he saw Levi son of Alphaeus sitting at the tax collector's booth. "Follow me", Jesus told him, and Levi got up and followed him.*

*While Jesus was having dinner at Levi's house, many tax collectors and "sinners" were eating with him and his disciples, for there were many who followed him. When the teachers of the law who were Pharisees saw him eating with the "sinners" and tax collectors, they asked his disciples: "Why does he eat with tax collectors and 'sinners'?"*

*On hearing this, Jesus said to them, "It is not the healthy who need a doctor, but the sick. I have not come to call the righteous, but the sinners."*

This narrative about the calling of Levi is so incredible because it combines two strong forces. One is that this narrative is specifically describing the calling of a person. The only other people who are described in that way in the Gospel of Mark are Peter, Andrew, James son of Zebedee, and John. From that perspective, a great deal of importance is going into this narrative. The other strong force is that Levi is being slandered to such an extent in this narrative. Not only is he labeled as a “sinner”, but he is also specifically labeled as a tax collector. Calling someone a tax collector in first century Israel was one of the worst insults a person could throw at someone. Tax collectors were thought of as traitors, people who took from their own people. The Gospel of Mark goes a long way in slandering Levi. In today’s world, you might see a defamation lawsuit for a narrative like that.

It has been shown that Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John appear to have been involved with the production of the Gospel of Mark, so it seems that they were in conflict with Levi and went as far as to produce a narrative that slanders him. We should now turn back to the Gospel of Mary for even more evidence.

The Gospel of Mary

*Peter responded, bringing up similar concerns. He questioned them about the Savior, “Did he then speak with a woman in private without our knowing about it? Are we to turn around and listen to her? Did he choose her over us?”*

*Then Mary wept and said to Peter, “My brother Peter, what are you imagining? Do you think that I have thought up these things by myself in my heart or that I am telling lies about the Savior?”*

*Levi answered, speaking to Peter, “Peter, you have always been a wrathful person. Now I see you contending against a woman like the adversaries. For if the Savior made her worthy, who are you then for your part to reject her? Assuredly the Savior’s knowledge of her is completely reliable. That is why he loved her more than us. Rather, we should be ashamed. We should clothe ourselves with the perfect human, acquire it for ourselves as he commanded us, and announce the good news, not laying down any other rule or law that differs from what the Savior said.”*

*After [he said these] things, they started going out [to] teach and to preach.*

The Gospel of Mary shows division between Peter and Levi, and then when we turn to the Gospel of Mark, which Peter appears to have been involved in producing, we see Levi being slandered. So both the Gospel of Mark as well as the Gospel of Mary show evidence of conflict between Peter and Levi.

As for the Gospel of Matthew, the tax collector is named Matthew instead of Levi. As shown in Part 4 and here in Part 5, there seems to have been revisions and additions going from Mark to Matthew. As we will go into more detail on later, Peter and the rest of the group in Jerusalem seem to have grown in their understanding of Judaism and society in Jerusalem. The Gospel of Mark shows signs of a rough start and so does Paul’s description in his letter to the Galatians of only seeing Peter and James son of Mother Mariam in Jerusalem three years after his conversion. The Gospel of Matthew shows signs of progress in their operation and so does the descriptions in Acts of the council at Jerusalem. Some of the revisions and additions going from Mark to Matthew relate to a larger focus on Jewish customs and Jewish law. Some of them relate to establishing a fuller overall storyline. In the case of the narrative about a tax collector, the shift from naming the tax collector Levi to naming him Matthew seems to be representative of the issue faced with placing importance on the calling of a “disciple” who is not named in the list of “the Twelve”. Without Levi being named in that list, the narrative about the calling of Levi represents the

calling of a thirteenth “disciple”. To solve that problem, the Gospel of Matthew takes out Levi’s presence entirely and replaces him with one of “the Twelve”, Matthew. That then shows the probable explanation for how the Gospel of Matthew was named after Matthew.

Our investigation has shown that the Gospel of Mark seems to respond to information contained in the Gospel of John and also slanders Levi. The Gospel of Mark seems to respond both to the Gospel of John as well as to Levi’s presence in society. The Gospel of Mark seems to attack both the Gospel of John as well as Levi. The Gospel of Mark seems to be battling with both the Gospel of John as well as Levi. That shows evidence that Levi was probably involved with the original production of the Gospel of John. The probable scenario is that Levi was involved with the original production of the Gospel of John, Peter and some of the others in “the Twelve” obtained a copy of the original version of the Gospel of John, and then they responded to it with the Gospel of Mark with one of the specific responses being a narrative that slanders Levi; and then the Gospel of Matthew was produced with Levi’s presence taken out entirely because the presence of a thirteenth “disciple” caused a separate issue for Peter and the rest of the group in Jerusalem as did other parts of the Gospel of Mark as already shown, including the narrative that describes that no miraculous sign will be given.

Since Levi seems to have been involved with the production of the original version of the Gospel of John, it seems that Levi produced a gospel that was independent of the Testimony of Mariam. Further evidence of that can be seen by the evidence laid out in Part 2 that showed that major portions of the original version of the Gospel of John seem to have portrayed Mariam as if she wasn’t a disciple. Since the Gospel of John appears to contain fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, the parts of the original version of the Gospel of John that aren’t a part of the Testimony of Mariam appear to be a separate layer from those fragments of the Testimony of Mariam. In other words, fragments of the Testimony of Mariam seem to have been a part of the original version of the Gospel of John, but the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have also included information that wasn’t a part of the Testimony of Mariam. So the original version of the Gospel of John appears to have contained at least two layers. Furthermore, the part in chapter 11 in the narratives about Lazarus that describes Martha as proclaiming her faith in Christ as the Messiah probably came directly from Martha. Being described as proclaiming faith in Christ as the Messiah is very significant. Only Peter, Nathanael, and Martha are described that way in the Gospels. It’s been shown that Peter appears to have been involved in exalting himself and it’s been shown that Nathanael appears to have been involved in exalting himself. In addition to that, it’s been shown that James son of Zebedee, John, Andrew, Philip, and Thomas all appear to have exalted themselves as well. So just based on that, it would seem that Martha did the same. Additionally, Martha is realistically the only person who would have expressed that about her. It doesn’t seem like that would be very relevant to that narrative unless Martha was the one telling the story. It’s doubtful that anyone else would insert that information given that chapter 11 is focused on the raising of Lazarus. That information about Martha was probably originally only important to Martha. So it seems that Levi may have compiled multiple testimonies in the process of developing the original version of the Gospel of John.

There have now been six different layers identified in the Gospel of John: fragments of the Testimony of Mariam; the rest of the original version that is separate from the Testimony of Mariam, which seems to have been at least in part compiled by Levi and seems to include testimony from Martha, and seems to have been produced in the time-period of 28-44; a layer that Philip, Andrew, and Thomas were involved with; a layer that Thomas was involved with that neither Philip nor Andrew was involved with; a layer

that Nathanael was involved with; and a layer that includes chapter 21. We will go into more detail later about how Peter was first exalted in the Gospel of John.

## **The Twelve**

We can go even deeper with our understanding of the conflict between Peter and Levi when we analyze the different people who are named James in the Gospels.

Mark 3:16-19

*These are the twelve he appointed: Simon to whom he gave the name Peter; James son of Zebedee and his brother John (to them he gave the name Boanerges, which means Sons of Thunder), Andrew, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James son of Alphaeus, Thaddeus, Simon the Zealot, and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him.*

All of the Synoptic Gospels name James son of Zebedee and James son of Alphaeus. Looking specifically within the Gospel of Mark, there is a mention of someone who seems to be a third James.

Mark 15:40

*Some women were watching from a distance. Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome.*

It has already been shown that Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses is probably Mother Mariam. That would mean that James the younger appears to be James son of Mother Mariam. James son of Mother Mariam is usually described as a son of Mother Mariam or as a brother of Christ. Therefore, James son of Alphaeus is probably not a reference to James son of Mother Mariam. Furthermore, there is obviously a good possibility that the biological father of James son of Mother Mariam was a man named Joseph. So the Gospel of Mark seems to describe three different people named James. However, the reference to James son of Mother Mariam as “the younger” shows that there seems to have only been two people named James. If James son of Mother Mariam is “the younger”, then there is most likely one James who is “the older” and one James who is “the younger”, and they would likely be the only two people named James. If there were more than two people named James, then a description of “the younger” wouldn’t likely have been used. A description like “the younger” sets up a relationship between two figures: the younger and the older. One objection could be that “the younger” could just refer to the youngest, and therefore there could be more than two people named James. However, if focus is placed on age and there were three people named James, then there would be two people who would be surpassed by the oldest James and so there would be two people for which youth would be attributable to. For “the younger” to apply to only one person, youth must be identified within just one person and that would not be the case if there was more than one person who was younger than the oldest. So the reference to “the younger” is probably an indication that only two people named James are involved. That means that James son of Alphaeus seems to be a fictional character who potentially represents someone who isn’t named James. Meanwhile, the Gospel of Mark describes Levi as a son of Alphaeus and there appears to have been a major conflict between Peter and Levi. So the reference to James son of Alphaeus is probably a representation of Levi. Furthermore, Levi is the only person who is described in the Gospel of Mark as being called to be a disciple who isn’t named in the list of “the Twelve”. The Gospel of Mark

portrays Levi as being called but as not being called as a part of “the Twelve”, which doesn’t make sense because “the Twelve” are portrayed as those who were specifically called. Therefore, Levi was probably a member of “the Twelve” and was probably later excluded because of the major conflict that seems to have existed between Peter and Levi; and a fictional character appears to have been used to replace Levi because they didn’t want to describe another real person as being a part of “the Twelve” who wasn’t really a part of their original group of twelve men.

As has been shown, there seems to have been somewhat of an obsession with John the Baptist represented in the Gospels. Additionally, it has been shown that John the Baptist probably didn’t prepare the way for the Messiah in the way that the Bible describes. That shows that the obsession with John the Baptist represented in the Gospels seems to have derived from beliefs that at least some of “the Twelve” had before they followed Christ and/or from societal circumstances. As was shown before, John the Baptist seems to have been very popular in Galilee. At least some of “the Twelve” seem to have been from Galilee. So at least some of those from Galilee were probably fans of John the Baptist and they also probably had to contend with disciples of John the Baptist as they tried to spread the Gospels. We can turn to Acts for more clarification.

Acts 1:21-22

*Therefore it is necessary to choose one of the men who have been with us the whole time the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from John’s baptism to the time when Jesus was taken up from us. For one of these must become a witness with us of his resurrection.*

Acts 18:24-25

*Meanwhile a Jew named Apollos, a native of Alexandria, came to Ephesus. He was a learned man, with a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures, though he knew only the baptism of John.*

As explained in Part 3, Acts 1:21-22 describe the choosing of a twelfth member since Judas was no longer with them. Acts 1:21-22 describe that one of the criteria for selecting this member was that they must have been with the others “beginning from John’s baptism”. That shows that they placed importance on the baptisms that John the Baptist performed. They weren’t as much concerned about when someone began following Christ, but were more concerned about John the Baptist. That shows very specific evidence that at least some of “the Twelve” appear to have been relatively big fans of John the Baptist before following Christ.

Acts 1:21-22 also show that there seems to have been a need to describe a replacement for Judas. By the time that Acts was written, it doesn’t even seem to have mattered whether exactly twelve men were present. Evidence has been shown that there was division among this group of men, some men left the group, and other men seemed to have entered into the mix, for example, James son of Mother Mariam, Stephen, and Barnabas. There being a group of exactly twelve men probably didn’t last long and they probably usually had less or more than twelve at any given point. So it doesn’t seem like they even cared to actually have exactly twelve men by the time that Acts was written. The specific designation of twelve seems to have been only important in official documentation by that time. As such, there seems to have been a need to specifically explain that there was supposedly a replacement for Judas. So they probably didn’t care as much later on but it seems to have been more important in the early stages.

Acts 18:24-25 describe someone named Apollos and describe him as “a learned man”, but then backs off of that by expressing that he only knew “John’s baptism”. We will go into more detail on those verses in Part 6. For now, it is important to recognize that only knowing John’s baptism is being presented as a relatively primitive realm of knowledge. To only know John’s baptism is to not know as much as someone who is a “disciple” of Christ. From that perspective, we can see that they place John the Baptist chronologically before Christ in their own timeline of learning. If someone is said to only know John’s baptism, then it is being said that they don’t know Christ’s teachings. But someone could know Christ’s teachings without even knowing who John the Baptist is, so the importance placed on John’s baptism combined with the expression that only knowing John’s baptism is a relatively primitive realm of knowledge shows further evidence that at least some of “the Twelve” probably first learned from John the Baptist before following Christ.

So “the Twelve” seem to have been a group of men that included Levi, and at least some of them seem to have been big fans of John the Baptist before following Christ. Later on, it seems that Levi was involved with the initial production of the original version of the Gospel of John, Levi was removed from “the Twelve”, Peter and some others in “the Twelve” were involved with the production of the Gospel of Mark, the Gospel of Mark responded to information contained in the Gospel of John, and Levi was slandered in the Gospel of Mark because of the conflict between Peter and Levi.

It appears that at least some of “the Twelve” were big fans of John the Baptist and that Peter and Andrew were from Capernaum, which is in Galilee. Also, it was shown that John the Baptist seems to have mainly resided in Galilee.

For more information about “the Twelve”, we can turn to chapter 1 of the Gospel of John.

John 1:28

*This all happened at Bethany on the other side of the Jordan, where John was baptizing.*

John 1:28 describes John the Baptist as having baptized in “Bethany on the other side of the Jordan”. The issue is that the Bethany that Lazarus was from seems to have been in Judea, which is west of the Jordan River. Just about the entire Roman Empire was west of the Jordan River. So the phrase “the other side of the Jordan” realistically refers to the east side of the Jordan River, which shows that there seems to be something wrong with saying “Bethany on the other side of the Jordan”.

There are two different aspects of verse 1:28 that we should analyze. One is the mentioning of Bethany and the other is the mentioning of the other side of the Jordan. At least one of those aspects is probably fraudulent given that Bethany appears to have been on the west side of the Jordan River, so it would seem that such a description wouldn’t have originated from just one author. The description ending up being in reference to a place that doesn’t seem to have existed is probably a result of a real place having been originally described and then a later alteration to one of the two aspects of that description resulting in a place being described that doesn’t exist. That leads us to the conclusion that either “Bethany” or “on the other side of the Jordan” was included in the original description and that the other was a later alteration. For insight into which was in the original description, we can turn to the narrative about the supposed calling of Philip.

John 1:43-44



*The next day Jesus decided to leave for Galilee. Finding Philip, he said to him, "Follow me."  
Philip, like Andrew and Peter, was from the town of Bethsaida.*

There is some reason why Philip, Andrew, and Peter are described as having been from Bethsaida. As mentioned earlier here in Part 5, Andrew's and Peter's inclusion appears to be a result of John 1:43-44 having been written after John 1:40-42 were already a part of the Gospel of John.

First, the hometown of Peter and Andrew appears to have been Capernaum. So the mentioning of their hometown as Bethsaida appears to be fraudulent, which shows that there is some reason why the author of verses 1:43-44 claimed that the hometown of Peter and Andrew was Bethsaida that doesn't relate to any knowledge of their actual hometown. There is some other reason why the author decided to write that.

Second, since it has already been shown that there seems to have been a disregard for Peter's and Andrew's actual hometown, the mentioning of anyone's actual hometown was probably not much of a concern. Additionally, the likelihood that Nathanael was involved in the production of these verses rather than Philip shows further evidence that the actual hometown of Philip probably wasn't of much concern when developing these verses. Bethsaida seems to be mentioned for some other reason.

Third, it's very strange to try to describe where Peter and Andrew are from in verses that introduce Philip and are after the verses that introduce Peter and Andrew. By the time Philip is described, the introductions of Peter and Andrew are over. For there to be a delay like that in bringing up the hometown of Peter and Andrew shows that apparently there originally wasn't any reference to a hometown of Peter and Andrew mentioned along with their introductions. Otherwise, such a reference would have presumably occurred in the verses that introduce Peter and Andrew. Instead, nothing like that gets said until Philip is being described. That shows that the author of verses 1:43-44 appears to have assumed that the setting of verses 1:40-42 was in Bethsaida. However, there isn't any mentioning of Bethsaida before verses 1:43-44, which shows that there appears to have previously been a mentioning of Bethsaida before verses 1:43-44 in a prior version of the Gospel of John.

Fourth, going from the narratives about John the Baptist to the narratives about the supposed callings of Andrew, Peter, Philip, and Nathanael, there isn't any description of movement to another town. There is the mentioning of Bethany in the narratives about John the Baptist and then there is the mentioning of Bethsaida in the narrative about the supposed calling of Philip, but there is no transitional description of moving from Bethany to Bethsaida. That suggests that the supposed calling of Philip was portrayed as having happened in the same town in which John the Baptist was originally portrayed as having baptized. Therefore, the supposed calling of Philip probably wouldn't have been described as happening in Bethsaida unless John the Baptist baptizing wasn't originally described as happening in Bethsaida.

Fifth, it was previously shown that John the Baptist appears to have mostly preached in Galilee and surrounding areas. The Gospels as well as Josephus describe John the Baptist as having been executed by King Herod (Antipas), who was the ruler of Galilee. The Synoptic Gospels seem to fraudulently describe John the Baptist as mainly preaching in Judea. He instead seems to have mainly preached in Galilee, especially considering King Herod was the one who had him executed. Additionally, that would explain why Peter and others appear to have been big fans of his because they lived in Galilee. So Bethsaida was realistically a place where John the Baptist would have been preaching and it's a more realistic place than Bethany to be mentioned in the Gospel of John when introducing John the Baptist.

Sixth, the obvious motivation for changing “Bethsaida” to “Bethany” would be to align with the Synoptic Gospels. Bethany appears to have been in Judea and all of the Synoptic Gospels describe John the Baptist as preaching in Judea. Furthermore, it has been shown that the Synoptic Gospels appear to be fraudulent in describing John the Baptist mainly preaching in Judea and that he mainly preached in Galilee and surrounding areas, which shows both that the mentioning of Bethany appears to be fraudulent and the apparent motivation for inserting Bethany into that narrative.

Seventh, the Greek word for “Bethany” is similar to the Greek word for “Bethsaida”. Both “Bethany” and “Bethsaida” begin with “Beth”. Bethany is translated from the Greek word βηθανια (“Bēthaniā”) and Bethsaida is translated from the Greek word βηθσαιδα (“Bēthsaïdá”). Both Greek words begin with βηθ (“Beth”). Meanwhile, the mentioning of Bethany was likely written in because the Synoptic Gospels describe John the Baptist as having baptized in Judea. As previously mentioned, Bethany appears to have been in Judea so describing John the Baptist as baptizing in Bethany would align with the Synoptic Gospels. So it seems that John the Baptist was originally described as baptizing in Bethsaida, then a later addition described Philip as being supposedly called in Bethsaida because that’s where the story in the Gospel of John was already set in, and then sometime after that “Bethsaida on the other side of the Jordan” was changed to “Bethany on the other side of the Jordan” to align with the Synoptic Gospels.

Eighth, in the third century, Origen went in search for “Bethany on the other side of the Jordan” and appears to have come up empty handed. In response, Origen is reported as having named the hypothetical “Bethany on the other side of the Jordan” as “Beth Abara”, meaning “House of the Crossing”. In the fourth century, Eusebius referred to the same place and spelled it as “Bethaabara”. So not only does there seem to be confusion about “Bethany on the other side of the Jordan”, but there also seems to be multiple spellings, all of which that have been shown have been shown to begin with “Beth” and that supports the assertion that the spelling was changed from “Bethsaida” to “Bethany”.

Ninth, as we will go into more detail on later, the Gospel of Mark seems to portray Bethsaida on the east side of the Jordan River. The narrative in chapter 6 of the Gospel of Mark about the feeding of the 5,000 appears to be set on the west side of the Sea of Galilee and then the narrative after that describes Christ walking on water and portrays Bethsaida as being on the other side of the Sea of Galilee, which would be to portray Bethsaida on the east side of the Jordan River.

What this all shows is that it is likely that at least one of “the Twelve” appears to have been following John the Baptist in Bethsaida. Additionally, this also shows that Bethsaida appears to have been on the east side of the Sea of Galilee and the Jordan River. Meanwhile, that places Bethsaida relatively near Capernaum, just on the other side of the Sea of Galilee and of course also on the other side of the Jordan River. Anyone who was following John the Baptist in Bethsaida wouldn’t have been far from Capernaum where Peter and Andrew seem to have been from. Capernaum was in Galilee and Bethsaida was near Galilee. Peter, Andrew, and/or others of “the Twelve” may have been followers of John the Baptist and may have followed him to Bethsaida as well. At least one of them appears to have seen John the Baptist baptizing in Bethsaida.

## Early Circulation of the Gospels

In the process of figuring out where the Gospels were initially circulating, we will also be considering where the author of Luke and Acts was from. The author of Luke and Acts seems to have possessed the Gospels of John, Mark, and Matthew, so the early circulation of the Gospels seems to have included where the author of Luke and Acts was from. Furthermore, since the author of Luke Acts seems to have possessed John, Mark, and Matthew, it appears that all three were circulating in the same place. Therefore, unless John, Mark, and Matthew were all circulating together in several different places, which probably wasn't the case since we're talking about the early days of circulation, the probable scenario is that there was one main area where they were all circulating together. Furthermore, since Mark and Matthew respond to John and oppose John, it seems that the Gospels were competing with each other wherever they were circulating together. Since they all seem to have been circulating in the same place, it would seem that the main place where all of the Gospels were circulating and competing with each other would be the place where the author of Luke and Acts was from. Additionally, as already shown, the author of Luke and Acts seems to have traveled to Jerusalem from a place outside of Judea, so the author seems to have been from somewhere outside of Judea. Therefore, Judea was probably not the main place where John, Mark, and Matthew were circulating.

We should first take a look at where Acts proposes that most of the spreading of Christianity took place in the early days.

Acts 8:1

*And Saul was there , giving approval to his death.*

*On that day a great persecution broke out against the church at Jerusalem, and all except the apostles were scattered throughout Judea and Samaria.*

Acts 8:4

*Those who had been scattered preached the word wherever they went.*

Acts 8:5

*Philip went down to a city in Samaria and proclaimed the Christ there.*

Acts 8:1 and 8:4 propose that Christians during that time were mainly in Judea and Samaria. Acts 8:5 is a specific reference to Philip being one of those people in Samaria. We will go into more detail about Philip shortly. For now, we're simply using these verses to show information about Judea and Samaria.

In addition to the information in Acts, there is also a narrative in the Gospel of John about Samaria. So one may wonder if the author of Luke and Acts may have been from Samaria. First, Samaria is just north of Judea and it seems as though "Theophilus" who Luke is addressed to lived further away since someone was sent to travel to write up an investigation that turned into the Gospel of Luke, so the author of Luke and Acts probably wasn't from Samaria. Additionally, the focus on Jerusalem and the temple in the Gospel of Luke wouldn't likely be the result if someone from Samaria was the author. There was a major conflict between Jews in Judea and people in Samaria. The narrative about Samaria in the Gospel of John explicitly refers to that conflict.

John 4:9

*The Samaritan woman said to him, “You are a Jew and I am a Samaritan woman. How can you ask me for a drink?” (For Jews do not associate with Samaritans.)*

John 4:20

*“Our fathers worshiped on this mountain, but you Jews claim that the place where we must worship is in Jerusalem.”*

John 4:9 explicitly lays out that there is such a conflict between Jews in Judea and people in Samaria that supposedly “Jews do not associate with Samaritans”. Furthermore, John 4:20 reflects that many Samaritans had a negative attitude towards Jerusalem by saying “you Jews claim that the place where we must worship is in Jerusalem”. So the narrative about Samaria in the Gospel of John shows that it is unlikely that someone from Samaria would travel to Jerusalem and write a gospel that exalts Jerusalem and the temple as much as the Gospel of Luke does.

Additionally, the Gospel of Matthew clearly states a very negative position on Samaria.

Matthew 10:5-6

*These twelve Jesus sent out with the following instructions: “Do not go among the Gentiles or enter any town of the Samaritans. Go rather to the lost sheep of Israel.”*

Matthew 10:5-6 clearly show that the Gospel of Matthew doesn't seem to have been intended for Samaria because it shows a position that preaching should not be done in Samaria.

While Jews in Judea viewed Samaritans differently, many Samaritans were still Jewish. There were certain historical conflicts and differences that separated people in Judea from people in Samaria, but many of the people in both Judea as well as Samaria were Jews. It's just that Samaritans didn't focus as much on Jerusalem and the temple like Jews in Judea did. So the exaltation of Jerusalem and the temple in the Gospel of Luke likely came from someone who was not from Samaria.

The inaccuracies in the Gospels about John the Baptist show that the Gospels were probably not intended for a population in Judea, Samaria, Galilee, or surrounding areas. It has already been shown that the Gospels don't seem to have been mainly circulating in Judea or Samaria, and now we will see even further evidence of that and also that they probably weren't mainly circulating in Galilee or surrounding areas either. As shown in Part 3, the Synoptic Gospels describe John the Baptist as mainly preaching in Judea even though it seems that he mainly preached in Galilee and surrounding areas. However, people in Judea probably knew very well who John the Baptist was. He seems to have been quite the local celebrity. Nevertheless, specifically describing Judea rather than Galilee as the main place of his preaching seems to be inaccurate and such a description probably wouldn't play out well with a population that knew John the Baptist well. Furthermore, the Gospels portray John the Baptist as the forerunner to the Messiah. That also probably wouldn't play out well with people who favored John the Baptist. The Gospels would have had a very tough time selling to a population that favored John the Baptist because the Gospels are inaccurate about him and demote him in relation to how he was looked upon by so many people. The inaccuracies and the demotion of John the Baptist show that the Gospels don't seem to have been mainly intended for areas in which John the Baptist was well-known, and therefore the Gospels don't seem to have been mainly circulating in Judea, Samaria, Galilee, or surrounding areas.

Furthermore, as we are about to see, Mark, Matthew, and the original version of the Gospel of John seem to have been written mainly for a liberal Jewish audience and/or a gentile audience. Even though Mark and Matthew are dominated by Jewish themes and Peter and his group wanted people to be Jewish, it seems that Mark and Matthew were produced to step away from conservative Judaism and allow a pathway to practice certain Jewish customs while being free of others, which would not likely be for a conservative Jewish population. In other words, Peter and his group appear to have been trying to reach liberal Jews as well as gentiles while trying to convert them to a modified pseudo form of Judaism mixed with Christianity. The following verses show this.

Mark 7:3-4

*The Pharisees and all the Jews do not eat unless they give their hands a ceremonial washing, holding to the tradition of the elders. When they come from the marketplace they do not eat unless they wash. And they observe many other traditions such as the washing of cups, pitchers, and kettles.*

Mark 12:18

*Then the Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, came to him with a question.*

Mark 15:42-43

*It was Preparation Day (that is, the day before the Sabbath). So as evening approached, Joseph of Arimathea, a prominent member of the Council, who was himself waiting for the kingdom of God, went boldly to Pilate and asked for Jesus' body.*

Matthew 5:17

*"Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them."*

Matthew 10:5-6

*These twelve Jesus sent out with the following instructions: "Do not go among the Gentiles or enter any town of the Samaritans. Go rather to the lost sheep of Israel."*

Matthew 15:24

*He answered, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel."*

The verses from Mark give instructions on Judaism as if the Gospel of Mark was circulating among a population that didn't know Judaism well. Mark 7:3-4 provide information about customs that Jews follow, which wouldn't likely be intended for someone who knew Judaism well. Mark 12:18 clarifies that Sadducees don't believe in resurrecting after death. Jews in Judea and surrounding areas would have likely been more aware of that. Mark 15:42-43 clarify that the preparation day is the day before a Sabbath day, which is information that a Jewish population obviously would have been aware of.

The verses from Matthew also show that Peter and his group appear to have been trying to reach liberal Jews as well as gentiles while trying to convert them to a modified pseudo form of Judaism mixed with Christianity. Matthew 5:17 talks about the Jewish law being fulfilled, which would be strange information to pass on to a conservative Jewish population, but would be good for liberal Jews and gentiles who don't want to follow strict Jewish customs. Matthew 10:5-6 say to not go among gentiles, which shows that gentiles would have to be circumcised to join Peter's religion, and these verses also say to go to "the lost

sheep of Israel”, which shows intent to reach people who are outside of the conservative Jewish population. Matthew 15:24 doubles down on that with another reference to “the lost sheep of Israel”.

In addition to those verses, there are also the inaccuracies in Mark and Matthew related to Passover and the week of unleavened bread. As shown in Part 3, the Synoptic Gospels appear to portray the Last Supper as the Passover Seder and then portray the day of the Crucifixion as a preparation day, which presents two preparation days in a row. Furthermore, as shown in Part 4, Matthew adds a fake day in between the day of Passover (the 14<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan) and the first day of the week of unleavened bread (the 15<sup>th</sup> day of Nisan). All of this inaccurate information realistically wouldn’t have been mainly intended for or have played out well with a conservative or knowledgeable Jewish population. Additionally, as shown in Part 3, the Synoptic Gospels even describe the day of Passover as the first day of the week of unleavened bread.

Mark 14:12

*On the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, when it was customary to sacrifice the Passover Lamb, Jesus’ disciples asked him, “Where do you want us to go and make preparations for you to eat the Passover?”*

Matthew 26:17

*On the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the disciples came to Jesus and asked “Where do you want us to make preparations for you to eat the Passover?”*

Luke 22:7

*Then came the day of Unleavened Bread on which the Passover lamb had to be sacrificed. Jesus sent Peter and John, saying, “Go and make preparations for us to eat the Passover.”*

So many inaccuracies in relation to Passover and the week of unleavened bread show that Mark and Matthew were not likely mainly intended for a conservative or knowledgeable Jewish audience, and therefore were likely mainly intended for a liberal Jewish audience and/or a gentile audience.

So far, it has been shown that John, Mark, and Matthew seem to have not been mainly circulating in Judea, Samaria, Galilee, or surrounding areas, and that Mark and Matthew seem to have been mainly intended for a liberal Jewish audience and/or a gentile audience. As we turn to the Gospel of John, we can see that the original version seems to have been intended for a gentile audience and that later layers seem to have been added by people who supported Judaism. We can see this by observing in certain narratives the phrase “the Jews” as if the author was talking to people who were not Jewish, and then by observing in other narratives certain Jewish concepts as if the author was very supportive of Judaism. We’ve already seen the narrative in the Gospel of John about Samaria, which discriminates against Samaritans and shows knowledge of Jewish history and culture indicating that the author seems to have been Jewish and in support of Judaism. There are other narratives in the Gospel of John that also seem to strongly favor Judaism. In contrast, the following verses show that the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have been intended for a gentile audience, and we can see that through the use of the phrase “the Jews”.

John 1:19

*Now this was John’s testimony when the Jews of Jerusalem sent priests and Levites to ask him who he was.*

John 2:6

*Nearby stood six stone water jars, the kind used by the Jews for ceremonial washing, each holding from twenty to thirty gallons.*

John 2:18

*Then the Jews demanded of him, "What miraculous sign can you show us to prove your authority to do all this?"*

John 5:1

*Some time later, Jesus went up to Jerusalem for a feast of the Jews.*

John 5:16

*So, because Jesus was doing these things on the Sabbath, the Jews persecuted him.*

John 6:41

*At this the Jews began to grumble about him because he said, "I am the bread that came down from heaven."*

John 6:52

*Then the Jews began to argue sharply among themselves, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"*

John 7:1

*After this, Jesus went around in Galilee, purposely staying away from Judea because the Jews there were waiting to take his life.*

John 8:31

*To the Jews who had believed him, Jesus said, "If you hold to my teaching, you are really my disciples.*

John 11:36

*Then the Jews said, "See how he loved him!"*

John 12:9

*Meanwhile a large crowd of Jews found out that Jesus was there and came, not only because of him but also to see Lazarus, whom he had raised from the dead.*

John 18:14

*Caiaphas was the one who had advised the Jews that it would be good if one man died for the people.*

John 18:28

*Then the Jews led Jesus from Caiaphas to the palace of the Roman governor. By now it was early morning, and to avoid ceremonial uncleanness the Jews did not enter the palace; they wanted to be able to eat the Passover.*

John 19:7

*The Jews insisted, "We have a law, and according to that law he must die, because he claimed to be the Son of God."*

John 19:12

*From then on, Pilate tried to set Jesus free, but the Jews kept shouting, "If you let this man go, you are no friend of Caesar. Anyone who claims to be a king opposes Caesar."*

John 20:19

*On the evening of that first day of the week, when the disciples were together, with the doors locked for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood among them and said, "Peace be with you!"*

All of those verses clearly portray the Jewish population as if Jews were not a part of the target audience, which shows that the target audience appears to have been a gentile audience. It's not just any use of the phrase "the Jews" that shows that. It's specifically the consistent attitude that "the Jews" are not a part of the target audience. The Synoptic Gospels sometimes use that phrase in certain context, but the Synoptic Gospels still try to represent some form of Judaism. The Gospel of John, on the other hand, really shows that the original version viewed "the Jews" as a different population than the target audience.

So Mark, Matthew, and the original version of John all seem to have been intended for a liberal Jewish audience and/or a gentile audience in an area that was not Judea, Samaria, Galilee, or surrounding areas.

The following verses from Mark show that the Gospels don't seem to have been mainly circulating in areas north of Galilee like Tyre and Sidon.

Mark 7:31

*Then Jesus left the vicinity of Tyre and went through Sidon, down to the Sea of Galilee, and into the region of the Decapolis.*

Mark 7:31 shows a traveling path going from Tyre to Sidon to the Sea of Galilee to the region of the Decapolis. Both Tyre and Sidon were north of Galilee, and Sidon was even further north than Tyre. Just based on that, this traveling path seems quite strange. It doesn't seem to make sense to go from Tyre to Sidon to get to the Sea of Galilee and the Decapolis because Sidon was north of Tyre and the Sea of Galilee and the Decapolis were south of Tyre. Therefore, the author of Mark 7:31 doesn't seem to have been well-versed in the geography of Tyre and Sidon because they seem to have assumed that Sidon was south of Tyre rather than north.

There are two main objections to that conclusion. One is that there was a large mountain in between Tyre and the Sea of Galilee and traveling to Sidon could have served the purpose of avoiding that mountain. However, while Sidon was relatively close to Tyre, it was still quite far in terms of walking distance. To describe going so far north on foot and in the opposite direction of the destination when there were plenty of other directions to travel doesn't seem to be to pass around a mountain but more of a geographical error in the process of producing a fraudulent narrative.

The other objection is that maybe Christ is being portrayed as having gone to Sidon for a specific reason like to teach. In other words, Sidon itself would serve as a destination rather than just a pass-through on the way to a destination. However, a study of the Greek words being used shows that Sidon is being described simply to serve as a pass-through and not a destination in and of itself. Mark 7:31 says "through Sidon", "down to the Sea of Galilee", and "into the region of the Decapolis". The word "through" in "through Sidon" is translated from the Greek word διὰ ("dia"), which does mean "through" in relation to a place. The phrase "down to" in "down to the Sea of Galilee" comes from the Greek word εἰς ("eis"), which means "into". The word "into" in "into the region of the Decapolis" comes from the Greek phrase



ἀνά (“ana”) μέσον (“meson”). “Ana” means “on” or “upon” in relation to a location and “meson” means “middle of”, “between”, or “amidst”. The Decapolis were a group of ten cities so “ana meson” means to be among, in between, or in the middle of those ten cities. There are different Greek words used to describe different things happening on this travel path to Sidon, the Sea of Galilee, and the Decapolis. In relation to Sidon, the Greek word “dia” simply refers to going through Sidon while Mark 7:31 refers to going into the Sea of Galilee and being amongst the ten cities of the Decapolis. If Sidon was a destination rather than simply being portrayed as a pass-through, then the Greek words for “into” (“eis”), “upon” (“ana”), or “amidst” (“meson”) would have likely been used. Instead, the Greek word that means “through” (“dia”) is used, which shows that Sidon seems to be presented as a pass-through.

What this all shows is that it doesn’t seem to have made much sense to have written Mark 7:31 the way that it is except that the author seems to have not known the geography of Tyre and Sidon, which in turn shows that the Gospel of Mark doesn’t seem to have been mainly circulating in those cities. Otherwise, Peter’s group would have likely been more well-versed in that geography if they were really targeting those places. So in addition to Judea, Samaria, Galilee, and surrounding areas, it also appears that Tyre and Sidon, which were a little further north, were also not where the Gospels were mainly circulating.

The narratives about the feeding of the 5,000 in John and Mark and the feeding of the 4,000 in Mark can show that the Gospels also don’t appear to have been mainly circulating anywhere east of the Jordan River. There are other conclusions that we will reach through this analysis, which we will go into even further detail shortly. For now, we’re focused on the evidence that shows that the Gospels were not mainly circulating anywhere east of the Jordan River.

John 6:1

*Some time after this, Jesus crossed to the far shore of the Sea of Galilee (that is, the Sea of Tiberias), and a great crowd of people followed him because they saw the miraculous signs he had performed on the sick.*

John 6:5-9

*When Jesus looked up and saw a great crowd coming toward him, he said to Philip, “Where shall we buy bread for these people to eat?” He asked this only to test him, for he already had in mind what he was going to do.*

*Philip answered him, “Eight months’ wages would not buy enough bread for each one to have a bite!”*

*Another of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter’s brother, spoke up, “Here is a boy with five small barley loaves and two small fish, but how far will they go among so many?”*

John 6:16

*When evening came, his disciples went down to the lake, where they got into a boat and set off across the lake for Capernaum. By now it was dark, and Jesus had not yet joined them.*

The Gospel of John describes 5,000 people being fed on the east side of the Sea of Galilee. We can tell that the setting of the narrative is on the east side of the Sea of Galilee because verse 6:1 describes traveling across the Sea of Galilee and verse 6:16 describes setting off “across the lake for Capernaum”. Capernaum was on the west side of the Sea of Galilee so the previous location would have been on the east side, which would make sense anyway given that verse 6:1 describes the first trip across the Sea of Galilee. There are two trips across the Sea of Galilee being described. So the first destination being on the

east side would make sense because then the second destination is back on the west side where most of the Gospel narratives take place. The Gospel of Mark responds to this by splitting this information into two different narratives: the feeding of the 5,000, which takes place on the west side of the Sea of Galilee, and the feeding of the 4,000, which takes place on the east side of the Sea of Galilee.

Mark 6:1

*Jesus left there and went to his hometown, accompanied by his disciples.*

Mark 6:6-7

*And he was amazed at their lack of faith.*

*Then Jesus went around teaching from village to village. Calling the Twelve to him, he sent them out two by two and gave them authority over evil spirits.*

Mark 6:14

*King Herod heard about this, for Jesus' name had become well known. Some were saying, "John the Baptist has been raised from the dead, and that is why miraculous powers are at work in him."*

Mark 6:32-33

*So they went away by themselves in a boat to a solitary place. But many who saw them leaving recognized them and ran on foot from all the towns and got there ahead of them.*

Mark 6:35-37

*By this time it was late in the day, so his disciples came to him. "This is a remote place", they said, "and it's already very late. Send the people away so they can go to the surrounding countryside and villages and buy themselves something to eat."*

Mark 6:44-45

*The number of the men who had eaten was five thousand.*

*Immediately Jesus made his disciples get into the boat and go on ahead of him to Bethsaida, while he dismissed the crowd.*

Mark 7:31

*Then Jesus left the vicinity of Tyre and went through Sidon, down to the Sea of Galilee, and into the region of the Decapolis.*

Mark 8:1-4

*During those days another large crowd gathered. Since they had nothing to eat, Jesus called his disciples to him and said, "I have compassion for these people; they have already been with me three days and have nothing to eat. If I send them home hungry, they will collapse on the way, because some of them have come a long distance*

*His disciples answered, "But where in this remote place can anyone get enough bread to feed them?"*

Mark 8:9-10

*About four thousand men were present. And having sent them away, he got into the boat with his disciples and went to the region of Dalmanutha.*

Chapter 6 of the Gospel of Mark describes Christ as being in Christ's "hometown" and then going from town to town (as previously shown, Mark 2:1 portrays Capernaum, which was in Galilee, as Christ's "hometown"), then the "the Twelve" are described as being sent out to different towns, then King Herod is described as hearing about that, and then Christ and "the disciples" are described as getting in a boat and people are described as following on foot and getting to the destination ahead of Christ and "the disciples". That sequence leads into the feeding of the 5,000 narrative, and that sequence begins in Galilee and then unnamed towns are described. Those unnamed towns are not explicitly described as being in Galilee, however, it is described that King Herod heard about what was going on and King Herod ruled over Galilee. So the sequence begins in Galilee, and then there are unnamed towns, and then the ruler of Galilee is described as having heard about what was going on in the unnamed towns, which implies that the unnamed towns were in Galilee. The only other traveling before the feeding of the 5,000 is described is on boat to a location that people followed on foot to and arrived at first, so that would seem to be a location that was still on the same side of the Sea of Galilee. So realistically, that entire sequence occurred in Galilee, and therefore on the west side of the Sea of Galilee, which would place the feeding of the 5,000 narrative on the west side of the Sea of Galilee. Furthermore, right after the feeding of the 5,000 narrative, there is a description of traveling across the Sea of Galilee to Bethsaida, which as shown earlier appears to have been on the east side of the Sea of Galilee, which provides further evidence that the placement of the feeding of the 5,000 narrative is on the west side of the Sea of Galilee. Additionally, that mentioning of Bethsaida is the beginning of the narrative that describes Christ walking on water. In John, Capernaum is specifically mentioned at the beginning of that narrative. That shows that even the narrative that describes Christ walking on water was changed to switch the setting of the feeding of the 5,000 narrative to the west side of the Sea of Galilee.

Mark 7:31 then describes traveling to the region of the Decapolis, which comprised of Hellenistic (Greek influenced) cities. In other words, it was mostly a gentile region. Then chapter 8 of the Gospel of Mark describes the feeding of the 4,000 without any description of any traveling back to the west side of the Sea of Galilee.

So the Gospel of Mark includes a narrative about the feeding of the 5,000, like the Gospel of John does, but specifically contradicts the Gospel of John by describing the narrative as taking place on the west side of the Sea of Galilee instead of the east side and then also includes a narrative that takes place on the east side but specifically assigns to it a lower number than the other narrative. This is significant because the west side would be portrayed as the area that is more heavily populated by Jews while the east side would be portrayed as the area that is more heavily populated by gentiles. So Mark is responding to the narrative in John being placed on the east side.

Additionally, the narrative in the Gospel of John names Philip and Andrew while the Gospel of Mark doesn't name any disciples. Furthermore, the Gospel of Mark describes multiple disciples saying the same thing as in "they said" rather than naming a specific disciple like the Gospel of John does with Philip and Andrew. That shows evidence that the Gospel of Mark is not only responding to this narrative in the Gospel of John but is also specifically responding to the presence of Philip and Andrew in that narrative. That shows that the exaltation of Philip and Andrew appears to have already been in an altered version of the Gospel of John before the Gospel of Mark was produced.

There's a lot to sort out in relation to Philip, Thomas, and Andrew, their involvement in the Gospel of John, and their relationship with Peter. We will go into more details about that shortly. For now, we are focused on where the Gospels were mainly circulating and this analysis of the narratives in John and Mark about the feeding of the 5,000 and the narrative in Mark about the feeding of the 4,000 shows that the Gospels don't seem to have been mainly circulating to the east of the Jordan River. The Gospel of Mark is discriminatory towards the east side of the Jordan River and therefore it appears that the Gospel of Mark was not mainly intended for any area on the east side of the Jordan River. Since it was shown earlier that John, Mark, and Matthew seem to have been circulating in the same area, and since Mark doesn't seem to have been mainly circulating east of the Jordan River, it is also the case that John and Matthew were probably not mainly circulating east of the Jordan River.

So far, it has been shown that Mark, Matthew, and the original version of John all seem to have been mainly intended for a liberal Jewish audience and/or a gentile audience in an area that was not Judea, Samaria, Galilee, or any surrounding areas nearby, not Tyre, Sidon, or anywhere to the near-north of Galilee, and not anywhere east of the Jordan River.

Paul's writing and his travels can provide further evidence.

Romans 15:20-22

*It has always been my ambition to preach the gospel where Christ was not known, so that I would not be building on someone else's foundation. Rather as it is written:*

*"Those who were not told about him will see, and those who have not heard will understand."*

*This is why I have often been hindered from coming to you.*

Romans 15:20-22 express that Paul wanted to preach in places where there wasn't a foundation developed by another Christian preacher and that is what kept him from traveling to Rome. There are two important pieces of information to derive from that. One is that someone other than Paul developed the Christian community in Rome. We will go into more detail in Part 6 about the Christian community in Rome and how nobody who was involved with the production of any of the Gospels was leading the development of that community. Furthermore, while the Gospels eventually were circulating in Rome, their initial circulation was not likely so far away from Jerusalem but instead much closer. For now, in relation to Rome, we can move forward with the assertion that Rome was not where the Gospels were mainly circulating initially.

The second piece of information that we can derive from Romans 15:20-22 is that most of the places that Paul traveled to probably hadn't previously had much of a Christian community there, and so none of the Gospels were likely previously mainly circulating there. While Paul talks about people following Peter in a letter to Corinthians, about spies infiltrating his ranks in a letter to Galatians, and about Peter and people sent by James son of Mother Mariam being in Antioch in the same letter to Galatians, Romans 15:20-22 along with Paul's strong presence in the places he went to shows that it is very unlikely that the Gospels were mainly circulating in any of the places Paul traveled to.

Paul seems to have had to deal with other people spreading different beliefs, and some of those people seem to have been a part of Peter's group; but these instances seem to have shown that those instigators were operating from a position of weakness rather than strength. Paul talks about countering Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and people connected to them in a way that shows that Paul had a stronger

presence in these places and that these people were poaching off of Paul's success. Verses from Galatians and Acts can show the dynamics of these circumstances.

Galatians 1:15-22

*But when God, who set me apart from birth and called me by his grace, was pleased to reveal his Son in me so that I might preach him among the Gentiles, I did not consult any man, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to see those who were apostles before I was, but I went immediately into Arabia and later returned to Damascus.*

*Then after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to get acquainted with Peter and stayed with him fifteen days. I saw none of the other apostles – only James, the Lord's brother. I assure you before God that what I am writing you is no lie. Later I went to Syria and Cilicia. I was previously unknown to the churches of Judea that are in Christ.*

Galatians 2:4-9

*This matter arose because some false brothers had infiltrated our ranks to spy on the freedom we have in Christ Jesus and to make us slaves. We did not give in to them for a moment, so that the truth of the gospel might remain with you.*

*As for those who seemed to be important – whatever they were makes no difference to me; God does not judge by external appearance – those men added nothing to my message. On the contrary, they saw that I had been entrusted with the task of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles, just as Peter had been to the Jews. For God, who was at work in the ministry of Peter as an apostle to the Jews, was also at work in my ministry as an apostle to the Gentiles. James, Peter, and John, those reputed to be pillars, gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship when they recognized the grace given to me. They agreed that we should go to the Gentiles, and they to the Jews.*

There are a few important points to make about these verses. One is that Paul talks about going to Arabia and Damascus before going to Jerusalem after three years to meet Peter. That shows that Peter doesn't seem to have been much of a factor for Paul to contend with. Paul waited three years to meet Peter and then was on friendly enough of terms to stay with him for fifteen days. The second point is that Paul doesn't mention any Gospels while talking about the challenges he faced with people spreading different information. He simply talks about spies infiltrating his ranks but nothing about Gospels. That shows that most of these challenges likely came from verbal transmission of information from individual people rather than documents that were spreading to different people. The third point is that it is described that James son of Mother Mariam sent people to Antioch. That shows that they don't seem to have had much of a presence there and had to send people. So while Paul had to contend with Peter's group spreading different information, Peter's group seemed to be in a weaker minority position that didn't have much of a base in the places where Paul traveled to. They don't even seem to have had much of a base in Antioch, the place that Acts claims was a place where they had influence as shown by the following verses.

Acts 9:29-31

*He talked and debated with the Grecian Jews, but they tried to kill him. When the brothers learned of this, they took him down to Caesarea and sent him off to Tarsus.*

*Then the church throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria enjoyed a time of peace. It was strengthened; and encouraged by the Holy Spirit, it grew in numbers, living in the fear of the Lord.*

Acts 11:19-22

*Now those who had been scattered by the persecution in connection with Stephen traveled as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, telling the message only to Jews. Some of them, however, men from Cyprus and Cyrene, went to Antioch and began to speak to Greeks also, telling them the good news about the Lord Jesus. The Lord's hand was with them, and a great number of people believed and turned to the Lord. News of this reached the ears of the church in Jerusalem, and they sent Barnabas to Antioch.*

Acts 11:25

*Then Barnabas went to Tarsus to look for Saul, and when he found him, he brought him to Antioch. So for a whole year Barnabas and Saul met with the church and taught great numbers of people. The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.*

It has already been shown that these verses from Acts appear to be false information that was passed from Peter and his group to the author of Luke and Acts. It has also already been shown that Peter and his group don't seem to have had much of a presence in Antioch, yet here they are trying to say that they decided to bring Paul there as if he didn't go there on his own accord. These verses also describe the "churches" in Judea, Samaria, and Galilee as Peter's group's main areas of operation. However, they seem to have been fairly unsuccessful in these areas. So the reality of the circumstances is that Peter and his group weren't very successful, spread false information boasting about fake accomplishments that never really happened, lied about Paul, and acted like they were in control of Paul. Meanwhile, Paul marched on according to his own ambition and didn't back down against Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and the rest of them. In conclusion, it is very unlikely that any of the places that Paul traveled to were the main place where John, Mark, and Matthew were initially circulating.

Paul seems to have traveled to many places on the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea. He seems to have preached as far east as Antioch and as far west as Corinth in Greece. Additionally, Paul wrote to Christians in Rome; and based on the robust list of greetings, Rome may have been the largest Christian community during that time-period.

If we imagine a map of the areas surrounding the Mediterranean Sea, there is Africa to the south with Egypt to the southeast, Jerusalem to the east, multiple communities that Paul preached to along the east and north sides, Greece to the north, Rome also to the north but further west than Greece, and France and Spain further west with Spain on the far west side just north of Africa.

With Paul seemingly having traveled as far east as Antioch and as far west as Corinth, the Gospels probably weren't circulating much in a lot of the areas on the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea between Jerusalem and Rome. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John appear to have been based in Jerusalem. A lot of the Christian foundation that was developed in the areas along the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea seems to have been developed by Paul. Additionally, the Gospels don't seem to have been mainly circulating in Judea, Samaria, Galilee, or areas nearby, Tyre, Sidon, or other areas to the near-north of Galilee, or anywhere to the east of the Jordan River. The Gospels don't seem to have been mainly circulating anywhere going from Judea all of the way to Rome, and also don't seem to have been mainly circulating anywhere east of the Jordan River. Meanwhile, Egypt was nearby to the southwest of Jerusalem with a large population comprised of many gentiles as well as less conservative Jews. All of the evidence shown so far shows that Egypt was probably one of the only, if not the only, heavily populated places outside of Jerusalem that was near Jerusalem where any of the Gospels were mainly circulating. That provides evidence that John, Mark, and

Matthew were probably circulating in Egypt. That in turn provides evidence that there is a good possibility that the author of Luke and Acts was from Egypt.

Additionally, the Gospel of Matthew contains specific evidence related to Egypt.

Matthew 2:13-15

*When they had gone, an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream. "Get up", he said, "take the child and his mother and escape to Egypt. Stay there until I tell you, for Herod is going to search for the child to kill him." So he got up, took the child and his mother during the night and left for Egypt, where he stayed until the death of Herod. And so was fulfilled what the Lord had said through the prophet: "Out of Egypt I called my son."*

It was shown in Part 4 that there doesn't appear to have been a physical "birth" or "childhood" of the physical appearance of Christ. So just from that, we can conclude that this narrative appears to be fraudulent. Additionally, even before coming to the conclusions reached in Part 4, evidence specifically about this narrative was presented in Part 3 that showed that this narrative appears to be fraudulent. First, this narrative isn't included in any other Gospel. Second, the supposed prophecy that is described as stating "Out of Egypt I called my son" is incorrectly used in these verses. That statement is referencing Hosea 11:1.

Hosea 11:1

*"When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son."*

Hosea 11:1 refers to Israel as the son called out of Egypt. Hosea 11:1 is not a prophecy about the coming Messiah. That is further evidenced by Hosea 11:2 and Hosea 9:1.

Hosea 11:2

*"But the more I called Israel, the further they went from me."*

Hosea 9:1

*Do not rejoice O Israel; do not be jubilant like the other nations. For you have been unfaithful to your God; you love the wages of a prostitute.*

Hosea 11:1 refers to the son called out of Egypt as Israel. Hosea 11:2 describes Israel as having moved further away after having been called, which seems to be a reference to the nation of Israel rather than the Messiah. Hosea 9:1 specifically relates Israel to other nations, which shows that the reference to Israel refers to a nation rather than the coming Messiah. So the use of that supposed prophecy in the Gospel of Matthew in relation to Egypt provides further evidence that the entire narrative appears to be fraudulent. So obviously the narrative in the Gospel of Matthew about Christ having gone to Egypt appears to be fraudulent. The narrative proposes that there was a physical "childhood" of the physical appearance of Christ, it is the only narrative in all of the Gospels that describes Christ as having gone to Egypt, and it incorrectly uses Hosea 11:1 by proposing that Hosea 11:1 is a prophecy about the coming Messiah. Since that narrative obviously appears to be fraudulent, it seems that it was added to the Gospel of Matthew for the purpose of influencing people with fraudulent propaganda. That would have been a useful tactic if the target audience was an Egyptian audience. Furthermore, the Gospel of Matthew doesn't include much other information about that time-period and there doesn't seem to be much significance to that narrative other than the involvement of Egypt. So just based on the Egypt narrative, it seems that the Gospel of

Matthew was mainly circulating in Egypt. That provides further evidence that the author of Luke and Acts was from Egypt. That would then also provide further evidence that the Gospels of John and Mark were also mainly circulating in Egypt.

The original version of the Gospel of John began circulating, which included some true testimony but also some false information, and then that version was fraudulently altered multiple times by different people. There have been six layers identified so far. The first layer contains fragments of the Testimony of Mariam and the second layer is the rest of the original version of the Gospel of John. So the original version of the Gospel of John contained the first two layers and the next four layers are fraudulent additions and alterations to the original version. There are two layers that involve Thomas: one that also involves Philip and Andrew and another that only involves Thomas. The one that involves Philip and Andrew was likely added before the one that only involves Thomas. The layer that involves Nathanael appears to have been added after the layer that first exalted Peter as shown by the comparison of the narratives about the supposed calling of the first disciples. So both the layer that only involves Thomas and the layer that involves Nathanael appear to not have been the third layer. Additionally, chapter 21 appears to have been a relatively late addition and very likely the last layer or at least close to it, especially given the reference to Peter's death, and therefore it appears to not have been the third layer. All of this shows that the layer that involves Philip, Thomas, and Andrew appears to have been the third layer. That conclusion combined with Andrew's inclusion in the narrative about the supposed calling of Peter shows evidence that the layer that first exalted Peter was the third layer. In addition to that evidence, it would make sense anyway that the third layer was the first layer to exalt Peter because that was the layer that was the first layer to fraudulently alter the original version of the Gospel of John. So Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew appear to have been a part of the first group to fraudulently alter the original version of the Gospel of John and appear to have done so in a way that added the first exaltation of Peter in the Gospel of John. Furthermore, since this group appears to have been the first to exalt Peter in the Gospel of John, they then also appear to have been the first to conceal Mariam's importance that was in the original version of the Gospel of John because the exaltation of Peter and the concealment of Mariam's importance are inherently connected in the Gospel of John in that way. The fraudulent verses in the first 17 verses of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John are a prime example of the connection between the exaltation of Peter and the concealment of Mariam's importance, which provides evidence that this group specifically produced those fraudulent verses in chapter 20.

Verses 2-15 and 17 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John are very strange and sloppy. There was obviously priority given to exalting Peter and concealing Mariam's importance, which shows at least somewhat of an alliance with Peter. However, the sloppiness of those verses also shows that the authors only mostly cared about certain technical guidelines and otherwise didn't put much effort into producing a decent narrative. They cared about exalting Peter, concealing Mariam's importance, and not presenting Peter as one of the first two to have believed that the tomb was empty. To care so much about those three components, particularly the part about Peter not being one of the first two to have believed that the tomb was empty, while being so sloppy and reckless throughout the narrative shows that they didn't care enough to make a good story for Peter's sake but were only willing to put in just enough effort to follow certain technical guidelines, which shows a certain degree of separation with Peter. If we compare chapter 20 of the Gospel of John to the Synoptic Gospels, we can clearly see that the exaltation of Peter in the Synoptic Gospels is much more organized, clearer, and written better overall. That shows that Peter did a better job of exalting himself than Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew did, which shows a certain degree of



separation with Peter. So there is evidence that shows somewhat of an alliance with Peter but also evidence that shows a certain degree of separation.

Text from a Gnostic book that claims to be a letter written from Peter to Philip can help us better understand some of the dynamics that existed back then.

*Peter, apostle of Christ, to Philip, our beloved brother and our fellow apostle, and the brothers who are with you: greetings.*

*I want you to understand, our brother, that we received orders from our Lord, the Savior of the whole world, that we should come together to teach and preach concerning the salvation that was promised us by our Lord Jesus Christ. But you were separated from us, and you did not wish us to come together and learn how to organize ourselves that we might tell the good news. So would it be agreeable to you, our brother, to come according to the orders of our God Jesus?*

This writing likely is not actually from Peter. However, it is amazing that anyone would write about division between Peter and Philip like that. For something like that to have been written, it seems that there really may have been division between Peter and Philip. Much like the exaltation of Mariam in these Gnostic texts, regardless of whether the writing is completely legitimate, it's still incredibly telling that anyone would write that about Peter's and Philip's relationship. When we combine this text with the conclusions already reached about Philip in relation to the Gospel of John and Egypt, we can further understand that Philip seems to have had his own motivations and we can see that play out in both the Gospel of John as well as the Gnostic books found in Egypt. More specifically, the conclusions reached about the combination of an alliance as well as a degree of separation with Peter is further evidenced by this text that is portrayed as a letter from Peter to Philip and addresses separation between them. This letter shows separation as well as a certain degree of closeness. The letter presents Peter and Philip as being old friends who ended up being separated. That is representative of the text in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John, which shows signs of some degree of alliance as well as some degree of separation.

The narratives about the feeding of the 5,000 in John and Mark and the feeding of the 4,000 in Mark can provide insight into when the Gospel of John was altered by Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew, and it also provides further evidence of the separation between them and Peter. The narrative in the Gospel of John names Philip and Andrew while the Gospel of Mark doesn't name any disciples. Furthermore, the Gospel of Mark describes multiple disciples saying the same thing as in "they said" rather than naming a specific disciple like the Gospel of John does with Philip and Andrew. That shows evidence that the Gospel of Mark is not only responding to this narrative in the Gospel of John but is specifically responding to the presence of Philip and Andrew in that narrative. That shows that the exaltation of Philip and Andrew appears to have already been in an altered version of the Gospel of John before the Gospel of Mark was produced. Therefore, the third layer of the Gospel of John, which appears to have been the first layer to alter the original version and the one that involves Philip, Thomas, and Andrew, appears to have been circulating before the Gospel of Mark was produced and the Gospel of Mark specifically responds to that layer of the Gospel of John and to the exaltation of Philip and Andrew.

The conclusion that the third layer of the Gospel of John was already circulating before the production of the Gospel of Mark and that the Gospel of Mark responds to the third layer of the Gospel of John is not only significant in terms of relative dating between the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Mark, it is also significant because it shows further evidence of the division between Peter and Philip, Thomas, and/or

Andrew. Furthermore, that conclusion also helps explain some of the sloppiness of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John. Had the Gospel of Mark already been produced, then there would have been more of an organized precedent to go off of when altering chapter 20 of the Gospel of John. Since those verses seem to have been produced before the production of the Gospel of Mark, there was less of a precedent set for how to deal with that situation, which likely gave way to some of the reason for the sloppiness of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John. Again, there was still some connection between Peter and Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew given the exaltation of Peter in the Gospel of John. However, the sloppiness of the exaltation of Peter in the Gospel of John shows a lack of caring and a rushed attempt to meet certain technical guidelines that probably originated from Peter. So both the sloppiness of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John as well as the response in the Gospel of Mark to the narrative in the Gospel of John about the feeding of the 5,000 show the division that existed between Peter and Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew.

The separation between Peter and Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew seems to have also been associated with a relationship that was previously closer. Unlike that, the conflict between Peter and Levi seems to have been much more hostile. The difference seems to be that Levi moved away from Judaism and somewhat exalted Mariam while Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew seem to have stayed with Judaism, exalted Peter, and concealed information about Mariam. So while Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew seem to have been separated from Peter, it seems that their relationship with Peter was kept from being as hostile as Levi's relationship with Peter.

So Levi seems to have been in Egypt spreading the original version of the Gospel of John; then it seems that Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew were in Egypt spreading the first altered version of the Gospel of John; then Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John produced the Gospel of Mark while being based in Jerusalem and attempted to spread it in Egypt; and then Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and maybe also John produced the Gospel of Matthew while being based in Jerusalem and attempted to spread it in Egypt. In conclusion, Egypt appears to have been the initial main battleground for the Gospels, which involved Levi, and then Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew, and then Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John. That means that at least seven of "the eleven" plus James son of Mother Mariam were mainly focused on Egypt in terms of the spread of the Gospels. Why was Egypt receiving so much attention from all of these people over all other places?

John 12:7

*"Leave her alone", Jesus replied. "It was intended that she should save this perfume for the day of my burial. You will always have the poor among you, but you will not always have me."*

Mark 14:6-9

*"Leave her alone", said Jesus. "Why are you bothering her? She has done a beautiful thing to me. The poor you will always have with you, and you can help them any time you want. But you will not always have me. She did what she could. She poured perfume on my body beforehand to prepare for my burial. I tell you the truth, wherever the gospel is preached throughout the world, what she has done will also be told, in memory of her."*

Matthew 26:10-13

*Aware of this, Jesus said to them, "Why are you bothering this woman? She has done a beautiful thing to me. The poor you will always have with you, but you will not always have me. When she poured this*

*perfume on my body, she did it to prepare me for burial. I tell you the truth, wherever this gospel is preached throughout the world, what she has done will also be told, in memory of her.”*

It was explained in Part 2 that Mariam appears to have anointed Christ twice, once in Bethany and once during the burial. It was also explained that these verses from John, Mark, and Matthew all imply that the woman who anointed Christ in Bethany was aware that the Crucifixion would take place. John expresses that the woman was supposed to save the perfume for the burial while Mark and Matthew express that the anointing in Bethany was in preparation for the burial. So Mark and Matthew aren't exactly like John but all three imply that the woman who anointed Christ in Bethany knew that the Crucifixion would take place. Since the Gospels portray a set of circumstances in which nobody seemed to understand that the Crucifixion would take place, it doesn't seem that the authors intended to imply that this woman knew that the Crucifixion would take place. Instead, it seems that such an implication was simply a by-product of the rest of what they were trying to do. To unravel this, we should start with analyzing what seems to have happened with the original version of the Gospel of John and then examine how Mark and Matthew responded.

Chapter 12 of the Gospel of John describes “Mary” as anointing Christ in Bethany. In Part 2, it was shown that the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have described Mariam as anointing Christ and then the Gospel of John was fraudulently altered to only show the name “Mary”, which presents Mariam of Bethany as the person who anointed Christ instead of Mariam. Additionally, it was shown that the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have described Mariam being present during the burial and then the Gospel of John was fraudulently altered to replace her name with Nicodemus. Meanwhile, John 12:7 claims that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany was supposed to save some of the perfume for the burial, thereby implying that this person knew that the Crucifixion would take place. Mariam of Bethany doesn't seem to have been present during the burial and Nicodemus doesn't seem to have been present during the anointing in Bethany, which clearly shows evidence that neither of them carried out either anointing. So the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have described Mariam as having anointed Christ twice and then the Gospel of John was later fraudulently altered to describe Mariam of Bethany anointing Christ in Bethany and Nicodemus helping to anoint Christ during the burial.

The next important point pertains to what layer was the first layer to conceal information about Mariam anointing Christ. The layer that includes chapter 21, which was likely the last layer of the Gospel of John or close to it, seems to have overreached in attempts to clarify information. For example, as explained earlier, chapter 21 claims that Nathanael was from Cana, which seems to be the product of combing information from chapter 1 about the supposed calling of Nathanael with information in chapter 2 about the supposed first miracle of turning water into wine in Cana. The narrative about Cana comes right after the narrative about Nathanael but they are in fact two separate narratives. So it appears that the author of chapter 21 erroneously assumed that Nathanael was from Cana, and there wasn't really any need to guess where Nathanael was from anyway. That is a good example of how the author of the layer that includes chapter 21 went too far in trying to provide extra details. Another example can be seen in chapter 12.

John 12:21-22

*They came to Philip, who was from Bethsaida in Galilee, with a request. “Sir”, they said, “we would like to see Jesus.” Philip went to tell Andrew; Andrew and Philip in turn told Jesus.*

In these verses Bethsaida is described as being in Galilee, but as shown earlier, Bethsaida seems to have been on the east side of the Sea of Galilee. So just like Nathanael is erroneously described as being from Cana, another geographical error is describing Bethsaida as in Galilee. The style of chapter 21, the way it pulls pieces of information from different parts of the Gospel of John, seems to be representative in John 12:21-22, which shows evidence that the narrative that John 12:21-22 are a part of was added by the author of chapter 21.

Another example relates to the anointing of Christ in Bethany.

John 11:1-2

*Now a man named Lazarus was sick. He was from Bethany, the village of Mary and her sister Martha. This Mary, whose brother Lazarus now lay sick, was the same one who poured perfume on the Lord and wiped his feet with her hair.*

First off, as explained in Part 2, it's very strange to refer to the anointing of Christ in Bethany in chapter 11 when the anointing isn't described until chapter 12, especially since there isn't any further clarification needed to identify Mariam of Bethany other than describing her as being from Bethany and being the sister of Lazarus and Martha. That shows evidence that someone fraudulently altered chapter 11 to support the idea that Mariam of Bethany anointed Christ instead of Mariam. Second, that isn't really even needed for chapter 12 either because without Mariam being specifically identified in chapter 12, it already appears that Mariam of Bethany is being presented as the person who anointed Christ. So that indication in chapter 11 shows yet another overreaching attempt to provide further detail.

Another important example relates to the anointing during the burial.

John 19:38

*Later, Joseph of Arimathea asked Pilate for the body of Jesus. Now Joseph was a disciple of Jesus, but secretly because he feared the Jews. With Pilate's permission, he came and took the body away.*

John 19:39

*He was accompanied by Nicodemus, the man who earlier had visited Jesus at night. Nicodemus brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about seventy-five pounds.*

John 19:40

*Taking Jesus' body, the two of them wrapped it, with the spices, in strips of linen. This was in accordance with Jewish burial customs.*

Verses 38 and 40 of chapter 19 seem to have been a part of the original version of the Gospel of John because verse 38 says "the Jews" and verse 40 says "in accordance with Jewish burial customs", which both present the Jewish population as if they are not the target audience, which is characteristic of the original version and not characteristic of later layers. Meanwhile, verse 39 seems to be a later fraudulent addition. First, as already shown, simply the presence of Nicodemus shows the fraudulent nature of the verse. Additionally, verse 39 uses the words "myrrh", which comes from the Greek word *σμύρνης* ("smyrnēs"), and "aloes", which comes from the Greek word *ἀλόης* ("aloēs"); and verse 40 uses the word "spices", which comes from the Greek word *ἀρωμάτων* ("arōmatōn"). Verse 39 using the words "smyrnēs" and "aloēs" when the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have used the word "arōmatōn" shows that verse 39 seems to have been written by a different author than verse 40, and

therefore is a later fraudulent alteration. So verses 38 and 40 seem to have been a part of the original version of the Gospel of John and verse 39 seems to have been a later fraudulent addition that was wedged in between verses 38 and 40. Meanwhile, verse 40 says “the two of them”, which shows the presence of a second person who wasn’t Nicodemus. Obviously that person appears to have been Mariam.

In addition to all of that, verse 39 says “the man who earlier had visited Jesus at night”, which is representative of the little extra details that have been provided by the author of the layer that includes chapter 21. There’s a particular level of supposed clarifying details and information pulled from other parts of the Gospel of John that seem to have been inserted by the author of this layer and verse 39 seems to be characteristic of that. Not only is Nicodemus’ name taken from a different part of the Gospel of John, but then there’s the clarifying detail that Nicodemus is the person that was introduced in chapter 3. Both of those components are characteristic of the layer that includes chapter 21. Therefore, verse 39 seems to have been added much later on after the layer that involves Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew.

More specifically, such a description of Nicodemus shows a different writing style than that of chapter 3 that describes him as “a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus, a member of the Jewish ruling council”. Chapter 3 shows a certain familiarity with Nicodemus while verse 39 of chapter 19 shows a certain distance with Nicodemus. That shows evidence that the beginning of chapter 3 was written by a different author, and since verse 39 of chapter 19 references chapter 3, verse 39 of chapter 19 appears to have been added after the introduction of Nicodemus in chapter 3 was already a part of the Gospel of John. Furthermore, given that the original version of the Gospel of John typically uses the phrase “the Jews” instead of a more specific description like “Pharisees”, the description in chapter 3 of Nicodemus as a Pharisee is not characteristic of the original version of the Gospel of John, which means at the earliest it appears to have been added in the layer that came from Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew. Since verse 39 of chapter 19 appears to have been added after the description of Nicodemus as a Pharisee in chapter 3 and that description appears to have been added at the earliest in the third layer, that shows more specific evidence that verse 39 seems to have been added much later on after the layer that involves Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew. What that shows is that Mariam was probably described in the burial narrative in the version that came from Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew, and therefore Mariam was probably described as anointing Christ during the burial in that version.

Something different seems to be happening with the narrative about the anointing of Christ in Bethany. As shown earlier here in Part 5, the author of Luke and Acts seems to have possessed a version of the Gospel of John that portrayed Mariam of Bethany as the person who anointed Christ in Bethany, which shows that she was probably portrayed that way in the version that came from Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew. Furthermore, that portrayal of her seems to have entered the Gospel of John after the original version was already in circulation, which shows that the version that came from Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew was probably the first version that showed that.

So the original version of the Gospel of John seems to have portrayed Mariam as anointing Christ twice; and then the version from Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew seems to have portrayed Mariam of Bethany as anointing Christ in Bethany while continuing the portrayal of Mariam as the person who anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial; and then the author of the layer that includes chapter 21 seems to have felt that it wasn’t clear enough that Mariam of Bethany was being portrayed as the person who anointed Christ in Bethany so they added details to chapter 11 to emphasize

that and then replaced Mariam's name in the burial narrative with Nicodemus' name to portray him as present during the burial instead of her because chapter 12 describes someone named "Mary" and implies that she had knowledge that the burial was going to take place and that she would save some of the perfume for the burial, which would imply that someone present during the burial anointed Christ in Bethany so they wanted to take Mariam's name out of the burial narrative.

So when the Gospel of Mark was produced, the version of the Gospel of John that Peter's group was responding to seems to have portrayed Mariam of Bethany as the person who anointed Christ in Bethany and Mariam as the person who anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. That's the starting point in terms of the Gospel of John that was presented to Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John as they were forming their narratives for the Gospel of Mark.

As we turn to the information in the Gospel of Mark, we can see that the woman who anointed Christ in Bethany goes unnamed, Mariam is presented as having been present during the burial, and there isn't any anointing during the burial described. So they took away naming the woman who anointed Christ in Bethany and took away describing an anointing during the burial while keeping Mariam's presence in the burial narrative.

It seems that both the group of Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew as well as the group of Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John had an issue with naming Mariam as the person who anointed Christ in Bethany. The issue that they appear to have had was that the anointing in Bethany shows that Mariam seems to have had knowledge of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection as soon as the night of the anointing, which contrasts with the idea that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection were surprises to everybody. Levi, on the other hand, seems to have named Mariam. Afterward, Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew appear to have fraudulently altered that narrative to portray Mariam of Bethany as that person; and then Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John portrayed an unnamed woman as that person.

The Gospel of John expresses that the woman who anointed Christ in Bethany was supposed to save some of the perfume for the burial, which implies that she would have had knowledge of the Crucifixion and that she was present during the burial. However, the layer that came from Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew portrays Mariam of Bethany as anointing Christ in Bethany and doesn't name her in the burial narrative, which shows that they seem to have overlooked the details of John 12:7 that imply that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany had knowledge of the Crucifixion beforehand and was present during the burial. That shows that the idea that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany had knowledge of the Crucifixion beforehand and was present during the burial was in the original version of the Gospel of John and then Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew overlooked that information when they portrayed Mariam of Bethany as having anointed Christ in Bethany. That means that the original version of the Gospel of John expressed information that implied that Mariam knew that the Crucifixion was going to happen and that she was present during the burial. Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew seem to have overlooked those details and seem to have been simply concerned with portraying Mariam of Bethany instead of Mariam as the person who anointed Christ in Bethany. Meanwhile, they left Mariam's presence in the burial narrative, which then created an issue because John 12:7 implies that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany had knowledge of the Crucifixion beforehand and was present during the burial; and that issue

appears to have then been recognized by the author of the layer that includes chapter 21 who then seems to have replaced Mariam's name in the burial narrative with Nicodemus to compensate for the issue that remained from John 12:7. Furthermore, the author of the layer that includes chapter 21 may have been afraid to take John 12:7 out because they may have felt that it contains important information about Christ, similar to how John 19:26-27 remained in the Gospel of John despite certain fraudulent alterations. So they instead seem to have changed the burial narrative to compensate for the issue that remained from John 12:7. As a result of all of this, to this day, John 12:7 implies that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany had knowledge of the Crucifixion beforehand and was present during the burial.

Another result of that is Mark and Matthew also implying that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany had knowledge of the Crucifixion beforehand. Mark and Matthew are very clear that "the disciples" were surprised by the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, so from that perspective it wouldn't have made sense to portray the person who anointed Christ in Bethany as having had knowledge of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection beforehand. Instead, that portrayal seems to have been an unintended consequence of responding to the Gospel of John as well as to information circulating in Egypt about Mariam anointing Christ in Bethany. They seem to have been fine with contradicting other people, making up false information, slandering people, and excluding important information, so they could have just entirely excluded the narrative about the anointing of Christ in Bethany. Instead, they did include it likely because they felt the need to address certain information that was circulating in Egypt.

Already, we can see that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John felt the need to address certain information that was circulating in Egypt about Mariam anointing Christ in Bethany. Additionally, Mark and Matthew go even further than John when describing the importance of the anointing in Bethany.

Mark 14: 9

*I tell you the truth, wherever the gospel is preached throughout the world, what she has done will also be told, in memory of her."*

Matthew 26:13

*I tell you the truth, wherever this gospel is preached throughout the world, what she has done will also be told, in memory of her."*

The information contained in these verses shows evidence that the anointing of Christ in Bethany was well-known where the Gospels were mainly spreading, which appears to have been in Egypt. The information in those verses is not in the Gospel of John. So Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John actually went further than the Gospel of John and indicated that the anointing of Christ in Bethany was well-known. However, they don't seem to have done that out of respect because they don't seem to have respected Mariam and left out a name in this narrative. Instead, they appear to have done that because they felt the need to address certain information that was circulating about the anointing in Bethany. Since that information isn't in the Gospel of John, that shows that they were doing much more than just responding to the Gospel of John. They were responding to information that was circulating among people even beyond the Gospel of John. That shows evidence that Mariam had a strong presence where the Gospels were mainly circulating, which appears to have been in Egypt, and that her strong presence there was not a result of the Gospel of John, which shows that her strong presence there

was more a result of her own actions. That in turn shows evidence that Mariam spread the true Christian Revolution in Egypt before any of the Gospels began circulating there.

There are multiple conclusions to now review. First, Mariam spread the true Christian Revolution in Egypt before any of the Gospels were circulating there, which shows that she probably went to Egypt shortly after the Resurrection. Second, Levi began spreading the original version of the Gospel of John in Egypt, which included some of the Testimony of Mariam and some other true information while also portraying Mariam as if she wasn't one of "the disciples" and also fraudulently describing Christ as appearing to "the disciples" after the Resurrection. Third, Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew fraudulently altered the Gospel of John and spread their version in Egypt. Fourth, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John obtained a copy of the Gospel of John that came from Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew and then produced the Gospel of Mark and spread it in Egypt. Fifth, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and maybe also John produced the Gospel of Matthew and spread it in Egypt. Sixth, the author of Luke and Acts had obtained some version of the Gospels of John, Mark, and Matthew in Egypt and then traveled to Jerusalem and produced the Gospel of Luke, which was then sent to "Theophilus" in Egypt.

Levi, Philip, Thomas, Andrew, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John could have spread their Gospels anywhere, especially since they were willing to target liberal Jews and gentiles. However, they chose to primarily focus on Egypt. That shows evidence that they specifically targeted a place where Mariam spread the true Christian Revolution, which shows that they appear to have been poaching off of her success. It appears that Mariam went to Egypt and the Gospels followed her there.

We saw earlier that Peter and his group seem to have been poaching off of Paul's success as well. So there seems to be quite a pattern of Peter and his group trying to infiltrate areas where Christianity had already spread and trying to poach off of other people's success. One main difference between infiltrating Paul's communities and infiltrating Egypt was the spread of the Gospels. If Peter and others were willing to poach off of both Mariam's as well as Paul's success, then why were the Gospels mainly spread in Egypt rather than in Paul's communities?

There are two key differences between the spreading of true Christianity by Mariam and what Paul was doing. One is that Mariam is the true human leader of Christianity and knew what true Christianity is. The other is that Mariam was a woman and Paul was a man. In terms of the spread of the Gospels, it is Mariam being a woman and Paul being a man that likely made such a difference. With Christianity growing in Egypt from Mariam's efforts, a lot of the converts would have probably been women. If Christianity spread among the female population, then the overall popularity of Christianity would have grown while much of the male population still hadn't been reached. That would have provided a prime opportunity for men to go into Egypt and convince other men that their brand of Christianity was the right way. Furthermore, men would have been much more likely to listen to another man than to a woman. With the overall popularity of Christianity growing in Egypt and men wanting to learn from other men instead of women, Egypt was ripe for men to come in and sell a false religion disguised as Christianity.

It's been said that history gets written by the winners, and men have usually been the winners in society. As such, the fraudulent Gospels that we see today in the Bible ended up being victorious over the last 2,000 years. But when we rewind back to the first century, we can see that a woman was spreading true



Christianity and that these fraudulent Gospels were poaching off of her success and appealing to the male population. Over time, these fraudulent Gospels continued to be pushed onto the people while so-called “heretics” were outcasted, imprisoned, murdered, or otherwise silenced while documents containing truth were burned or otherwise destroyed.

So far here in Part 5, we have assessed some of what appears to have been going on in the late twenties, the thirties, the forties, and the fifties. Levi seems to have given way to the original version of the Gospel of John. Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas seem to have given way to an altered version of the Gospel of John. Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John seem to have been involved with the production of the Gospel of Mark. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and maybe also John seem to have been based in Jerusalem, and they seem to have been involved with the production of the Gospel of Matthew and James son of Zebedee appears to have been executed by then. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and/or John seem to have been involved with providing information to the author of Luke and Acts. Some version of the Gospels of John, Mark, and Matthew all appear to have been circulating in Egypt before the production of the Gospel of Luke. An already fraudulently altered version of the Gospel of John appears to have been circulating before the Gospel of Mark was produced. The Gospel of Luke was likely circulating in Egypt shortly after production.

This analysis combined with what we had previously analyzed shows an exaltation of Peter and others as well as concealment of information about Mariam, Mother Mariam, Paul, Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany. Our findings have developed a storyline that is very different than the popular account of early Christianity. So far, we have seen evidence of the following: Mariam was the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century; the Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mariam; the Gospel of John was fraudulently altered to conceal information about Mariam; the Synoptic Gospels are massively fraudulent and unreliable; there was a campaign carried out to fraudulently exalt Peter and others and to conceal information about Mariam, Mother Mariam, Paul, Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany; this campaign was well under way by the forties and maybe much sooner; this campaign was carried out by people who were based in Jerusalem; and this campaign was carried out by Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, John, and some others of “the eleven”. There seems to have been serious division very early on in the history of Christianity. This division contributed to there being three massively fraudulent and unreliable Synoptic Gospels and a fraudulently altered version of the Gospel of John that seems to possess fragments of the Testimony of the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century.

As we try to uncover when this division began, we can look to how all four Gospels turned out. There are two kinds of narratives in each of the four Gospels that we should look at, one about Peter and one about Mariam. All four Gospels describe Peter as having disowned Christ and describe Mariam as having discovered the empty tomb. The distinction between those two kinds of narratives shows that this division existed even before the Crucifixion. Peter disowned Christ while Mariam stayed faithful. Afterwards, there was a campaign carried out by people who disowned Christ against the disciple who stayed faithful.

As previously explained, Mariam appears to have expected the Resurrection and it's not necessarily the case that she "discovered" the empty tomb. Nevertheless, it matters that all four Gospels describe her as discovering the empty tomb because that shows her presence near the tomb on the day of the Resurrection when Peter and others were not there.

The Gnostic Gospels can provide further evidence that this division was present as early as during Christ's Ministry.

Pistas Sophia

*"Mary, thou blessed one, whom I will perfect in all mysteries of those of the height, discourse in openness, thou, whose heart is raised to the kingdom of heaven more than all thy brethren."*

Pistas Sophia

*"Well done, Mary. You are more blessed than all women on earth, because you will be the fullness of fullness and completion of completion."*

Pistas Sophia (Peter is described as talking)

*"My Master, we cannot endure this woman who gets in our way and does not let any of us speak, though she talks all the time."*

Pistas Sophia (a woman is described as talking, probably Mariam)

*"My Master, I understand in my mind that I can come forward at any time to interpret what Pistas Sophia has said, but I am afraid of Peter, because he threatens me and hates our gender."*

Pistas Sophia (Christ is described as talking)

*"Any of those filled with the spirit of light will come forward to interpret what I say: no one will be able to oppose them."*

The Gospel of Mary

*Then Mary stood up. She greeted them all, addressing her brothers and sisters, "Do not weep and be distressed nor let your hearts be irresolute. For his grace will be with you all and will shelter you. Rather, we should praise his greatness, for he has prepared us and made us human beings." When Mary said these things, she turned their heart toward the Good, and they began to debate about the words of [the Savior].*

The Gospel of Mary

*Peter said to Mary, "Sister we know that the Savior loved you more than all other women. Tell us the words of the Savior that you remember, the things you know that we don't because we haven't heard them."*

The Gospel of Mary

*Peter responded, bringing up similar concerns. He questioned them about the Savior, "Did he then speak with a woman in private without our knowing about it? Are we to turn around and listen to her? Did he choose her over us?"*

*Then Mary wept and said to Peter, "My brother Peter, what are you imagining? Do you think that I have thought up these things by myself in my heart or that I am telling lies about the Savior?"*

*Levi answered, speaking to Peter, "Peter, you have always been a wrathful person. Now I see you contending against a woman like the adversaries. For if the Savior made her worthy, who are you then for your part to reject her? Assuredly the Savior's knowledge of her is completely reliable. That is why he loved her more than us. Rather, we should be ashamed. We should clothe ourselves with the perfect human, acquire it for ourselves as he commanded us, and announce the good news, not laying down any other rule or law that differs from what the Savior said."*

*After [he said these] things, they started going out [to] teach and to preach.*

Those parts from Pistas Sophia and the Gospel of Mary show Mariam as the top disciple and best student of Christ, and show Peter as having been in conflict with Mariam. That information from Pistas Sophia and the Gospel of Mary is consistent with conclusions that we have reached from analyzing the Gospels in the New Testament. Therefore, the conclusions that Mariam was the top disciple and best student of Christ and that Peter was in conflict with Mariam can be supported by information found in both the New Testament as well as the Gnostic Gospels. That doesn't necessarily validate all of the details in those verses from the Gnostic Gospels. It simply shows further justification for the beliefs that Mariam was the top disciple and best student of Christ and that Peter was in conflict with Mariam.

So there seems to have been division during Christ's Ministry. Additionally, as shown in Part 2, Mariam was probably the only disciple who saw Christ after the Resurrection. As shown here in Part 5, what seems to have ensued was that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, John, Philip, Thomas, Andrew, Levi, and maybe others were behind fraudulent Gospels that concealed information about Mariam and exalted Peter, James son of Zebedee, John, and the rest of "the Twelve".

As previously mentioned, all four Gospels describe Peter as having disowned Christ and describe Mariam as having discovered the empty tomb. The distinction between those narratives shows that this division existed even before the Crucifixion. Peter disowned Christ while Mariam stayed faithful. The inclusion of those narratives in the Gospels and the consistency of their presence among all four Gospels, particularly the Synoptic Gospels, shows that information related to those narratives was probably widely circulated. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John would not likely have wanted to include narratives about their disownment of Christ unless they were pressured into doing so because of the wide circulation of that information. If it was widely known that they disowned Christ, then there would likely have been pressure to include information about that because so many people were already aware of that. Similarly, they probably didn't want to describe Mariam as being the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. That is further evidenced by the ending in the Gospel of Mark through verse 16:8. There isn't a single appearance of Christ after the Resurrection described in the Gospel of Mark through verse 16:8. Then, the Gospel of Matthew was produced with a description of Christ having appeared to Mariam. The shift from Mark to Matthew in that way is likely a result of wide circulation of information about Christ having appeared to Mariam after the Resurrection.

The Testimony of Mariam began to spread soon after the Resurrection. Additionally, as was shown in Part 2 and earlier here in Part 5, information contained in the Gospel of John was circulating before any of the Synoptic Gospels were. Mark appears to have been the first Synoptic Gospel produced. Matthew appears to be a remodeled version of Mark. Luke appears to have been produced last.

Mariam probably proclaimed to others that Christ had risen shortly after the Resurrection, and then began the circulation of the Testimony of Mariam. We can see that division seems to have existed during

Christ's Ministry, and we can see from the information contained in the Gospels and in Acts that division seems to have still existed during the periods of time in which those documents were originally produced. The Gospel of Mary explicitly describes division between Peter and Mariam and that division that is described there shows Peter as the instigator. At different times after the beginning of that division, a fraudulent original version of the Gospel of John, multiple fraudulently altered versions of the Gospel of John, and three different fraudulent Synoptic Gospels were produced.

There was division during Christ's Ministry. Probably about twenty years after the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, the Gospel of Luke was produced, showing details about how that division had grown. There was a campaign carried out to discredit Mariam and to exalt Peter and the rest of "the Twelve", and that campaign appears to have been carried out by Peter and others of "the Twelve".

All four Gospels appear to have been circulating in Egypt. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and/or John appear to have been based in Jerusalem. Levi, Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas were likely in Egypt. It seems that Paul was traveling around but had not yet made it to Rome.

What about Mariam? What about Rome? What about France, Spain, the rest of northern Africa, and everywhere else?

## Part 6 – Your Chosen Sister

Evidence has been shown for the following beliefs about Mariam.

Mariam was the first disciple of Christ

Mariam anointed Christ in Bethany

Mariam proclaimed her faith in Christ as God before the Crucifixion and the Resurrection

Mariam followed Christ after Christ was arrested

Mariam was near the Cross during the Crucifixion

Christ spoke to Mariam during the Crucifixion

Christ expressed to Mother Mariam that Mariam is her daughter

Christ expressed to Mariam that Mother Mariam is her mother

Mariam took Mother Mariam into her home after the Crucifixion

Mariam anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial

Mariam expected the Resurrection

Mariam was at the tomb on the day of the Resurrection because she expected the Resurrection

Mariam was the only disciple to see Christ after the Resurrection

Mariam was the first disciple to believe in the Resurrection of Christ

Mariam was the first Christian to proclaim to others that Christ had risen

Mariam was the most faithful disciple of Christ during Christ's Ministry

Mariam was the true human leader of Christianity after the Resurrection

Mariam was chosen by God to be the true human leader of Christianity after the Resurrection

The Gospel of John possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mariam

Corrupted efforts were made to conceal information about Mariam, to conceal information related to Mariam having been the true human leader of Christianity after the Resurrection, and to conceal information related to the Gospel of John possessing fragments of the Testimony of Mariam

What happened to Mariam? Where did she go? What did she do?

First and foremost, we should recognize that the mission of a disciple is to spread Christianity and Mariam was the top disciple of Christ. Therefore, it seems that she would have gone somewhere to spread Christianity. Additionally, evidence has already been shown in Part 2 and Part 4 that Mariam led the true Christian Revolution. So she obviously would have had the biggest impact of any human being back then on the spread of true Christianity. The main questions revolve around where, when, and to what magnitude Mariam spread true Christianity.

To continue to set the stage, we should go back to Origen's writing. As we discussed in Part 2, Origen wrote "Contra Celsum" in response to writing by an anti-Christian philosopher named Celsus. We had seen that Origen wrote about "sects" of Christianity that were named after women. So it seems that into the second century and maybe into the third century and beyond, there were Christians who followed teachings that were passed on from women. The names Salome, Mariamme, and Martha are mentioned. There seems to be ten different women mentioned in the Gospels by name or in relation to someone else's name (with all mentions of a woman named Mariam who has a son named James or a son named Josés

considered to be in reference to Mother Mariam). Those ten women are Mariam, Mother Mariam, Mother Mariam's sister, Mariam the wife of Clopas, Mariam of Bethany, Martha, Salome, the mother of Zebedee's sons, Joanna, and Suzanna. Three of those women were likely among an older generation: Mother Mariam, Mother Mariam's sister, and the mother of Zebedee's sons. One of those women is described as having been married: Mariam the wife of Clopas. Women who were of an older generation and women who were married would have been less likely to have passed on teachings to a large quantity of people. Joanna and Suzanna only appear in the Gospel of Luke and the Gospel of Luke seems to be largely fraudulent, downplays female involvement more than any other Gospel, and refers to Mariam as someone whom seven demons came out and who supported "the Twelve" out of her own means. So information related to women in the Gospel of Luke is obviously not reliable. If we extract a list of names from the Gospels that consists of women who were likely of a younger generation, were not mentioned as having been married, and whose names appear in a Gospel other than Luke, then we would have a list that consists of Mariam, Mariam of Bethany, Martha, and Salome. Among those four women are three different first names: Mariam, Martha, and Salome. Those are the three names that we have been analyzing from Origen's writing. That conclusion shows that there is a good possibility that Origen's references to "sects" of Christianity that he connects to women named Mariam, Martha, or Salome are references to Christians who followed teachings that were passed on from Mariam, Mariam of Bethany, Martha, and/or Salome. So there is a good possibility that those four women spread teachings that were then passed on into at least the second century and were looked at as heretical by the "orthodox church". However, it is important to note that we really don't know if Celsus was referring to Mariam of Bethany, Martha, or Salome. He could have very well been referring to other people with those names. So we shouldn't assume that they were a part of the spread of Christianity. Regardless of what happened with Mariam of Bethany, Martha, and Salome, there are two important points to keep with us as we proceed. The first is that Mariam seems to have spread teachings of Christ and there was a campaign beginning in the first century to suppress information about her and oppose some of her teachings. The second is that there were "sects" of Christianity that were formed by women.

The following text is from the First Epistle of Clement.

*Through envy, those women, the Danaids and Dircaë, being persecuted, after they had suffered terrible and unspeakable torments, finished the course of their faith with steadfastness, and though weak in body, received a noble reward. Envy has alienated wives from their husbands, and changed that saying of our father Adam, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. Envy and strife have overthrown great cities, and rooted up mighty nations. (Chapter 6)*

The first sentence of that text refers to a group of women who were tormented and murdered. The second sentence of that text shows that there was separation between "husbands" and "wives", that the letter is opposed to that, and that the letter blamed that separation on envy. Since that separation is described immediately after describing the torment and murder of a group of women, that separation seems to be in connection with those women. The author was not only critical of these women, but was critical of them even while describing their torment and murders. This letter shows evidence that there were independent women who were Christians and that the "orthodox church" opposed them.

We previously saw that the "orthodox church" considered teachings from certain women to have been heretical. In Part 5, we saw that Peter and other men in the first century were likely involved with

suppressing information about women and discrediting them. We can now see from the First Epistle of Clement that there were independent women who were Christians who the “orthodox church” opposed. So there are several pieces of evidence that show that there were female Christian leaders, that there were independent women who were Christians, and that the “orthodox church” opposed female Christian leadership and independent women.

Mariam was the true human leader of Christianity in the first century after the Resurrection. Meanwhile, it appears that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, John, and the rest of “the eleven” went in a separate direction. Mariam gave her Testimony; Levi seems to have given way to the original version of the Gospel of John; Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas seem to have given way to an altered version of the Gospel of John; and Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John as a group seem to have given way to the Gospels of Mark and Matthew and influenced the Gospel of Luke.

All four Gospels seem to have been circulating in Egypt, which had a large gentile population as well as a large Jewish population and seems to have been more liberal than Jerusalem. At some point, Paul began his ministry and there was then another division of Christianity. There seems to have been one group that consisted of Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John; one group that included Levi; one group that included Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas; and then there was Paul. All of these divisions had their own beliefs. Meanwhile, the true Christian Revolution was led by the true human leader of Christianity in the first century, Mariam.

John 19:26-27

*When Jesus saw his mother there, and the disciple he loved standing nearby, he said to his mother, “Dear woman, here is your son”, and to the disciple, “Here is your mother.” From that time on, this disciple took her into his home.*

With the recognition that Mariam is the beloved disciple, the information in John 19:26-27 would suggest that Mariam took Mother Mariam into her home. Where was Mariam’s home?

## **Egypt**

As mentioned in Part 2, the name “Magdalene” is probably not a part of Mariam’s actual name. It is probably an indication of where Mariam was from. Some people believe that “Magdalene” was a name given to Mariam out of respect because it can refer to towers. However, the Gospels don’t give much respect to Mariam, and the Gospel of Luke describes her as someone whom seven demons came out of and who supported “the Twelve” out of her own means. Additionally, John 20:16, the only seemingly reliable verse about the Resurrection, does not use the name “Magdalene” and neither does Romans 16:6, which we will go into more detail on shortly. So Magdalene was probably not a name given out of respect. It was probably a name given in relation to where she was from. There seems to have been a Migdol in Israel and a Migdol in Egypt. So Mariam was probably from Israel or Egypt.

There is plenty of archaeological evidence for Migdol, Israel; and the popular belief is that Mariam was from Migdol, Israel because it was in Galilee on the coast of the Sea of Galilee, like Capernaum where Peter appears to have been from. Much less is known about Migdol, Egypt. Many believe that other

mentions of “Migdol” besides Migdol, Israel are in reference to a tower or a fortress because of the meaning of the word “Migdol”. An example of what gives way to that belief can be seen in the book of Joshua.

Joshua 19:35-39

*The fortified cities were Ziddim, Zer, Hammath, Rakkath, Kinnereth, Adamah, Ramah, Hazor, Kedesh, Edrei, En Hazor, Iron, Migdal El, Horem, Beth Anath, and Beth Shemesh. There were nineteen towns and their villages. These towns and their villages were the inheritance of the tribe of Naphtali, clan by clan.*

In those verses is a reference to “Migdal El”, which can be translated as “tower of El” and is often translated as “tower of God”. However, even if there was an actual tower that “Migdal El” was named for, this reference to “Migdal El” clearly relates to a city or town as the first and last verses indicate. Verse 35 states “The fortified cities were” and then goes on with all of the names that it does including “Migdal El”. Verse 39 states “These towns and their villages”. So clearly every one of those names relates to a city or town. Therefore, “Migdal El” was a city or a town.

The following verses also indicate that there was a city or town in Egypt called Migdol.

Ezekiel 29:10

*“Therefore, I am against you and against your streams, and I will make the land of Egypt a ruin and a desolate waste from Migdol to Aswan, as far as the border of Cush.”*

Ezekiel 30:6

*“This is what the Lord says:*

*‘The allies of Egypt will fall and her proud strength will fail. From Migdol to Aswan they will fall by the sword within her, declares the Sovereign Lord.’ ”*

Jeremiah 44:1

*This word came to Jeremiah concerning all the Jews living in Lower Egypt – in Migdol, Tahpanhes, and Memphis – and in Upper Egypt*

Outside of the Bible, there is a letter written to the Egyptian Pharaoh by Satatna who was a ruler of Akka, which is modern-day Acre, Israel. This letter, which has been dated to 1350-1335 BCE, states “Like Magdalu in Egypt”.

So there are multiple sources in and outside of the Bible that show that there was a city or town in Egypt called Migdol. It is important to note that the verses from the books of Joshua, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah specifically refer to Migdol as a city or town, so these references are not simply using the word “Migdol” to refer to a tower or a fortress. These verses specifically indicate that there was a city or town called Migdol. Furthermore, these verses from the books of Joshua, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah show that Migdol, Egypt was known to biblical authors, and more specifically, to Jews. Another important point is that the letter written by Satatna has been dated to 1350-1335 BCE and the books of Joshua, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah were likely written in the time-period of 750-500 BCE, which shows specific evidence that the name “Migdol” was associated with a city or town in Egypt for several centuries, more specifically over half a millennium and maybe over three quarters of a millennium depending on the dating of the books in the Hebrew Bible; and that’s just from the evidence that we have, so it’s likely that Migdol, Egypt was a city or town for well over a millennium and maybe even much more than that.



Just based on the name “Magdalene”, we are only initially focused on Galilee and Egypt. As shown in Part 5, it appears that Mariam was in Egypt shortly after the Resurrection. That conclusion was supported by the evidence that shows that John, Mark, and Matthew were mainly circulating in Egypt and that they all respond to Mariam’s strong presence there. The Gospels seem to have followed Mariam to Egypt, which appears to have been the main initial battleground for the Gospels. All of the evidence that was shown in Part 5 for these conclusions about Mariam’s presence in Egypt and the Gospels circulating there shows very specific evidence that Mariam was from Migdol, Egypt rather than Galilee.

Additionally, the relationship and interactions between Peter and Paul would have likely been very different if Mariam was in Galilee. Peter was in Jerusalem and Paul was further north with Galilee in between. So if Mariam lived in Galilee, the dynamics between Peter and Paul would have likely been different. Instead, Mariam appears to have been further southeast in Egypt and she doesn’t seem to have been involved in many of the interactions between Peter and Paul and the development of their relationship. The dynamics of the relationship between Peter and Paul serves as additional evidence that Mariam was further away from Peter and Paul, and therefore she likely wasn’t in Galilee.

There is yet another analysis that shows that Mariam was from Egypt. The following analysis will show multiple conclusions, one of which is that Mariam is from Egypt and another of which is that Paul knew Mariam.

Acts 18:11

*So Paul stayed for a year and a half, teaching them the word of God.*

Acts 18:19-23

*They arrived at Ephesus, where Paul left Priscilla and Aquila. He himself went into the synagogue and reasoned with the Jews. When they asked him to spend more time with them, he declined. But as he left, he promised, “I will come back if it is God’s will.” Then he set sail from Ephesus. When he landed in Caesarea, he went up and greeted the church and then went down to Antioch. After spending some time in Antioch, Paul set out from there and traveled from place to place throughout the region of Galatia and Phrygia, strengthening all the disciples.*

Acts 18:24-27

*Meanwhile a Jew named Apollos, a native of Alexandria, came to Ephesus. He was a learned man, with a thorough knowledge of Scriptures. He had been instructed in the way of the Lord, and he spoke with great fervor and taught about Jesus accurately, though he knew only the baptism of John. He began to speak boldly in the synagogue. When Priscilla and Aquila heard him, they invited him to their home and explained to him the way of God more adequately. When Apollos wanted to go to Achaia, the brothers encouraged him and wrote to the disciples there to welcome him. On arriving, he was a great help to those who by grace had believed.*

Acts 19:1-7

*While Apollos was at Corinth, Paul took the road through the interior and arrived at Ephesus. There he found some disciples and asked them, “Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?”*

*They answered, “No, we have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit.”*

*So Paul asked, “Then what baptism did you receive?”*

*“John’s baptism”, they replied.*

*Paul said, "John's baptism was a baptism of repentance." He told the people to believe in the one coming after him, that is, in Jesus. On hearing this they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. When Paul placed his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they spoke in tongues and prophesied. There were about twelve men in all.*

Acts 19:10

*This went on for two years, so that all the Jews and Greeks who lived in the province of Asia heard the word of the Lord.*

Acts 18:11 describes Paul as having stayed in Corinth for a year and a half. Acts 18:19-23 describe Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla as having arrived in Ephesus together. Those verses then go on to describe Paul refusing to stay with people who asked that he stay, leaving Aquila and Priscilla there, and traveling to several places without much explanation for what happened during those travels. Acts 18:24-27 then describe Apollos as having arrived in Ephesus and having met Aquila and Priscilla. Acts 19:1-7 describe Apollos as having been in Corinth when Paul is described as having returned to Ephesus. Acts 19:10 describes Paul staying in the same place (Tyrannus) for two years.

There are several points to make. The first is that Paul is suspiciously described as having been unwilling to talk to people who wanted him to. That doesn't sound like Paul. His mission was to spread Christianity. Why would he deny people the opportunity to learn from him? Also, he was previously described in chapter 18 as having stayed in Corinth for a year and a half and is described in chapter 19 as having stayed in Tyrannus for two years, so it's hard to believe that he was all of a sudden in too much of a hurry to teach people who wanted to learn. The second point is that Paul is described as going from place to place without much explanation for what specifically was going on. The third point is that Priscilla and Aquila are described as having been left in Ephesus while Paul continued to travel. Why were they left in Ephesus and why didn't they go with Paul? The fourth point is that Paul is described as having returned to Ephesus and there is all of a sudden more detail about what's going on as opposed to the lesser level of detail about the travels described in chapter 18 of Acts. The fifth point is that there is focus on Ephesus when Paul is described as not being there, which is strange because the story revolves around Paul. The sixth point is that Paul is then described as returning to Ephesus but Aquila and Priscilla are not a part of the scene anymore, which is strange because they were supposedly left in Ephesus and the narrative immediately before the description of Paul's return describes Aquila and Priscilla as still having been there. These points show that there seems to be something wrong with several aspects of this storyline, which is an indication that there was fraudulent alteration made to an already existing story.

Apollos is described as a learned man who knew scripture well and taught about Christ accurately, but then is also described as having only known "John's baptism". That doesn't make sense. If Apollos was a learned man who knew scripture well and taught about Christ accurately, then wouldn't he know more than just "John's baptism"? As shown in Part 5, a reference to someone only knowing John's baptism appears to be a reference to them not knowing Christ's teachings. So describing Apollos, who has already been described as someone who taught about Christ accurately, as not knowing Christ's teachings is a contradiction and indicates that there is writing in this narrative from multiple authors. The reference to "John's baptism" seems to be used to present Apollos as having inferior knowledge. However, Apollos is also described as a learned man who knew scripture well and taught about Christ accurately. There are obviously two different images of Apollos being represented within the narrative, which shows opposing

influences. It was previously shown that there seems to be something wrong with this narrative and therefore that there seems to have been fraudulent alteration to some aspect of the narrative. Now that we've identified opposing influences related to Apollos, we can narrow in on Apollos to see why this narrative was altered and in what ways.

Acts 19:1

*While Apollos was at Corinth, Paul took the road through the interior and arrived at Ephesus. There he found some disciples.*

1 Corinthians 16:12

*Now about our brother Apollos: I strongly urged him to go to you with the brothers. He was quite unwilling to go now, but he will go when he has the opportunity.*

Acts 19:1 describes Apollos as having been in Corinth but 1 Corinthians 16:12 shows that Apollos was unwilling to go to Corinth when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians. Paul presumably wrote both of the letters to the Corinthians after he left Corinth. Chapter 18 of Acts contains the first instance of a description of Paul going to Corinth and goes on to describe Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla as having gone to Ephesus and goes on to describe Paul leaving Ephesus. Chapter 19 describes Paul returning to Ephesus, chapter 20 describes more travels of Paul, and chapter 21 describes Paul going to Jerusalem and getting arrested. So presumably, both of the letters to the Corinthians would have been written during the timeline that spans from chapter 18 to chapter 21. According to 1 Corinthians 16:12, Apollos was unwilling to go to Corinth during that time-frame, but chapter 19 contradicts that and describes Apollos as having gone to Corinth, which shows further evidence that the descriptions of what happened in Ephesus were fraudulently altered. Furthermore, 1 Corinthians 16:19 supports that conclusion.

1 Corinthians 16:19

*The churches in the province of Asia send you greetings. Aquila and Priscilla greet you warmly in the Lord, and so does the church that meets at their house.*

1 Corinthians 16:19 shows that Aquila and Priscilla were with Paul when he wrote 1 Corinthians, which provides evidence that 1 Corinthians was written during the time-frame that chapter 18 of Acts covers. Since Apollos was unwilling to go to Corinth when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians and since Paul was with Aquila and Priscilla when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, it seems that Apollos would not have been in Corinth around the time that Paul was with Aquila and Priscilla, which is the time-frame covered by chapter 18 of Acts. At the end of chapter 18 of Acts, Apollos is described as having met Aquila and Priscilla shortly after Paul is described as having been with them and is described as having wanted to go to Corinth shortly after that; but as 1 Corinthians shows, Apollos refused to go to Corinth after already knowing Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla. So it seems that the description of Apollos going to Corinth is fraudulent. Apollos was probably not in Corinth as Acts 19:1 describes. Additionally, since Paul references Apollos in 1 Corinthians and 1 Corinthians was presumably written before Paul parted ways from Aquila and Priscilla, then it seems that it doesn't make sense that Aquila and Priscilla would have met Apollos for the first time in Ephesus without Paul as Acts describes. According to 1 Corinthians, Apollos was already known by Paul during a time that Paul was with Aquila and Priscilla, so Apollos wouldn't have been some stranger who appears onto the scene for the first time the way that Acts describes in chapter 18. The two conclusions being reached here are that Apollos wasn't in Corinth as Acts 19:1 describes and that he didn't meet Aquila and Priscilla for the first time without Paul as chapter 18 of Acts describes.

As discussed in Part 2, there are references to unnamed people in 2 Corinthians. Paul refers to a “brother” who received praise through all of the churches and who was planning to go to Corinth. Furthermore, Papyrus 46 states that this person received praise in the gospel through all of the churches. There is only one obvious person who comes to mind, Mariam. That would explain why this person goes unnamed. 2 Corinthians provides evidence that Paul probably knew Mariam when he wrote 2 Corinthians. Additionally, given that Paul was describing this person as planning to go to Corinth, Mariam was probably with Paul when he wrote 2 Corinthians and she probably went to Corinth afterwards. So not only did Paul probably know Mariam but he also probably spent time with her in person. As we will go into more detail on later, Paul’s knowledge of Christianity seems to have grown over time; and he probably went from thinking that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John were “pillars” to thinking that Mariam is the disciple who was praised in the gospel through all of the churches.

Since Mariam seems to have gone to Corinth and since Apollos’ name seems to have been used in fraudulent ways, it seems that Apollos’ name was used to conceal information about Mariam going to Corinth. Since Apollos’ name seems to have been used to conceal information about Mariam and since it doesn’t seem that Apollos met Aquila and Priscilla for the first time in Ephesus without Paul, it seems that Apollos’ name was used to conceal information about Mariam meeting Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus. That would also explain why Apollos is portrayed as having inferior knowledge shortly after being portrayed as having superior knowledge. The original story seems to have described Mariam with superior knowledge, and the story that we have today describes Apollos with both superior knowledge as well as inferior knowledge.

For further evidence we can look to more references to Apollos in 1 Corinthians.

1 Corinthians 1:11-12

*My brothers, some from Chloe’s household have informed me that there are quarrels among you. What I mean is this: One of you says, “I follow Apollos”; another, “I follow Cephas”; still another, “I follow Christ.”*

1 Corinthians 3:3-6

*You are still worldly. For since there is jealousy and quarreling among you, are you not worldly? Are you not acting like mere men? For when one says, “I follow Paul”, and another, “I follow Apollos”, are you not mere men? What after all, is Apollos? And what is Paul? Only servants, through whom you came to believe – as the Lord has assigned to each his task. I planted the seed, Apollos watered it, but God made it grow.*

Apollos is described in that same letter as having been unwilling to go to Corinth. So it seems unlikely that Apollos would be so highly regarded in Corinth. Furthermore, if Paul wrote on behalf of Apollos related to his unwillingness to go to Corinth, then it’s unlikely that there was so much of a divide between them that Corinthians followed either Paul or Apollos over the other. Additionally, we have seen that Apollos’ name has probably been used to cover up Mariam’s name. It would also make more sense for the three people described in relation to the division to be Mariam, Paul, and Peter as described in verses 1:11-12 (“Cephas” is Hebrew for “rock” and refers to Peter). Verses 3:3-6 describe Apollos watering a seed that Paul planted. That shows evidence that Mariam probably traveled to communities that were developed by Paul. Ephesus may have been one of those places or it may have been a community that Mariam developed. Either way, it seems that Mariam, Paul, Priscilla, and Aquila all met together in

Ephesus. Especially given that Mariam seems to have met Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus and Paul is suspiciously and mysteriously described as having left Ephesus before “Apollos” enters the scene, it seems that Paul was in Ephesus when Mariam was there.

So Apollos’ name seems to have been used to conceal information about Mariam. Mariam was likely in Ephesus when Paul, Priscilla, and Aquila were in Ephesus; and that is probably why Paul is described as leaving Priscilla and Aquila there and why Apollos’ name appears in such strange ways.

As mentioned before, Paul’s knowledge of Christianity seems to have grown over time; and he probably went from thinking that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John were “pillars” to thinking that Mariam is the disciple who was praised in the gospel through all of the churches. This meeting in Ephesus may have been the beginning of that or at least a part of Paul’s learning. That conclusion would explain the following verse.

Acts 18:26

*He began to speak boldly in the synagogue. When Priscilla and Aquila heard him, they invited him to their home and explained to him the way of God more adequately.*

This verse describes Aquila and Priscilla as teaching “Apollos”. However, the original story probably described Mariam teaching Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla. Mariam teaching Paul would have likely been the catalyst for Paul to have gone from thinking that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John were “pillars” to thinking that Mariam is the disciple who was praised in the gospel through all of the churches.

The following verse shows that Mariam seems to have gone to Corinth (Corinth was in Achaia) after meeting Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla in Ephesus.

Acts 18:27

*When Apollos wanted to go to Achaia, the brothers encouraged him and wrote to the disciples there to welcome him. On arriving, he was a great help to those who by grace had believed.*

The reference to “the brothers” writing to the disciples in Corinth to welcome “Apollos” is likely connected to Paul’s reference in 2 Corinthians of an unnamed person (presumably Mariam) planning to go to Corinth.

Now that it has been established that Apollos’ name seems to represent information in relation to Mariam, we can now uncover evidence regarding where Mariam was from.

Acts 18:24

*Meanwhile a Jew named Apollos, a native of Alexandria, came to Ephesus. He was a learned man, with a thorough knowledge of Scriptures.*

Acts 18:24 describes “Apollos” as having been from Alexandria, Egypt. Evidence has been shown that Mariam was probably from Migdol, Egypt. While Acts refers to Alexandria rather than Migdol, the reference to a location in Egypt serves as evidence that Mariam was from Egypt. Mariam seems to have been called “Magdalene” or a similar name that represented where she was from. Since it seems that someone was trying to conceal information about Mariam, any description of Migdol would likely have been problematic for them. So while Egypt stays in the picture, Alexandria is the specific city mentioned

rather than Migdol. Alternatively, instead of Alexandria being named instead of Migdol to avoid mentioning Migdol, it may have been the case that Mariam was associated with Alexandria because she spread Christianity there. Alexandria was the capital of Egypt during the first century. For someone to go to Egypt to spread Christianity, the most probable place they would go is Alexandria. Given the evidence that Mariam spread Christianity in Egypt, it is likely the case that she spread Christianity specifically in Alexandria. Regardless of exactly why Alexandria is mentioned rather than Migdol and regardless of whether Migdol or Alexandria was described in the original version of the narrative, it seems that Mariam was likely described in the original version of the narrative and that Apollos was later used to conceal information about Mariam. So instead of a description of Mariam as having been from Migdol, Egypt, the story that we have today describes “Apollos” as having been from Alexandria, Egypt. In conclusion, the description of Apollos, whose name seems to have been used to conceal information about Mariam, having been from Egypt is evidence that Mariam was from Egypt and spread Christianity there.

This analysis of Acts and the letters to the Corinthians shows further evidence that Mariam was from Egypt rather than Galilee. With all of the evidence shown for that conclusion, it seems very improbable that Mariam was from Galilee. Instead, there is enough evidence to be very confident that Mariam was from Egypt rather than Galilee.

## **Rome**

Another letter that we should look at is Paul’s letter to the Romans. In Romans, Paul names 29 people for whom he wants to send greetings to. At least nine of them are women: Phoebe, Priscilla, Mary, Tryphena, Tryphosa, Persis, Rufus’ mother, Julia, and Nereus’ sister. Out of all of the people mentioned throughout the entire letter, there is only one person who is described as having been someone who “worked very hard” specifically for the people who the letter is addressed to, whom were Christians in Rome.

Romans 16:6

*Greet Mary, who worked very hard for you.*

Obviously, since the letter is addressed to Christians in Rome, the kind of work being referred to in Romans 16:6 seems to be Christian missionary work in Rome. This “Mary” is the only person Paul specifically described as having “worked very hard” for Christians in Rome. Why is there only one person specifically described as having “worked very hard” for Christians in Rome? There being only one person specifically described as having worked very hard for Christians in Rome doesn’t necessarily mean that the other people mentioned didn’t work very hard for Christians in Rome, it just means that only one person was specifically called out as having worked very hard for Christians in Rome. So why is there only one person being specifically called out as having “worked very hard” for Christians in Rome? Well, this person was likely the leader of the Christian community in Rome. Why would the only person who Paul specifically describes as having worked very hard for Christians in Rome be someone other than the leader of the Christian community in Rome? Even if this person wasn’t necessarily considered the top leader, it appears that they were at least some kind of leader.

Additionally, we can look to the order of the names in Paul’s greetings for further evidence that the person mentioned in Romans 16:6 was the leader of the Christian community in Rome. The first person

mentioned is Phoebe who apparently was planning to travel to Rome based on Paul's request that they receive her well. Her plan to travel to Rome was probably why she was mentioned first. She may have been with Paul when he wrote his letter to the Romans, and she may have been the person who delivered the letter. After that, Priscilla and Aquila are named. Acts describes Paul having met Priscilla and Aquila in Corinth and traveling with them. Romans 16:4 states "They risked their lives for me". Paul was presumably very close to Priscilla and Aquila. So they seem like natural choices to be named towards the beginning of the greetings. After that, "the church that meets at their house" is mentioned. After that, Epenetus is mentioned and is described as "the first convert of the province of Asia". There are only four individual people mentioned before "Mary". After "Mary", Andronicus and Junias are mentioned and are described as relatives of Paul's who had been in prison with him. They obviously seem to have had a very close relationship with Paul and they are named after "Mary", which shows further evidence of her importance. Furthermore, nothing else is said about "Mary" other than that she worked very hard for Christians in Rome. Priscilla and Aquila are credited with saving Paul's life, Epenetus is credited with being the first convert in the province of Asia, and Andronicus and Junias are credited with being relatives of Paul's and having been in prison with him. Meanwhile, all that is said about "Mary" is that she worked very hard for Christians in Rome. The extravagance of what Paul says about Priscilla, Aquila, Epenetus, Andronicus, and Junias contrasted with the simplicity of what Paul says about "Mary" shows evidence that she is probably listed as high as she is in the order of names precisely because of her hard work for the Christian community in Rome, which shows evidence that "Mary" was probably the leader of the Christian community in Rome.

For further evidence that this person was probably the leader of the Christian community in Rome, we can look to the name of that person, which is translated as "Mary". The Greek word shown on Papyrus 46 that refers to the person's name who is greeted in Romans 16:6 can be translated as "Mariam". It doesn't seem like a coincidence that the only person specifically described by Paul as having worked very hard for Christians in Rome is identified with the same name as the person who was the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century. Of course, "Mariam" was a popular name back then; however, the name "Mariam" seems to have been a lot less common in Rome than it was in Israel. Additionally, out of 29 names, the name "Mariam" only appears once. So the name "Mariam" is only 1 out of 29 names in this list, which is an indication that the name "Mariam" wasn't that popular in Rome and the connection this name has with the most faithful disciple of Christ is evidence that the use of this name is a reference to Mariam. Regardless, since Mariam was the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century, it would make sense if she was the person who led the development of the Christian community in the capital city of the Roman Empire. There doesn't seem to have been anyone else better qualified for that mission.

Additionally, since all that is said about her is that she worked hard and there isn't any other piece of identifying material that would specifically identify her as the Mariam who was the top disciple of Christ, there seems to have not been motivation to conceal her name in Romans 16:6 as opposed to what happened in 2 Corinthians. In 2 Corinthians, an unnamed person is described as the disciple who was praised in the gospel through all of the churches. That description would have been more problematic for the "orthodox church" than the description of hard work in Romans 16:6.

So there is only one person specifically described by Paul as having worked very hard for Christians in Rome, that person was named "Mariam", and it would make sense if the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century, who was Mariam, was the person who led the development of the Christian

community in the capital city of the Roman Empire. Even though “Mariam” wasn’t a rare name in the first century, it’s still probably not a coincidence that the only person specifically described by Paul as having worked very hard for Christians in the capital city of the Roman Empire shares the same name as the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century.

There are two important pieces of information to derive from Romans 16:6. One is that there is only one person specifically described by Paul as having worked very hard for Christians in Rome. The other is that this person was referred to as “Mariam”. A conclusion that can be derived from those two pieces of information is that there was someone named “Mariam” who was a leader of the Christian community in Rome. In response to that conclusion, we can compare that conclusion to the strong evidence that shows that Mariam was the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century. We can then also recognize that it would make sense for the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century to have been the leader of the Christian community in the capital city of the Roman Empire. This analysis brings us to the conclusion that Mariam was probably the leader of the Christian community in Rome.

Additionally, it has already been shown that Paul probably knew Mariam and was probably with her when he wrote 2 Corinthians. Priscilla and Aquila both seem to have known Mariam as well and they are both mentioned in Paul’s letter to the Romans. Priscilla and Aquila are mentioned in 1 Corinthians as well as in Romans. They are mentioned in 1 Corinthians as having been with Paul and are mentioned in Romans as having been in Rome apart from Paul. Meanwhile, Paul, Priscilla, and Aquila seem to have all known Mariam and Paul indicates in Romans that there seems to have been someone named Mariam who was with Priscilla and Aquila in Rome. Priscilla and Aquila seem to have been with Paul in Ephesus when he wrote 1 Corinthians, seem to have met Mariam in Ephesus, and seem to have been with Mariam in Rome when Paul wrote Romans. The evidence that shows that Paul, Priscilla, and Aquila knew Mariam is supporting evidence that Mariam is referenced in Romans 16:6. That in turn shows evidence that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome since Romans 16:6 seems to portray the person described in that verse as the leader of the Christian community in Rome.

Who else would have spread Christianity to Rome? The New Testament doesn’t explicitly tell us. There isn’t any legitimate public record that tells us how Christianity spread to Rome. There are legends that describe Peter going there and then naming bishops who carried on his legacy. As we will go into more detail on later, those legends are probably fraudulent. Regardless, even if Peter did make it to Rome and named bishops, there isn’t any description in any legitimate public record about Peter having developed the Christian community in Rome. There are simply legends about Peter being the first bishop of Rome and naming other bishops to succeed him. As will be shown later, Peter probably never made it to Rome.

There is absolutely no recorded explanation from any legitimate public record from the first few centuries that explains how Christianity spread to Rome. The development of the Christian community in Rome is one of the biggest mysteries of Christian history. The presence of such a mystery combined with evidence already shown that information about Mariam was fraudulently concealed is further evidence that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome. If Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome, that would provide a very sufficient explanation as to why there isn’t any legitimate publicly recorded history from the first few centuries of the development of the Christian community in the capital city of the Roman Empire during the first century. An easy argument can be made that one of the most important parts of Christian history is missing from the available records. Of everything that we have, we



may not have any record of one of the most important parts of Christian history. That assertion is incredible evidence that Mariam was the person who led the development of the Christian community in Rome. Romans 16:6 may be the most important verse that Paul ever wrote, evidence in the New Testament that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome when Paul wrote his letter to Christians in Rome.

There are a few other pieces of evidence in Paul's letter to the Romans. One relates to the amount of people named in this letter. There isn't any other letter throughout the entire New Testament that names as many people as Paul did when he wrote to Christians in Rome. If one were to judge solely on that fact, then the Christian community in Rome would appear to have been the strongest Christian community in the world during that time-period. We don't know if that was the case, but it appears that way based on Paul's list of greetings in his letter to the Romans being so extravagant compared to every other letter in the New Testament. It is so distinguishable. Paul's list of greetings in his letter to the Romans sets it apart from every other letter in the New Testament. So there is evidence that suggests that the Christian community in Rome was probably the strongest Christian community during that time-period. Not only is Paul's letter to the Romans strong evidence that the Christian community in Rome was probably strong; but also with the population level in Rome during that time-period, there is good reason to believe that if there was a Christian community in Rome then that community was probably large, at least proportionate to the overall population in that city. Even if that community wasn't the strongest Christian community, it was nevertheless likely a strong community. So not only does Paul's letter to the Romans show strong evidence that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome, but it also shows evidence that the Christian community in Rome was probably a very strong community and probably the strongest Christian community during that time-period. In other words, Paul's letter to the Romans shows evidence that Mariam was probably the leader of the strongest Christian community in the world during that time-period and that such a community was in the capital city of the Roman Empire. It would make sense if the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century was the leader of the strongest Christian community in the world during that time-period, and it would make sense if the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century was the leader of the Christian community in the capital city of the Roman Empire.

The next piece of evidence that we should look at in Paul's letter to the Romans is his explanation for why he had been hindered from going to Rome, which we first saw in Part 5.

Romans 15:20-22

*It has always been my ambition to preach the gospel where Christ was not known, so that I would not be building on someone else's foundation. Rather, as it is written:*

*"Those who were not told about him will see, and those who have not heard will understand."*

*This is why I have often been hindered from coming to you.*

Paul shows evidence that someone other than himself developed the Christian community in Rome. Furthermore, another piece of evidence is that nobody mentioned in the Gospels besides Mariam seems to be mentioned in Paul's letter to the Romans. Romans 15:20-22 shows evidence that it wasn't Paul who developed the Christian foundation in Rome. The exclusion of the names of Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, John, and the rest of "the eleven" in Paul's letter to the Romans shows evidence that probably none of them were in Rome when Paul wrote that letter, which shows evidence that they probably were not leaders of that community. So there is evidence that shows that Mariam was

the leader of the Christian community in Rome and there is evidence that shows that Paul, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, John, and the rest of “the eleven” were not leaders of that community.

In addition to all of that, Acts may provide further evidence as well. The document that doesn't show a single mention of Mariam's name may just end up giving us important information about Mariam after all. The end of Acts describes Paul talking to some Jews in Rome and some of them believing in what Paul was saying and some of them not believing. Immediately after that, there is a brief conclusion that summarizes the rest of Paul's supposed time in prison.

Acts 28:30-31

*For two whole years Paul stayed there in his own rented house and welcomed all who came to see him. Boldly and without hindrance he preached the kingdom of God and taught about the Lord Jesus Christ.*

The part immediately before these verses is the part about Paul talking to some Jews and some of them believing and some of them not believing. That is presented as having happened shortly after they got to Rome. Then all of a sudden, we're hit with a brief two-verse summary that covers two years of Paul's prison sentence and doesn't even offer any explanation as to what happened to Paul at the end of those two years. There are two popular beliefs. One is that he was executed during that prison sentence, but it's strange to have a brief summary of two years and then have absolutely no information that leads to evidence of an execution. The other is that Paul was released from prison, and then there are some who believe that he was imprisoned again later on. Where did the information at the end of Acts come from? Why are we told about one conversation that supposedly took place there but then hit with a brief summary of two years? Did the author of Acts stay with Paul for those two years? If so, why don't we have more details about what happened during those two years? If the author of Acts didn't stay with Paul for those two years, then where did that conclusion come from? Why does Acts cut off shortly after they get there before getting to the conclusion?

The author of Acts presumably traveled with Paul through a very long duration of time and even supposedly traveled on a ship with Paul while he was being transported as a prisoner. Are we really to believe that they just up and left shortly after arriving in Rome and only described one conversation with some Jews and that's it? What about that Christian community in Rome that Paul wrote to before he was arrested? What about all of those people mentioned in Paul's famous letter to the Romans? The author of Acts was supposedly on a ship for months with Paul while he was a prisoner. This person seems to have been incredibly committed to discovering how Christianity was spreading. Why would the author of Acts leave Rome almost as soon as they got there?

Rome was not new territory for Christianity when Paul arrived there. The last narrative before the conclusion of Acts depicts a scene that excludes the already existing Christian community in Rome. There's obviously a lot more to the story. It seems unrealistic that the author of Acts up and left shortly after they arrived in Rome. The abrupt transition to a summary of a two-year period of time is evidence that a portion of Acts that describes what happened in Rome was probably fraudulently removed. Such an assertion is even more justified given that there is mysteriously no explanation given by any legitimate public record as to how Christianity spread to Rome. It is incredibly outrageous that there is no legitimate public explanation as to how Christianity spread to Rome, the capital city of the Roman Empire. Such an atrocity is evidence that incredibly important parts of Acts are missing, those parts being about Paul and

the author of Acts having been in Rome. Such a simple conclusion to such a magnificent story is evidence that portions of Acts were probably removed. The conclusion itself shows that someone attempted to force a conclusion. It's not just that the Christian community in Rome is not described much in Acts, it's also the particular form that the brief conclusion is in. Such a conclusion shows that there was likely an attempt to fill a void caused by the removal of other information.

The author's supposed willingness to travel on that ship with Paul is evidence that they too probably wanted to go to Rome. Why would they want to go to Rome? Probably to see the Christian community there. It seems that the author of Acts was from Egypt, traveled to Jerusalem and obtained information from Peter and others, and traveled with Paul on the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea. By then, Rome was the obvious place left for someone who was trying to document the spreading of Christianity, which is what Acts is about. The author of Acts had gathered a lot of information about Christianity from different sources and there was one key piece missing: the Christian community in Rome. That leads to the author of Acts traveling with Paul to Rome. With all of the information in Acts about other places, including Jerusalem and all of the places traveled to with Paul, and with the presumption that the author of Acts did in fact travel to Rome, it's almost a foregone conclusion that the author of Acts wrote plenty of details about Christianity in Rome. So the exclusion from Acts of more details about the Christian community in Rome is evidence that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome when Paul was there as a prisoner and that information about the Christian community in Rome was fraudulently removed from Acts.

The exclusion from Acts of more information about the Christian community in Rome is in line with the general concealment of information about Mariam. There seems to have been an effort to conceal information about Mariam as well as the Christian community in Rome. Along with that, it seems that the "orthodox church" did not want to report information about the Great Fire of Rome in 64. There isn't a single publicly known document written by a Christian author before the fifth century about the Great Fire of Rome in 64. That is incredibly astonishing because there were supposedly extreme persecutions of Christians by the Roman emperor Nero in the aftermath of the Great Fire. If Christians really were persecuted by Nero in the aftermath of the Great Fire, then the absence of any Christian documents that were written before the fifth century that describe those persecutions would show further evidence that there was an effort to conceal information about the Christian community in Rome.

As will be shown, there are some documents written by the "orthodox church" about persecution of Christians by Nero, but those writings specifically exclude any connection to the Great Fire. It will be shown that this is the case because the timing of the persecutions by Nero seems to have been important to the "orthodox church". They wanted to say that Peter was in Rome and that there were persecutions of Christians by Nero, but they specifically avoided connecting those persecutions to the Great Fire. It will be shown that Mariam and the Christian community in Rome that she developed were the people persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire. So the recognition by the "orthodox church" that there were persecutions by Nero seems to be based on truth, but they then disconnected those persecutions from the Great Fire and inserted Peter into the story.

If Christians really were persecuted by Nero in the aftermath of the Great Fire, then the absence of any Christian documents that were written before the fifth century that describe those persecutions would show further evidence that there was an effort to conceal information about the Christian community in

Rome. The next question is about whether Nero actually persecuted Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire.

The following text is from a work called “Annals” and is attributed to Tacitus, a Roman historian who lived in the first and second centuries.

*But all human efforts, all the lavish gifts of the emperor, and the propitiations of the gods, did not banish the sinister belief that the conflagration was the result of an order. Consequently, to get rid of the report, Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the populace.*

*Christus, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilatus, and a most mischievous superstition, thus checked for the moment, again broke out not only in Judæa, the first source of the evil, but even in Rome, where all things hideous and shameful from every part of the world find their centre and become popular.*

*Accordingly, an arrest was first made of all who pleaded guilty; then, upon their information, an immense multitude was convicted, not so much of the crime of firing the city, as of hatred against mankind. Mockery of every sort was added to their deaths. Covered with the skins of beasts, they were torn by dogs and perished, or were nailed to crosses, or were doomed to the flames and burnt, to serve as a nightly illumination, when daylight had expired. Nero offered his gardens for the spectacle, and was exhibiting a show in the circus, while he mingled with the people in the dress of a charioteer or stood aloft on a car. Hence, even for criminals who deserved extreme and exemplary punishment, there arose a feeling of compassion; for it was not, as it seemed, for the public good, but to glut one man's cruelty, that they were being destroyed.*

That text from Annals is some of the most contested text in all of history. There have been a lot of books written about the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire. However, all of that is based on very little evidence. That text from Annals is apparently the only public source from the first four centuries of information about the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire. Furthermore, many question the authenticity of that text. So the only public source from the first four centuries might not even be authentic. Was it all made up or is at least some of it true?

We've seen an account that was supposedly written down in the second century. The copy that exists today is not from the second century, but it is supposedly a copy of Tacitus's work that was supposedly originally produced in the second century. So the next question is about whether Tacitus actually wrote that account.

There is evidence on the manuscript of Annals that the Latin word that translates to “Christians” was originally the Latin word that would have been translated as “Chrestians”. The Latin letter that gets translated as an “i” as the fourth letter seems to have originally been the Latin letter that would have gotten translated as an “e”. There is a relatively large space in the middle of the word after the Latin letter that translates to the “i” as the fourth letter and ultra-violet examination of the manuscript showed that there seems to have been an alteration to the ink on that copy. So it seems that after the word was written as the Latin word that would have gotten translated as “Chrestians”, the Latin letter that would have been translated as an “e” was changed to the Latin letter that gets translated as that “i”. This matters a great

deal because in the very next sentence, the first sentence of the second paragraph, “Christus” is spelled with an “i” as the fourth letter. If the preceding sentence showed “Chrestians” instead of “Christians”, then that misspelling would show evidence that each sentence was probably first written by different authors.

Christians in the first few centuries were often incorrectly called “Chrestians” based on the name “Chrestus”. It even seems that some Christians may have called themselves “Chrestians”. “Chrestus” was a relatively common name in the Roman Empire back then and that name means “good”. So it was easy for Christians to be mistakenly called “Chrestians”. The reference to “Chrestians” with an “e” in one sentence and the reference to “Christus” with an “i” in the very next sentence would show a break in writing style. Therefore, there were likely at least two authors involved in the text shown from Annals. A likely scenario is that the author of the second paragraph copied the first paragraph from previously written material that showed the Latin word for “Chrestians” and then added the second paragraph with the Latin word for “Christus”; and then after that, the same person or someone else made a physical adjustment to the ink that was on that particular document to show the Latin word for “Christians” instead of the Latin word for “Chrestians”. Regardless of what exactly happened, it seems that there were at least two authors involved in the text shown from Annals.

Another reason to believe that the second paragraph was written by a different author than the first paragraph is the level of familiarity with Christianity that the author of the second paragraph seems to have had that seems to be absent in the first paragraph. First, if the original writing of the first paragraph used the Latin word for “Chrestians”, then the use of the word “Chrestians” would show that the author of the first paragraph seems to have been less familiar with Christianity than the author of the second paragraph who used the name “Christus”. Second, the first paragraph describes Christians as “called Christians by the populace”. Whoever wrote that seems to have drawn on information from what the general population called Christians. If the author was confident that such a group of people was called Christians, then they wouldn’t have to specifically refer to them as being called Christians by the populace; the author could have just called them Christians and not refer to the populace. The reference to the populace calling them Christians shows a certain degree of unfamiliarity. The second paragraph, on the other hand, seems to only serve the purpose of providing more details about Christianity, which shows a higher degree of familiarity with Christianity. Since the second paragraph refers to the name “Christus”, the author of that paragraph seems to have not needed to have drawn on what the populace called Christians. If they were familiar with the population of Christians, then they would probably have known that followers of Christ were called Christians. Third, a second century Roman historian like Tacitus, or any Roman historian in the second century or later who needed to rely on what the populace called Christians, would not likely have known who Pontius Pilate was. Pontius Pilate only governed the small area of Judea during the twenties and thirties in the first century. Tacitus is estimated to have been born multiple decades afterward and estimated to have died about a century afterward. A governor of a small area like Judea so far from Rome is not likely to be well-known by a Roman historian so long afterward. However, the Christian population knew Pontius Pilate much better. Pontius Pilate was made famous by Christianity. Therefore, the reference to Pontius Pilate in the second paragraph shows a certain degree of familiarity with Christianity that does not seem to be present in the first paragraph. So the different degrees of familiarity among the first and second paragraphs show that they were probably written by different authors.

The third paragraph can also be shown to have been likely written by a different author than the first paragraph. The first paragraph expresses that Nero was suspected of ordering the fire and that he tried to blame Christians. The third paragraph expresses that Christians plead guilty to starting the fire and specifically referred to them as criminals. Such a contrast shows that the author of the first paragraph focused on suspicions directed at Nero and the author of the third paragraph seems to have portrayed Christians as the guilty party. Such a contrast clearly shows a difference of opinion, and therefore, the first and third paragraphs were probably written by different authors.

So there seems to have been at least two authors who contributed to this writing. Paragraph 1 was probably written by a different author than paragraphs 2 and 3. Given how strongly discriminatory paragraphs 2 and 3 are towards Christians, there is a good possibility that the same author wrote both paragraphs; but even if that's not the case, the main point is that multiple authors were likely involved in this writing. The exact number of authors is not as important as the likelihood that there were simply multiple authors rather than a single author.

While there seems to have been fraudulent additions to the writing, what is most important in analyzing this text is assessing whether Christians were really persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire. We can assess that by analyzing the likely intentions of the authors who produced these paragraphs. Regardless of how many authors were involved and even regardless of whether Tacitus was one of those authors, all three paragraphs seem to be discriminatory towards Christians. Therefore, it is unlikely that any Christians were involved with the original production of any of these paragraphs. So all of these paragraphs are probably from a non-Christian Roman historian, it's just that there were probably at least two non-Christian Roman historians who contributed to the writing. Additionally, although the second paragraph shows a higher degree of familiarity with Christianity and the third paragraph shows some degree of sympathy for Christians, both paragraphs were still likely written by a non-Christian given the discriminatory attitude towards Christians. Within the first few centuries, the Christian population grew immensely and the non-Christian population became more aware of Christianity. So it's not unusual for a non-Christian to have known certain details about Christianity. Furthermore, specifically in relation to the third paragraph, anyone can have sympathy for people who were tortured and murdered. So even though the third paragraph shows some degree of sympathy for Christians, the author was still likely a non-Christian. Also, the third paragraph calls Christians "criminals", so it seems obvious that the author was not a Christian. In conclusion, all three paragraphs were likely written by a non-Christian, and it seems that at least two non-Christians contributed to the writing.

It's important that none of the authors were likely Christians because that helps us understand the likely intentions of the authors. If any of the authors had been Christian, then the mentioning of Christians could have simply been about giving Christians attention. Since all of the authors seem to have disliked Christians, they didn't likely write about Christians just to give Christians attention. Additionally, they don't seem to have written about Christians just to discredit Christians. The first paragraph simply states that Christians were hated for their supposed abominations. The first paragraph mostly focuses on the Great Fire and Nero, so the first paragraph was not likely written with the main purpose of discrediting Christians. The assertion in the first paragraph that Christians were hated for their supposed abominations seems to simply serve as a supplementary detail rather than a main detail. The main details are about the Great Fire and Nero. The second paragraph seems to serve to give us more details about Christianity rather than to just discredit Christians. The third paragraph, while it is discriminatory against Christians,

also shows sympathy for Christians. If the author of the third paragraph simply wanted to discredit Christians, then there wouldn't likely be any degree of sympathy for Christians. So the sympathy for Christians that is expressed in the third paragraph shows that the author's main purpose probably wasn't to discredit Christians. In conclusion, the authors of this writing were probably not Christians and so they probably didn't write about Christians just to give Christians attention, and the authors were probably writing with a main purpose that was beyond simply discrediting Christians. What that conclusion shows is that these authors seem to have probably been producing an account that they thought appropriately described real history. That doesn't necessarily mean that everything that they wrote is true, it simply means that their intentions probably revolved around trying to give what they thought was an appropriate account of history.

Since these authors seem to have been trying to give what they thought was an appropriate account of history, there seems to have been information circulating that these authors used to give their accounts. So it seems that they probably didn't just make up this information on their own, but drew upon information that was already circulating. They may have made up certain specific details but the general concept of Christians having been persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire was probably already circulating for the authors to draw upon. If there was information already circulating about Christians having been persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire, then Christians probably really were persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire. Realistically, the only people who maybe would have had any motive to falsify details about that would have been people among the Christian population. There doesn't seem to have been much use for a non-Christian Roman historian to have falsely made up the idea that Christians were persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire. Meanwhile, information seems to have been circulating among non-Christian Romans that Christians were persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire. We can tell that by the conclusion already reached that the writing that we've been examining from Annals seems to have been written by non-Christian Romans. So if information was circulating among non-Christian Romans about the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire and a non-Christian Roman historian was unlikely to have made up those details themselves, then that information was circulating probably because Christians really were persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire.

Once information begins spreading, it can continue to spread and can transform. We saw that in Part 5 with the attention that Peter gets in the Gospels and with the narrative in the Gospel of Matthew about a rumor about disciples taking away the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ from the tomb. The attention that Peter gets in the Gospels probably originated from Peter. Once Peter got so much attention, it was easy for other people to give Peter attention. Other people could gain power from aligning themselves with the legacy of Peter. But the first person to have given Peter attention was probably Peter. Likewise, the rumor about disciples taking away the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ from the tomb probably originated in Jerusalem. Once that rumor began, it could spread and even transform, but it likely began in Jerusalem. So regarding the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire, for information about that to have been circulating among non-Christian Romans shows that such information likely originally derived from real history. Once that information began circulating, there could have been false information generated, but the mere idea of Christians having been persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire probably began with real history.

The first paragraph gives us the fundamentals of the story: the Great Fire happened, some people suspected that Nero ordered the Great Fire to have been started, and Nero persecuted Christians in the

aftermath of the Great Fire. If that much is true, then the absence in the first four centuries of writing from the “orthodox church” about the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire is evidence of fraudulent concealment of information about the Christian community in Rome, which would provide further evidence that Mariam was the leader of that community. That absence of information about the Great Fire from the “orthodox church” for four centuries is in line with the absence of information in Acts about what happened in Rome after Paul and the author of Acts are described as having arrived there, and both of those are in line with the general concealment of information about Mariam.

For further evidence, we can turn to Suetonius, a Roman historian who lived in the first and second centuries.

“The Twelve Caesars” – Nero 16

*He likewise inflicted punishments on the Christians, a sort of people who held a new and impious superstition.*

This text is from Suetonius’ work “The Twelve Caesars”, which chronicles the reigns of certain Roman Emperors. This text is from the 16<sup>th</sup> chapter of the part about Nero and describes that he persecuted Christians. The authenticity of this text can be demonstrated by looking at writing from Tertullian, a bishop of Carthage in the third century.

“Scorpiace” by Tertullian of Carthage

*We read the lives of the Cæsars: At Rome Nero was the first who stained with blood the rising faith. Then is Peter girt by another, when he is made fast to the cross.*

Tertullian lived in the third century and seems to refer to Suetonius’ work by stating “we read in the lives of the Caesars”. So Tertullian’s writing is evidence that the writing about the persecution of Christians by Nero in Suetonius’ “The Twelve Caesars” was in circulation by the time that Tertullian wrote the excerpt just previously shown.

Suetonius lived in the second century and Tertullian lived in the third century. Tertullian’s writing shows that another non-Christian Roman historian wrote about the persecution of Christians by Nero. We can then see that these persecutions seem to have been in the aftermath of the Great Fire because Paul’s letter to the Romans, which was probably written in the latter half of the fifties, doesn’t reference anything about Nero persecuting them. Nero’s reign began in 54 and it seems that the Christian community was already a strong community by the time that Paul wrote his letter to the Romans. It is doubtful that there was so much growth after Paul wrote his letter that Nero would have begun persecuting Christians after Paul wrote his letter for a different reason than a reason related to the Great Fire. So Suetonius’ writing shows evidence that Nero persecuted Christians and Paul’s letter to the Romans is evidence that Nero was not persecuting Christians early on in his reign, which shows that those persecutions likely began after the Great Fire rather than before.

So the probable scenario is that Tacitus, at least one other non-Christian Roman historian who added to Tacitus’ work, and Suetonius all wrote about the persecution of Christians by Nero. So it seems that at least three non-Christian Roman historians wrote about the persecution of Christians by Nero, and at least two of them specifically related those persecutions to the Great Fire.



Going back to what Tertullian wrote, we should narrow in on the fact that the writing refers to persecution of Christians by Nero but avoids relating those persecutions to the Great Fire and instead refers to Peter. As we will go into more detail on later here in Part 6, contrary to popular belief, Peter was probably never in Rome. We will go into detail about how the legend of Peter being persecuted in Rome is a fraudulent legend used to develop a fictional history about Christians in Rome to replace the true history of Mariam in Rome. Writing about the persecution of Christians by Nero but avoiding any mention of the Great Fire while putting Peter at center stage is very specific evidence of the effort in the first few centuries to conceal information about the true history of the persecutions after the Great Fire.

We should now take a look at some other writing that expresses that Nero persecuted Christians but makes no mention of the Great Fire.

“Of the Manner in which the Persecutors Died” by Lactantius

*When Nero heard of those things, and observed that not only in Rome, but in every other place, a great multitude revolted daily from the worship of idols, and, condemning their old ways, went over to the new religion, he, an execrable and pernicious tyrant, sprung forward to raze the heavenly temple and destroy the true faith. He it was who first persecuted the servants of God; he crucified Peter, and slew Paul: nor did he escape with impunity; for God looked on the affliction of His people; and therefore the tyrant, bereaved of authority, and precipitated from the height of empire, suddenly disappeared, and even the burial-place of that noxious wild beast was nowhere to be seen.*

We can see that both Tertullian and Lactantius describe persecution of Christians by Nero, but neither of them makes any reference to the Great Fire. There are three possibilities: Nero didn't persecute Christians at all, Nero persecuted Christians but none of those persecutions had anything to do with the Great Fire, or Nero persecuted Christians and at least some of those persecutions were related to the Great Fire. The first possibility is probably not true. As already shown, Tacitus, Suetonius, and at least one other non-Christian Roman historian appear to have really written about persecution of Christians by Nero and a non-Christian Roman historian would probably only write that if it were true because there doesn't seem to be any other obvious motivation for a non-Christian Roman historian to describe a disliked minority group as victims. Additionally, since Tertullian and Lactantius mention persecutions by Nero, that is supporting evidence that Nero really did persecute Christians. The question that then remains is about whether any persecutions of Christians by Nero were related to the Great Fire.

From here, there are three main pieces of evidence. One is that Tacitus and at least one other non-Christian Roman historian appear to have really written about Christians having been persecuted by Nero specifically in the aftermath of the Great Fire, which provides evidence that Nero really did persecute Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire. The second is that the “orthodox church” seems to have avoided talking about the Great Fire. It's incredibly strange that the “orthodox church” didn't want to write about the Great Fire, especially considering that they wrote about Peter having been in Rome around the same time-period. Their avoidance of writing about such a tragedy shows that they probably purposely avoided that subject. They likely would have only wanted to avoid that subject if it represented a major part of Christian history under the leadership of someone who they didn't want to write about. That someone seems to be Mariam. Since they seem to have purposely avoided that subject, it seems to be a major part of Christian history; and it is probably a major part of Christian history because Christians really were persecuted by Nero in the aftermath of the Great Fire. The third piece of evidence is that the

“orthodox church” seems to have wanted to relay some information about Nero having been a persecutor of Christians. That is evidence that Nero really did persecute Christians. If Nero really did persecute Christians, then that alone leaves a good possibility that those persecutions would have either began or escalated in the aftermath of the Great Fire. If Nero persecuted Christians at all, Nero probably persecuted Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire. With all of that information having been presented, still the biggest piece of evidence that Nero persecuted Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire is the evidence showing that multiple non-Christian Roman historians seem to have written about those persecutions and there doesn’t seem to be any obvious motivation for a non-Christian Roman historian to have done that unless Christians really were persecuted by Nero in the aftermath of the Great Fire. As previously stated, writing about the persecution of Christians by Nero but avoiding any mention of the Great Fire while putting Peter at center stage is very specific evidence of the effort in the first few centuries to conceal information about the true history of the persecutions after the Great Fire.

We can turn to the First Epistle of Clement for further evidence.

*But not to dwell upon ancient examples, let us come to the most recent spiritual heroes. Let us take the noble examples furnished in our own generation. Through envy and jealousy the greatest and most righteous pillars [of the church] have been persecuted and put to death. Let us set before our eyes the illustrious apostles. Peter, through unrighteous envy, endured not one or two, but numerous labours; and when he had at length suffered martyrdom, departed to the place of glory due to him. Owing to envy, Paul also obtained the reward of patient endurance, after being seven times thrown into captivity, compelled to flee, and stoned. After preaching both in the east and west, he gained the illustrious reputation due to his faith, having taught righteousness to the whole world, and come to the extreme limit of the west, and suffered martyrdom under the prefects. Thus was he removed from the world, and went into the holy place, having proved himself a striking example of patience. (Chapter 5)*

*To these men who spent their lives in the practice of holiness, there is to be added a great multitude of the elect, who, having through envy endured many indignities and tortures, furnished us with a most excellent example. Through envy, those women, the Danaids and Dircaë, being persecuted, after they had suffered terrible and unspeakable torments, finished the course of their faith with steadfastness, and though weak in body, received a noble reward. Envy has alienated wives from their husbands, and changed that saying of our father Adam, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. Envy and strife have overthrown great cities, and rooted up mighty nations. (Chapter 6)*

*Let every one of you, brethren, give thanks to God in his own order, living in all good conscience, with becoming gravity, and not going beyond the rule of the ministry prescribed to him. Not in every place, brethren, are the daily sacrifices offered, or the peace-offerings, or the sin-offerings and the trespass-offerings, but in Jerusalem only. And even there they are not offered in any place, but only at the altar before the temple, that which is offered being first carefully examined by the high priest and the ministers already mentioned. (Chapter 41)*

This writing refers to the deaths of Peter and Paul, and then goes on to refer to the torment and murder of women who are referred to as “the Danaids and Dircaë”. Since this author is writing about this group of women having been persecuted, we can reasonably derive the belief that they were Christians. The author probably wouldn’t have written about their persecution if they weren’t Christians. So the description of “the Danaids and Dircaë” seems to be a reference to a group of women who were Christians.

The letter speaks proudly of Peter and Paul and exalts them as the pillars of the church. The letter then takes a different direction when describing the group of women. It portrays women as inferior to men by stating “though weak in body, received a noble reward”. That statement takes a position that implies that women are typically not given “a noble reward”, as if they received a noble reward despite being women. It’s amazing that the author expressed an idea like “weak in body” when referring to the torment and murder of people. The author is clearly showing a discriminatory attitude towards this group of women and towards women in general. Then, going even further, the author goes on to refer to the Adam and Eve narratives to express the opinion that women have been separated from men. This is said immediately after the sentence that refers to the torment and murder of the group of women. So obviously the reference to women being separated from men was written in reference to this group of women.

The author’s discriminatory attitude towards this group of women can be further seen in the description “the Danaids and Dircae”. There is an ancient Greek myth that describes a group of women as having murdered their husbands and describes them as “Danaids”. The myth goes on to describe them as being punished by having to spend eternity carrying water. There was then a poem called “Metamorphoses” written by a Roman poet named Ovid that has been dated to 8 CE that uses this myth about the “Danaids” and their described murders. This poem, using Greek mythology in the first century in the Roman Empire, shows that the name “Danaids” was known in the Roman Empire in the first century as a reference to a fictional group of murderous women.

There is another ancient Greek myth that describes a woman as “Dirce”. In this story, the character named “Dirce” is described as ordering another woman to be murdered and is then described as being murdered by her two sons by being tied to the horns of a bull. There was a marble statue that was excavated in Rome that has been dated to the first century CE that depicts the fictional death of “Dirce”. This statue, having been influenced by Greek mythology and being seen by the public in Rome in the first century, shows that the name “Dirce” was known in the Roman Empire in the first century as a reference to a fictional woman who wanted another woman murdered and who was murdered by her two sons by being tied to the horns of a bull.

So the author of the letter used the names “Danaids” and “Dirce” during a time-period when those names would have been well-known and looked at negatively. There are two conclusions to derive from that. One is of course that the author discriminated against these women. The other is that these women probably didn’t call themselves “the Danaids” or “Dirce”. Those names appear to be inappropriate labels used by the author in a discriminatory way.

The author is obviously discriminating against this group of women who are being portrayed in the letter as independent from men, and the author probably wouldn’t have written about their persecution if they weren’t Christians. So there seems to have been a group of independent women who were Christians who were tormented and murdered, and these women were looked at as outcasts by the “orthodox church”.

The letter refers to sacrifices being made at the temple in Jerusalem, which indicates that this letter seems to have been written before the destruction of the temple in 70. The author instructs that people should not be making sacrifices in places outside of Jerusalem, and even in Jerusalem, sacrifices are only to be made at the temple. These instructions are focused on location. If the temple had already been destroyed, then location of sacrifices would not be an issue. If sacrifices were to only be made at the temple and the temple didn’t exist anymore, then no sacrifices should have been made at all, in which case location

would not have been an issue at all. So for location to have been the issue, the temple would seem to have still been standing. Additionally, since Paul's death is referred to, it seems that this letter was probably not written before the sixties in the first century. Since the letter seems to have not been written before the sixties and seems have been written before the destruction of the temple in 70, the letter seems to have been written in the sixties, or at the very latest in 70 shortly before the destruction of the temple. Since the letter was likely written in the sixties, that is likely when the murders of these women took place. It is very unlikely that the author would have referred to murders that occurred several years before given that the author was referring to a group of independent women who the they discriminated against.

As for location, the author was in Rome so the most likely location where these women were at was in Rome. Peter and Paul were looked at by the author as pillars of the church. Regardless of where Peter and Paul were when they died, this person was likely to have learned of their deaths. But for a group of independent women who the author discriminated against, it is far less likely that they would know much about them unless they lived in the same area.

The author was unlikely to have written about the murders of people they discriminated against unless those murders were recent and was unlikely to have even known about the murders of people they discriminated against unless those murders were local relative to the author. Therefore, since the letter appears to have been written in Rome during the sixties, it seems that the murders of these women took place in Rome during the sixties. Since these women seem to have been murdered in Rome during the sixties, it seems that these torments and murders were the persecutions that occurred in the aftermath of the Great Fire.

The reference to "unspeakable torments" is almost certainly a reference to actions of the Roman government. There isn't likely anyone else in the Roman Empire who could have gotten away with "unspeakable torments", especially since these torments seem to have been known to people who weren't among those who were tormented and murdered. Additionally, the reference to "unspeakable torments" seems to refer to torments that were beyond typical capital punishment for the Roman government. People were crucified, burned alive, and fed to animals as capital punishment carried out by the Roman government. Furthermore, Jews would stone people to death for what they considered blasphemy. In an environment with such punishment, "unspeakable torments" would seem to be punishment that is worse than being crucified, burned alive, fed to animals, and stoned to death. Therefore, the reference to "unspeakable torments" seems to refer to the Roman government inflicting torments that were beyond typical capital punishment, including being crucified, burned alive, fed to animals, and stoned to death. The evidence that shows that the Roman government inflicted torments that were beyond typical capital punishment like that shows evidence that the reference to "unspeakable torments" likely refers to the persecutions in the aftermath of the Great Fire.

We have now seen two ways in which this letter shows evidence that the reference to "unspeakable torments" refers to the persecutions in the aftermath of the Great Fire. The first is the setting in which the letter was written: Rome during the sixties. The second is that "unspeakable torments" most likely refers to torments inflicted by the Roman government that were beyond typical capital punishment, including being crucified, burned alive, fed to animals, and stoned to death, which would most likely refer the persecutions in the aftermath of the Great Fire.

The inclusion of both names “the Danaids” and “Dirce” with one of them referring to a group and the other referring to an individual shows that one woman seems to stand apart among a group of women. If there is to be one human being to be singled out apart from the rest of the human race, let alone a group of independent Christian women in the first century, that person would be the most faithful disciple of Christ and the true human leader of Christianity: Mariam. So when singling out a woman among a group of independent Christian women in the first century, we can easily derive the conclusion that this woman is Mariam. That conclusion not only shows evidence that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome, it also shows evidence that Mariam was tortured and murdered in the aftermath of the Great Fire.

This letter shows evidence that Christians were persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire, that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome, that Mariam and other independent Christian women were tortured and murdered in the aftermath of the Great Fire, and that the “orthodox church” avoided explicitly referring to the Great Fire and Mariam when writing about persecutions by Nero.

The Great Fire was in 64 and Nero reigned until 68, so if Nero’s persecution of Christians was continuous, then those persecutions could have lasted for about four years. However, as far as we can tell, there doesn’t seem to have been continuous persecutions of Christians over a multi-year period. Instead, the evidence seems to support that the persecution of Christians by Nero took place in the relatively immediate aftermath of the Great Fire.

Hypothetically, if there were continuous persecutions through a multi-year period, then there would have likely been an empire-wide sanction to criminalize Christians. However, the first empire-wide persecution of Christians seems to have not occurred until the middle of the third century under the reign of emperor Decius. An empire-wide sanction to hunt for and murder a certain group of people is much more likely to be recorded by the empire while a local persecution is much less likely to be. So the evidence clearly shows that the persecution of Christians by Nero seems to have occurred in the relatively immediate aftermath of the Great Fire and did not extend through the rest of the reign of Nero.

There are two points to now recognize together. The first is the point just previously established: that the persecution of Christians by Nero seems to have not extended through the rest of the reign of Nero. The other point is that there still seemed to be Christians in Rome even after the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire. Both the First Epistle of Clement as well as the book of Hebrews provides evidence of that. The First Epistle of Clement seems to have been written in the sixties after the Great Fire and the author seems to have claimed to have been a Christian living in Rome. The book of Hebrews claims that the author was writing from Italy. Additionally, the book of Hebrews, like the First Epistle of Clement, seems to have been written in the sixties. More specifically, the book of Hebrews seems to represent feelings about the Jewish-Roman war, which began in 66, about 2 years after the Great Fire. So both the First Epistle of Clement as well as the book of Hebrews show evidence that Christians were in and around Rome in the sixties well after the Great Fire.

If there continued to be Christians after the emperor blamed Christians for the Great Fire and after the emperor ordered the murder of Christians, then those Christians who were persecuted seem to have been a particular group of Christians who were separate from a lot of the Christian population that remained in Rome. Otherwise, persecutions would have likely continued for as long as Christians were found to be in

Rome. Therefore, Nero doesn't seem to have simply identified this group of people as Christians. So there must have been some other characteristic that Nero identified this group of people by.

Going back to the First Epistle of Clement, we can see that there seems to have been a group of independent women who were Christians who were tortured and murdered in Rome during the sixties and that these tortures and murders seem to have been the persecutions in the aftermath of the Great Fire. So we can easily identify that unique characteristic that Nero identified as being a community of independent women, which certainly would have stood out in first century Roman society. A group of independent women who were Christians could have easily been identified as independent women rather than Christians; and in the first century, the Roman government was more likely to notice independent women than Christians. Christianity probably wasn't known much to Nero, if at all. Christianity remained relatively unnoticed by the Roman government for a long time, well past the first century. So Nero very well may have never even known the existence of Christianity. Instead, it is much more likely that a community of independent women would have stood out in first century Rome.

The evidence that shows the presence of this group of independent women led by Mariam doesn't mean that Mariam didn't also teach men and married women. As we can see from Paul's letter to the Romans, several Christian men and married women are named along with what appears to be a reference to Mariam as the leader of that Christian community. For example, Aquila and Priscilla are named. It wasn't necessarily the case that Mariam only led a group of independent women. Christianity is obviously for both men and women, and for both married and unmarried people, so the top disciple of Christ likely taught both men and women, and both married and unmarried people. However, among the people who Mariam taught, there were likely a fairly large percentage who were independent women; and those who were could have been easily identified as independent women rather than as Christians. So the group of people who were persecuted after the Great Fire were likely independent women who were Christians, but there were also likely men and married women who Mariam taught who were not included in those persecutions.

The evidence that shows the presence of this group of independent Christian women in Rome supports the conclusion that Mariam led the development of the Christian community in Rome. Additionally, the reference to "the Danaids and Dirce", which is a reference to this group of independent Christian women, appears to specifically refer to Mariam with the name "Dirce". That provides specific evidence that Mariam led the development of the Christian community in Rome.

The first known Christian production about the persecution of Christians after the Great Fire was written by Sulpicius Severus around 403. The following text is from chapter 29 of Book 2 of his writing called "Sacred History". This text details multiple legends, some of which may be true while others probably aren't.

*In the meantime, the number of the Christians being now very large, it happened that Rome was destroyed by fire, while Nero was stationed at Antium. But the opinion of all cast the odium of causing the fire upon the emperor, and he was believed in this way to have sought for the glory of building a new city. And in fact, Nero could not by any means he tried escape from the charge that the fire had been caused by his orders. He therefore turned the accusation against the Christians, and the most cruel tortures were accordingly inflicted upon the innocent. Nay, even new kinds of death were invented, so that, being covered in the skins of wild beasts, they perished by being devoured by dogs, while many were crucified*

*or slain by fire, and not a few were set apart for this purpose, that, when the day came to a close, they should be consumed to serve for light during the night. In this way, cruelty first began to be manifested against the Christians. Afterwards, too, their religion was prohibited by laws which were enacted; and by edicts openly set forth it was proclaimed unlawful to be a Christian. At that time Paul and Peter were condemned to death, the former being beheaded with a sword, while Peter suffered crucifixion. And while these things went on at Rome, the Jews, not able to endure the injuries they suffered under the rule of Festus Florus, began to rebel. Vespasian, being sent by Nero against them, with proconsular power, defeated them in numerous important battles, and compelled them to flee within the walls of Jerusalem. In the meanwhile Nero, now hateful even to himself from a consciousness of his crimes, disappears from among men, leaving it uncertain whether or not he had laid violent hands upon himself: certainly his body was never found. It was accordingly believed that, even if he did put an end to himself with a sword, his wound was cured, and his life preserved, according to that which was written regarding him —And his mortal wound was healed,— to be sent forth again near the end of the world, in order that he may practice the mystery of iniquity.*

This chapter shows the following aspects combined into one story: the Great Fire happened, Nero was suspected of having ordered the Great Fire to have been started, Christians were persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire, Paul was beheaded in Rome, Peter was crucified in Rome, and Nero might have committed suicide. The aspects that we should compare to each other are about the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire and Peter described as having been crucified in Rome (or simply Peter having been in Rome at all).

As we analyze the legend about Peter having been in Rome, we should take into account the exaltation of Peter in the Gospels. Plenty of evidence has already been shown in this book that Peter has been fraudulently exalted and information about Mariam has been concealed. It seems that the legend about Peter having been in Rome follows in line with that. First we will take a look at writings about that legend and then we will move on to an analysis that disputes that legend.

“Against Heresies” by Irenaeus of Lyons

*Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the Churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vainglory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings; [we do this, I say,] by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also [by pointing out] the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the successions of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church, on account of its preeminent authority.*

“De Praescriptione Haereticorum” by Tertullian of Carthage

*if you are near Italy, you have Rome, from where we also derive our authority. How blessed is that church on which the apostles poured forth their whole doctrine along with their blood, where Peter endures the same passion as the Lord, where Paul is being crowned in death like John.*

“Scorpiace” by Tertullian of Carthage

*We read the lives of the Cæsars: At Rome Nero was the first who stained with blood the rising faith. Then is Peter girt by another, when he is made fast to the cross.*

“Commentary on the First Epistle of Peter” by Clement of Alexandria

*Mark, the follower of Peter, while Peter publicly preached the Gospel at Rome before some of Caesar’s equites, and adduced many testimonies to Christ, in order that thereby they might be able to commit to memory what was spoken, of what was spoken by Peter, wrote entirely what is called the Gospel according to Mark.*

“Epistle on Penance” by Peter of Alexandria

*Thus Peter, the first of the apostles, having been often apprehended, and thrown into prison, and treated with ignominy, was last of all crucified at Rome.*

“Of the Manner in which the Persecutors Died” by Lactantius

*And while Nero reigned, the Apostle Peter came to Rome, and, through the power of God committed unto him, wrought certain miracles, and, by turning many to the true religion, built up a faithful and steadfast temple unto the Lord.*

“De Viris Illustribus” by Jerome

*Simon Peter the son of John, from the village of Bethsaida in the province of Galilee, brother of Andrew the apostle, and himself chief of the apostles, after having been bishop of the church of Antioch and having preached to the Dispersion — the believers in circumcision, in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia — pushed on to Rome in the second year of Claudius to overthrow Simon Magus, and held the sacerdotal chair there for twenty-five years until the last, that is the fourteenth, year of Nero. At his hands he received the crown of martyrdom being nailed to the cross with his head towards the ground and his feet raised on high, asserting that he was unworthy to be crucified in the same manner as his Lord. He wrote two epistles which are called Catholic, the second of which, on account of its difference from the first in style, is considered by many not to be by him. Then too the Gospel according to Mark, who was his disciple and interpreter, is ascribed to him. On the other hand, the books, of which one is entitled his Acts, another his Gospel, a third his Preaching, a fourth his Revelation, a fifth his Judgment are rejected as apocryphal.*

*Buried at Rome in the Vatican near the triumphal way he is venerated by the whole world.*

“Church History” by Eusebius

*Peter appears to have preached in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia to the Jews of the dispersion. And at last, having come to Rome, he was crucified head-downwards; for he had requested that he might suffer in this way. What do we need to say concerning Paul, who preached the Gospel of Christ from Jerusalem to Illyricum, and afterwards suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero? These facts are related by Origen in the third volume of his Commentary on Genesis.*

Those writings all express that Peter was in Rome. We have writings describing Peter in Rome from Irenaeus of Lyons, Tertullian of Carthage, Clement of Alexandria, Peter of Alexandria, Lactantius, Jerome, and Eusebius. Irenaeus of Lyons was a bishop, Tertullian of Carthage is considered to have been a “church father”, Clement of Alexandria is considered to have been a “church father”, Peter of Alexandria was a pope, Lactantius was an advisor to Constantine, Jerome was a priest, and Eusebius was a bishop. These writings outline a common theme through several different authors who all seem to have been connected with the “orthodox church” and/or the Catholic Church. What this outline shows is that a legend was likely to be written about if it was favorable to the “orthodox church”, and so the legend of Peter in Rome was written about many times. However, Peter was probably never in Rome. Paul doesn’t name Peter in his letter to the Romans, which is evidence that Peter had probably not been to Rome by the late fifties. The part about Paul in Rome seems to be mostly missing from Acts and probably wouldn’t be



if Peter was in Rome during that time-period. So far, there is evidence that Peter probably had never been to Rome before 60; and depending on how one dates this time-period, maybe it includes the first few years of the 60's. Since the Great Fire seems to have occurred in 64, it seems that Peter probably never made it to Rome before the Great Fire. Furthermore, as an example of how these authors appear to have written false information, Jerome mentioned that Peter was supposedly from Bethsaida. That detail obviously seems to have come straight from John 1:44, which has already been shown to likely be fraudulent, especially since Peter seems to have been from Capernaum.

There are seven additional pieces of evidence that show that Peter probably never went to Rome. One is that if Peter didn't make it to Rome before the Great Fire, and it has already been shown that he probably didn't, then he likely wouldn't have gone after the Great Fire took place because of the persecutions and also because if he ever planned to go he probably would have by then. The second is that Paul describes in his letter to the Galatians that Peter was afraid to be open around gentiles in front of Jews. Rome was mostly populated with gentiles. Paul's letter to the Galatians shows Peter's apparent reluctance to be a teacher to gentiles and so Rome would not likely have been a place that Peter would have become a leader in. The third is that the Synoptic Gospels seem to contain attempts to better a relationship with the Roman government as shown in Part 3. That suggests that Peter would not have wanted to go to Rome while the Roman emperor was dealing with such a tragedy in his own capital city. The fourth is that there is evidence that Peter was based in Jerusalem for multiple decades and it seems strange that Peter would have all of a sudden left Jerusalem for a place like Rome. Peter presumably grew up in Israel and was then based in Jerusalem for a good portion of his adult life. Not only leaving Jerusalem but also moving away from Israel for Rome seems uncharacteristic of what we seem to know about Peter. The fifth, building off of the fourth point, is that Peter seems to have spread information about the expectation that Christ would return in physical form to Jerusalem so Peter would have been even less likely to leave Jerusalem before the destruction of the temple in 70 than after that. Additionally, the First Epistle of Clement seems to indicate that Peter passed away before the destruction of the temple. So Peter probably passed away while Jerusalem was still his home. The sixth is that the First Epistle of Clement mentions Peter's death but does not connect it to the Great Fire or even to Nero at all. Clement was supposedly a bishop of Rome and even a pope. He was supposedly at the top of the hierarchy of the "orthodox church" and he supposedly personally knew Peter. If the "orthodox church" spent hundreds of years trying to push a story about Peter in Rome, but someone who was supposedly a bishop of Rome and a pope who personally knew Peter and who specifically wrote about Peter's death didn't mention anything about Peter being in Rome, then it seems that the "orthodox church" made that legend up later on. Clement of Rome would have probably been one of the first people to write about Peter in Rome if it was true. Even if the First Epistle of Clement was written by someone else, it was still probably written by someone who was a leader of the "orthodox church" in Rome sometime before the destruction of the temple in 70. So whoever the author was, they would likely have mentioned Peter having been in Rome if he was. Additionally, the letter describes Paul traveling from the east to the far west. So the letter includes information about both Peter's and Paul's death, but only includes information about Paul's travels. The author was presumably in Rome, supposedly personally knew Peter, and even specifically mentions Peter's deaths, but they don't say anything about Peter having been in Rome even though they mention Paul's travels. Therefore, it is justified to believe that Peter was never in Rome and that the "orthodox church" created a false legend about Peter ever having been in Rome. The seventh piece of additional evidence that Peter never went to Rome takes us to a letter that has been attributed to Peter.

1 Peter 5:13

*She who is in Babylon, chosen together with you, sends her greetings, and so does my son Mark.*

1 Peter 5:13 supposedly represents a part of Peter's greetings at the end of this letter. "She who is in Babylon" is almost certainly a reference to the Christian community in Rome. As mentioned in Part 4, Rome seems to have been called Babylon after the destruction of the temple in 70. Also, many used female pronouns to refer to a church, so the word "she" is probably a reference to a church. Therefore, "she who is in Babylon" appears to refer to the Christian community in Rome. That would be in line with the legend about Peter having been in Rome. 1 Peter 5:13 supposedly represents Peter saying that the Christian community in Rome sends greetings. However, a reference to Rome as Babylon would realistically have been written after the destruction of the temple in 70 and the legend about Peter having been in Rome describes Peter as having been executed by Nero who seems to have died in 68. Additionally, as previously mentioned, the First Epistle of Clement provides evidence that Peter passed away before the destruction of the temple in 70. So 1 Peter 5:13 appears to be a fraudulent attempt to present Peter as having been in Rome. Such an attempt shows that the "orthodox church" seems to have wanted to fraudulently push the idea that Peter was in Rome. That then shows further evidence that Peter was never in Rome. If Peter had really been in Rome, then such a fraudulent attempt wouldn't seem to be necessary. So 1 Peter 5:13 is strong evidence that not only was there a desire by the "orthodox church" to fraudulently push a legend about Peter having been in Rome, but it is also strong evidence that Peter was never in Rome.

We should now turn back to the fifth century writing by Sulpicius Severus. Both the legend about the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire as well as the legend about Peter in Rome ended up in this fifth century writing. However, those two legends took very different paths leading up to the production of that writing. The "orthodox church" obviously made an incredible effort to push a story about Peter having been in Rome, but they don't seem to have made the same kind of effort with the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire. Nevertheless, information about those persecutions ended up in a fifth century writing that was produced by someone who was associated with the Catholic Church. So it seems that information about those persecutions existed despite the "orthodox church" not seemingly writing anything specific about them. Therefore, some other avenue must have influenced Sulpicius Severus to write about them. Additionally, his writing mirrors information that is in Tacitus' Annals. Therefore, it is justified to believe that the information about the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire was already in Annals before the fifth century. Furthermore, it seems that there were two different authors in that section of Annals. If there were later additions and those additions were in place before the fifth century, then there is a good possibility that the original work was produced by the second century, which is when Tacitus supposedly wrote Annals. Regardless of when later additions were added, it doesn't seem that the "orthodox church" wanted to write about the persecution of Christians in aftermath of the Great Fire so they were unlikely to have created or added to that information in Annals; and if that information was in Annals before the fifth century, then information about the persecution of Christians seems to have been circulating before the fifth century and by people who were not associated with the "orthodox church". Therefore, it is justified to believe that Tacitus really did write some information about the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire. But even it wasn't Tacitus, it seems to have been a non-Christian.

If Tacitus or some other non-Christian Roman historian really did write about the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire and the “orthodox church” didn’t want to write about that information, then those persecutions seem to have really happened and the “orthodox church” seems to have tried to conceal that information. That conclusion provides further evidence that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome.

We have seen twelve main pieces of evidence to believe that Mariam led the development of the Christian community in Rome:

1. Romans 16:6 describes someone named “Mariam” as having “worked very hard” specifically for Christians in Rome. That shows that someone named Mariam seems to have been the leader of the Christian community in Rome.
2. Paul seems to have known Mariam, so Paul writing about someone named Mariam who seems to be portrayed as a Christian leader is evidence that Paul was writing about Mariam.
3. Aquila and Priscilla seem to have known Mariam, so writing about someone named Mariam being with Aquila and Priscilla is evidence that Paul was writing about Mariam.
4. The most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century would have been the best qualified to have been the leader of the Christian community in the capital city of the Roman Empire.
5. There isn’t any legitimate publicly recorded history for who developed the Christian community in Rome. That would probably not be the case if a man developed the Christian community in Rome, and there has been plenty of evidence shown that information about Mariam was concealed. The absence of information about who developed the Christian community in Rome is in line with the general concealment of information about Mariam and so appears to have resulted because of an effort to conceal information about Mariam.
6. The Christian community in Rome was likely the strongest Christian community during at least part of the first century. This provides evidence in two different ways. One is that it would make sense for the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century to have been the leader of the strongest Christian community during the first century. The other is that there would probably be more information available in the New Testament about the strongest Christian community if that community was developed by a man.
7. Paul indicates in his letter to the Romans that he wasn’t the one who developed the Christian community in Rome.
8. “Mariam” is the only name that is mentioned in any of the Gospels that is also mentioned in the greetings of Paul’s letter to the Romans.
9. Acts doesn’t say much about the Christian community in Rome and ends shortly after describing Paul arriving there. That would probably not be the case unless there was an effort to conceal information about the Christian community in Rome. The likely concealment in Acts of information about the Christian community in Rome is in line with the general concealment of information about Mariam and so appears to have resulted because of an effort to conceal information about Mariam.
10. The “orthodox church” seems to have concealed information about the Great Fire and the persecutions in the aftermath of the Great Fire. That would probably not be the case unless there was an effort to conceal information about the Christian community in Rome. The likely concealment of information about the Great Fire is in line with the general concealment of

information about Mariam and so appears to have resulted because of an effort to conceal information about Mariam.

11. The “orthodox church” seems to have tried to push a false legend about Peter having been in Rome. They probably wouldn’t have felt the need to do that unless a woman led the development of the Christian community in Rome.
12. The First Epistle of Clement refers to a group of women as “the Danaids and Dirce”. Those names appear to have come from Greek mythology that was well-known in the first century in Rome. The inclusion of both names “the Danaids” and “Dirce” with one of them referring to a group and the other referring to an individual shows that one woman seems to stand apart among a group of women. If there is to be one human being to be singled out apart from the rest of the human race, let alone a group of independent Christian women in the first century, that person would be the most faithful disciple of Christ and the true human leader of Christianity: Mariam. So when singling out a woman among a group of independent Christian women in the first century, we can easily derive the conclusion that this woman is Mariam. The letter seems to have been written in Rome during the sixties so this group of women seems to have resided in and/or around Rome. That shows that Mariam seems to have been referred to in a way that portrays her as a leader among a group of Christian women in and/or around Rome. That is evidence that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome.

Evidence has been shown for the following beliefs:

Mariam was the true human leader of Christianity in the first century

Mariam was from Egypt and spread Christianity there after the Resurrection before going to Rome

Mariam led the development of the Christian Community in Rome

Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome

Mariam met Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla in Ephesus

Mariam was with Paul when he wrote his second letter to the Corinthians

Mariam went to Corinth after Paul wrote his second letter to the Corinthians

Mariam was with Aquila and Priscilla in Rome when Paul wrote his letter to the Romans

Mariam was recognized by Paul as the leader of the Christian community in Rome

The Christian community in Rome that Mariam developed was the community that was targeted in the persecutions in the aftermath of the Great Fire in 64

Mariam and other independent Christian women were tortured and murdered in the aftermath of the Great Fire

### **Early Development of the Christian Community in Rome**

Mariam seems to have been the leader of the Christian community in Rome when Paul wrote his letter to the Romans. Paul probably wrote that letter in the second half of the fifties and probably shortly before his arrest in Jerusalem, which was probably around 58. So Mariam seems to have been the leader of the

Christian community in Rome in the late fifties. Additionally, the robust list of greetings in Romans shows evidence that there was probably a very strong community in Rome around that time-period. Such a strong community would not have turned up overnight. Such a strong community probably took many years to develop. So there is a good possibility that the Christian community in Rome began developing well before the late fifties. Therefore, there is a good possibility that Mariam began developing the Christian community in Rome well before the late fifties.

Claudius, the Roman emperor from 41 to 54, is believed to have expelled Jews from Rome during his reign. That belief is partly based on the following text from Suetonius.

*Since the Jews constantly made disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, he expelled them from Rome.*

What that text is saying is that Jews were expelled from Rome because they were making disturbances and that those disturbances were related to “Chrestus”. At initial glance, it may seem like there should only be one way to interpret the text and that it should simply be interpreted as someone named “Chrestus” having personally instigated disturbances themselves. However, there are two important considerations to take into account. The first is that ancient language was limited and the way text is translated may leave the translation in a way that seems obvious to interpret while the text really should be interpreted another way. For example, “at the instigation of” does not necessarily mean that someone named “Chrestus” was personally instigating these disturbances themselves, but it might seem like that’s what it means at initial glance. The second is that Suetonius may not have understood the exact situation and therefore may have recorded the exact details incorrectly. For example, it’s possible that Suetonius intended to convey that someone named “Chrestus” personally instigated disturbances themselves, but Suetonius may have been incorrect. So it’s not a forgone conclusion that someone named “Chrestus” instigated these disturbances themselves. Instead, we need to examine the realistic possibilities to see what seems to have actually happened.

We’ve already discussed the common misspelling that can lead to an “e” instead of an “i”, which could then lead to a translation of “Chrestus” instead of “Christus”. So this reference to “Chrestus” could be a reference to Christ or could be a reference to a Jew named “Chrestus”.

If the text is referring to a Jew named “Chrestus”, then “the instigation of Chrestus” would seem to refer to this Jew named “Chrestus” instigating disturbances among other Jews. However, if “Chrestus” refers to Christians, then it is not clear exactly what “the instigation of Chrestus” is referring to. The phrase “at the instigation of” does not explicitly indicate whether the “disturbances” were in support or opposition of “Chrestus”. “At the instigation of Chrestus” could mean that those who were making disturbances were doing so in support of “Chrestus”, or it could mean that the disturbances were directed at “the instigation of Chrestus” and that the disturbances were in opposition to “Chrestus”. In other words, “disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus” could refer to disturbances that were aligned with “the instigation of Chrestus”, or could refer to disturbances that were acted out against “the instigation of Chrestus”. If it refers to disturbances that were acted out against “the instigation of Chrestus”, that is to say that “disturbances at” is equivalent to “disturbances directed at” and “the instigation of Chrestus” is equivalent to “the insistence of beliefs related to Chrestus”. In other words, if “Chrestus” is a reference to Christ and the disturbances were opposed to Christianity, then “disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus” would be equivalent to “disturbances directed at the insistence of Christianity”. The text would then be saying that Jews made disturbances directed at the insistence of Christianity, which would make sense considering

how many Jews reacted negatively to the spreading of Christianity. On the other hand, if “Chrestus” is a reference to Christ and the “disturbances” were in support of Christianity, then the text would refer to Jews who identified as Christians who caused “disturbances” related to their Christian beliefs. So if the reference to “Chrestus” is a reference to Christ, it is not explicitly clear whether the group of people exiled would have been Jews in general or specifically Jews who identified as Christians. If the people who were exiled were only Christians, then “disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus” would seem to refer to “disturbances” made by Jews who identified as Christians. If the people who were exiled were Jews and not necessarily Christians, then “disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus” would seem to refer to Jews acting out against Christians in response to the instigation of Christians spreading Christianity.

We are left with three possibilities: Jews were making disturbances and were led by someone named “Chrestus”, and then Jews were exiled; Jews who identified as Christians were thought to be making disturbances, and then Christians were exiled; or non-Christian Jews were making disturbances by acting out against Christians, and then Jews were exiled.

If the reference to “Chrestus” refers to a real human being who was a Jew, then it would seem to be the case that a Jew was leading other Jews in some sort of rebellion, in which case they would have probably been imprisoned or executed, not exiled. Also, there seems to have been a strong Christian community in Rome when Paul wrote his letter to the Romans, so it is likely that a reference to “Chrestus” in relation to Jews and disturbances in Rome is somehow a reference that relates to Christians. So the reference to “Chrestus” probably doesn’t refer to a real human being who was a Jew. Instead, the reference to “Chrestus” seems to relate to Christians.

One objection is that Suetonius refers to the persecution of Christians by Nero and does so with a spelling that translates to “Christians” rather than “Chrestians”, which would show that Suetonius knew the correct spelling and so his reference to “Chrestus” must not be a reference to Christians because of the different spelling. One possibility is that each was written by a different author. It’s also possible that Suetonius wrote both and simply made a spelling error with one of them considering Suetonius wasn’t a Christian and Christians were often called “Chrestians”, making the spelling difference insignificant. It’s also possible that Suetonius wrote both and didn’t even know that the reference to “Chrestus” was a reference to Christians. There could have been disturbances by Jews because of the presence of Christians in Rome and so Suetonius wrote about that but didn’t realize when reporting the story that “Chrestus” was a reference to Christians. Whatever exactly happened, it is unlikely that the reference to “Chrestus” is a reference to a real human being who was a Jew named Chrestus, and therefore it is probable that the reference to “Chrestus” relates to Christians.

Regarding the point that Suetonius might not have known that “Chrestus” was a reference to Christians, it’s very possible that Suetonius reported what happened inaccurately. It’s very possible that he became aware of these events and reported the story based on the information that he had come upon and inaccurately assumed that that “Chrestus” was a reference to a Jew and that Jews were following instructions from this supposed person. If that were the case, then the likely scenario is that Jews were acting out against Christians and were exiled for that, and then Suetonius erroneously reported the story as Jews following a Jew named “Chrestus”. So even if people want to debate the true meaning of the text, what remains important is what actually happened back in the first century. If Suetonius reported the events inaccurately, then it doesn’t do much good to debate what exactly he meant. Even if Suetonius

meant to write about a supposed Jew named “Chrestus”, it would still be unlikely that this supposed person actually existed. Regardless of what Suetonius thought happened, it is unlikely that the reference to “Chrestus” is a reference to a real person who was a Jew named “Chrestus”. So it’s most important to assess what actually happened in the first century rather than how exactly the text should be interpreted.

Paul’s letters show plenty of evidence of the consequences one could face back then for trying to spread Christianity. If Paul was ever exiled, he seems to have been exiled by himself or with just one other person or with just a few other people. If one were to preach about Christianity back then and get exiled for it, such an exile probably wouldn’t extend to a whole group of people in general. Also, while the Christian community in Rome may have been strong relative to other Christian communities, such a community would have still probably represented an incredibly small percentage of the overall population in Rome. Preaching from Christians wouldn’t have likely gotten so much attention from the emperor of the Roman Empire that there would be a broad exile of all Christians. Furthermore, Suetonius writes as though readers are expected to know “Chrestus”, so it seems that Suetonius identifies a difference between Jews who are not associated with “Chrestus” and people who are associated with “Chrestus”; and so Suetonius would seem to not have referred to Jews in general as associated with “Chrestus”. That would show that the reference to Jews making disturbances is a reference to non-Christian Jews, which would show that Jews seem to have been making disturbances because of the presence of Christians in Rome. Especially given the agitation about Christianity that existed among Jews in the first century, it is justified to believe that Suetonius was referring to Jews making disturbances because of the presence of Christians in Rome.

Additional evidence can be found in information contained in Acts 18:1-4

Acts 18:1-4

*After this, Paul left Athens and went to Corinth. There he met a Jew named Aquila, a native of Pontus, who had recently come from Italy with his wife Priscilla because Claudius had ordered all the Jews to leave Rome. Paul went to see them, and because he was a tentmaker as they were, he stayed and worked with them. Every Sabbath he reasoned in the synagogue, trying to persuade Jews and Greeks.*

In Acts 18:1, Aquila is referred to as a Jew and is not identified at all as a Christian. Furthermore, it is explained that Paul stayed with them because they were tentmakers but again makes no reference to them being Christians. That is evidence that the reference to Aquila as a Jew is a reference that refers to a non-Christian Jew. Additionally, Acts 18:4 refers to Paul “trying to persuade Jews”, which shows that a reference to Jews by itself is specifically not a reference to Christians. So the reference to Claudius’ expulsion of “all the Jews” in Acts 18:1-4 seems to be a reference to the expulsion of Jews without any indication of any involvement of Christians. That shows evidence that Claudius’ expulsion of Jews did not specifically target Christians, and so Suetonius seems to have been referring to Jews making disturbances because of the presence of Christians in Rome.

Claudius seems to have been the emperor of Rome in the time-period of 41-54. So this expulsion of Jews from Rome could have begun as early as 41 and could have extended as late as 54. There is evidence that suggests that Jews were not exiled during the early part of Claudius’ reign. So generally, this expulsion probably began sometime from the mid forties to the early fifties. One proposed dating is 49.

Assuming 49 as a reasonable estimate, the writing from Suetonius shows that there seems to have been a Christian community in Rome by the late forties, which shows that Mariam seems to have been in Rome by the late forties. By then, it seems that the Christian community in Rome had such a presence that Jews were causing such disturbances that they were exiled from Rome. Since the community had that strong of a presence by the late forties, Mariam was probably in the Rome by the mid forties and maybe by the early forties.

Additional evidence can be seen by a part of a legendary account about Peter written by Jerome that was previously examined here in Part 6.

*pushed on to Rome in the second year of Claudius*

This text is a part of an elaborate legend about Peter in Rome. It was previously shown that Peter was probably never in Rome. We've seen plenty of general accounts about Peter supposedly having been in Rome. This account written by Jerome gets so specific that it even displays a year in which Peter supposedly went to Rome. Since Peter probably was never in Rome, it's hard to tell why Jerome picked this year. The only obvious reason would be that it represents when someone actually did go to Rome, in which case it could be an indication of when Mariam went to Rome. The second year of Claudius seems to have been in 42 and/or 43 and it has already been shown that Mariam probably arrived in Rome by the mid forties and maybe by the early forties. With the second year of Claudius being strangely selected for this legend about Peter, it is reasonable to believe that Mariam arrived in Rome by the early forties. Then, by the late forties, it seems that the Christian community in Rome had such a strong presence that Jews in Rome were making such disturbances that they were exiled from Rome. It seems that the forties were a decade in which Mariam arrived in Rome, Christianity first spread to Rome, and the Christian community in Rome experienced significant growth.

## **The Great Fire**

The different accounts that we have of the fire vary in their details. We don't have a very clear picture of what exactly happened. It is believed that the fire began on July 18<sup>th</sup>. There are varying descriptions of the duration of the fire. Suetonius says that it lasted for six days and seven nights. Tacitus describes the fire as having come to a halt on the sixth day and then having broken out again in the estate of one of Nero's prefects Tigellinus. A way to reconcile those two accounts is to compare Suetonius' use of both days and nights with Tacitus' use of only days without nights. Suetonius counts the amount of days and nights involved while Tacitus' six days seem to represent calendar days. Suetonius counts half-days while Tacitus counts full days. So if Suetonius' and Tacitus' accounts are to be reconciled, then the fire would have broken out during the night, which would be considered the first night according to Suetonius' way of accounting, and then the fire continued on for a continuous duration of six days and came to halt during the seventh night, which was six days after the first night. The amount of time passed between the first night and the seventh night would have been six days. Additionally, Tacitus describes the fire as having broken out again and Suetonius does not. So to reconcile those accounts, it must be that the fire broke out again after having come to a halt and Suetonius only focused on the first breakout and left out the second breakout. Also, there had been some Domitian inscriptions found that describe the fire as having lasted for nine days. To reconcile that, the second breakout as described by Tacitus would have to bring us to



nine days. With all of that information having been presented, the reconciliation between the accounts of the Great Fire brings us to the following: the fire broke out during the night of July 18<sup>th</sup> and continued on until coming to a halt during the night of July 24<sup>th</sup>, and then broke out again later on July 24<sup>th</sup> or on July 25<sup>th</sup> and continued on until finally ending on July 27<sup>th</sup>. The duration of time from the beginning to the end of the fire would have been nine days, while the first phase would have lasted for a continuous duration of six days and that duration would have included six days and seven nights. We don't know if that is what actually happened, but considering we have limited information, that is probably a decent enough of a baseline for our understanding within this analysis.

Tacitus describes the fire as having started on the side of the stadium of the Circus Maximus that was adjacent to the Palatine and Caelian Hills. Tacitus describes combustible merchandise as having contributed to the fire's immediate strength and describes the winds as having provided further strength after that. After the fire is described as having begun with the Circus Maximus, the fire is described as having traveled to Palatine Hill, which was mostly property owned by the upper class including the emperor. After that, the fire is described as having traveled to other parts of Rome. We don't know exactly what happened, how much of Rome was damaged, or which parts of Rome were damaged. Ancient historians often exaggerated legends and so we cannot rely on many specific details. However, in general, it seems fairly reliable that the fire began in or near the Circus Maximus, traveled to Palatine Hill, and then also reached some other areas of Rome.

There is a lot of mystery and speculation about how this fire got started, who was involved if anyone was, and why they would have carried out such an act. Tacitus describes that many people believed that Nero was behind it. That's certainly possible. However, there isn't the evidence necessary to draw a strong conclusion on how the Great Fire started. Even if Nero ordered the fire to have been started, it is unlikely that Nero planned on burning so much of Rome. It is more likely that the winds provided strength to the fire. Even if there was malicious intent, it is likely the case that such intent was directed for a smaller area and then the fire grew out of control. Tacitus describes people during the fire as having aided the fire maybe on orders from Nero. However, even if those reports are based on real observations, such people could have been diligently trying to fight the fire. Another aspect that could point to Nero as a guilty party is that the fire reportedly started back up again in the estate of Tigellinus after having been halted. If the fire really did start back up again in the estate of Tigellinus, then it's possible that such an outbreak was started deliberately. On the other hand, such an account could be false; or even if it is true, it could have been the natural course of the fire rather than a deliberate attempt to keep the fire going. The main point of all of this is that Nero could be responsible for having ordered the fire to have been started, but we really don't know how the fire got started.

Many believe that Nero ordered the fire to have been started because he wanted to rebuild Rome. After the fire, much of Rome was rebuilt. Additionally, Nero had his so-called "golden palace" built. Many believe that Nero wanted the fire to happen so that he could clear space for his golden palace. That's certainly possible; however, Nero very well could have just taken advantage of the destruction and may have had nothing to do with the fire having started. There have been other fires in Rome, including a fire in 36 that also supposedly started in the Circus Maximus like the Great Fire in 64. Furthermore, there have been other Roman emperors who have supposedly taken advantage of destruction and there have been other emperors who have had serious accusations made against them that were never proved. Given the accounts written about Nero and the construction of his golden palace, it's very easy to view Nero as

guilty of having ordered the fire to have been started. However, there is evidence that the golden palace was at least in part built for public use and that much of the construction after the Great Fire was to increase fire safety. Additionally, there is evidence that Nero wanted to be admired by the general public, so the accusation of deliberately destroying the city seems to be a stretch. Also, there is evidence that the upper class did not like Nero and apparently there was even a group that tried to assassinate Nero. That shows that there was plenty of motivation to slander Nero. In conclusion, it seems unlikely that Nero wanted the fire started, and the accounts suggesting that he ordered the fire to have been started seem to simply be a product of hatred against Nero. So the fire may have started accidentally or may have been deliberately started by a person or a group of people who didn't have orders from Nero to do so.

We should now return to the first paragraph of the three paragraphs previously shown from Annals about the Great Fire, which is the part that was previously asserted to have more likely been written by Tacitus.

*But all human efforts, all the lavish gifts of the emperor, and the propitiations of the gods, did not banish the sinister belief that the conflagration was the result of an order. Consequently, to get rid of the report, Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the populace.*

There are three main beliefs that can be derived from that text. The first is that Nero was blamed by many people as having ordered the fire to have been started. The second is that Nero persecuted Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire. The third is that the group of Christians who were persecuted were distinguishable enough for the Roman emperor or someone close to him to have noticed them. So in 64, Mariam seems to have still been the leader of the Christian community in Rome and the Christian community in Rome seems to have been strong enough to be recognizable enough for the Roman emperor to have wanted to persecute Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire. These persecutions were probably mostly focused on the city of Rome. There probably wasn't nearly as much of an effort in other places of the Roman Empire.

We should now return to the third paragraph of Annals that was shown before.

*Accordingly, an arrest was first made of all who pleaded guilty; then, upon their information, an immense multitude was convicted, not so much of the crime of firing the city, as of hatred against mankind. Mockery of every sort was added to their deaths. Covered with the skins of beasts, they were torn by dogs and perished, or were nailed to crosses, or were doomed to the flames and burnt, to serve as a nightly illumination, when daylight had expired. Nero offered his gardens for the spectacle, and was exhibiting a show in the circus, while he mingled with the people in the dress of a charioteer or stood aloft on a car. Hence, even for criminals who deserved extreme and exemplary punishment, there arose a feeling of compassion; for it was not, as it seemed, for the public good, but to glut one man's cruelty, that they were being destroyed.*

It was previously asserted that the second and third paragraphs of the three paragraphs previously shown from Annals about the Great Fire were probably written by a different author than the first paragraph. That leaves a good possibility that the second and third paragraphs were written by the same author. The second paragraph seems to be much more familiar with Christianity than the first paragraph. So the second and third paragraphs were probably written after the first paragraph was. The first paragraph has the greatest possibility of actually having been written by Tacitus. The second and third paragraphs were

probably not written by Tacitus and were probably later additions. It was previously shown that the author of the third paragraph was probably trying to write what they thought was an appropriate account. However, the legends of what happened with the Great Fire and shortly afterwards seem to have grown substantially. So we can't necessarily trust all of the information contained in the third paragraph. A few examples of suspicious material are the pieces of text about Christians having pleaded guilty, Christians having hated mankind, and Christians having been persecuted in the circus as a part of a show. The part about Christians having pleaded guilty probably came from the opinion that Christians started the fire and/or from hatred against Christians. The part about Christians having hated mankind likely came from the perspective of a non-Christian and likely a pagan, so such a perspective is likely biased and false. The part about Christians having been persecuted in the circus is likely not true because the circus was apparently severely damaged during the fire. So there seems to be some false information in the third paragraph. However, as previously shown, the fundamental concept that Christians were persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire appears to have originated from real history. So we can't necessarily depend on specific details from the third paragraph, but we can justifiably believe that Christians were persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire.

That third paragraph from Annals describes Christians as having been burned alive, crucified, and killed by animals in the circus. As previously explained, the circus was probably not in use in the immediate aftermath of the fire because it appears to have been severely damaged during the fire. We don't know what exactly happened. However, it appears that that Mariam and other independent Christian women were falsely convicted of arson by the Roman government in the aftermath of the Great Fire and were tortured and murdered.

The probable scenario is that Mariam arrived in Rome by the early forties and developed the Christian community there; by the end of the forties, the Christian community in Rome had such a strong presence that Jews were causing such disturbances that Claudius expelled Jews from Rome; and then in 64, on orders of the Roman emperor Nero, Mariam and other independent Christian women seem to have been blamed for the Great Fire and then tortured and murdered.

Now that we've come to understand more of what happened to Mariam after the Resurrection, we should now examine what may have happened before Mariam became a disciple.

John 19:25-27

*Near the cross of Jesus stood his mother, his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus saw his mother there, and the disciple whom he loved standing nearby, he said to his mother, "Dear woman, here is your son", and to the disciple, "Here is your mother." From that time on, this disciple took her into his home.*

We've discussed that it seems that Mariam took Mother Mariam into her home after the Crucifixion. Another point to recognize is that John 19:25-27 describe Mother Mariam as Mariam's mother. That seems to imply that there wasn't another woman who was viewed as Mariam's mother in the same way on the day of the Crucifixion. That might give us insight into the circumstances revolving around

Mariam's biological family. Additionally, a name like "Magdalene", which is probably a name derived from the town that Mariam was from, shows that Mariam's name was not likely based on any relationship with a husband or a father. If Mariam had been married, then the description of her name would have likely shown that. For example, John 19:25 shows "Mary the wife of Clopas". If Mariam was not married, then it would have been of common practice to relate her name to her biological father, but "Magdalene" likely refers to a town. The description of Mother Mariam as Mariam's mother shows that there probably wasn't another woman who was viewed as Mariam's mother in the same way on the day of the Crucifixion, and the likelihood that the name "Magdalene" refers to a town shows that Mariam was probably not married and that there likely was not a man who was viewed enough as Mariam's father by the time that Mariam was called "Magdalene" for Mariam to have been called a name that was associated with a man who was viewed as Mariam's father. So Mariam may have been living by herself. Of course, we don't know that, but that does seem likely. A possible scenario is that Mariam was living by herself in Egypt before she became a disciple.

We don't know how Mariam was influenced to begin following Christ. What we have is John 1:38-39.

John 1:38-39

*Turning around, Jesus saw them following and asked, "What do you want?"*

*They said, "Rabbi", which means Teacher, "where are you staying?"*

*"Come", he replied, "and you will see."*

*So they went and saw where he was staying, and spent that day with him. It was about the tenth hour.*

So it seems that Mariam came from Egypt, and John 1:38-39 may give us a good indication of what may have happened when Mariam began following Christ. Approximately two years later, Mariam seems to have anointed Christ in Bethany.

John 12:1-3

*Six days before the Passover, Jesus arrived at Bethany, where Lazarus lived, whom Jesus had raised from the dead. Here a dinner was given in Jesus' honor. Martha served, while Lazarus was among those reclining at the table with him. Then Mary took about a pint of pure nard, an expensive perfume; she poured it on Jesus' feet and wiped his feet with her hair. And the house was filled with the fragrance of the perfume.*

Late on Sunday, March 28<sup>th</sup>, or early on Monday, March 29<sup>th</sup>, in the year 28, Christ was arrested and Mariam appears to have followed. On Monday, March 29<sup>th</sup>, 28, Mariam was one of only four people who saw Christ crucified who were there in support of Christ. After the Crucifixion, the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ was placed in a tomb. It seems that Mariam anointed Christ again during the burial.

John 12:7

*"Leave her alone", Jesus replied. "It was intended that she should save this perfume for the day of my burial."*

Mariam may not have left the tomb after the burial before the Resurrection. All of the Gospels describe her as having gone to the tomb on the day of the Resurrection, but she may have stayed at the tomb. If Mariam expected the Resurrection, and it seems that she did, and the Resurrection occurred on the day

after the Crucifixion, and it seems that the Resurrection did, then there is a good possibility that Mariam stayed at the tomb. Regardless of whether Mariam stayed at the tomb, likely on Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28, Mariam saw Christ.

The Gospel of Mary can help us see what may have happened after the Resurrection.

*Then Mary stood up. She greeted them all, addressing her brothers and sisters, "Do not weep and be distressed nor let your hearts be irresolute. For his grace will be with you all and will shelter you. Rather, we should praise his greatness, for he has prepared us and made us human beings." When Mary said these things, she turned their heart toward the Good, and they began to debate about the words of [the Savior].*

*Peter said to Mary, "Sister we know that the Savior loved you more than all other women. Tell us the words of the Savior that you remember, the things you know that we don't because we haven't heard them."*

*Peter responded, bringing up similar concerns. He questioned them about the Savior, "Did he then speak with a woman in private without our knowing about it? Are we to turn around and listen to her? Did he choose her over us?"*

*Then Mary wept and said to Peter, "My brother Peter, what are you imagining? Do you think that I have thought up these things by myself in my heart or that I am telling lies about the Savior?"*

*Levi answered, speaking to Peter, "Peter, you have always been a wrathful person. Now I see you contending against a woman like the adversaries. For if the Savior made her worthy, who are you then for your part to reject her? Assuredly the Savior's knowledge of her is completely reliable. That is why he loved her more than us. Rather, we should be ashamed. We should clothe ourselves with the perfect human, acquire it for ourselves as he commanded us, and announce the good news, not laying down any other rule or law that differs from what the Savior said."*

*After [he said these] things, they started going out [to] teach and to preach.*

After Mariam first proclaimed the Resurrection of Christ, it seems that Mother Mariam went with her, likely to Egypt. It seems that Mariam spread the Christian Revolution in Egypt before traveling to Rome.

Mariam seems to have probably traveled to Rome in the early forties. Mariam seems to have been the leader of the Christian community in Rome, which seems to have been the largest Christian community in the world by the end of the forties.

Mariam seems to have been in Rome when Paul wrote his letter to the Romans, which was probably in the latter half of the fifties. There was then the Great Fire of Rome in 64. In the aftermath of the Great Fire, it is likely that the Roman government convicted Mariam and other independent Christian women of arson. Mariam and other independent Christian women seem to have been blamed for the Great Fire and then tortured and murdered.

There are three letters attributed to “John”. These letters share some similar language with the Gospel of John and so many people believe that these letters were written by the same person who wrote the Gospel of John. However, the first and third letters appear to have been written by someone else. The first letter refers to Christ as an anointing sacrifice, which is not a part of the main theology in the Gospel of John and was likely based on false theology developed after the Crucifixion and the Resurrection in step with fraudulent ancient Jewish thinking. Additionally, the first letter makes a reference that is similar to the end of ages concept, which aligns with the Synoptic Gospels rather than the Gospel of John. The third letter is a letter of anger and division, and so does not seem to align well with the Gospel of John. Additionally, the end of the third letter is so similar to the end of the second letter that it appears that one is copied from the other. Given the angry and dividing nature of the third letter, it is easy to imagine that it is a forgery and that the author copied a part of the second letter. So the first and third letters that are attributed to “John” are probably fraudulent. We should now analyze the second letter.

2 John 1

*The elder,*

*To the chosen lady and her children, whom I love in the truth – and not I only, but also all who know the truth – because of the truth, which lives in us and will be with us forever.*

2 John 13

*The children of your chosen sister send their greetings.*

First and foremost, the author’s name is concealed and the author is described as “the elder”. Who is “the elder”? The second and third letters attributed to “John” are the only two letters in the New Testament that refer to who supposedly wrote the letter in a way that conceals their name. The third letter is likely a forgery made to look like it was written by the same person who wrote the second letter, so it makes sense that the third letter is the only other letter that refers to the supposed author in a way that conceals their name. Second, the letter is addressed to “the chosen lady and her children”. Many believe that “the chosen lady” refers to a church. However, if that were the case, then it would not be necessary to also address “her children”. If a letter was addressed to a church, then it would be addressed to the people who are members of the church, in which case “the chosen lady” and “her children” would refer to the same group of people. “The chosen lady” is referred to separately from “her children”, which indicates that “the chosen lady” seems to be a reference to a person. If “the chosen lady” is a person, then that person seems to have been a woman and “her children” seem to have been people who she taught about Christianity to. Third, the end of the second letter seems to refer to the author of the letter, the one previously referred to as “the elder”, as “your chosen sister”. So not only does “the elder” seem to have been a woman, but “the elder” also seems to have been a “chosen sister” of “the chosen lady” who the letter is addressed to. If “the elder” is a woman, then her being a woman is the likely reason for why her name is concealed. Given that her name is concealed, she is referred to as “the elder” and as a “chosen sister”, and she seems to write in a way that suggests that she is a teacher of “the chosen lady” who the letter is addressed to, it seems that the author of the original letter is probably Mariam. Even if that is not the case, and even though there appears to have been later fraudulent alterations, this letter does seem to have been written by a woman and seems to be addressed to a woman and people who that woman taught about Christianity to. So this letter is further evidence that women were Christian leaders in the first century.

As mentioned in Part 2, Mark 16:9-20 were probably added to the Gospel of Mark in the second century. Verse 9 describes Christ as having appeared to Mariam alone. So in the second century, when someone was probably trying to reconcile the Gospels, they described Christ as having appeared to Mariam alone. In Part 2, it was asserted that verse 16 of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John probably represents the only reliable account of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. Information in that verse is represented by verse 9 in chapter 16 of the Gospel of Mark. That shows evidence that the Gospel of John was likely the most popular Gospel in the second century and that many people believed that Christ first appeared after the Resurrection to Mariam alone. As also mentioned in Part 2 as well as here in Part 6, Celsus seems to have referred to female Christian leaders and seems to have been referencing the Gospel of John. That also shows evidence that women were Christian leaders and that the Gospel of John was probably the most popular Gospel in the second century. So it seems that in the second century, many people believed that Christ first appeared after the Resurrection to Mariam alone, many people were aware of female Christian leadership, and the Gospel of John was the most popular Gospel.

The Gnostic Gospels were likely produced in the second, third, and/or fourth centuries and they include many references to the importance of Mariam.

Toward the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century, Pope Gregory called Mariam a prostitute. Such a disgusting and disgraceful attack shows that Mariam was probably still so well-known as late as the 6<sup>th</sup> century that the pope, the top person in the Catholic Church, had a desire to attack her.

It wasn't until 2016 that the Roman Catholic Church finally recognized Mariam as an "apostle".

Still to this day, many believe that Mariam, the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century and the true human leader of Christianity, was a prostitute who had seven demons come out of her.

## Part 7 – Lines of Succession

Here in Part 7, we will develop a timeline that spans nearly 3,500 years from the 15<sup>th</sup> century BCE all of the way to now in the third millennium CE.

Egyptian artifacts show the presence of the Shasu of YHW in the 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> century BCE. Biblical text suggests that beliefs about Yahweh came from people in Edom. A likely scenario is that Yahwists either migrated from Edom to the highlands of Israel and/or they shared their beliefs with people who already lived in the highlands of Israel. Either way, the likely scenario is that Yahwist beliefs were exported from Edom and imported into communities that lived in the highlands of Israel. Whatever exactly happened, it seems that information about Yahwist beliefs traveled from Edom to the highlands of Israel.

For centuries, the highlands of Israel harbored different religions. Eventually, the kingdom of Israel was established as the northern kingdom. There is archaeological evidence of a “House of David” having existed in the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE. So the character of David in the Bible may actually be based on a real person. The south does seem to have been separate from the north. So the south may have had their own local government. However, such a local government would have likely been relatively very small, not likely much of a kingdom. Also, the evidence of the House of David seems to be from the 9<sup>th</sup> century BCE, not the 10<sup>th</sup> century BCE, and also seems to show an inscription that refers to the kingdom of Israel. So the House of David seems to have been a local government that existed during the same time-period as the kingdom of Israel. The kingdom of David as described in the Bible supposedly existed before the kingdom of Israel and encompassed all of Israel, not just the southern highlands. The real House of David likely was a smaller local government that was only in the southern highlands, existed during the same time-period as the kingdom of Israel, and was overshadowed by the kingdom of Israel. Additionally, there is evidence that suggests that the House of David may have been a vassal for the kingdom of Israel at some point, so people of the House of David may have even identified as Israelites. The probable scenario is that there was first a community called Israel that grew into a kingdom called Israel, a kingdom named for the people it arose from, and then afterward people in the kingdom of Judah identified as Israelites because generations of people who had lived there had already identified as Israelites for centuries; and so the name “Israel” continued on and still exists to this day.

The legacy of the House of David seems to have grown into the kingdom of Judah, and the kingdom of Judah seems to have thrived after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire in the 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE. There could have been substantial migrations of people from the north to the south after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed. The Assyrian Empire seems to have taken some Israelites captive while taking control of northern Israel and placing captives from other places in that land. A result of that could have been that many Israelites who had previously lived in the north who were not taken captive migrated to southern Israel. Those migrations could have fueled the economic system in the south. Alternatively or in addition, the kingdom of Judah may have expanded into the north. Either way, there was likely substantial population growth and an increase in resources leading to a more advanced economic system. A little over a century after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire, the kingdom of Judah was destroyed by the Babylonian Empire, and Israelites were then exiled and taken into captivity in Babylon.



There seems to have been religious reforms and fraudulent religious documents produced during the reigns of King Hezekiah and King Josiah of the kingdom of Judah, and possibly also during the reign of any other king. Those fraudulent religious documents seem to have then been taken along with some Elohistic documents to Babylon where Israelites seem to have compiled a lot of what became the Hebrew Bible and later on the Old Testament.

As shown before, the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament are mostly written from a Judahite perspective. Additionally, the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament seem to have taken on a lot of their current form during the Babylonian Exile. The combination of those two assertions shows that the people who seem to have compiled documents together during the Exile seem to have favored Judah. That makes sense considering the kingdom of Judah was the last Israelite kingdom standing before the Exile. Since the Israelites who were first exiled in Babylon had just previously lived in the kingdom of Judah, it makes sense that they would favor Judah.

Towards the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE, after the Persian Empire defeated the Babylonian Empire, the Persian emperor Cyrus freed Israelites who were in captivity in Babylon and Israelite priests brought a new order to the people in Israel. That new order became known as Judaism. The name “Judaism” comes from the same root as the name “Judah”. “Judaism” can be viewed as “Judah-ism”. Judaism is the Judahite religion that seems to have risen to fame during the reign of the kingdom of Judah and seems to have been further solidified in writings that came out of the Babylonian Exile.

After Israelites who were exiled in Babylon were freed, a new temple was built in Jerusalem, the priests had taken control, and there wasn't a king among the Jews. Israel had become a vassal for the Persian Empire; but among the Jews, the priests took control. From then on, Judaism progressed and so much of Israel's history was buried. Eventually, the Roman Empire took over much of the area surrounding the Mediterranean Sea with Israel on the east side of that empire.

It seems that fraudulent prophecies about the coming Messiah were first produced before the Exile, apparently during the reigns of King Hezekiah and King Josiah, and possibly also during the reign of any other king. During and/or after the Exile, it seems that more fraudulent prophecies were produced that shifted expectations about the coming Messiah. The combination of all of the fraudulent prophecies about the coming Messiah seem to have given people the expectation that the Messiah would come during the end of days, destroy the temple, end sacrifice and offering, and reign on David's throne and over his kingdom. Those expectations seem to have been widespread among the Jewish population heading into the first century CE.

As shown in Part 6, Mariam was likely from Egypt. So the top disciple of Christ was likely from Egypt and “the Twelve” were all likely from Galilee or surrounding areas. Mariam and “the Twelve” seem to have met through following Christ. Mariam probably followed Christ before anyone else. Given that the Gospel of John seems to portray a two-year timeline and the Synoptic seem to portray a one-year or less timeline, Mariam may have begun following Christ about a year or so before “the Twelve”.

As shown in Part 4, Christ's Ministry seems to have begun in 26, probably in the spring shortly before Passover. Evidence has been shown that the probable scenario is as follows.

In the spring of 26, shortly before Passover, Mariam chose to follow Christ and then became the first disciple of Christ.

Almost two years later, sometime in March of 28, Christ raised Lazarus from the dead. On Wednesday, March 24<sup>th</sup>, 28, Mariam anointed Christ in Bethany.

Late on Sunday, March 28<sup>th</sup>, or early on Monday, March 29<sup>th</sup>, the priests moved forward with arresting Christ. They didn't charge Christ with a crime. Instead, they arrested Christ because they were afraid of the destruction of the temple based on fraudulent prophecies that they knew had been fraudulently made up hundreds of years before then.

A legion of Jews came to arrest Christ. After Christ was arrested, Mariam followed. Christ was first taken to Annas and then to Caiaphas.

On Monday, March 29<sup>th</sup>, 28, the Jews took Christ to Pontius Pilate and Christ was crucified. Mother Mariam, Mother Mariam's sister, Mariam the wife of Clopas, and Mariam were present during the Crucifixion. During the burial, Mariam anointed Christ.

On Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28, Christ appeared to Mariam.

It seems that Mariam proclaimed the Resurrection to "the eleven" and then at least some of them went to Galilee afterwards.

Mark 16:7

*"But go, tell his disciples and Peter, 'He is going ahead of you into Galilee. There you will see him, just as he told you.' "*

Matthew 28:16

*Then the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain where Jesus had told them to go.*

Luke 24:50

*When he had led them out to the vicinity of Bethany, he lifted up his hands and blessed them.*

Luke 24:52-53

*Then they returned to Jerusalem with great joy. And they stayed continually at the temple, praising God.*

Acts 1:4

*On one occasion, while he was eating with them, he gave them this command: "Do not leave Jerusalem, but wait for the gift my Father promised, which you have heard me speak of."*

Acts 1:12

*Then they returned to Jerusalem from the hill called the Mount of Olives, a Sabbath day's walk.*

All of these verses describe a time-period after the Resurrection. The verse from Mark alludes to "the eleven" going to Galilee, and Matthew specifically describes them being in Galilee. Luke and Acts take a different direction. Luke describes "the eleven" being in Bethany and then going to Jerusalem, both of which are in Judea, and Acts describes them being near Jerusalem and then going to Jerusalem. As shown in Part 5, Luke and Acts were likely originally produced by the same person. Also, since Luke and Acts

seem to have been produced after Mark and Matthew, there seems to have been more of a focus on Jerusalem and Judea as time progressed. So in terms of where “the eleven” are described as having been shortly after the Resurrection, there was originally a focus on Galilee and then a shift to Judea. The shift to Judea was probably simply because Peter moved to Jerusalem and apparently became quite obsessed with Jewish society there. The focus on Galilee, on the other hand, may actually be truthful. The focus on Galilee in the verses just previously shown from Mark and Matthew serves as evidence that at least some of “the eleven” went to Galilee after the Resurrection. Otherwise, the focus probably would have been on Judea. Furthermore, since at least some of “the eleven” seem to have been from Galilee and surrounding areas, it would make sense for them to return there.

We should now revisit the Gospel of Mary while combining it with the verses from Mark and Matthew to show the sequence of Mariam proclaiming the Resurrection and then at least some of “the eleven” going to Galilee.

The Gospel of Mary

*Then Mary stood up. She greeted them all, addressing her brothers and sisters, “Do not weep and be distressed nor let your hearts be irresolute. For his grace will be with you all and will shelter you. Rather, we should praise his greatness, for he has prepared us and made us human beings.” When Mary said these things, she turned their heart toward the Good, and they began to debate about the words of [the Savior].*

The Gospel of Mary

*Peter said to Mary, “Sister we know that the Savior loved you more than all other women. Tell us the words of the Savior that you remember, the things you know that we don’t because we haven’t heard them.”*

The Gospel of Mary

*Peter responded, bringing up similar concerns. He questioned them about the Savior, “Did he then speak with a woman in private without our knowing about it? Are we to turn around and listen to her? Did he choose her over us?”*

*Then Mary wept and said to Peter, “My brother Peter, what are you imagining? Do you think that I have thought up these things by myself in my heart or that I am telling lies about the Savior?”*

*Levi answered, speaking to Peter, “Peter, you have always been a wrathful person. Now I see you contending against a woman like the adversaries. For if the Savior made her worthy, who are you then for your part to reject her? Assuredly the Savior’s knowledge of her is completely reliable. That is why he loved her more than us. Rather, we should be ashamed. We should clothe ourselves with the perfect human, acquire it for ourselves as he commanded us, and announce the good news, not laying down any other rule or law that differs from what the Savior said.”*

*After [he said these] things, they started going out [to] teach and to preach.*

Mark 16:7

*“But go, tell his disciples and Peter, ‘He is going ahead of you into Galilee. There you will see him, just as he told you.’ ”*

Matthew 28:16

*Then the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain where Jesus had told them to go.*

So at least some of “the eleven” seem to have gone north to Galilee and surrounding areas after they learned about the Resurrection.

There is a good possibility that Mariam took Mother Mariam into her home, which was likely in Egypt. Meanwhile, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and/or John seem to have moved to Jerusalem. Levi, Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas were likely in Egypt.

Paul probably began his ministry in the time-period of 28-39. After that, Paul probably traveled to Jerusalem in the time-period of 30-41 and spent 15 days with Peter; and James son of Mother Mariam seems to have been the only other supposed “apostle” there. So it appears that during the late twenties and/or the thirties, there weren’t many Christians in Jerusalem. Meanwhile, Christianity was probably spreading much greater in Egypt where Mariam likely was.

Probably by the early forties, Mariam seems to have traveled to Rome and began spreading Christianity there. By the late forties, it seems that the Christian community in Rome had grown so substantially that Jews were making such disturbances that the Roman emperor Claudius expelled Jews from Rome. Levi seems to have given way to the original version of the Gospel of John, likely in the time-period of 28-44. Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew seem to have fraudulently altered the Gospel of John, likely in the time-period of 28-44. Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John gave way to the Gospel of Mark, likely in the time-period of 39-44. Eventually, the Gospel of Mark was revised into the Gospel of Matthew by Peter and James son of Mother Mariam, likely in the time-period of 41-54. The Testimony of Mariam, some version of the Gospel of John, the Gospel of Mark, and the Gospel of Matthew all appear to have been circulating in Egypt before the Gospel of Luke was produced, which was likely in the time-period of 43-54. By the fifties, it seems that all four Gospels were circulating in Egypt.

The probable scenario by the early fifties and maybe earlier was that Mariam had led the Christian Revolution in Egypt; Mariam had left Egypt to travel to Rome and spread the Christian Revolution there; the Christian community in Rome had grown substantially; Levi, Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas were in Egypt; some version of John, Mark, and Matthew were circulating in Egypt; Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and/or John were based in Jerusalem, and James son of Zebedee had been executed by then; and Paul had traveled to different communities along the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea. It’s also possible that Christianity had already spread to France, Spain, and the rest of northern Africa, and maybe even elsewhere by then.

There were at least five different realms of information that began circulating in the first 25 years of early Christianity. There is the true Christian Revolution that Mariam has led. There was the original version of the Gospel of John, which Levi seems to have been involved with. There then began to spread an altered version of the Gospel of John, which Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas seem to have been involved with. There are also the Synoptic Gospels, which Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John seem to have been involved with. Another was Paul’s ministry.

As for some of “the eleven”, if not all of them, they seem to have wanted to spread false information and distort the recorded history of early Christianity. The Gospel of Luke shows evidence that fraudulent narratives were in circulation by the early fifties and well before then. This fraud seems to have begun in the late twenties, the thirties, or the forties. Mariam appears to have led the charge first in Egypt and then in Rome, and spread the Christian Revolution in both places. Meanwhile, Peter, James son of Mother

Mariam, James son of Zebedee, John, Levi, Philip, Andrew, Thomas and/or others of “the eleven” appear to have been spreading fraudulent information. Mariam appears to have been based in Egypt and then in Rome; and the corruption appears to have been based in Jerusalem, Egypt, and/or surrounding areas. Within 25 years of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, this situation evolved in a way that produced the compilation of narratives that make up the Gospel of Luke, a Gospel that exalts Peter and attempts to reduce the best student and most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century to someone whom seven demons had come out and who had supported Peter and eleven other men out of her own means. Regardless of the exact timing of such an evolution, it appears that by the early fifties, there was incredible division within Christianity, stemming from long before then, apparently even during Christ’s Ministry. Within 25 years of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, Mariam seems to have spread the Christian Revolution in Egypt, and then led the development of what seems to have become the strongest Christian community during that time-period and that community was in the capital city of the Roman Empire. Meanwhile, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John were likely based in Jerusalem and traveled to nearby communities while Levi, Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas were likely in Egypt. Mariam appears to have been in Rome and certain other people were probably in Jerusalem and Egypt. Nearly 2,000 years later, we are left with the Gospel of John, which seems to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, and the Synoptic Gospels, which appear to be fraudulent and unreliable.

Through the forties and the fifties, Paul seems to have traveled to Galatia, Ephesus, Corinth and other places as well. Paul seems to have arrived in Corinth and met Priscilla and Aquila by 54. About a year and a half later, the three of them seem to have traveled to Ephesus. They probably met Mariam in Ephesus. Paul probably wrote both of his letters to the Corinthians in Ephesus. Mariam probably went to Corinth after that. By the time that Paul wrote his letter to the Romans, it seems that Mariam, Priscilla, and Aquila were all in Rome together. Around 57-58, Paul seems to have traveled to Jerusalem and was then arrested. He was likely transported to Rome as a prisoner in the late fifties or the early sixties. The author of Acts gives first-person accounts in chapters 27 and 28, the last two chapters of Acts. Based on those first-person references, we can justifiably derive the belief that the author of Acts traveled with Paul to Jerusalem and then traveled with Paul to Rome. The probable scenario is that Paul and the author of Acts traveled to Jerusalem, met with James son of Mother Mariam and some other people there, and then Paul was arrested there. Paul was probably then transported to Rome by boat and the author of Acts probably went with. Romans 16:6 provides good evidence that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome in the late fifties. The abrupt, strange, and unfulfilling ending of Acts shows evidence she was still there when Paul was transported there as a prisoner, likely in the late fifties or the early sixties.

Acts ends with Paul’s supposed imprisonment in Rome. There isn’t much information leading up to that ending and there isn’t much information available anywhere about what happened afterwards. However, there are certain pieces that can be put together that form a reasonably reliable storyline.

The description in Acts about Paul arriving in Jerusalem before he was arrested there doesn’t include any mention of Peter.

Acts 21:18

*The next day Paul and the rest of us went to see James, and all the elders were present.*

It's highly unlikely that Peter wouldn't have been mentioned if Peter was in Jerusalem then. It could have just been the case that Peter was traveling. However, if that wasn't the case, given that Peter would've likely been mentioned along with James son of Mother Mariam if Peter was in Jerusalem then, Acts 21:18 might be an indication that Peter had passed away by then.

The popular legend is that Peter died in Rome during Nero's reign sometime after the Great Fire. As shown in Part 6, Peter probably never went to Rome and probably remained in Israel. If Peter passed away before Paul arrived in Jerusalem, then Peter probably passed away around 10-15 years before the time that the popular tradition asserts. Many believe that Peter passed away in Rome around 67-68. However, Acts 21:18 might indicate that Peter had likely passed away in the fifties or sooner.

For more evidence, we can turn to the two letters in the New Testament that are attributed to Peter. The first letter shows the name "Peter" and the second letter shows the name "Simon Peter". While it's certainly possible that Peter wrote his name differently in each letter, the name change is probably an indication that two different authors wrote each, which would mean that at least one of those letters is probably fraudulent. Additionally, the first letter is addressed to "God's elect, strangers in the world, scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" and the second letter is addressed to "those who through the righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ have received a faith as precious as ours". It might not seem like a major difference that the addresses are different given that they are both addressed to a general audience. However, the author of the second letter specifically identifies it as the second letter written to the audience who it is addressed to. So it's not as if the second letter was targeting a different audience. If both letters were written by the same author and were written for the same audience, then the addresses would likely not be so different from each other. That shows further evidence that different authors wrote each.

Additionally, as shown in Part 6, Jerome, who was a priest in the fifth century, wrote the following in relation to Peter.

*He wrote two epistles which are called Catholic, the second of which, on account of its difference from the first in style, is considered by many not to be by him.*

This writing from Jerome shows that it was of common belief that the second letter attributed to Peter was not written by Peter.

For more evidence, the second letter specifically refers to Peter's death.

2 Peter 2:13-15

*I think it is right to refresh your memory as long as I live in the tent of this body, because I know that I will soon put it aside, as our Lord Jesus Christ has made clear to me. And I will make every effort to see that after my departure you will always be able to remember these things.*

These verses were probably written after Peter's death. Peter probably didn't prophesy his own death as these verses suggest. These verses show evidence that this letter is probably fraudulent and was probably written after Peter's death.

For even more evidence, the second letter specifically mentions Paul.

## 2 Peter 3:15-16

*Bear in mind that our Lord's patience means salvation, just as our dear brother Paul also wrote you with the wisdom that God gave him. He writes the same way in all his letters, speaking in them of these matters. His letters contain some things that are hard to understand, which ignorant and unstable people distort, as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction.*

Peter and Paul were separate from each other. Peter would not have likely written these verses. That shows that these verses are probably fraudulent. Such unity between Peter's side and Paul's side likely began when there was new leadership after Peter and James son of Mother Mariam. Additionally, these verses describe Paul's teachings as confusing, which shows that this letter was likely written before the union between Peter's side and Paul's side was complete. The First Epistle of Clement, which appears to have been written before the destruction of the temple in 70, also shows a union between Peter's side and Paul's side and does so in a way that presents Peter and Paul as equal co-leaders of Christianity. So the unification process seems to have taken pretty full shape by the time that letter was written. 2 Peter, on the other hand, seems to represent an earlier time-period when that union was still in the process of being worked out. So 2 Peter was also probably written before the destruction of the temple in 70 and probably before the First Epistle of Clement was written. Acts 21:18 shows that James son of Mother Mariam seems to have still been a leader in Jerusalem in the late fifties. So for the union between Peter's side and Paul's side to have been completed by 70, there was probably a change in leadership in the sixties. Jerome, who was a priest in the fifth century as mentioned earlier, wrote that James son of Mother Mariam was the leader in Jerusalem until the seventh year of Nero, which would have probably been 60 or around 60. We don't know if that information from Jerome is accurate, but it does seem like a reasonable time-period to believe that James son of Mother Mariam was no longer leading in Jerusalem. Additionally, many believe that James son of Mother Mariam was stoned to death in Jerusalem in 62. There's a good possibility that information isn't accurate but it nevertheless represents a realistic time-period for James' death or at least him no longer being a leader in Jerusalem. So generally speaking, it is justified to believe that there was a change in leadership in or around the early sixties.

So regardless of whether 1 Peter is authentic or fraudulent, it seems that 2 Peter is fraudulent and was probably written in the sixties during a time-period when new leadership appears to have been trying to win over communities that Paul had developed.

1 Timothy can take us further in our analysis of what happened in the sixties. 1 Timothy provides instructions for bishops and deacons. First, instructions for bishops and deacons show support for the hierarchy of bishops, which, as shown in Part 2, consisted of bishops who exalted themselves, exerted control over people, and spread false teachings. Furthermore, these instructions address the obedience of their families, how much wine they drink, and their wives not being malicious talkers. Such instructions would have likely been more characteristic of this new leadership, which included the hierarchy of bishops, than of Paul. This controlling attitude with a focus on bishops and the relaying of false teachings was characteristic of the hierarchy of bishops that evolved. The letter goes on to say "I am writing you these instructions so that, if I am delayed, you all know how people ought to conduct themselves in God's household". A person only needs Christian teachings to be a Christian teacher. These instructions in 1 Timothy are not needed to know how to be a Christian teacher and so they are obviously apparently fraudulent. 1 Timothy obviously appears to be fraudulent. It was not likely written by Paul, but instead

seems to have been written by someone who was in support of the hierarchy of bishops and wanted to exert control over people. Additionally, the verses below will bring us further.

1 Timothy 5:17-18

*The elders who direct the affairs of the church well are worthy of double honor, especially those whose work is preaching and teaching. For the Scripture says, "Do not muzzle the ox while it is treading out the grain", and "The worker deserves his wages".*

These verses give us two important pieces of evidence. One is that the "elders who direct the affairs of the church well" are exalted, which would have likely come from someone who was in support of the hierarchy of bishops. The second is that the phrase "The worker deserves his wages" is from the Gospel of Luke, which means that the author of this letter seems to have had knowledge of the Gospel of Luke. That one piece of evidence provides evidence in two different ways. One is that Paul would not likely have referenced the Gospel of Luke, so that shows additional evidence that this letter is fraudulent. The second is that this letter appears to have been written after the production of the Gospel of Luke, and so could have been produced in the forties but was probably produced in the fifties or later, most likely in the sixties.

1 Timothy is a great example of how the hierarchy of bishops began to take shape. Since this letter seems to have been written to a community that Paul developed, it serves as evidence that there were fraudulent attempts to control communities that were developed by Paul. Additionally, since it seems to be representative of a very early time-period in the history of the hierarchy of bishops, it was probably produced in the sixties.

There seems to have been a shift in strategy at some point, maybe around 60. After that, it seems that new leadership tried to take over communities that Paul developed, which seems to have been a continuation of efforts by Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and others. The Bible shows clear evidence that these kinds of efforts were taking place before Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, John, and Paul passed away, particularly in Paul's letter to the Galatians, especially the reference to spies infiltrating Paul's ranks. However, the original efforts carried out by Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and others seemed to have distinctly opposed Paul. In the continued efforts by this new leadership, it seems that there were also efforts to unify Peter's side with Paul's side. Also, apparently as a part of the efforts by this new leadership, 1 Timothy and 2 Peter were fraudulently produced. It seems that a result of these efforts was a union between Peter's side and Paul's side, a union that probably took full shape only after both of them had passed away. It was probably this new leadership, not the original leadership of Peter and James son of Mother Mariam, that pulled off such a union that still exists to this day. 1 Timothy and 2 Peter seem to have been a part of that process.

Paul's mentioning of Mariam, Priscilla, and Aquila in his letter to Romans as well as the inclusion of James son of Mother Mariam and the exclusion of Peter in Acts 21:18 give us a decent picture of what was happening around the late fifties. Mariam, Priscilla, and Aquila seem to have been in Rome; Paul seems to have been traveling around before being arrested in Jerusalem; Peter seems to have likely passed away; and James son of Mother Mariam seems to have still been a leader in Jerusalem. Paul seems to have been transported to Rome as a prisoner around 60. 1 Timothy and 2 Peter give us a decent picture of what likely occurred in the sixties with new leadership implementing a new strategy of trying to unify Peter's side with Paul's side while trying to take over communities that were developed by Paul.



This new leadership seems to have advanced through communities that were developed by Paul. They seem to have distributed a letter that was fraudulently attributed to Peter. If 1 Timothy was actually intended to be read by Timothy, then that shows that the new leadership was trying to deceive Timothy and control his behavior. Alternatively, this letter was never meant to be read by Timothy but was simply meant to appear to be a letter to Timothy to influence a community. Regardless, such an effort would seem to be in line with the likely efforts to take over communities that were developed by Paul and to unify Peter's side with Paul's side within one religion.

The First Epistle of Clement can give us a good example of how such a conquest ended up in the sixties. The First Epistle of Clement appears to have been written in the time-period of 64-70 because it appears to have been written after the Great Fire in 64 and before the destruction of the temple in 70. That letter shows evidence that Mariam, Peter, and Paul had passed away; that the author discriminated against Mariam and independent women in general, even while describing their torture and murder; that the author was aligned with the so-called "orthodox church" stemming from Peter; that the author was in Rome and therefore that the "orthodox church" was in Rome; that Peter's side and Paul's side had been unified; that there was a bishop in Corinth and therefore that the hierarchy of bishops had begun to be implemented; and that the author was trying to influence and control that community in Corinth and was even willing to threaten them to do so.

The book of Hebrews shares some similar components as the First Epistle of Clement. First, as far as dating, the book of Hebrews appears to have been written before the destruction of the temple in 70 as shown by the verses below.

Hebrews 5:1-3

*Every high priest is selected from among men and is appointed to represent them in matters related to God, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins. He is able to deal gently with those who are ignorant and are going astray, since he himself is subject to weakness. This is why he has to offer sacrifices for his own sins, as well as for the sins of the people.*

Hebrews 8:13

*By calling this covenant "new", he has made the first one obsolete; and what is obsolete and aging will soon disappear.*

Hebrews 5:1-3 describes Jewish traditions related to the selection of the high priest and sacrifices. After the destruction of the temple in 70, there was no longer a high priest or sacrifices as described in those verses. Therefore, Hebrews 5:1-3 show evidence that the book of Hebrews was written before the destruction of the temple in 70. Likewise, Hebrews 8:13 describes the so-called "first" covenant obsolete, which is a reference to the supposed covenant with Abraham. The author describes the supposed covenant with Abraham as obsolete because of the "new" supposed covenant that the author believed came along with Christianity. The author goes on to say that the supposed old covenant will "soon disappear". Such a statement is a reference to what the author proposed would happen in the near future related to the end times, the destruction of the temple, and the supposed second coming of the physical appearance of Christ. The author's claim about all of that happening soon inherently shows that none of that had happened, and therefore that the temple had not yet been destroyed. So the book of Hebrews was clearly apparently written before the destruction of the temple in 70. Furthermore, the First Epistle of Clement

references the book of Hebrews thereby showing that the book of Hebrews was written before the First Epistle of Clement.

The following verses show evidence of the lower limit of the likely time-period in which the book of Hebrews was produced.

Hebrews 2:3

*How shall we escape if we ignore such a great salvation? This salvation, which was first announced by the Lord, was confirmed to us by those who heard him.*

Hebrews 13:23

*I want you to know that our brother Timothy has been released. If he arrives soon, I will come with him to see you.*

Hebrews 2:3 states “This salvation, which was first announced by the Lord, was confirmed to us by those who heard him”. That statement shows that the author was not Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, John, any of the rest of “the eleven”, or Paul because that statement expresses that they learned about Christianity second-hand. That doesn’t necessarily prove anything in terms of dating but that statement does strongly suggest a later time-period after Peter and Paul had passed away. The phrase “confirmed to us by those who heard him” shows a likely disconnection from “those who heard”, which suggests that “those who heard” had already passed away, which likely leads to a dating that goes past the fifties and into the sixties. Hebrews 13:23 states that Timothy had been in prison, which also suggests a dating that goes past the fifties and into the sixties. Hebrews 2:3 and 13:23 don’t provide definitive evidence but merely provide strong suggestions that the book of Hebrews was written no earlier than the sixties; and with the evidence that shows that the book of Hebrews was written before the destruction of the temple in 70 and before the First Epistle of Clement, it’s easy to derive the conclusion that the book of Hebrews was probably written in the sixties.

Not only was the book of Hebrews likely written in the same decade as the First Epistle of Clement, it also seems to have been written around the same area as shown by the following verse.

Hebrews 13:24

*Greet all you leaders and all God’s people. Those from Italy send you their greetings.*

Hebrews 13:24 shows evidence that the author was writing from Italy. Some argue that the reference to Italy could refer to people who were originally from Italy but not necessarily in Italy at the time the book was written. However, describing people in the community that an author was among during their writing was a very common way to end such writing. Verse 13:24 is the second to last verse in the book of Hebrews. The only text after that verse is verse 13:25, which simply states “Grace be with you all”. When ending a letter with greetings from a community, it is almost a forgone conclusion that the author was among that community or at least was recently relative to when they wrote the letter. Furthermore, it doesn’t really make much sense to say that people from Italy send greetings unless it is a reference to the community that was currently in Italy at that time. It’s a general reference to people from Italy and so it is very unlikely that verse 13:24 is referring to people who were from Italy but were not in Italy at that time. Instead, it seems obvious that the author was sending greetings from people in Italy because the author

was in Italy when they wrote the book of Hebrews. So much like the First Epistle of Clement, the book of Hebrews seems to have been written in Italy during the sixties.

The following verses give some idea of some of the beliefs of the author of the book of Hebrews.

Hebrews 5:7-10

*During the days of Jesus' life on earth, he offered up prayers and petitions with loud cries and tears to the one who could save him from death, and he was heard because of his reverent submission. Although he was a son, he learned obedience from what he suffered and, once made perfect, he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him and was priest in the order of Melchizedek.*

Hebrews 13:7

*Obey your leaders and submit to their authority. They keep watch over you as men who must give an account. Obey them so that their work will be a joy, not a burden, for that would be of no advantage to you.*

Hebrews 5:7-10 show multiple strange beliefs about Christ. These verses describe Christ, who is God, being saved from death, being in submission, as a “son”, as obedient and more specifically as learning from that obedience, as having been made perfect and therefore as previously not having been perfect, and as being a priest like Melchizedek, which is a reference to a human character. Hebrews 13:7 states “obey your leaders and submit to their authority”, which like the First Epistle of Clement, demands submission to human authority.

The First Epistle of Clement, the book of Hebrews, 1 Peter, and 1 Timothy all appear to provide examples of the character of the so-called “orthodox church” in the sixties. Combined together, they show the following: discrimination against Mariam and independent women in general, even while describing their torture and murder; alignment with Peter; presence in Rome and elsewhere in Italy; unification between Peter’s side and Paul’s side; the implementation of the hierarchy of bishops; demands of obedience and submission; specific instructions on how to behave; and control being asserted over communities and even with the willingness to make threats.

It’s unknown what happened to Paul after he was transported to Rome as a prisoner. If Paul had been executed during that prison sentence, then that would have likely been described in Acts. So Paul was probably released from prison in Rome. After that, Paul probably spent some time with the Christian community in Rome. Paul’s letter to Romans describes Paul as having wanted to go to Spain. The First Epistle of Clement describes Paul as having traveled to the far west. So Paul may have ended up in Spain.

As shown in Part 6, Mariam and other women in and/or around Rome appear to have been convicted by the Roman government of arson and then tortured and murdered.

Mariam was the true human leader of Christianity for over three decades leading up to the Great Fire. She spread the Christian Revolution in Egypt and then in the capital city of the Roman Empire. Today, Christianity is spread throughout the world in large part because of her efforts over that time-period of over three decades. From the twenties to the sixties, Mariam spread the true Christian Revolution.

Clement is thought to have passed away by the end of the first century or a few years into the second century. In the second century, the hierarchy of bishops included Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of

Smyrna, and later on, Irenaeus of Lyons and Tertullian of Carthage. In the third century, the bishops included Origen and Clement of Alexandria.

As shown earlier, Celsus wrote about what seems to have been the Gospel of John and referenced “Salome”, “Mariamme”, and “Martha”. So this power struggle that seems to have been happening in the first century was likely occurring throughout the Roman Empire in the second century. The hierarchy of bishops seems to have been fighting a large population of Christians who seem to have held to teachings passed on from women. Meanwhile, the Gospel of John seems to have been the most popular Gospel. By the end of the second century, a biblical canon seems to have been produced by the “orthodox church” that consisted of the four Gospels, some of Paul’s letters, and some other letters. The battle between the hierarchy of bishops and those who they called “heretics” continued through the second and third centuries and so on.

In 306, Constantine took over as the emperor of Rome. He significantly contributed to the proclamation of the Edict of Milan in 313, which declared tolerance for Christianity. Constantine called the First Council of Nicaea in 325. By this time, there were already hundreds of bishops throughout the Roman Empire and possibly over 1,500 bishops. Many believe that this council decided what was included in the New Testament. While it seems that was one of the objectives of the council, there is evidence that shows that Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John were already accepted by bishops as the four Gospels that should be in the biblical canon by the end of the second century. As previously mentioned, it seems that a biblical canon had already been produced by the end of the second century. So by the time that the First Council of Nicaea occurred, there probably wasn’t much debate about which Gospels should be included in the New Testament. So contrary to some popular beliefs, Constantine probably didn’t play much of a role in deciding what material was included in the New Testament.

What seems to have been a larger issue around the time of the Council of Nicaea was Arianism, which revolves around the beliefs that Christ is the Son of God and that Christ didn’t always exist but was begotten at a point in time. The debate over the divinity of Christ as well as other issues led to division among the bishops. With the population of the Roman Empire strongly turned towards Christianity, this division among the bishops seems to have been a major problem for the emperor Constantine and he responded with the Council of Nicaea. As a result, the Nicene Creed was produced. The Nicene Creed set the standard for the Catholic Church from then on.

Also while Constantine was emperor, he moved the capital city of the Roman Empire from Rome to a city he named Constantinople. A main theory as to why he did that expresses that the move was in response to the threat of foreign attack. That may have been the case. However, it does seem hard to imagine an emperor of the Roman Empire moving the capital city away from Rome, the very city that the Roman Empire is named along with, because of the threat of a foreign invasion. Leaving Rome left behind over a millennium of history. It seems more likely that Constantine wanted a fresh start after the Roman Empire had been taken over by Christianity. If we take a look at what happened during the reign of Constantine versus what happened about a century later, we can see which possibility seems more likely. Rome was attacked in 410 by the Visigoths, about a century after Constantine’s reign. Meanwhile, during Constantine’s reign, which is when the capital city was moved from Rome to Constantinople, Constantine worked to legalize Christianity and ordered the Council of Nicaea to settle disputes among bishops. It seems that Christianity was more of an issue for Constantine than the threat of a foreign attack. So it

seems that the spread of Christianity may have influenced the emperor of the Roman Empire to move the capital city away from Rome, which was a capital city for over a millennium. That is an incredible testament to how prevalent Christianity had become in the Roman Empire.

Later in the fourth century, Theodosius I became the last Roman emperor to rule over a united Roman Empire before the final split between the Western Roman Empire and the Eastern Roman Empire. Augustine, the legendary Catholic bishop and theologian, had made his historic conversion to Christianity during the reign of Theodosius I in 386. Augustine's mentor, bishop Ambrose of Milan, held incredible influence over the Roman emperor Theodosius I, which shows how powerful the Catholic Church had become.

After Theodosius I, the Roman Empire split between the Western Roman Empire and the Eastern Roman Empire. The Visigoths invaded Rome in 410 and the Western Roman Empire eventually dissolved. The Eastern Roman Empire remained and had its capital in Constantinople. Western Europe then evolved through the fifth century and so on with different kingdoms shifting around. Among these kingdoms were the Visigoths, the Ostrogoths, and the Franks. The Eastern Roman Empire would eventually also be known as the Byzantine Empire. Western Europe began to see tremendous economic downturn with less advanced kingdoms taking over after the fall of the Western Roman Empire. This gave way to a period that has been called "the dark ages".

Towards the end of the sixth century, Pope Gregory claimed that Mariam was a prostitute. Such a disgusting and disgraceful action shows that there was an attack on Mariam by the top person in the Catholic Church as late as the sixth century.

In the seventh century, a new religion called Islam was formed. Islamic kingdoms spread fast through much of the territory that had previously been the southern half of the old Roman Empire. By the eighth century, Islamic kingdoms spread from Syria to the south through Israel and to the west through northern Africa all of the way to Spain. By this time, there were different kingdoms, including the Franks, in Western Europe while the Eastern Roman Empire continued on.

In 1054, there began the official separation between the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church that exists to this day.

In 1095, Pope Urban II declared war against Islamic kingdoms. Such a declaration from a pope shows that the Roman Catholic Church was a multinational super-power that could declare war using forces from multiple kingdoms. That declaration began what has been known as "the Crusades". There were three main Crusades from the perspective of Europe that occurred during a time-period spanning from the end of the eleventh century through the middle of the thirteenth century. The Crusades have been labeled as a series of so-called "religious wars". A proposed objective of the Crusades was to recover "the Holy Land" from Islamic rule. However, the Crusades turned into a powerful economic system that pumped wealth back to Europe along with valuable information related to science, technology, and philosophy. The Crusades seem to have been instrumental in revolutionizing Europe after "the dark ages" and seem to have helped give rise to a period that has been called "the Renaissance".

In 1453, the Ottoman Empire, which was an Islamic empire, destroyed the Eastern Roman Empire and captured Constantinople, which was renamed Istanbul. That marked the end of what remained of the old

Roman Empire and the succession of emperors since the first Roman emperor Augustus in the first century BCE.

In 1486, *The Malleus Maleficarum*, often translated as the Hammer of Witches, was published as a guide for the extermination of witches. Convictions of witchcraft reached a peak from 1580 to 1630. It has been estimated that around 50,000 people were burned at the stake during that time-period. It has also been estimated that around 80% of those people were women.

Probably around the time-period of 1495-1498, Leonardo Da Vinci painted "The Last Supper". That painting is the most reproduced religious painting ever. That painting shows the Last Supper as described in the Gospel of John. Many believe that the person shown in the painting as sitting to the left of Christ (from the perspective of the viewer), the one described in the Gospel of John as the beloved disciple, is supposed to portray Mariam. That theory suggests that Leonardo Da Vinci believed that Mariam is the beloved disciple.

In 1517, Martin Luther wrote "The Ninety-five Theses", which was critical of the Roman Catholic Church and in part addressed abuse of power. What followed is known as "the Reformation". As a result, Protestantism was formed and was separate from the Roman Catholic Church. The trajectory that began with the formation of Protestantism and "the Reformation" gave rise to many different denominations.

In the 1500's, settlers from Spain arrived in the Americas and began spreading Roman Catholicism there. In the 1600's, settlers from Britain arrived on the east coast of what is now the United States of America. Eventually, the British government controlled 13 colonies along the east coast and then defeated the Spanish military in Florida to add the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> colonies. The British presence on the east coast instead of the Spanish gave rise to a Protestant British-America instead of a Roman Catholic Spanish-America.

Many denominations had sprung from Protestantism and "the Reformation" in Europe, and people of these different denominations found homes in the new British-America. This new nation included Congregationalists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Baptists, Quakers, Lutherans, Methodists, and Roman Catholics. That mixed Christian population set the religious foundation for a nation that eventually grew into the United States of America.

The 1700's and the 1800's gave rise to religious exploration among the Christian American population. Large gatherings of people would come together for what is known as "revivals". Christian Americans had religious freedom being free from restrictions and persecution in Europe, and they were looking to be fulfilled in this age of religious exploration.

In the midst of this transforming Christian American population came the formation of Mormonism. Joseph Smith, who was born in 1805 and died in 1844, claimed to have seen visions of two figures who he described as God and Christ. The separation that he made between God and Christ shows that a fraudulent story was put forth for the formation of Mormonism. Additionally, he claimed that Peter, James, and John had appeared to him, which gives further evidence that Joseph Smith fraudulently made up stories to start his own religion. He went on to develop a large colony with its own military. Joseph Smith was the leader of this colony and military, and he was also a polygamist who had sex with married women of the colony. The formation of Mormonism is a more modern example of what happened with

the formation of Islam. Both Islam and Mormonism used Christianity to form a new religion in the pursuit of power.

The path of Christianity includes truthful origins followed by a battle between truth and corruption. Below is a timeline of events that we have discussed.

1400 BCE

Nomads were worshipping Yahweh

1200 BCE

An Israelite community had formed in the highlands of Israel

850 BCE

The kingdom of Israel and the House of David had been formed

750 BCE

The kingdom of Judah had been formed

722 BCE

The Assyrian Empire destroyed the kingdom of Israel

720-600 BCE

King Hezekiah reigned over the kingdom of Judah for a part of this time-period

King Josiah reigned over the kingdom of Judah for a part of this time-period

Serious religious reforms were implemented

King Josiah and King Hezekiah ordered the production of fraudulent prophecies about the coming Messiah

593 BCE

The Babylonian Empire destroyed the kingdom of Judah

593-512 BCE

The Babylonian Exile

Documents were compiled together and edited, which gave way to what became recognized as the book of Judaism

512 BCE

Israelites were allowed to go to Israel after being held captive in Babylon

500-100 BCE

The book of Daniel was produced, shifting expectations about the coming Messiah

26

Mariam began following Christ

Wednesday, March 24<sup>th</sup>, 28

Mariam anointed Christ in Bethany

Late on Sunday, March 28<sup>th</sup>, or early on Monday, March 29<sup>th</sup>, 28

Christ's was arrested

Monday, March 29<sup>th</sup>, 28

The Crucifixion

Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28

The Resurrection

28-54

Mariam was the true human leader of Christianity. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John tried to act as authority and enforce Jewish customs. Paul converted and began his ministry. Mariam had probably first traveled to Egypt and then traveled to Rome. Levi, Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas were in Egypt. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John spent a lot of their time in Jerusalem. Paul traveled around on the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea. There were at least five different realms of information circulating: the true Christian Revolution that was spread by Mariam; the original version of the Gospel of John, which Levi was likely involved with; an altered version of the Gospel of John, which Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas were likely involved with; the Synoptic Gospels, which Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and/or John were likely involved with; and Paul had gone in his own direction. Mariam had given her Testimony. Levi was likely involved with the original version of the Gospel of John, which was likely later altered by Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and/or John were appear to have been involved with the productions of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, and appear to have influenced the production of the Gospel of Luke. Some version of the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, and John seem to have been circulating before the Gospel of Luke was produced, and they were probably circulating in Egypt. The Gospel of Luke was then produced and was probably circulating in Egypt shortly afterwards.

28-39

Paul's conversion

30-41

Paul traveled to Jerusalem for the first time after his conversion. The only supposed "apostles" who he saw there were Peter and James son of Mother Mariam.

28-44

The original version of the Gospel of John was produced  
Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew fraudulently altered the Gospel of John

39-44

The Gospel of Mark was produced

41-44

James son of Zebedee was executed

41-54

The Gospel of Matthew was produced



43-54

The council at Jerusalem

The author of Luke and Acts traveled to Jerusalem

The Gospel of Luke was produced

The author of Luke and Acts joined Paul

Paul met Priscilla and Aquila in Corinth

54-60

Paul wrote his letter to Christians in Rome

Paul was arrested in Jerusalem

Around 60

Paul was transferred to Rome as a prisoner to stand trial before Caesar

44-60

Peter was executed

60-70

Paul was executed

64

The Great Fire of Rome in 64

Mariam and other women were tortured and murdered on orders of the Roman emperor Nero

60-70

The book of Hebrews was written in Italy

64-70

The First Epistle of Clement was written in Rome or nearby

66

Riots in Jerusalem

66-74

The Jewish-Roman War

70

The destruction of the Jewish temple

88-99

Clement was supposedly the bishop of Rome

100-200

Gnostic Gospels probably began to be in circulation sometime in the second century, possibly even sooner

170

Celsus wrote an anti-Christian production

150-200

A canon was established by the end of the second century

248

Origen wrote "Contra Celsum"

306-337

Constantine was the emperor of Rome

325

The First Council of Nicaea

330

Constantine moved the capital city of the Roman Empire from Rome to Constantinople

386

Augustine converted to Christianity

591

Pope Gregory claimed that Mariam was a prostitute

570-632

The formation of Islam

1054

Official separation between the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church

1096-1271

The Crusades

1453

The Ottoman Empire destroyed the Eastern Roman Empire and captured Constantinople, which was renamed Istanbul.

1486

The Malleus Maleficarum, often translated as the Hammer of Witches, was published as a guide for the extermination of witches.

1495-1498

Leonardo Da Vinci painted "The Last Supper", which seems to represent the belief that Mariam is the beloved disciple.

1517

Martin Luther wrote "The Ninety-five Theses", which was critical of the Roman Catholic Church and in part addressed abuse of power.

1580-1630

Convictions of witchcraft reached a peak and it has been estimated that around 50,000 people were burned at the stake during this time-period. It is believed that around 80% of those people were women.

1773

Pistas Sophia was discovered in Egypt

1945

The Nag Hammadi Scriptures were discovered in Nag Hammadi, Egypt

2016

Mariam was declared an “apostle” by the Roman Catholic Church

Today

Christians around the world put their faith in fraudulent writing. It is popular to believe that Peter was the top disciple during Christ’s Ministry and in the few decades afterwards. Mariam, the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century and the true human leader of Christianity, is still believed by many to have been a prostitute who had seven demons come out of her.

## Part 8 – The Revolution

It's been nearly 2,000 years since the Resurrection and today we have a Bible filled with fraud and so many different denominations that spread disagreeing beliefs. Fraud and corruption have filled people's minds but there is the true Christian Revolution that began spreading in the first century. The Revolution never stopped. It just became less known among the human population.

Today, Christians around the world believe that Christ is "the Son of God" and was sacrificed for our sins, and that Peter and Paul are the two giants of early Christianity. We need to return to the Revolution that began in the first century. We need to seek the truth of what happened back then and carry that forward to the present day.

We don't know of everything that happened during Christ's Ministry but we have seen the evidence that shows that Mariam was the first and top disciple of Christ and that she was the only disciple to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. We need to look to the life of Mariam to learn about the Revolution that Christ gave to her. Through the Testimony of Mariam, we can know Christianity. If we trace the steps of Mariam and what went wrong during and after her time here, we can bring ourselves and this world back to the true Christian Revolution.

The evidence shows that Mariam became a disciple around the year 26 CE and that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection occurred in 28. On the day of the Resurrection, Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup>, 28, a new chapter for the human race began. From then until now, for nearly 2,000 years, the human race has been in a chapter that includes the true Christian Revolution.

It seems that Mariam told Peter and the others of "the eleven" about the Resurrection, but they mostly didn't believe her. Maybe only Levi did. Afterward, Mariam went to Egypt and spread the Christian Revolution there. Maybe in the early forties, she left Egypt for Rome.

By the late forties, the Revolution had spread in Rome to the point that Jews were causing disturbances that got some Jews exiled from Rome. By the late fifties, even Paul recognized the leadership of Mariam in Rome.

The Christian community in Rome grew and grew through the forties, the fifties, and into the sixties. Paul's letter to the Romans names 29 people. That list only includes people who Paul knew. The letter that has been labeled "The First Epistle of Clement" states "the Danaids and Dirce", which references a group of independent Christian women. We don't know how large this community was but Paul knew of 29 of them, a member of the "orthodox church" knew of a group of them who were independent women, and even the emperor of Rome went after these women. This community is unlike any other before or after their time here. What Mariam started in Rome became known even to the Roman emperor.

After the Great Fire, the emperor needed someone to blame. It was this community that Mariam led that became the target. A group of independent Christian women were captured, tortured, and murdered. Mariam seems to have been among them. The most faithful disciple of Christ and the true human leader of Christianity was tortured and murdered. Not only should we remember the path of Mariam, but we should also remember the community she developed and the others who were tortured and murdered.

This community is like a lost city that needs to be discovered by everyone. Like the so-called city of "Atlantis", this community is like a city at the bottom of an ocean in that it has been in obscurity for

nearly 2,000 years. We don't know if Atlantis actually existed, but the legend of it being a lost city is similar to the Christian community that Mariam developed in Rome. We must bring the memory of this community from obscurity back in sight for everyone to see.

It's a wonder what this community was like. What was it like to learn directly from the top disciple of Christ? What was it like to learn from her in the midst of the capital city of the Roman Empire? What was this community like in the forties? The fifties? The first few years of the sixties? What was this community like in 64 before the Great Fire broke out? This is what we should imagine in our minds. We should try to recreate some of the aspects in our minds to better understand what this community was like. It is this community that sets the model for what we should try to build. We are not Mariam and Rome is not what it once was, but the Christian community in Rome in the forties, the fifties, and the sixties sets the standard that we should move toward. We should try to be like Mariam, we should try to spread Christianity as she did, and we should try to build society as she did. What a glorious accomplishment she succeeded at that was unprecedented during its time and that has never been reached again since.

Mariam followed Christ during Christ's Ministry, anointed Christ, maintained her faith during and after the Crucifixion, and was there to see Christ after the Resurrection. From then on, she spread the true Christian Revolution and took it all of the way to the capital city of the Roman Empire. That is what the Revolution looks like. That is the Revolution that exists in our minds today. It is our responsibility to take that from our minds and implement it into the world we live in. How easy it would have been for Mariam to sit back and do nothing. How easy it would have been to let "the eleven" take over. How easy it is to give up. Instead, she persevered through it all and developed the Christian community in the capital city of the Roman Empire. She is a human being just like us. She accomplished all of this as a mere human and as a woman in the first century. What excuse do we have to not follow that example? What excuse do we have to not be amazing in our discipleship? What excuse do we have to not accomplish what everyone else tells us we can't?

Christ was crucified and the top disciple of Christ was tortured and murdered. What excuse do you have to do nothing to spread the true Christian Revolution?

After all of the tragedy that surrounds early Christianity, there is infinite hope. Christ was crucified, but then there was the Resurrection. There is death, but then there is life after death. The top disciple of Christ was tortured and murdered, but she lives on and the Revolution that she spread is here today and exists within us.

It is of course important to understand the amazing accomplishments of Mariam. But it is also important to understand the corrupt efforts that were made to conceal information about her and to lie and deceive people about what Christianity really is. As we have seen, these efforts seem to have begun during Christ's Ministry.

The Gospel of Mary gives one account that is likely a fairly accurate description of this division shortly after the Resurrection.

*Then Mary stood up. She greeted them all, addressing her brothers and sisters, "Do not weep and be distressed nor let your hearts be irresolute. For his grace will be with you all and will shelter you. Rather, we should praise his greatness, for he has prepared us and made us human beings." When Mary said these things, she turned their heart toward the Good, and they began to debate about the words of [the Savior].*

*Peter said to Mary, "Sister we know that the Savior loved you more than all other women. Tell us the words of the Savior that you remember, the things you know that we don't because we haven't heard them."*

*Peter responded, bringing up similar concerns. He questioned them about the Savior, "Did he then speak with a woman in private without our knowing about it? Are we to turn around and listen to her? Did he choose her over us?"*

*Then Mary wept and said to Peter, "My brother Peter, what are you imagining? Do you think that I have thought up these things by myself in my heart or that I am telling lies about the Savior?"*

*Levi answered, speaking to Peter, "Peter, you have always been a wrathful person. Now I see you contending against a woman like the adversaries. For if the Savior made her worthy, who are you then for your part to reject her? Assuredly the Savior's knowledge of her is completely reliable. That is why he loved her more than us. Rather, we should be ashamed. We should clothe ourselves with the perfect human, acquire it for ourselves as he commanded us, and announce the good news, not laying down any other rule or law that differs from what the Savior said."*

*After [he said these] things, they started going out [to] teach and to preach.*

As we can see from all of the evidence in Part 5, Peter and others went on to lie and deceive people about Christianity and conceal information about Mariam, the result of which we have today in the Gospels in the Bible.

As we can see from "The First Epistle of Clement", the "orthodox church" picked Peter and Paul to be their two giants while discriminating against Mariam and other independent Christian women even after their torture and murder.

*But not to dwell upon ancient examples, let us come to the most recent spiritual heroes. Let us take the noble examples furnished in our own generation. Through envy and jealousy the greatest and most righteous pillars [of the church] have been persecuted and put to death. Let us set before our eyes the illustrious apostles. Peter, through unrighteous envy, endured not one or two, but numerous labours; and when he had at length suffered martyrdom, departed to the place of glory due to him. Owing to envy, Paul also obtained the reward of patient endurance, after being seven times thrown into captivity, compelled to flee, and stoned. After preaching both in the east and west, he gained the illustrious reputation due to his faith, having taught righteousness to the whole world, and come to the extreme limit of the west, and suffered martyrdom under the prefects. Thus was he removed from the world, and went into the holy place, having proved himself a striking example of patience.*

*To these men who spent their lives in the practice of holiness, there is to be added a great multitude of the elect, who, having through envy endured many indignities and tortures, furnished us with a most excellent example. Through envy, those women, the Danaids and Dircaë, being persecuted, after they had suffered terrible and unspeakable torments, finished the course of their faith with steadfastness, and though weak in body, received a noble reward. Envy has alienated wives from their husbands, and changed that saying of our father Adam, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. Envy and strife have overthrown great cities, and rooted up mighty nations.*

Not only can we see through the Gospels in the Bible as well as the Gnostic Gospels that Peter and others specifically attacked Mariam and spread their own religion that deviates from the truth of Christianity, but also the "First Epistle of Clement" is clear evidence of the position of the bishops of the "orthodox church" who took their guidance from influence passed down from Peter and others. In reference to Peter

and Paul, they say “To these men who spent their lives in the practice of holiness, there is to be added a great multitude of the elect, who, having through envy endured many indignities and tortures, furnished us with a most excellent example”. In reference to the women, they call them “the Danaids and Dirce”, which are references to fictional murderous women, and they say “weak in body” and “envy has alienated wives from husbands” while avoiding saying anything about being a part of “the elect” or furnishing us with “a most excellent example” as they do in reference to Peter and Paul. Not only are there criticisms directed at these women, there are criticisms directed at them immediately after describing them having been tortured and murdered and they are also called names that refer to fictional murderous women.

This is the same letter that refers to the removal of a bishop from Corinth as the following text shows.

*But we see that you have removed some men of excellent behaviour from the ministry, which they fulfilled blamelessly and with honour.*

*But that inclination for one above another entailed less guilt upon you, inasmuch as your partialities were then shown towards apostles, already of high reputation, and towards a man whom they had approved. But now reflect who those are that have perverted you, and lessened the renown of your far-famed brotherly love. It is disgraceful, beloved, yea, highly disgraceful, and unworthy of your Christian profession, that such a thing should be heard of as that the most steadfast and ancient church of the Corinthians should, on account of one or two persons, engage in sedition against its presbyters. And this rumour has reached not only us, but those also who are unconnected with us; so that, through your infatuation, the name of the Lord is blasphemed, while danger is also brought upon yourselves.*

*You therefore, who laid the foundation of this sedition, submit yourselves to the presbyters, and receive correction so as to repent, bending the knees of your hearts. Learn to be subject, laying aside the proud and arrogant self-confidence of your tongue.*

In addition to criticizing a group of women who were tortured and murdered, they also criticize people for not wanting to be controlled by a bishop who was appointed by others. They go as far as to threaten danger and demand submission. The same people who lied and deceived people about Christianity and concealed information about the top disciple of Christ implemented a hierarchy of bishops who threatened people and tried to control them. This is the line of succession that led to the Bible and still exists in our world today.

“The First Epistle of Clement” shows us a foundation that has persisted for nearly 2,000 years. This letter appears to have been written in the sixties in the first century. So shortly after the torture and murder of the top disciple of Christ, a leader of the “orthodox church” in Rome presented Peter and Paul as the two giants of early Christianity, concealed information about Mariam, discriminated against women even while describing them having been tortured and murdered, asserted that appointed bishops should be in control of the people, demanded submission from the people, and threatened danger to those who did not submit.

From then on, the battle between the “orthodox church” and so-called “heretics” ensued. People who didn’t agree with the “orthodox church” were criticized, ousted from society, and at times murdered, and documents were destroyed.

As the centuries went by, there were still people who believed that Mariam was the top disciple of Christ. The Gnostic Gospels are evidence of that for the second through the fourth centuries. Then, in the late

sixth century, Pope Gregory called Mariam a prostitute, presumably to fight against her popularity among the people. The Revolution spread information about Mariam being the top disciple of Christ for over half of a millennium. But then what?

There are legends about people praising Mariam through the centuries in Europe, particularly in France. Many of those legends probably contain false details but these legends still likely indicate some sort of truth. The legends probably wouldn't exist at all if there weren't really people praising Mariam at all. Then, late in the fifteenth century, Leonardo da Vinci painted his famous painting called "The Last Supper", depicting Mariam as the beloved disciple. We don't know exactly how people viewed Mariam from the first century to the fifteenth century, but we have the work of Leonardo da Vinci that gives us the idea that some people, even some people of so-called "high society", believed that Mariam is the beloved disciple.

Moving forward from the fifteenth century, there was the Reformation, the European conquering of the Americas, which brought Christianity with it, and the development of so many different denominations in Europe, Africa, Asia, what later became the United States of America, and elsewhere.

Think back to the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Revolution that Mariam spread, and the persecution after the Great Fire. Return to the Revolution. Seek the truth and spread the Revolution to others.

We live our lives perceiving reality from our own relative perspective. We all have our own knowledge and our own experiences. We all have our own happiness and our own suffering. When we were born into this world, we began experiencing, learning, and growing. Ever since then, we have been on a path of experiencing, learning, and growing. As we move forward on our path, we continue to perceive reality from our own relative perspective. We are accustomed to living life from our own perspective, which gives way to overlooking other aspects of existence. As we experience, learn, and grow, we continue to be ignorant to so much of the truth. We can't live beyond our own perspective, but we can expand our perspective.

Human beings are naturally self-absorbed beings. We are absorbed within ourselves. There isn't any other way for us to exist. We do not exist beyond ourselves, we exist within ourselves. We exist in coordination with our own perspective. It is our mission to expand our perspective and obtain more knowledge so that we can experience, learn, and grow in the way that we should.

Human society has the tendency to get stuck in tradition. We are born into the world and move forward on our path, not knowing any other path. People pay attention to how society is during the time that they live and tend to go along with what is traditionally accepted. This is largely what has led to people holding false beliefs without diligently investigating such beliefs. For example, not many people realize that Mariam is the true human leader of Christianity. Because of tradition, many people believe that Peter was the first human leader of Christianity. Many people believe in traditions and perform rituals that are not even described in the Bible but were implemented by human beings. For example, many people believe that baptisms will wash away past sins; but truthfully, every human being's sinfulness comes from within them and is not washed away with a baptism. Tradition and conformity to societal norms can give way to idolatry and submission to human authority. People are taught to follow tradition and societal norms, but many of these traditions and societal norms should not be followed.



We have been stuck in our own reality and missing out on so much of the truth that has been available to us if we would only take it. People spend so much of their efforts trying to improve their own lives. We see what we see from our own perspective. We cannot avoid viewing reality from our own perspective, but we should expand our perspective to know more truth.

People have oppressed others for at least thousands of years. Judging by some of the laws described in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament, some of the narratives in the New Testament, and other historical documents, it appears that Israelites oppressed their own people. After all, it was Jewish leadership who desired to have Christ crucified. The New Testament shows a lot of evidence that Christians were persecuted. Additionally, the Roman government went after Jews, Christians, and everyone else. The ancient world was a stage for brutal and vicious actions carried out by the human race; although, so is today's world as well.

There were Christians who were oppressors in the first century and later. Christians have oppressed Christians. Mariam and so many other women were oppressed by male Christians. Even some male Christians were oppressed by other Christians if they didn't follow what the self-proclaimed Christian leadership at the time wanted them to. Christianity became the most popular religion in the world and the oppression that came from self-proclaimed leaders grew.

It's easy to say that's all in the past. We're better now. We're more civilized now. But one thing about our civilization that remains is that each of us views reality from our own perspective. Are you a disciple of God? Do you spread the teachings of God? Are you willing to sacrifice for your faith?

People use their religion and their country as security. People stay loyal to their own personal community and build up opposition to outsiders. We must break away from that. We must serve God and do away with ideology that separates the human race. Along with that, we should recognize that Christ is never described as having overthrown the Jewish priests or having gone to Rome to overthrow the Roman emperor. Christ's teachings were about sacrificing on behalf of all of existence. You should not think of yourself as just a citizen of your country. You should think of yourself as a citizen of the world and as a citizen of all of existence. You are a child of God. You should be a disciple of God.

As you live your life, think about the Crucifixion. Think about the Christians in Rome in the aftermath of the Great Fire. Think about Christ. What should you really be doing as a Christian? What is Christianity really about?

Christianity is for the weak, the poor, the hungry, the sad, the desperate, the suffering. If you think that your happiness is the priority, then you do not understand true Christianity. If you think that you are good enough without discipleship, then you do not understand true Christianity. It's not that you shouldn't be happy or that you shouldn't seek happiness. It's good to be happy and it's good to seek happiness. Happiness is good in and of itself. It's that your own personal happiness apart from everyone else is not the most important priority. Regardless of how happy or unhappy you are, there needs to be a focus on others and that comes in the form of discipleship. We are all imperfect. We are all flawed. We are all asymmetrical. We are all broken. We all struggle. Despite your struggles, you should serve God and spread the true Christian Revolution.

As much as we suffer in our own lives, we need to still recognize the suffering of other people. We can't help but focus on ourselves because we live within ourselves. But we also need to broaden our perspective to recognize suffering that occurs beyond ourselves. We need to focus on all of existence. We need to think in terms of "we" instead of "me". We all are children of God and we all are brothers and sisters. We all live within God and God lives within all of us. To ignore a person or to ignore their suffering is to ignore a child of God, and in a way, that is ignoring God. Even if you recognize the presence of God, if you ignore the suffering of a child of God, you are ignoring suffering that is experienced by God. Every experience is experienced by God because God encompasses all of existence. We need to live for others. We are connected to each other. We are connected to everyone. We need to take care of each other. We need to attend to each other's suffering. There is a whole world filled with suffering. People are raped, kidnapped, enslaved, tortured, and murdered every day. There are people starving all around the world. There are people without homes all around the world. Who are we if we don't care to do anything about any of this suffering? We must care and we must act. We must try to do what is best for all of existence. A part of that is taking care of yourself; and as challenging as that may be by itself, there is much more to do. We must take care of everyone.

With our own suffering and with everyone else's suffering, it can be very challenging to not break. We can be overwhelmed with sadness when faced with the pain of this world. That is where faith comes in. Faith is not simply about believing in God's existence. Proof of God's existence was shown in Part 4. We can know that God exists. What faith is really about is faith in God's Plan. Even in the midst of our own suffering and trying to attend to other's suffering, will we maintain our faith in God's Plan? We must. Over the course of time, God's Plan will take shape in the way that it's supposed to. With all of the suffering that has taken place today, there is infinite hope. Time will continue to move. Our lives will continue forever. God's Plan will continue to unveil the truth of where we are headed. With discipleship, there is pain, but there will always be infinite hope.

Discipleship is the real fountain of youth. We will live forever and we will learn forever. With everything that we learn, we will never know everything. We will continuously be on a path of learning. In that way, we will always be children. We get older and we learn more, but since we will always be learning, we will always be children. We will always be children of God.

God communicates with all of us. We are within God and God is within us. We all are children of God. We just need to recognize the presence of God within us and all around us, and pay attention to the information that is given to us. The information that is given to us allows us to learn and understand how to move forward.

As a Christian, you should try to do what is best for all of existence. What can you do for anybody? At the very least, you can spread the true Christian Revolution.

We can live forever. There is life after death. That is one of the teachings of the Resurrection. Both the Crucifixion and the Resurrection set an example for us. We should sacrifice in any way needed to serve God, and we can live after we die.

There is infinite knowledge. As finite beings, we will never know all knowledge. Our path will lead us to obtaining knowledge forever. We will learn forever. We will never stop learning. We will never stop

growing. We have been given life and we should learn and sacrifice for God. We are children of God. We should be disciples of God.

We have been given a mission, the mission of a disciple of God. Now that you know that, if you reject that mission, then you are not a disciple of God. If you accept that mission, then you are a disciple of God. The decision is yours to make.

In our lives there is suffering and that is felt within our discipleship. Your discipleship is a way for you to live your life and so any suffering you feel affects your discipleship. Our experiences, this world, and society can influence you to feel pain and a sense of hopelessness. Human beings feel sadness, depression, anger, frustration, anxiety, and fear. All of those feelings not only affect a human being in general, but also affect their discipleship. If one is discouraged in the way that they feel about their lives, the people around them, how people treat them, how people treat others, or the challenges that come from this world and society, that can affect how one feels about their discipleship. It can be difficult to move forward with anything when one feels discouraged. These feelings can negatively affect how someone views their discipleship and can have a negative impact on their effectiveness as a disciple.

We must look to God for guidance. Looking to God for guidance should really begin with recognizing and feeling God's presence within us. As shown in Part 4, God encompasses all of existence and we literally live within the Mind of God. Close your eyes, feel your consciousness, and feel God encompassing your mind. You only need to look within yourself to find God. During every single moment that you experience, God lives your life with you. None of us can exist at all apart from God. You are never really alone. As alone as you may feel, it's literally impossible for you to be alone. Feel your own life, feel your consciousness, and you will feel God. This is what it really feels like to know God and to know the presence of God within us.

Not only does God live our lives with us, but God has also shown us that there is infinite hope through the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. God allowed human beings to crucify God, and then God showed us the Resurrection. Feel God's presence within you and remember the Crucifixion and the Resurrection.

To show us even further, we have the examples that Mariam set for us. Christ is God, but Mariam is a human being just like us. She was hated and discriminated against over and over again through decades, and she overcame all of that to conquer the Roman Empire, and she did so with God's teachings and with God living within her.

There is always risk and danger in our lives and there was in Mariam's life. She not only faced hatred and discrimination through the decades, but she also faced a torturing death. We exist within God and so it can be easy to think that we may not be able to follow the example of God, for God is God and we are merely human. However, in addition to the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, we also have a mere human in Mariam who spread the Revolution, faced hatred and discrimination, and suffered a torturing death. You can look to the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, and you can also look to what Mariam accomplished and what she faced. So that when you feel sad, depressed, angry, frustrated, anxious, nervous, afraid, or hopeless, let yourself turn back to the Revolution, recognize God's presence within you, look to the examples set for us by God, and look to the life of Mariam. If you do that, then in your darkest moments, you can persevere and be magnificent in your discipleship.

The truth needs to be given to the people. Corruption, fraud, and deception have been spread throughout the population for thousands of years. Please tell others about this book and advise them to read it. The people deserve to know the truth. Will you help spread the truth? Will you be a disciple of God? Being a disciple of God means spreading the true Christian Revolution.

You are within God and God is within you. If you spread the true Christian Revolution, then you will be a disciple of God.

Christ set examples for us through teaching, taking care of people, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection. Mariam set examples for us by learning from Christ, maintaining her faith during and after the Crucifixion, being with Christ through her faith, giving us her Testimony, and spreading Christianity in the face of fierce opposition.

Christ set four main examples that show us the following: we should teach others, we should take care of others, we should be willing to suffer and die to teach and take care of others, and we will live forever. Mariam followed those four examples and set two additional main examples that show us the following: we should learn and we should have faith. These six examples show us the following framework: we should learn, we should have faith, we should teach others, we should take care of others, we should be willing to suffer and die to teach and take care of others, and we will live forever.

This is the path of discipleship. This is the mission that has been given to us by God. This is the Revolution. This is Christianity.

Will you be lost or will you choose to be a disciple of God?