Logic in the Lions' Den

An Investigation into Christianity

© 2024

All rights reserved

Contents

Introduction 4

Part 1 – Division among the Gospels 10

Part 2 – The Testimony 35
The First Four Centuries 37
Something Hidden 54
The Beloved Disciple 61
The Empty Tomb and the Resurrection 96
The Anointing of Christ 121
The Case for the Christian Revolution 131
Eyewitness Testimony 143
Instances of an Unnamed Disciple 157

Part 3 – Enigma 162
The Beginning of Christ's Ministry 162
The Last Supper 174
The Crucifixion 190
The Resurrection 191
The Old Testament 198
Adam and Eve 216
Genesis and Exodus 223
Yahwehism and the Development of Ancient Israel 234
Remnants of the Real Ancient Israel 243
Dating the Productions of Old Testament Narratives 247
The Formation of Judaism 264
The Immaculate Conception and the Following Years 265

Part 4 – The Logic 271
Why? 271
Necessary and Inherent 278
The Case for the Christian Revolution 282
Dating the Resurrection 300
Summary of the Case 336
God is One 341
The Crucifixion 346
The Teacher 351
Evil and Suffering 353
The Framework of Discipleship 356
Prophecies about the Coming Messiah 357
Why They Wanted Christ Crucified 372
Prophecies about the Second Coming of Christ 380

Part 5 – Dividing Lines 393
The Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts 394
Authorship and Dating of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew 426
Luke's Responses to John 446
Authorship and Dating of the Gospel of John 455

The Twelve 469
Early Circulation of the Gospels 474
Paul 497
The Division 502

Part 6 – Your Chosen Sister 511
Egypt 514
Rome 534
Early Development of the Christian Community in Rome 560
The Great Fire 565

Part 7 – Succession 572

Part 8 – The Revolution 593

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 communities in Rome and Alexandria, 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 correct 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 appear 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 are a later addition. Furthermore, it shows that 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 four Gospels are incorrect when describing the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. At most, only one of them can be trusted.

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" appears 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 appear to refer to the birth of a boy that was to occur before the Assyrian Empire destroyed the kingdom of Israel, which appears to have been in the 8th century BCE, over 700 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 appears to be a prophecy about the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by the Assyrian Empire in the 8th 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 over 700 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 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 full submission. I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And 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 own 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 women must be in submission, and that women 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 women should learn in quietness and full submission, that women are not allowed to teach or to have authority over a man, and that women 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 masters and to obey their masters just as they would obey Christ. So Ephesians not only condones slavery and advises slaves to fear their masters, but also actually compares slave masters to Christ. It is believed that Ephesians 6:5 was used by many slave masters 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 masters and to obey their masters 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 emperor, as God's "anointed". The Hebrew word מָשִׁיחַ ("mashíakh"), which means "anointed", 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 there were prophecies about the coming Messiah, a reference to "God's anointed" was a reference connected to prophecies about the coming Messiah. From that perspective, Isaiah 45:1 appears to refer to Cyrus, a Persian emperor, as the coming Messiah. So the Bible appears 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 21:20-21
"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, condones 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 will not be "purified" 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 true story of Christianity that has been hidden for nearly 2,000 years.

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 in the introduction, 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 worshipped 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 24:33-35
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.

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 he 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 in the introduction, only Mark and John agree on who Christ first appeared to after the Resurrection. That means that at most only two Gospels can be correct about who Christ first appeared to after the Resurrection. Additionally, if Mark 16:9-20 are a later addition as they appear to be, 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. 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 four Gospels are incorrect when describing the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. At most, only one of them can be trusted.

Moving to the beginning of the Gospels, Matthew and Luke are the only Gospels that present a genealogy and the only Gospels that have any Christmas narratives. So the first point to recognize is that neither Mark nor John have any genealogy or any Christmas narrative. In terms of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, Matthew begins with Abraham and Luke goes all the way back to Adam (the genealogy in Matthew is at the very beginning and the genealogy in Luke is in chapter 4 and goes in reverse order). Going in historical order, Abraham is the first name that is in both Gospels. Matthew and Luke have the same exact order going from Abraham to King David. After that, the lists take very different paths. After King David, Matthew has 26 more names and Luke has 41 more names. Of the 26 other names in Matthew and the 41 other names in Luke, only 4 names are the same: Shealtiel, Zerubbabel, Matthan (Matthat in Luke), and Joseph. That means that there are 22 names in Matthew that contradict Luke and 37 names in Luke that contradict Matthew. 14 of the 26 other names in Matthew are names of kings of Judah leading up to the Babylonian Exile as described in the Old Testament: Solomon, Rehoboam, Abijah, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, Masseh, Amon, Josiah, and Jeconiah. Luke takes a different path all together and names Nathan after Kind David instead of Solomon as is the case in Matthew. So Luke does not follow the path of kings of Judah that Matthew does. So obviously, these genealogies in Matthew and Luke are irreconcilable in many ways. Therefore, it is definitely the case that at least one of them is false in many ways.

As for the Christmas narratives, Matthew and Luke take very different paths on that as well. Matthew contains narratives that aren't in Luke about the visit of the Magi and the escape to Egypt; and Luke contains narratives that aren't in Matthew about the foretelling of the birth of John the Baptist, Mother Mary visiting the mother of John the Baptist, the birth and circumcision of John the Baptist, and the supposed circumcision of the physical appearance of Christ. Luke even claims that John the Baptist is a biological cousin of Christ, which is not mentioned at all in any of the other three Gospels. So either the Gospel of Luke falsely claims that John the Baptist is a biological cousin of Christ or three of the four Gospels fail to mention what would be a very important detail. It would be incredibly strange for only one Gospel to mention that detail if it's true.

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 appear 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 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 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 reliability 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 turning water into wine 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 the turning of 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 appears 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 the turning of water into wine 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 this narrative is at the beginning of chapter 2 and 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 2:1-2

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 1:12-13
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 4:1-2
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 appears 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 appear to describe Christ as having gone into the desert for 40 days right after the supposed baptism of Christ. It doesn't appear 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 turning of water into wine would appear to be false. On the other hand, if the narratives in the Gospel of John about the calling of the first disciples and the turning of water into wine are true, then the narratives in Mark and Matthew about the temptation of Christ would appear 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 could be considered to not be in contradiction with each other.

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.

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" and also mentions Lazarus and Martha. 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 would appear to be false. If either the account in Luke or the one in John is truthful, then it would appear that 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 appears 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, portrays 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 appears to have been just before the Passover Feast and so appears 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 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 appear 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 appear to describe the day of the Crucifixion as a preparation day, which means that the Synoptic Gospels appear 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 portrays 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 breasts and went away. But all those who knew him, including the women who had followed him from Galilee, stood at a distance, watching these things.

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.

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 appear to have had to have the Crucifixion of Christ completed sooner appears 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 13:55-57
"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 all his sisters with us? Where then did this man get all these things?" And they took offense at him.

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 13:55-57 mention the name Joseph. Mark translates the Greek word Ἰωσῆτος ("Iōsētos") as "Joseph" in verse 6:3 and as "Joses" in verse 15:40 in the Crucifixion narrative. Matthew translates the Greek word Ἰωσὴφ ("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. Are there two different women being described with the same name who both gave the same two names to two of their sons? Those were all common names so maybe that's the case, but that would then mean that the woman named Mary who witnessed the Crucifixion is not Mother Mary and so Mother Mary would then appear to have not been present during the Crucifixion. 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 Synoptic Gospels, Christ seems to not have had a special relationship with Mother Mary (besides the Christmas narratives) and she isn't specifically described as having been present during the Crucifixion. 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 portrays 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 (besides the Christmas narratives), 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. For the Bible to be 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. Christ has been described as both God and "the Son of God". How can Christ be both God and "the Son of God"? If "the Son of God" is God, then does it make any sense to differentiate between God and "the Son of God"? If there is a distinction between God and "the Son of God", then "the Son of God" would not be exactly identical to God. So is Christ God, "the Son of God", or both? How could Christ be both God and "the Son of God"? How are we to understand the divinity of Christ?

In the first few centuries, there was a lot of debate about the divinity of Christ. Some believed that Christ is exactly identical to God and that the physical appearance of Christ was the physical appearance of God. Others believed that Christ was divine but was simply "the Son of God" and not exactly identical to God. Some believed that Christ always existed and therefore was not created. Others believed that Christ was begotten at a point in time and did not always exist.

The portrayal of Christ as both God and "the Son of God" really arose from differences in the Gospels. We've already seen plenty of differences in the Gospels in terms of historical events. Now we are about to see the different portrayals in the Gospels of the divinity of Christ.

First off, the Christmas narratives are only found in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, not in Mark or John. So only half of the Gospels describe what people celebrate on Christmas. Nevertheless, all three Synoptic Gospels clearly portray Christ as "the Son of God", and specifically portray Christ as not being identical to God. We will go into more details about that shortly.

The Gospel of John, on the other hand, has a mixture of different information about Christ. As we will go into more detail on later, there appears to have been different layers of 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 appear to have been a later addition. The same also appears 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, as we

will see through these different pieces, the Gospel of John expresses that God is the Logic, 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".

Another important point is that many people believe that the Gospel of John was produced after all of the Synoptic Gospels, and it is therefore asserted that Christian theology had evolved by the time that the Gospel of John was produced. However, as we will see, the original version of the Gospel of John appears to have been produced before any of the Synoptic Gospels, and then there were later additions that were more in line with the Synoptic Gospels. Regardless of what you believe in relation to the dating of the production of the Gospels, we shouldn't let the dating of any of the Gospels affect our analysis of what the Gospels tell us about the divinity of Christ.

What it all comes down to is whether Christ is exactly identical to God or is somehow not identical to God. What does "the Son of God" mean? What exactly is the relationship between God and Christ? What exactly is the distinction between God and Christ? Is there any distinction between God and Christ? Was the physical appearance of Christ in the first century the physical appearance of God?

As we proceed, we will need to assess these questions along the lines of divine decision making. Is Christ a separate decision maker than God? In other words, is Christ a separate thinker than God? Would it be fair to say that Christ is the Creator of the world? Or is Christ 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? Is Christ exactly identical to God or is Christ somehow not identical to God? Was the physical appearance of Christ in the first century the physical appearance of God or is Christ somehow not identical to God? 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
[1] In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. [2] He was with God in the beginning. [3] 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 "the Word was God". John 1:14 specifically states "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 distinct from the identity of God. A common interpretation among Christians is that "the Word" is specifically "the Son of God", or God's "spoken Word". There are four points to now make.

The first point is that the statement "the Word was God" derives from Greek manuscripts that should actually be translated as saying "God was the Word". Both Papyrus 66 as well as Papyrus 75 show a

statement that can be translated as “God was the Word”. Papyrus 66 and Papyrus 75 are both Greek manuscripts that contain the Gospel of John that have been dated to the third century and are the earliest known manuscripts that contain John 1:1. The distinction between the statement “the Word was God” and the statement “God was the Word” may seem like a minor difference. However, the statement “the Word was God” could potentially mean that “the Word” is a part of God but not necessarily all of God, as in “the Word” is divine but not necessarily all of God. On the other hand, the statement “God was the Word” specifically means that all of God is “the Word”.

The second point is that “Word” is translated from the Greek word λόγος (“logos”). “Logos” can be defined as logic, thought, reason, or wisdom. It has been recorded that the concept of “logos” was used as far back as the 5th century BCE when Heraclitus, an ancient Greek philosopher, used the term for a principle of order and knowledge, which is similar to the definitions previously described. 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 is Logos analogous to human reasoning that is 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 is a single law governing the entire world and that the Logos encompasses all forms and ideas. Through the centuries, many philosophers have understood the Logos as the divine Mind. 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 “God was the Word”. The divine Mind is with God and God is the divine Mind. The divine Logic is with God and God is the divine Logic. So “the Word” is with God and God is “the Word”.

It might seem redundant or unnecessary to express both that the Logic is with God and that God is the Logic. It might seem that it was only necessary to simply state that God is the Logic. Those two statements are the product of John 1:1 relating two different Greek words to each other. “Logos” is a word that means logic, and Θεός (“Theos”) is a word that 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 were 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 God is in fact the Mind of God. Although there may appear to be some redundancy there, both statements are true.

The third 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”. In verse 2, the word “houtos” is used as a demonstrative pronoun, which are words like “this”, “that”, “these”, and “those”. That is different than the use of the word “him” in verse 3, which is translated from the Greek word αὐτοῦ (“autou”). “Autou” is used as a personal pronoun, which are words like “he”, “she”, “him”, and “her”. Furthermore, both Papyrus 66 as well as Papyrus 75 show a version of John 1:2 that places the Greek words that get translated as “in the beginning” before the Greek words that get translated as “with God”. So a more appropriate translation is “This was in the beginning with God”, 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 distinct from

the identity of 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 an identity that is distinct from the identity of God. "He" would appear to refer to a distinct identity from the identity of God and "this" appears to refer to the preceding sentence. Additionally, as previously mentioned, "houtos" is used in verse 2 as a demonstrative pronoun rather than a personal pronoun, which is an important distinction when assessing whether a pronoun is referring to another identity or simply referring to the preceding sentence. "This was in the beginning with God" is a more accurate translation and simply refers to the preceding sentence. Furthermore, "the beginning" can be interpreted as referring to the state of existence before God created the world. So "This was in the beginning with God" can be interpreted as referring to the preceding sentence, John 1:1, as the state of existence before God created the world.

The fourth point is that John 1:3 is a continuation of John 1:1-2 and refers simply to the Creator of the world. Therefore, verse 3 confirms that verses 1-2 are simply in reference to the Creator of 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, the Creator of the world. As ancient philosophy tells us, the Logic is the divine Mind who encompasses all forms and ideas and governs the entire world. God is the Logic, and God possesses all logic.

The following is a more appropriate translation of John 1:1-3.

[1] In the beginning was the Logic, and the Logic was with God, and God was the Logic. [2] This was in the beginning with God. [3] Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made.

John 1:1-2 show that God is the Logic and that God was the Logic before God created the world. Verse 3 then confirms that the identity referred to in John 1:1-2 is one single identity and is the identity of the Creator of the world. Therefore, all of John 1:1-3 is simply specifically referring to the Creator of 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", which can also be interpreted as "The Creator of the world 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 and as portraying Christ as the Creator of the world. 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, God is the Logic 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 identity of Christ is the identity 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 God is the Logic 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 again be recognized 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.

John 1:10 confirms the understanding of Christ as the Creator of the world by specifically portraying 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 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 portrays 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 Son" and "the Father"?

We can return to John 1:14 for a good example.

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.

We've already seen that God is the Logic and that John 1:14 states that the Logic became flesh. We can also see that John 1:14 also says "came from the Father". There are multiple ways to interpret that. If you were to think that Christ is not exactly identical to God, you could simply view that statement as saying that Christ came from God and was born into this world. However, if we follow that John 1:14 is referring to the Logic becoming flesh, then John 1:14 is saying that Christ is God, and therefore that the physical appearance of Christ came from God. Christ is the embodiment of God, and the embodiment of God came from God. So while John 1:14 may seem to refer to "the Father" as if Christ is distinct from "the Father" because of the phrase "came from the Father", John 1:14 is still portraying God as becoming flesh and therefore portraying Christ as God. So any reference to the titles "the Father" and "the Son" should not deter us from recognizing that at least some of the Gospel of John portrays Christ as the Creator of the world.

We should now take a look at John 3:16

John 3:16

"For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life."

There are two points to make here. The first is that it's already been established that the Gospel of John uses the titles "the Father" and "the Son" even when portraying Christ as God, so those titles should not deter us from understanding that at least some of the Gospel of John portrays Christ as the Creator of the world. Therefore, John 3:16 saying that God gave God's "one and only Son" does not necessarily mean that John 3:16 is making a distinction between God and Christ. On the other hand, even if you do believe that John 3:16 is making a distinction between God and Christ, it has already been discussed that there have been contributions from different authors at different times, and therefore John 3:16 is not necessarily representative of the theology that was in the original version of the Gospel of John.

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 14:7-10
"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 the identity of Christ is the same as the identity 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 statement "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 14:7-10 express that if one knows Christ then they know "the Father" and that if one has seen Christ then they have seen "the Father". John 14:7-10 specifically express that "the Father" lives in Christ and carries out work in Christ. John 14:7-10 are 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 the identity of Christ is the same as the identity 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. God is the Logic 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.

τοῦτον ("touton") γὰρ ("gar") ὁ ("ho") Πατὴρ ("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 Πατὴρ ("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 they also equate “the Son” to “the Father”, thereby agreeing with chapter 1 that the identity of Christ is the identity of God. Again, as we will go into more detail on later, there appears to have been different layers of 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 appear to have been a later addition. The same also appears 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 God is the Logic, 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 identity of Christ is the identity 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”) ἀγαθὸς (“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 whose identity is different from the identity of God, and therefore whose will is different than the will of God. The Gospel of John expresses that God is the Logic, 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 identity of Christ and the identity of God. Mark 10:18 and Luke 18:19 are very definitive in portraying Christ as separate 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 13:32-33
"No one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, nor 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, nor the Son, but only the Father."

Mark 13:32-33 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 presents the identity of Christ as separate from the identity of God, which contradicts what we've seen from the Gospel of John.

Matthew 20:23
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 20:23 expresses the idea that "the Father" grants places for people that Christ does not. Matthew 20:23 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 exact wisdom of God, and therefore Christ would not have the same identity as God. Additionally, Luke 2:52 specifically portrays Christ as separate from God by expressing that Christ grew in favor with God. If Christ grew in favor with God, then Christ would not be 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 if Christ is

God? 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 Christ 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. How could Christ have ever been baptized for repentance for the forgiveness of sins if Christ is God? How could God have ever been baptized for repentance for the forgiveness of sins?

How could Christ have been tempted for 40 days in the desert if Christ is God? How could 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 God as having expressed satisfaction with Christ, which portrays 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 portrays Christ's will as separate from God's will. Both of them portray Christ's will as separate from God's will. They both portray 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, how could there be anything for God to be forgiven for and how could 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 the Gospel of John about Christ having the same identity as God. There is an incredibly harsh contrast between these narratives and the verses shown from the Gospel of John. The Gospel of John portrays Christ as God in flesh, and the Synoptic Gospels portray Christ as separate from God and they appear to try to connect Christ to sin and temptation. Both of these sets of 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
After Jesus said this, he looked toward heaven and prayed:
"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", 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 so-called "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 describe 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 by itself 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 the identity of Christ as the identity 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 identity of God and the will of God, and as previously shown, the Synoptic Gospels explicitly describe 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 sabachthani?" – 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 sabachthani?" – 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 the identity of Christ is the identity of God, then how could Christ have thought that God had forsaken Christ? If Christ's will is God's will, then how could Christ have felt forsaken? These verses cannot be reconciled with the belief that the identity of Christ is the identity 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 portray the identity of Christ as separate from the identity of God and Christ's will as separate from God's will.

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."

In Luke 24:19 Christ is described as having been a prophet before God rather than being divine, which is similar to the Islamic view. Christianity views Christ as divine but Islam views Christ as a prophet and as separate from God. All of the Gospels describe someone calling Christ a prophet and there was obviously confusion among people about Christ, so it's not necessarily a major issue for a Gospel as a whole. What's so striking about the Gospel of Luke doing it is that Luke 24:19 specifically describes Christ as separate from God by stating "before God and all the people" and does that in the first narrative in the Gospel of Luke that is supposed to be about an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. So the Gospel of Luke not only describes Christ as a prophet and separate from God, but also does all of that in a narrative that is supposed to be about an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. It's one thing for a description of someone calling Christ a prophet to occur earlier in a Gospel, but to do so in a Resurrection narrative makes it appear as though the Gospel of Luke as whole tries to portray Christ as a prophet and separate from God rather than that just being attributed to one person who is described as expressing that view. Describing Christ as a prophet and separate from God instead of as divine opposes Christianity and supports Islam, and Luke 24:19 does that in a Resurrection narrative making it appear that the Gospel of Luke as a whole views Christ as a prophet and separate from God. So while the other Gospels describe someone calling Christ a prophet, only the instance in a Resurrection narrative in the Gospel of Luke appears to be representative of the view of an entire Gospel rather than just the person who is described as expressing that view. So Luke 24:19 opposes the Christian view of Christ as divine and supports the Islamic view of Christ as a prophet and separate from God.

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 not be the same as 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 power could have come from Christ without Christ deciding that, then the identity and will of Christ would not be the same as the identity and will of God. It doesn't make sense to describe God as having given power without God deciding that, and so we can see that Mark 5:30 and Luke 8:46 portray Christ as separate from 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 power having come from Christ without Christ deciding that. The Synoptic Gospels clearly portray Christ as separate from God. The Synoptic Gospels portray Christ as if Christ is not God, and more specifically, as if the identity of Christ and the will of Christ are separate from the identity of God and the will of God.

The Synoptic Gospels portray Christ as separate from God while the Gospel of John expresses that God is the Logic, 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". These theological differences are about how the Gospels define the Christ. What does it mean to be the Christ? All of the Gospels describe the Christ but represent different definitions of the Christ. Is Christ exactly identical to God or is Christ somehow not identical to God? Was the physical appearance of Christ in the first century the physical appearance of God or is Christ somehow not identical to God? Is Christ the Creator of the world or the Son of the Creator of the world? The two different possible answers to each of those

questions represent the fundamental difference in how the Gospel of John defines the Christ versus the Synoptic Gospels. The belief that Christ is a separate being from God is absolutely incompatible with the belief that the identity and will of Christ is the identity and will of God.

The division among the Gospels is much more than just some small differences. In many ways, 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.

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 Bible 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 Gospels.

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 Gospels is a result of people compiling documents together from different sources.

It is believed that the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John were thought of by many as the standard four Gospels by the end of the second century, but the compiling of documents that eventually became the New Testament that we have today was a centuries-long process that continued into the fourth century and beyond. 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 appears 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 5:18-24
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 that is believed to have been produced around 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 appears to be a reference to it in the New Testament. Given that the Bible is thought to be perfect and divinely inspired, there shouldn't be any reference to a source that was deemed heretical and was excluded from the Bible. Even if one wanted to argue that it's only two verses, it's still a significant problem because those verses contain information about Enoch that isn't in the book of Genesis, and more specifically, information that came from a source that was deemed heretical. This information describes a supposed prophecy from Enoch, and none of that is described in the book of Genesis. If that information was legitimate, then it should have landed in the Bible, but it didn't. So either the book of Gensis is wrong for excluding that supposed prophecy or the book of Genesis is right for excluding that supposed prophecy, in which case the book of Jude is wrong for referring to it. Either way, a mistake was made at some point, and that definitively means that the Bible isn't perfect. If the book of Enoch wasn't heretical, then it should have been included in the Bible, in which case the exclusion of it would show that the Bible isn't perfect and that a mistake was made by someone. If the book of the Enoch is heretical, then there shouldn't be any reference to it, in which case that reference in the book of Jude would show that the Bible isn't perfect and that a mistake was made by someone. Either way, the Bible isn't perfect and a mistake was made by someone. Therefore, the reference to the book of Enoch in the book of Jude is clear 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 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 led to some incorrect information having been passed along. So there being incorrect information in the Bible doesn't necessarily mean that all of the Bible is incorrect. It simply means that some incorrect information was included in the compiling of documents that eventually led to the development of the Bible.

It is justified to believe that some of the Bible is true, but it is unjustifiable to believe that all of the Bible is true. We can therefore see that the level of validity of the Bible 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 Bible, the first step is to recognize that the documents contained in the Bible were originally produced by real human beings in the real past. The documents contained in the Bible 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 four 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; and these documents refer to some of the people named in the Gospels and introduce some new people, including Paul, who is described as having persecuted Christians and having later converted to Christianity.

A popular storyline about the disciples is that there were twelve main disciples (called "the Twelve"), some women who helped out (including Mary Magdalene), and some other followers. Judas, one of "the Twelve", is described as having betrayed Christ to the Jewish priests, which is presented as having led to the arrest of Christ, which then led to the Crucifixion. The rest of "the Twelve" (called "the eleven" without Judas) are portrayed as having disowned Christ after Christ was arrested and none of them are described as having been present during the Crucifixion. Mary Magdalene, on the other hand, is specifically described as having been present during the Crucifixion, and three of the four Gospels portray her as having been the first person or one of the first people to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. The Gospels go on to portray "the eleven" as later seeing Christ after the Resurrection and going on to spread Christianity. Peter is portrayed as the leader among the original group of disciples and it is popular to believe that he was eventually the first bishop of Rome.

The documents in the New Testament also describe the spread of Christianity as having been divided between spreading Christianity to Jews and spreading Christianity to gentiles (non-Jewish people). Peter is described as the leader of spreading Christianity to Jews and Paul is described as the leader of spreading Christianity to gentiles. To make matters more complicated, the New Testament also shows that the sons of Zebedee (James and John) and one of Mother Mary's sons (also named James) took on leadership roles as well. There are two different people named James to focus on. One is described as a son of Zebedee and the brother of John, and he will be referred to in this book as "James son of Zebedee". The other is described as a son of Mother Mary, and he will be referred to in this book as "James son of Mother Mary". Chapter 12 of Acts describes James son of Zebedee as having been executed, and Paul's letter to the Galatians portrays James son of Mother Mary, Peter, and John as the top three leaders of their group (presumably written after the execution of James son of Zebedee). Some believe, largely based on Paul's letter to the Galatians, that James son of Mother Mary eventually became the top leader of their group or at least a close second to Peter. The leadership status of everyone is questionable, but generally speaking, it is popular to believe that Peter and Paul were the top two giants of early Christianity.

Despite the image that 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 this 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 looked at as having been leaders during this time-period.

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 who forces others to follow Jewish customs that he doesn't even follow himself. 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 also went by a name that means "rock" and that is where

the names “Cephas” and “Peter” come from. Peter is referred to as “Simon”, “Peter”, “Simon Peter”, and “Cephas”. 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 2:4-6
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 2:12-13
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. Their idea of pleasure is to carouse in broad daylight. They are blots and blemishes, reveling in their pleasures while they feast with you.

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 backs 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, and there is also the claim that Peter is a hypocrite who forces others to follow Jewish customs that he doesn't even follow himself. In addition to all of that, apparently there was even a conflict that Peter was having with himself given that he is described as having been willing to eat with gentiles as long as certain people didn't find out and as having been so afraid of certain people

finding out that he immediately drew back as soon as certain people showed up, all of which shows that Peter appears to have been more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings. 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 with Peter, James son of Mother Mary, and some other people. The account in Acts claims that certain people accompanied Paul and Barnabas to Antioch after the council at Jerusalem and delivered a letter to the Christian community in Antioch, 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 after the council at Jerusalem when Peter and Paul were in Antioch together.

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 2:1-14

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. 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. 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 the group based in Jerusalem (a group that included Peter and James son of Mother Mary) demanded that the Christian community in Antioch abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals, and from sexual immorality. Galatians describes Peter, James son of Mother Mary, and John as "those reputed to be pillars" and says that they only requested that Paul, Barnabas, and Titus remember the poor.

Acts describes "the apostles and elders" (a group that included Peter and James son of Mother Mary) choosing men to travel back to Antioch with Paul after the council at Jerusalem to deliver a letter to the Christian community in Antioch. Galatians describes that "certain men came from James" after Paul had already traveled back to Antioch and describes Peter already being in Antioch with Paul.

Acts describes the letter as being received well. Galatians describes Paul becoming upset and "opposing" Peter "to his face", and even accusing Peter of being a hypocrite who forced gentiles to follow Jewish customs that Peter didn't even follow himself.

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 gave a very different story of what happened than the information contained in Paul's letter to the Galatians, and there's no way for those details from Acts to be true if those details from Galatians are true. It wasn't necessarily the author

of Acts who came up with that account as they may have just written the information that was given to them, and we will go into more detail on that in Part 5. Regardless of how exactly this information was first produced, the person who first gave the account contained in Acts, whether it was written or verbal, gave an account that diverges drastically from the account in Galatians. The account in Acts and the account in Galatians contradict each other in several important ways, and therefore it's impossible for both accounts to be true. At least one of these sources produced false information and that false information is still in the Bible to this day.

It's important to remember that the original productions of these documents were independent from each other and independent from the eventual compiling of the Bible. Acts was originally produced independently from Paul's letter to the Galatians, and both of them were originally produced long before the compiling of the Bible. So it appears that the people who compiled the Bible together either didn't realize the contradictions between Acts and Galatians or simply didn't care enough. Regardless, the fact that they contradict each other in such important ways and both ended up in the Bible serves as a prime example of how there is a significant level of false information in the Bible.

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 hiding the truth. 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 hiding the truth. Again, whoever first gave that information contained in Acts gave a very different story of what happened than the information contained in Paul's letter to the Galatians, and there's no way for both to be true. The source that originally produced the account in Acts presented a story in which everything was sorted out and there wasn't a conflict. Meanwhile, Paul apparently opposed Peter to his face and referred to Peter and Barnabas as hypocrites, and accused Peter of forcing gentiles to follow Jewish customs that Peter didn't follow himself. Whoever first gave that information contained in Acts completely missed on providing any of those very damaging details, and they even specifically contradicted the account in Galatians. 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 hide the truth. 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 hide the truth and that such information is still in the Bible to this day.

The description of the demands made by the group in Jerusalem is a really obvious indication that such information is false and was produced with the intention of hiding the truth. It wouldn't have made any sense for the group in Jerusalem to agree that gentiles don't need to be circumcised, which goes against Jewish law and the covenant described as having been made with Abraham, and then make demands of gentiles to adhere to Jewish law right after the council at Jerusalem that concluded that gentiles don't need to be circumcised. Even if James son of Mother Mary sent a letter like that, it wouldn't realistically have happened immediately after the council at Jerusalem. It also wouldn't make any sense for Paul to accept those demands because his position was that gentiles didn't need to follow Jewish law. The whole issue about circumcision arises from the narrative in Genesis about a covenant with Abraham. Based on that, circumcision could be viewed as the most important Jewish law or at least one of the most important. If a man doesn't need to be circumcised, then they don't need to follow Jewish law. If a person needs to follow Jewish law, then they need to be circumcised if they're a man. Therefore, it doesn't make sense and it's unrealistic that a man wouldn't need to be circumcised but would need to follow other Jewish laws. So this supposed letter described in the account in Acts really doesn't make any sense, which shows clear evidence that the account in Acts contains false information that was produced with the intention of diverging from the truth about the conflicts that were going on. Additionally, the claim that this supposed letter went with Paul's traveling companions back to Antioch right after the council at Jerusalem specifically contradicts the account in Galatians because Paul said that they were only supposed to remember the poor, not adhere to specific Jewish laws. So even if James son of Mother Mary sent a letter like that, it would realistically have happened sometime later, like when Peter was in Antioch with Paul and "certain men came from James" as described in Paul's letter to the Galatians.

It can't even be reasonably argued that whoever originally came up with the account in Acts simply didn't know that there was such a conflict between Peter and Paul because they provided an explanation for why Paul and Barnabas parted ways and the account in Galatians connects the conflict between Peter and Paul with the conflict between Paul and Barnabas. Paul even described the conflict with Barnabas in the midst of describing the conflict with Peter. Paul described opposing Peter to his face, then said that Barnabas was led astray by the hypocrisy of Peter and some other Jews, and then went on to accuse Peter of forcing gentiles to follow Jewish customs that Peter didn't even follow himself. So the conflict between Paul and Barnabas was apparently connected to the conflict between Peter and Paul. Therefore, it appears that anyone who knew anything about why Paul and Barnabas parted ways would have known about the conflict between Peter and Paul. So an explanation being provided in Acts about Paul and Barnabas parting ways that contradicts Galatians while not mentioning anything about the conflict between Peter and Paul shows clear evidence that the account in Acts was produced with the intention of hiding the truth.

The verses about Paul and Barnabas parting ways shows intent to be dishonest even without consideration of the conflict between Peter and Paul. 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 were given, but someone along the line was dishonest and that

dishonest information ended up in the Bible. What shows that the account in Acts is a dishonest account rather than the account in Galatians 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 up that story 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 hiding the truth.

So far, evidence has been shown that there is some incorrect information in the Bible, that there was division and disagreement between different groups of Christians during the first generation after the Resurrection, 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 intention of hiding the truth. 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, although the bishop of Rome was thought of as the top bishop.

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 full submission. I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And 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 women be silent and in full submission, demand that women are not allowed to teach or to have authority over a man, claim that a woman was the first sinner, and claim that women will be saved through childbearing as if a woman couldn't be saved otherwise.

Not only were women treated as inferior, but 1 Timothy also supports slavery.

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.

Christianity isn't about being submissive to slavery so that nothing bad is said about Christianity. There have been bad things said about Christianity since before the Crucifixion and there shouldn't be any support given to a system of slavery. While people should respect each other, that doesn't mean respecting a system of slavery and being submissive to those who use it for their own personal gain. Meanwhile, 1 Timothy 6:1 is dismissive of the suffering of slaves simply for the purpose of trying to avoid facing consequences that could result if a slave were to oppose this system of slavery.

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

1 Timothy 5:9-10
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 5:11-14
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, it has been shown that 1 Timothy contains information about a hierarchy of bishops and deacons; gives instructions for bishops, deacons, and their wives; gives instructions on how women should dress; demands that women be silent and in full submission; demands that women are not allowed to teach or to have authority over a man; claims that women will be saved through childbearing as if a woman couldn't be saved otherwise; supports slavery; and gives 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 own 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 and support of slavery, and instructions for slaves to obey their masters. Ephesians 6:5 even goes as far as to instruct slaves to obey their masters just as they would obey Christ. 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. Keep yourself pure.

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 and that people had the power to give other people spiritual gifts by laying hands 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 Spirt to others began to be practiced very early on, apparently by Peter and John; 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 there were demands that women are not allowed to teach or to have authority over a man; that it was claimed that women will be saved through childbearing as if a woman couldn't be saved otherwise; that slavery was condoned and supported; that there were instructions for slaves to obey their masters and to even obey their masters as they would obey Christ; 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, 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 of 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 someone with a similar position, and that 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, and blames wrongdoing on a group of women while describing them having been tortured and murdered.

Through envy, those women, the Danaids and Dircæ, 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 specifically

about separation between men and women and is described immediately after describing a particular group of women, that separation is apparently being attributed to that particular group of women, especially since it would otherwise seem entirely irrelevant and confusing to relate separation between "husbands" and "wives" to the torture and murders of these 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 being tied to a bull. Long story short, it was obviously insulting to refer to someone as a "Danaid" or as "Dirce". In addition to all of that, the author also describes these women as "weak in body". In the same sentence that describes the torture and murders of these women, the author labeled them with the insulting names of "the Danaids" and "Dirce" that refer to fictional murderous women and described them as "weak in body"; and then the author complained about separation between men and women and appears to have blamed these women for that right after describing the torture and murders of these women and insulting them. So this person from Rome who wrote this letter 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 person 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 of Rome or something like that.

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 the top three "apostolic fathers" along with Clement of Rome and Polycarp of Smyrna (Christian theologians in the first and second centuries who are believed to have personally known some of "the eleven" or to have been significantly influenced by them). Pay attention to how he exalts the status of bishops and asserts that bishops should be in control of the people. He even goes as far as to assert that bishops should be looked upon as people would look upon God and should be reverenced as Christ. He portrayed 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 Trallians:

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 a person can only be subject to God if they are not in opposition to the bishop, claims that people should look upon bishops 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 the top 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 all women "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 all women. 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 some information in the Bible is incorrect; 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 intention of hiding the truth; 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 there were demands that women are not allowed to teach or to have authority over a man; that it was claimed that women will be saved through childbearing as if a woman couldn't be saved otherwise; that slavery was condoned and supported; that there were instructions for slaves to obey their masters and to even obey their masters as they would obey Christ; 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 the top 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 all women 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, and then there was that much more power once Christianity was legalized.

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 appears 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 appears quite unrealistic to believe that Constantine favored Christianity. Instead, he probably just used Christianity for political purposes. If a significant percentage of the population was Christian, 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 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 compiling of documents that became the New Testament continued into the fourth century and beyond, but the four Gospels that are in the New Testament today appear to have been pretty much established as the four Gospels by many well before then. It was apparently by the end of the second century that a biblical canon was produced that included the four Gospels. As will be shown in more detail in Part 5, the four Gospels were each originally produced in the first century; and then by the end of

the second century, the four Gospels were all pretty much established by the "orthodox church". The biblical canon that the "orthodox church" appears to have put together in the second century eventually grew into the New Testament.

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 appear to have been even more far gone than the first century. This division grew even wider, and meanwhile, there was that hierarchy of bishops who claimed to represent the "orthodox church", called other people "heretics", discriminated against all women and anyone who didn't submit to their demands, condoned slavery, tried to control the people, and claimed that bishops were like God. It appears 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 contrasting information 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. The names 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. The verses below are examples of these names appearing in the Gospels.

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 appears 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 appears to have been women in the first few centuries who were Christian leaders. Furthermore, Origen describes these sects as if they were heretical. Either they were heretical and/or the "orthodox church" was heretical and discriminated against female leadership, and we've already seen extreme forms of discrimination against women from several leaders of this hierarchy of bishops. 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.

Additionally, as previously shown, the letter that has been labeled as the First Epistle of Clement insults a group of women while describing their torture and murders. That information comes right after the author discusses the deaths of Peter and Paul as shown below.

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 Dircæ, 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)

So the description of the torture and murders of these women comes right after the author talks about the deaths of Peter and Paul. That is a clear indication that these women were Christians. The author obviously probably wouldn't have written about their persecution if they weren't Christians, especially since their persecution is mentioned shortly after the mentioning of the deaths of Peter and Paul. So the description of "the Danaids and Dirce" appears to be a reference to a group of women who were Christians. Additionally, as previously explained, the references "the Danaids" and "Dirce" are from Greek mythology and refer to fictional murderous women, which clearly shows that these women obviously probably didn't call themselves those names and that the author was using those names to insult these women. The author also called them "weak in body" in the same sentence that describes their torture and murders and then proceeded to blame them for separation between men and women.

We already saw that Origen wrote in "Contra Celsum" about sects of Christianity that were formed by women and that he portrayed them as heretical. Now we can see that a group of female Christians were described as "weak in body", blamed for separation between men and women, and referred to by names used for fictional murderous women all while the author described their torture and murders. With Origen's "Contra Celsum" and the First Epistle of Clement, we can see that there were several groups of female Christians and that the "orthodox church" opposed them.

Going back to Origen's "Contra Celsum", 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 calumniates 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 appears 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 apparent 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 "those 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 without any specific names and referred to separately from Mary Magdalene, who is referred to first and explicitly named. In Origen's response, he then only specifically named Mary Magdalene. So not only is Mary Magdalene specifically named, she is also 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 without any specific names.

Celsus apparently referred to Mary Magdalene as a "half-frantic woman", which is likely a reference to the Gospel of John. There are three points that show that Celsus was likely using the Gospel of John. First, the Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes Mary Magdalene as crying and frantically trying to find the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ. Second, Origen refers to "the

narrative of Mary Magdalene" and the Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes Mary Magdalene as being alone at the tomb and the only Gospel besides the later addition to the Gospel of Mark that describes her as being the only person to have first seen Christ after the Resurrection, and the Gospel of Mark simply states that Christ appeared to her in verse 16:9 and that one simple verse can't be realistically considered "the narrative of Mary Magdalene" like the narrative in the Gospel of John. So "the narrative of Mary Magdalene" would most likely refer to the Gospel of John. Third, according to Origen, Celsus differentiated between Mary Magdalene and "someone else of those engaged in the same system of deception". That statement by itself is not clear enough to tell if Celsus was referring to one of the women described as having been with Mary Magdalene in the Synoptic Gospels or if it's a general reference to everyone who is described as having seen Christ after the Resurrection. However, since Celsus singled out Mary Magdalene as frantic and specifically excluded everyone else from that, it appears that Celsus was referring to an account that only describes Mary Magdalene as frantic, which could only be in the Gospel of John because it's the only Gospel that describes her as being alone at the tomb and the only Gospel besides the later addition to the Gospel of Mark that describes her as being the only person to have first seen Christ after the Resurrection, and the Gospel of Mark simply states that Christ appeared to her in verse 16:9 but that verse does not say anything about her behavior that could be viewed as frantic.

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. 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 appears 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 is maybe an indication that the Gospel of John was the most popular Gospel or at least close to that kind of status. There are two important points to make about the Gospel of John. The first is that the Gospel of John is the only Gospel that describes Mary Magdalene as being alone at the tomb and the only Gospel besides the later addition to the Gospel of Mark that describes her as being the only person to have first seen Christ after the Resurrection. 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 1-2
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 appears 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". So the naming of the letter as "John" shows clear evidence that there was an 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.

In that particular version it states "the brother who is praised by all the churches for his service to the gospel". That is a more recent translation and it's incorrect in the use of the word "service". The following is the King James Version.

2 Corinthians 8:18-19
And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches; and not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and declaration of your ready mind.

The key distinction is that the correct translation expresses that this "brother" is praised "in the gospel throughout all the churches" rather than the incorrect translation expressing that this "brother" is "praised by all the churches for his service to the gospel". The incorrect translation states that the praise was for service to the gospel and the correct translation states that the praise is possessed within the gospel. So there is someone who apparently received praise in the gospel throughout all the churches whose identity has been concealed in 2 Corinthians 8:18-19. Who is this disciple who received praise in the gospel through all of the churches and why do they go unnamed?

Whoever they are, 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's very strange that there is anyone unnamed in these verses in 2 Corinthians, especially a disciple who was praised in the gospel throughout 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 apparently 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’re apparently dealing with a similar situation here in 2 Corinthians.

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’s 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.

Further evidence can be seen when we look at verse 19 more closely and 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.”

Verse 19 in the modern version states, “and not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and declaration of your ready mind”. 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. Furthermore, since the earlier version found in Papyrus 46 doesn’t provide a name for this person, there was apparently 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 appears 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 throughout all of the churches, who goes unnamed in Paul’s second letter to the Corinthians, 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 likely 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 appears obvious that someone wanted these people's identities concealed. There doesn't appear 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 is the only Gospel that describes Mary Magdalene as being alone at the tomb and the only Gospel besides the later addition to the Gospel of Mark that describes her as being the only person to have first seen Christ after the Resurrection, there are several instances of a disciple going unnamed in the Gospel of John, there is an unnamed person described as "the elder" and as a "chosen sister" whose identity has been concealed in the second letter attributed to the name "John", and there is an unnamed person who apparently received praise in the gospel through all of the churches whose identity has been concealed in 2 Corinthians and there also appears to have been efforts later on to further downplay their importance and describe them as having been chosen by "the churches". Meanwhile, there was that hierarchy of bishops who claimed to represent the "orthodox church", called other people "heretics", discriminated against all women and anyone who didn't submit to their demands, condoned slavery, tried to control the people, and 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's 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's also 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 substantial evidence that someone intentionally produced false information to hide the truth. 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 contrasting information 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.

Moving forward, 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" appears 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 not have 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 shows 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 appear 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 is portrayed as having been a witness of the Crucifixion. None of the Gospels describe John son of Zebedee as having been a witness of the Crucifixion and Mark, Matthew, and John only name women as having been witnesses while Luke doesn't name anyone. 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, then realistically the Synoptic Gospels would have 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 the second letter attributed to the name "John" and Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, and both of those appear 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 have been much motivation to add these verses in the first place unless they are 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 is represented in all four Gospels, especially the Synoptic Gospels but also the Gospel of John to a lesser extent. The fact that the Gospels exalt Peter in the ways that they do but also describe him disowning Christ shows that Peter probably really disowned Christ. That information wouldn't have likely been included unless it's 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 people were already aware of it. 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 appear to be necessary that Peter led the spread of Christianity after the Resurrection. However, Peter appears 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 for Peter outside of Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. 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; and the First Epistle of Clement says that Paul went to "the extreme limit of the west", which could have been Spain or close to there. 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, according to Galatians 2:11-14, Peter was trying to force people to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself, he was only willing to eat with gentiles as long as certain people didn't find out, and he was so afraid of certain people finding out that he immediately drew back as soon as certain people showed up. It's unrealistic to believe that anyone who fits that profile would be even close to being the top disciple of Christ. Not only did Peter throw away his discipleship before the Resurrection and not only did he get surpassed by Paul after the Resurrection, but apparently he also tried to force others to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself and was also concerned about adhering to someone else's standards instead of practicing Christ's teachings. There's no realistic way that Peter could have been the top disciple if he was more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than practicing Christ's teachings. 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 appears 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 appears 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 better 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 appears to be obviously false given Paul's accomplishments, especially since Peter apparently tried to force people to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself and was more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings.

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 appears 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 appears to indicate that a different author than the original author fraudulently concealed information about them. Since it appears that information about the beloved disciple was fraudulently concealed, they don't appear to have been fraudulently exalted. Since it appears that either Peter or the beloved disciple was fraudulently exalted and it doesn't appear to have been the beloved disciple given the fraudulent concealment of information about them, it appears 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 and was more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings.

Only one of them could have been the top disciple, and the beloved disciple was present during the Crucifixion while Peter disowned Christ and then Peter went on to have far less success than Paul after the Resurrection, he tried to force people to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself, and he was more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings. We will continue to dive into more evidence, but it already appears 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, she

is the only person named as having first discovered the empty tomb, and she 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 Mary. 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 presented that supports that conclusion.

From a broader view of all of the Gospels, we can begin to see that the inclusion of Mary Magdalene at all in the Gospels as well as the specific ways that she's included shows evidence 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 person or one of the first people to have discovered the empty tomb. Mark and John name Mary Magdalene as the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection while Matthew names her as one of the first people to have seen Christ after the Resurrection. All of that strongly supports the conclusion that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, and it all collectively shows that she appears to have been the top disciple of Christ even without considering the presence of the beloved disciple in John 19:26-27.

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 appears 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 are attempts 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 possibly wearing a necklace. All of the other "disciples" painted in the picture have shorter hair. All of them have hair that doesn't go past the neck-line of their clothing. The beloved disciple has their head slanted to the left so that their hair on the right is

diagonal, thereby showing that the hair would go past the neck-line of their clothing if their head was straight. Furthermore, there is a blanket on the beloved disciple covering up what would be long hair. So the exact way that the beloved disciple is portrayed in this painting covers up the long hair to the untrained eye but shows that there is longer hair if a closer look is taken. In this way, the beloved disciple is portrayed as a woman but that is hidden so that the painting was accepted back when it was produced.

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" appears 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 Martha and Mary of Bethany both appear to not be the beloved disciple. Meanwhile, the Gospel of John portrays Mary Magdalene as having been 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 appears that Leonardo portrayed Mary Magdalene as the beloved disciple, and so it appears that Leonardo da Vinci believed that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple.

Just because Leonardo da Vinci appears to have portrayed Mary Magdalene as the beloved disciple, that doesn't necessarily mean that she is. However, Leonardo's apparent portrayal of Mary Magdalene as the beloved disciple appears to be agreement that she is the beloved disciple 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 this: 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 named Mary is described as talking)
"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
"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 in which Christ is God and Mary Magdalene is a child of God who learns from God as a disciple. A single verse from the Gospel of Philip shouldn't dictate our understanding anyway and many inappropriate theories have been made up based on that information from the Gospel of Philip.

Not only is a woman named "Mary" being shown as a leader, but she is specifically referred to as someone who appears to 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 appears to be the beloved disciple. Additionally, the name "Mary of Magdala" is used in the Gospel of Philip and is used to describe her as 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 as having been near the Cross during the Crucifixion. "Mary of Magdala" (Mary Magdalene) is described as being in an exclusive group of three that includes Mother Mary and Mother Mary's sister. Regardless of how much of this information is true of Mary Magdalene, it's incredibly striking that any of it was written at all. The popular account asserts that Mary Magdalene was a sinful prostitute who had seven demons come out of her, but there are documents that portray 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 how much 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. Furthermore, we can already see that there were at least two different waves of information spreading in the first few centuries about who the top disciple was. We could already see that the Bible shows us that there was a wave of information that portrayed Peter as the top disciple. We could also already see that there is evidence in the Bible that someone other than Peter was portrayed as the top disciple (the beloved disciple) and that the top disciple was probably Mary Magdalene. Now with the evidence from the Gnostic Gospels, we can see even further that there was a wave of information that portrayed Mary Magdalene as the top disciple.

There is already plenty of evidence showing that Mary Magdalene is probably the beloved disciple. We should now turn back to the Gospel of John 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 the second letter attributed to the name "John" and Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, and both of those appear 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 appear to contain much of the original information but appear 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 appear 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 the truth more obvious. So while the 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 is 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 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears to have been issues that the "orthodox church" had with it because there appears 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 appears to have been something about the Gospel of John that was a big problem for the "orthodox church" back then. More specifically, there appears 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 appears 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 appears to have been a part of a

testimony that originally identified who the beloved disciple is, and that there appears to have been 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 appears to be a later fraudulent alteration, which shows that the description of that communication appears to have been a part of a testimony that originally identified who the beloved disciple is. Additionally, John 19:26-27 wouldn't seem to hold any significance if they aren't truthful. It doesn't seem like there would have been any motivation to add those verses if they aren't truthful, so it is very unlikely that those verses were fraudulent upon their original production. Therefore, that information probably 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 appears to be truthful. The fraud is focused on someone's name, so that is where the fraud appears to be and the rest of these verses were probably fairly preserved. The designation of a beloved disciple in the specific way that description appears, "the disciple whom Jesus loved", 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 in the specific way that description appears, whether authentic or fraudulent, shows that there is apparently some disciple of particular importance. Even if it wasn't in a testimony that originally identified the beloved disciple, the person or people who decided to add that wouldn't have likely designated the unnamed disciple as the 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. Regardless of whether the designation of a beloved disciple was in a testimony that originally identified the beloved disciple, the probable scenario 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 apparently was already a disciple of particular importance described in those verses and the other is that someone apparently wanted to conceal their identity. So there appears to have been at least some Christians who were aware of a disciple who was of particular importance who was not Peter. Therefore, even if the designation of a beloved disciple is a later

alteration, there appears to have been some disciple of particular importance who was not Peter, and it's presumably that particular importance that was the catalyst for this disciple going unnamed, especially since Peter was being exalted as if he was the top disciple.

It's unlikely that the beloved disciple wouldn't have been 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.

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 could be someone other than the four people mentioned in the current version of verse 25.

The first point in response to that objection is that the strategy taken in verses 26-27 was to simply leave the beloved disciple unnamed, not to take their presence out entirely. Given the willingness to leave someone unnamed in verses 26-27, the same probably would have 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, and 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 appears to be one of those four people.

Second, if there was a fifth person mentioned in the original version of verse 25, the purpose of the hypothetical 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. The bottom-line point is that the presence of the beloved disciple remains in the narrative, which defeats any purpose of eliminating their presence in one single verse. Therefore, it does appear that the beloved disciple would be one of the four people mentioned in verse 25.

Third, 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 presence of the beloved disciple remaining in the narrative defeat the purpose of hypothetically removing their presence from verse 25, 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.

Those three points show that it appears that there wasn't a fifth person ever mentioned in verse 25. That conclusion then brings into question why the beloved disciple doesn't go unnamed in verse 25 when they go unnamed in verses 26-27. One possibility is that it was considered important to keep the names of witnesses of the Crucifixion in verse 25 while the specific information in verses 26-27 gave way to the motivation to conceal the beloved disciple's identity in those verses. Another possibility is that the concealment of anyone's identity in verse 25 could give away who that person is when compared to the other information that was circulating back then, which can be seen by the information in the Gospels. Hypothetically, if Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple and her name was concealed in verse 25 and she was simply described as the beloved disciple like verses 26-27, then she could have been easily identified as the beloved disciple because it was well-known among Christians that Mary Magdalene was present during the Crucifixion, which can be seen by looking at the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, and John (Luke doesn't name anyone specific). Mark names Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses (presumably Mother Mary), and Salome. Matthew names Mary Magdalene, "the other Mary" (presumably Mother Mary), and the mother of Zebedee's sons. John names Mary Magdalene, Mother Mary, Mother Mary's sister, and Mary the wife of Clopas. Mary the wife of Clopas is only named in John. Mother Mary's sister or the mother of Zebedee's sons could be Salome, but even if one of them is, Mother Mary's sister is presumably not the mother of Zebedee's sons, which means that it appears that neither Mother Mary's sister nor the mother of Zebedee's sons is consistently named. Neither of them would likely be the beloved disciple anyway. That only leaves Mary Magdalene and Mother Mary as the only two people who are consistently named as having been present during the Crucifixion. Additionally, Mother Mary is specifically described as someone who is not the beloved disciple. So only Mary Magdalene would have caused a problem in terms of being the beloved disciple and going unnamed in verse 25. Therefore, if Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, then concealing her identity and describing her as the beloved disciple in verse 25, like verses 26-27, would then make it easy to identify her as the beloved disciple because it was well known among Christians that she was present during the Crucifixion, which again is evidenced by the information in the Gospels. That conclusion not only shows potentially why the beloved disciple doesn't go unnamed in verse 25 when they go unnamed in verses 26-27, it also shows evidence that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple.

Mother Mary is described as having been involved in a conversation with the beloved disciple and so obviously appears to not be the beloved disciple. It appears highly 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 appears 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 obviously appears to be 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, 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, she is the only person mentioned in the Gospel of John as the first person to have discovered the empty tomb, and she 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 appears to be 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 appears 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 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 is described as discovering 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 are 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 a disciple is going to go unnamed, it makes 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 one Jesus loved" or in any other way shows that a general reference to a fictional character was fraudulently inserted into the text because that reference in chapter 20 is built off of the assumption that an unnamed disciple already appears in chapter 19. The word "other" assumes that there was already information previously presented in relation to this "other disciple". It doesn't say anywhere before then that there was only one other person besides Peter who Mary Magdalene was supposedly running to and "the other disciple" is not introduced in chapter 20 before that. Yet right after Peter is introduced, the text then immediately refers to "the other disciple" as if it is already known to the reader who that would be, which shows that the word "other" is used in reference to information presented before chapter 20 and therefore assumes that an unnamed disciple already appeared before chapter 20, which shows that the narrative in chapter 20 was altered in that way after the narrative in chapter 19 had already been altered to conceal the identity of the beloved disciple and that shows that the mentioning of a beloved disciple in chapter 20 was a later fraudulent alteration. 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 because they were building off of the presence of the unnamed disciple in chapter 19. 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 after the identity of the beloved disciple in chapter 19 had already been concealed. In chapter 19, the identity of a real person was concealed, which shows that the fundamental information of the narrative is still truthful. In chapter 20, the narrative revolves around the assumption that there has already been an unnamed person presented before chapter 20, and therefore the narrative revolves around a fraudulent alteration, which shows that the narrative in chapter 20 appears to be mostly fraudulent as opposed to the narrative in chapter 19. In step with that, the use of the word "we" is 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 appears 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 portrayed as understanding 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. That would also mean that all of the mentions of the beloved disciple specifically 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 because it shows a fraudulent attempt to portray the beloved disciple specifically as someone other than Mary Magdalene, which there would only be a use for if Mary Magdalene was previously portrayed as someone who would be the beloved disciple. The evidence that shows that there was an effort to conceal information related to Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple 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 in chapter 20? 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 wasn'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 reasonable 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 wasn'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 counterproductive 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 eleven". 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 appears 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 appears 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 trying to force people to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself, he was only willing to eat with gentiles as long as certain people didn't find out, and he was so afraid of certain people finding out that he immediately drew back as soon as certain people showed up, which shows that Peter appears to have been more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings. 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, being surpassed by Mary Magdalene in terms of faith and discipleship, 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 appears to contain 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 about a century after the Resurrection, a Synoptic Gospel was being edited to show Mary Magdalene as the first person to have seen 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 realistically 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 to look at next is a deeper examination of the description of Mary Magdalene having said "we" even though she is the only person who is described as having discovered the empty tomb. That shows evidence 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 appears to be fraudulent.

Since there wasn't anybody else added to verse 1, the use of the word "we" may have actually been a simple mistake in that the author may have disregarded that only Mary Magdalene was described in verse 1. Clearly, it doesn't make sense to use the word "we" when only one person is described, which shows that they may have just disconnected from the information that was already established in verse 1. Even if the use of the word "we" resulted from a simple mistake like that, it still points to apparent 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 appears to have been a later fraudulent alteration to a 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 or accidentally disregarded verse 1. 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. With such a strange abundance of details about Peter and an unnamed disciple running to the tomb contrasted with no details at all about Mary Magdalene returning to the tomb, there is obviously 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.' Now I have told you."
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 worshipped 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 worshipped 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 "the disciples" as not believing. So we can see that Peter and the rest of "the eleven" 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 appears 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 what is described as Mary Magdalene's claim that the tomb was empty. Instead, as we are about to see, the unnamed disciple in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John 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. The description of seeing the strips of linen portrays the unnamed disciple as being able to see

that the tomb was empty before Peter even arrived. 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, and therefore it appears that this supposed belief was about the tomb being empty, meaning that the unnamed disciple is described as believing the claim that the tomb was empty. A person would have to first believe the claim that the tomb was empty before being considered a witness of the empty tomb or being grouped with anyone who is described as claiming that the tomb was empty. A person who didn't believe that the tomb was empty couldn't realistically be considered a witness of the empty tomb because they wouldn't have believed what they would be identified as a witness for. 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 while grouping them with Mary Magdalene, and Peter is left out of that. Believing that the tomb was empty appears to have been an issue because the Synoptic Gospels describe "the disciples" as not believing the claim that the tomb was empty. So this supposed belief being attributed to the unnamed disciple is significant and presents them as the second witness to the empty tomb. The unnamed disciple is being specifically presented as a witness to the empty tomb and believing the claim that the tomb was empty, and they are specifically described as reaching the tomb before Peter. So it appears that the desire to present at least two witnesses and the desire to not present Peter as one of those initial witnesses or as having believed Mary Magdalene is why the unnamed disciple is described as reaching the tomb first and believing the claim that the tomb was empty. In John 20:2-9, there are two witnesses of the empty tomb, Peter is not one of those two witnesses, and Peter is not portrayed as having believed Mary Magdalene.

The third component revolves around the attention given to Peter. Not only is Peter specifically named in this sequence, he is also the one described as going into the tomb first (after the unnamed disciple reached the tomb first and saw the strips of linen, thereby seeing that the tomb was empty before Peter arrived). 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 appears to be best explained by the combination of a desire to present at least 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 wasn'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 that 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 she 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 verses 14 and 15 appear to have come from a different author than verse 16, which means that they appear to be fraudulent additions. Furthermore, verses 14-15 refer to Mary Magdalene as crying similar to verses 10-11, which have already been shown to appear to be fraudulent. So the reference to Mary Magdalene crying in verses 14-15 is another indication that those verses appear to be 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? The description of Mary Magdalene as having been prohibited from touching Christ shows 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 portray 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 use of the description "the other disciple" as if we're supposed to know who that is, 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, plenty of evidence has been shown 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 wasn'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 counterproductive 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 appears to have been fraudulently concealed. From that perspective, it's very easy to see that there appears 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 appears to have been female Christian leadership and that the "orthodox church" appears to have been opposed to that. It's 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, but 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, one to "the disciples" without Thomas and then another a week later with Thomas. 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 apparent 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 appears to have been information that was concealed about a disciple, but also

further evidence that there appears to have been information concealed specifically about Mary Magdalene. Additionally, 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. Furthermore, the comparison of verse 18 to verse 25 shows another attempt to separate Mary Magdalene from "the disciples".

John 20:18
Mary Magdalene went to the disciples with the news: "I have seen the Lord!" And she told them that he 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 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 ("álloi") 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.

So John 20:10-11, John 20:18, and John 21:14 combine to present three 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 was 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 appear 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 appear to combine contradicting accounts from the other three Gospels, which shows that whoever wrote those verses appears to have copied information from the other Gospels. Mark 16:9-20 also appear to contain information from Acts that describes disciples speaking in different tongues and Paul being bitten by a snake, which shows that whoever wrote those verses appears to have 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 appears to have been 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears to be how the original version of the Gospel of Mark ended. So the original version of the Gospel of Mark appears to have not included 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? Some argue that there wasn’t any description of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection because people already knew what happened, but that’s ridiculous because the whole purpose of the Gospel is to describe what happened and the Resurrection is the most important part. If there wasn’t a need to describe what happened then there wouldn’t be a need for the Gospel at all. So the sudden end clearly indicates an issue and shows that the author apparently struggled with what to write and 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 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 formed 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 is described as having been 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's 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's very unrealistic 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 it's quite a stretch because it doesn't provide much of an explanation for having gone to the tomb, there doesn't appear 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 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 apparent 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 therefore was just 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, but even aside from Jewish tradition it still wouldn't make sense to not anoint a body during a burial and to instead wait multiple days to do it, and John 11:38-39 clearly support that assertion. 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 realistically 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 already been anointed during the burial.

This assessment shows apparent 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 is 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 and is what would realistically happen anyway because it doesn't make sense to anoint a body days after a burial even aside from Jewish customs. Additionally, 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 apparently 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 apparently wasn't 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 expected the Resurrection. Additionally, there doesn't appear 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 apparently wasn't there to anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ. Another aspect that should show that Mary Magdalene 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 likely an indication of truthful eyewitness testimony given that it was unusual to be out before the sun rose and such a description is unique to the Gospel of John, thereby showing that it likely only ended up in the Gospel of John because of 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 appears to have been fraudulent concealment of information about that expectation. That not only shows further evidence that the Synoptic Gospels contain fraudulent information, but also shows further evidence that chapter 20 of the Gospel of John is 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 are 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 shown 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 appears to 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 appears to be the beloved disciple. Additionally, the name "Mary of Magdala" is used in the Gospel of Philip and is used to describe her as 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" (Mary Magdalene) is described as being in an exclusive group of three that includes Mother Mary and Mother Mary's sister. Regardless of how much of that 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 who had seven demons come out of her, but there are documents that portray 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 how much 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.

All of the other 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 appears to be 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 centers 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 appear 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 truthful. If John 20:16 was 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. Furthermore, 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 appear 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 apparently didn't care as much about that and they even went 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 was placed on John 20:16, and as a result, it appears 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 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 appears to be real eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene about the Resurrection of Christ.

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 appear to be fraudulent by downplaying Mary Magdalene's importance and presenting her as a messenger along with at least one other woman. Therefore, it appears that all four Gospels contain attempts to conceal information about Mary Magdalene. However, 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 appears to have been contributions from multiple authors, which shows that there appears 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 appears to have been information circulating about Mary Magdalene being the top disciple. On the other hand, there appears 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 appears to have been a previously existing version of the Gospel of John that portrayed Mary Magdalene as someone who would be viewed as the beloved disciple and the modern version of the Gospel of John appears to contain fraudulent alterations that conceal information about Mary Magdalene being the beloved disciple.

There appears to have been one party that believed that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple and 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 appears 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 state "you are Peter", that really means "you are rock". So then, when Matthew 16:17-19 say "on this rock I will build my church", "this rock" refers to Peter.

Given that Peter disowned Christ, refused to be present during the Crucifixion, wasn't present during the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, didn't believe at first that Christ had risen, was surpassed in discipleship by Mary Magdalene, was surpassed by Paul in the spreading of Christianity, tried to force gentiles to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself, and was so afraid of certain people finding out that he was eating with gentiles that he immediately drew back as soon as certain people showed up, thereby showing that he was more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings, we can very obviously see that Peter not only wasn't the top disciple of Christ but more specifically that the information about Peter contained in Matthew 16:17-19 is fraudulent.

"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."

With these verses, both Matthew and Luke claim that "the Twelve" will sit on thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. Additionally, Luke describes "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 are extreme and obviously appear to be fraudulent. Furthermore, the description of Judas betraying Christ shows by itself how ridiculous it is to say that "the Twelve" will sit on twelve thrones. These verses are basically saying that Judas, someone described in all of the Gospels as betraying Christ, will sit on a throne judging the twelve tribes of Israel, and Luke adds that a kingdom will be conferred just as a kingdom was conferred to Christ. But aside from Judas, these are ridiculous statements to say about any of "the Twelve" and are obviously 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 "the Twelve".

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 wasn't the top disciple and that "the Twelve" weren't the top twelve disciples. That in turn shows

evidence that Peter and the rest of "the Twelve" were 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" excluded the top disciple. Given that "the Twelve" appear to have been a group of men who excluded the top disciple, "the Twelve" apparently weren't 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 that shows defining evidence 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" are given 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?"

The information in these verses describes 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. This letter also describes Peter as having been only willing to eat with gentiles as long as certain people didn't find out and as having been so afraid of certain people finding out that he immediately drew back as soon as certain people showed up, which shows that Peter appears to have been more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings. 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 and who was more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings. 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" 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" appear to have not 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 appears to have had far more success 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 appears have lost out on achieving the top spot. Paul appears 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 wasn't even a disciple during Christ's Ministry. He entered the situation 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" appear 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. The evidence shows that they were never specially appointed, they were an exclusive group that excluded the top disciple, they disowned Christ, and they were surpassed by Paul in addition to Mary Magdalene. In conclusion, Peter and the rest of "the Twelve" should not be exalted 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 appear to be 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 appears to be 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 apparently 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 apparently fraudulent and so all of the narratives that describe Christ as having appeared to "the eleven" are apparently 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 actually described a real 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 already appears 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 Peter, 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 apparently fraudulent. The fourth point is that these two people are described as not having 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 before God rather than being divine, which is similar to the Islamic view. All of the Gospels describe someone calling Christ a prophet and there was obviously confusion among people about Christ, so it's not necessarily a major issue for a Gospel as a whole. What's so striking about the Gospel of Luke doing it is that Luke 24:19 specifically describes Christ as separate from God by stating "before God and all the people" and does that in the first narrative in the Gospel of Luke that is supposed to be about an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. So the Gospel of Luke not only describes Christ as a prophet and separate from God, but also does all of that in a narrative that is supposed to be about an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. It's one thing for a description of someone calling Christ a prophet to occur earlier in a Gospel, but to do so in a Resurrection narrative makes it appear as though the Gospel of Luke as whole tries to portray Christ as a prophet and separate from God rather than that just being attributed to one person who is described as expressing that view. Describing Christ as a prophet and separate from God instead of as divine opposes Christianity and supports Islam, and Luke 24:19 does that in a Resurrection narrative making it appear that the Gospel of Luke as a whole views Christ as a prophet and separate from God. So while the other Gospels describe someone calling Christ a prophet, only the instance in a Resurrection narrative in the Gospel of Luke appears to be representative of the view of an entire Gospel rather than just the person who is described as expressing that view. So Luke 24:19 opposes the Christian view of Christ as divine and supports the Islamic view of Christ as a prophet and separate from God. 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 is a sign of apparent 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 apparent 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 appears obvious 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, appears incoherent, opposes the Christian view of Christ as divine, and supports the Islamic view of Christ as a

prophet and separate from God. The apparent 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 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 excludes 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 I 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 here 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 worshipped 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 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 excludes the top disciple of Christ, Mary Magdalene, as being entrusted with spreading Christianity to the world. So 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 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 doesn’t make sense 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 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 evidence that those verses are fraudulent. The fourth point is that these men are described as having their minds opened so they could understand “the Scriptures”. Why do they need to understand “the Scriptures” to see that Christ had risen? If they could see Christ, then they shouldn’t need anything else 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? This narrative represents a major 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 obviously appears to be fraudulent.

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"; 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, seeing Lazarus rise after he died could 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 Lazarus rising after he died. 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 Lazarus potentially having risen after he died. 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 and compares "the disciples" with Christ, which contradicts other theology in the Gospel of John that portrays 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 are apparently 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 a fraudulent addition. 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 additions. Furthermore, 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.

As shown before, 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 he 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, or at least one of them, because the use of nearly identical statements appears to either be representative of one author's writing style rather than of what actually happened, in which case the same author wrote both and both would then apparently be fraudulent, or representative of one author copying from another, in which case at least one verse would apparently be fraudulent. If the same author wrote both, then both verses would appear to be fraudulent because the use of nearly identical statements would then appear to be more representative of that author's writing style than of what actually happened. If one author copied from another, then at least one of those verses would apparently be fraudulent, and verse 25 is more likely to have been copied from verse 18 than vice versa. We will go into detail in Part 5 about the different layers of the Gospel of John. That analysis will show that verse 25 is likely a part of a later addition to the Gospel of John relative to verse 18; so if verses 18 and 25 were written by different authors and one was copied from the other, then verse 25 was probably copied from verse 18. Therefore, verse 25 already appears to be fraudulent and verse 18 is probably fraudulent as well. 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 would appear likely that she typically called Christ “Rabboni” instead of “the Lord”. That of course is not necessarily the case, however, it does appear 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 “Kyrion” 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 either written by the same author as verse 18 or copied form verse 18, that shows further that verse 25 is also apparently fraudulent. Fourth, it appears 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 either written by the same author as verse 18 or copied from verse 18, that shows further that verse 25 is also apparently fraudulent. Fifth, as shown before, 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 (“álloi”) 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 “Kyrion”. 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 “Kyrion” to refer to God doesn’t necessarily show that the writing is fraudulent. 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 “Kyrion” to refer to Christ appears 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 appear to be authentic, refers to Christ as “Rabboni”. Therefore, it is likely the case that the only other use of the Greek word “Kyrion” 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 all appear to be fraudulent. It has also already been shown that verses 30-31 appear to be fraudulent. Just based on that, it is then easy to see that verses 26-29 are also probably 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, 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 obviously appears 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 apparent motivation for adding these verses. These verses were apparently 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 apparently 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 a description of people receiving the Spirit of God by being breathed on, a description of people being able to decide who is forgiven, one of only three references in the Gospel of John to “the Twelve”, a description 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. Based on this information, it appears that the rest of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John after verse 16 is all fraudulent. Based on all of the evidence presented about chapter 20 of the Gospel of John, it appears that verses 1 and 16 are the only truthful verses through all of chapter 20.

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), Nathanael from Cana in Galilee, 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 is 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 chapter 24 of the Gospel of Luke in the narrative about the two men who are described as having seen Christ after the Resurrection and that narrative along with the rest of chapter 24 has been shown to appear to be fraudulent. So we should be able to see that the descriptions of anyone having seen Christ but not having recognized Christ are all apparently 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, one to "the disciples" without Thomas and then another a week later with Thomas. 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.

The evidence has shown that 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 appears 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 have all been shown to apparently be fraudulent, and they all apparently 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 apparently 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, which means that 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 choose to be a disciple. 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 oppose the verses just previously examined.

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 these two sets of verses are not compatible with each other and that each set of verses appear to have been produced by different authors. A lot of the Gospel of John focuses on the Spirit and the Synoptic Gospels focus on the physical world, so the verses in the second set that focus on the physical world appear to be later fraudulent additions that are in line with the Synoptic Gospels. That shows evidence 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 apparently represent accurate theology and the verses in the second set have already shown to apparently 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 appears 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.

The evidence that shows that the first set of verses appears to represent accurate theology and that the verses in the second set appear to be fraudulent provides further evidence that Mary Magdalene was the only disciple who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection because she is the only disciple who is described in the Gospel of John as having been both present during the Crucifixion as well as 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 would appear 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 would appear 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.

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 both present during the Crucifixion as well as 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 realistically be more in agreement with each other regarding the Resurrection narratives because the authors would have been able to draw from the truth and should have come up with similar accounts since they were describing the same truth. So the degree of contradiction between the Gospels in the Resurrection narratives shows strong evidence that the authors were doing something else than simply drawing from the truth. There is one crucial detail, however, that is found in all four of the Gospels: Mary Magdalene is described as having been 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 apparently 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. The information in these verses describes 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. This letter also describes Peter as having been only willing to eat with gentiles as long as certain people didn't find out and as having been so afraid of certain people finding out that he immediately drew back as soon as certain people showed up, which shows that Peter appears to have been more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings. 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 and who was more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings. 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 was the top disciple and the frontrunner of spreading Christianity. As a result, this information from Galatians shows 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” appear to have not been relatively very successful. That shows further evidence that they did not see Christ after the Resurrection. Among the men, Paul appears to have had far more success than Peter. So just among the men, Peter still appears to have lost out on achieving the top spot. Paul appears 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” were not the top frontrunners of spreading Christianity because they weren’t even the top frontrunners among the men, and that shows further evidence that they did not see Christ after the Resurrection.

Paul wasn’t even a disciple during Christ’s Ministry. He entered the situation afterwards. So even someone who wasn’t a disciple during Christ’s Ministry appears 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 Twelve” appear 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. The evidence shows that they were never specially appointed, they were an exclusive group that excluded the top disciple, they disowned Christ, and they were surpassed by Paul in addition to Mary Magdalene. In conclusion, Peter and the rest of “the Twelve” should not be exalted over all of the overwhelming evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple.

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 apparently were 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 apparently 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 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" apparently 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, it appears that the original version of the Gospel of John didn't exalt Peter as much as later additions did, 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 were 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 that doesn't name those people because that narrative would be about their discipleship in particular. The narrative would be about a particular person's discipleship, so there is something inherently wrong about a narrative that is about the beginning of someone's discipleship that doesn't identify them because the narrative is about them. Therefore, 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 were 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 is only 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 appears to have avoided describing any appearance of Christ after the Resurrection. The original version of the Gospel of Mark appears 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 appears 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 saw Christ after the Resurrection, 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 appears 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 appear 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 implied 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 these Resurrection narratives were formed based on certain fraudulent information that was circulating at the time.

Matthew 28:17
When they saw him, they worshipped 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 evidence 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 further 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 from the Gospel of Mary, Mary Magdalene appears 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 is the only person who saw Christ after the Resurrection. In Luke 24:45-46 and the Gospel of Mary, the male "disciples" 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" 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 appear to represent some of what actually happened with Mary Magdalene and the Resurrection while the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, like Mark, appear 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 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.
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 even further evidence that "the eleven" did not see 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 appears to be representative of them not having seen Christ after the Resurrection and simply having been told about the Resurrection.

What we've seen evidence of 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 isn'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 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.

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 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 takes 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 appears 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 appears to have added that text to influence readers and they realistically would only have wanted to make a specific effort to influence readers like that if there were some people who believed that someone other than Mary of Bethany anointed Christ. If there wasn't any question about who anointed Christ then there wouldn't be any need

to clarify. So the desire to clarify shows evidence that there was disagreement about who anointed Christ, which shows that some people believed that someone other than Mary of Bethany anointed Christ and that someone made a specific effort to change the Gospel of John to convince people to not believe that. 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 appears 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 appear to have known that the burial was going to take place, in which case they would appear 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 would appear that they would have expected the Resurrection. As previously asserted, Mary Magdalene appears 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 appears to have expected the Resurrection and the person who anointed Christ in Bethany appears 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 was 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.

Moving further, 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 appears 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 he would have probably been mentioned alongside Joseph of Arimathea in the Synoptic Gospels if he was present during the burial. 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 appears 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 appear to have been added by Jewish authors who 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 appear 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 appears 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 appears to have used the word "arōmatōn" shows that verse 39 appears to have been written by a different author than verse 40, and therefore is apparently a later fraudulent alteration. So verses 38 and 40 appear to have been a part of the original version of the Gospel of John and verse 39 appears 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 appears to be someone other than Nicodemus. Obviously that person appears to be 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 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, 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 could have been 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, or the motivation could have simply been about not wanting Mary Magdalene described as having anointed Christ.

Evidence has been shown that Mary of Bethany didn't anoint Christ in Bethany, that Nicodemus didn't anoint the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial, and that the same person 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 appears to have expected the Resurrection. Mary Magdalene is the only person who has been shown to meet all of those criteria. She is not Mary of Bethany or Nicodemus, she appears to have expected the Resurrection, and she appears 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 appears to have anointed Christ in Bethany and then anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. Mary Magdalene appears 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 appears 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, but 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 appear 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 appear 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 imply that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany was aware that the burial would take place and so appear 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 appears to have been fraudulently altered many times, 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 appear 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 appear 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 appears 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 appear to have not 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 apparent 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 appears that those verses reflect some of the reality in society during

that time-period. It appears that information about the anointing of Christ in Bethany was widely circulated and that's apparently why the authors of Mark and Matthew felt pressured to address the matter. They appear 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 appears 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 appears 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 appear 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 appear 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 appears that those Gospels are responding to information contained in the Gospel of John. We will go into more detail in Part 5 about how the Gospels respond to information contained in each other and how the original version of the Gospel of John was circulating before the Synoptic Gospels were produced. Specifically about the anointing of Christ in Bethany, Mark and Matthew responding to the Gospel of John appears to be the reason why Mark and Matthew would imply that this person expected the burial to take place. Just as the authors appear to have been responding to societal

circumstances, they also appear 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 appears 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 this 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 name "Christ" comes from the Greek word Χρῑστός ("Christos"), which means "anointed", and corresponds to the Hebrew word מָשִׁיחַ ("mashíakh"), which also means "anointed". The name "messiah" comes from the title of "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 appears to have been the one who anointed Christ in Bethany and anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ during the burial. Christ is the Anointed One and Mary Magdalene is the one who anointed Christ. Mary Magdalene is the one who anointed the Anointed One. 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 and would explain why Mark and Matthew claim that the anointing in Bethany will be talked about wherever the Gospel is preached.

Earlier here in Part 2, it was asserted that Mary Magdalene appears to have expected the Resurrection because there doesn't appear to be any other explanation that's 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 appears to have expected the burial to take place and therefore appears 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 apparently was 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 have been a shift in the relationship between the statuses of Mary Magdalene and "the Twelve". Such a shift would be quite mysterious and appears 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 represents what appears to be 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 appears 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 appears to be 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 appears to have happened after the Resurrection. From then on, Mary Magdalene spread the true Christian Revolution.

The Case for the Christian Revolution

The evidence in the Gospels of the Revolution that Mary Magdalene spread can also show evidence that Christianity is the true religion.

In the process of showing that Christianity is the true religion, we will begin with what we know. We know that we have the text in the Bible. Regardless of what information in the Bible is true and what isn't, we know that the Bible exists. We know that the Bible claims that Christ was crucified, that Christ resurrected, that Peter was appointed by Christ, that Peter is "the rock" on which Christ's Church will be built, that Peter disowned Christ, that Mary Magdalene was present during the Crucifixion and during the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, and that there is someone who witnessed the Crucifixion who is "the disciple whom Jesus loved".

The fact that Christianity is about Christ shows evidence that Christ taught someone. If Christ hadn't taught anyone, then it is incredibly unlikely that Christianity would have been formed based on Christ. Therefore, it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone.

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. Therefore, it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone and that Christ was crucified.

Christianity did in fact spread. We know that Christianity exists today and we can be reasonably confident that the spreading of Christianity began in the first century. Therefore, it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone, that Christ was crucified, and that a religion based on Christ began spreading in the first century.

From here, we should examine how Christianity began spreading in the first century. The Bible claims that Peter was appointed by Christ and that he is "the rock" on which Christ's Church will be built. The Bible also claims that Peter disowned Christ. Since the Bible exalts Peter as the top disciple, the fact that the Bible also discredits him by describing him as disowning Christ shows that he likely really did disown Christ. It's very unlikely that someone who is exalted so much in the Gospels would also be discredited in such a way unless that was truthful because it is counterproductive to the exaltation. Therefore, it is more likely than not that Peter is a real person who really disowned Christ.

The following points show that Peter was not appointed by Christ and was not the top disciple of Christ.

1. Discipleship is a choice, so the narratives describing the appointment of Peter are fraudulent. Therefore, Peter was not appointed as the top disciple of Christ or as "the rock" on which Christ's Church will be built.
2. Discipleship is a choice and Peter disowned Christ, so Peter was not even a disciple anymore. Therefore, if Christianity is the true religion, then someone other than Peter began the spread of true Christianity after the Resurrection.
3. John 19:25-27 show that someone other than Peter was the top disciple of Christ.
4. Mary Magdalene was more advanced than Peter in terms of discipleship.
5. Paul's presence at all in the history of Christianity shows that Peter was not even the most successful among men.
6. According to Paul's letter to the Galatians, Peter was trying to force people to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself, he was only willing to eat with gentiles as long as certain people didn't find out, and he was so afraid of certain people finding out that he immediately drew back as soon as certain people showed up, which shows that he was more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings, which would obviously not be characteristic of the top disciple of Christ.

It has been shown that it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone, that Christ was crucified, that a religion based on Christ began spreading in the first century, that Peter is a real person who really disowned Christ leading up to the Crucifixion, and that someone else was the top disciple of Christ.

The following points show that Mary Magdalene appears to have been the top disciple.

1. The Gospels of Mark, Matthew, and John all name Mary Magdalene as having been present during the Crucifixion.
2. All four Gospels name Mary Magdalene as the first person or one of the first people to have discovered the empty tomb.
3. The Gospels of Mark and John name Mary Magdalene as the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection while Matthew names her as one of the first people to have seen Christ after the Resurrection.
4. In the Gospel of John, Mary Magdalene is one of only four people named as having been present during the Crucifixion, she is the only person named as having first discovered the empty tomb, and she is the only person named as having first seen Christ after the Resurrection.
5. The Gnostic Gospels present Mary Magdalene as the top disciple of Christ, and one of them strongly suggests that she was the only one who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection.

Those points by themselves show strong evidence that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple of Christ, and that's even without considering the presence of the beloved disciple in John 19:26-27. When we consider the presence of an unnamed person who is described as the beloved disciple and how that person appears to be Mary Magdalene, we can see even more so that Mary Magdalene appears to have been the top disciple of Christ.

The presence of an unnamed person in John 19:26-27 shows the likely presence of two different authors. It is not likely the case that so much importance would have originally been placed on an unnamed person. Therefore, it is more likely than not that John 19:26-27 were fraudulently altered.

Additionally, since the presence of an unnamed person shows evidence that John 19:26-27 were fraudulently altered, that in turn shows evidence that someone's identity was fraudulently concealed, and more specifically someone who is portrayed as the top disciple of Christ. Therefore, it is more likely than not that there was real eyewitness testimony of the Crucifixion that was later fraudulently altered to conceal the identity of someone who is portrayed as the top disciple of Christ.

Since John 19:26-27 were likely fraudulently altered but were not entirely deleted, it is more likely than not that the person who fraudulently altered those verses wanted to preserve a part of the testimony that was originally there. When that assertion is combined with the assertion that it is more likely than not that Christ really was crucified, that shows that it is more likely than not that the original form of John 19:26-27 represented real eyewitness testimony of the Crucifixion. Therefore, it is more likely than not that there was real eyewitness testimony of the Crucifixion that was later fraudulently altered to conceal the identity of someone who is portrayed as the top disciple of Christ.

Given that the Bible claims that Peter was the top disciple, that the portrayal of Peter as the top disciple is likely fraudulent, and that it is likely that the identity of someone else who is portrayed as the top disciple of Christ was concealed, it is more likely than not that the identity of this person was concealed for the sake of fraudulently portraying Peter as the top disciple.

It has been shown that it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone, that Christ was crucified, that a religion based on Christ began spreading in the first century, that Peter is a real person who really disowned Christ leading up to the Crucifixion, that someone else was the top disciple of Christ and their identity was fraudulently concealed for the sake of fraudulently portraying Peter as the top disciple, and that Mary Magdalene appears to have been the top disciple of Christ even without considering the presence of the beloved disciple in John 19:26-27.

The following points show that Mary Magdalene is the person whose identity was fraudulently concealed in John 19:26-27.

1. She is one of only four people mentioned in the Gospel of John as having witnessed the Crucifixion.
2. She is the only person named in the Gospel of John as having first discovered the empty tomb.
3. She is the only person named in the Gospel of John as having first seen Christ after the Resurrection.
4. The person whose identity was concealed in John 19:26-27 appears to be one of the four people mentioned in the Gospel of John as having witnessed the Crucifixion, and the beloved disciple

probably wasn't Mother Mary or Mother Mary's sister and probably wasn't married. Therefore, Mary Magdalene is the only person who would likely be the beloved disciple.

The following points show that a fictional character was inserted into chapter 20 of the Gospel of John to further conceal that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple, which shows further evidence that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple.

1. The unnamed disciple is first called "the other disciple" as if the reader is supposed to know who that is, which shows that the narrative was formed with the assumption that an unnamed beloved disciple is already a part of the Gospel of John prior to chapter 20, which shows that the narrative in chapter 20 was altered in that way after the narrative in chapter 19 had already been altered to conceal the identity of the beloved disciple, which shows that the mentioning of a beloved disciple in chapter 20 was a later fraudulent alteration, which shows that the mentioning of a beloved disciple as someone other than Mary Magdalene is entirely fraudulent, which shows that there was a specific effort to fraudulently portray the beloved disciple as someone other than Mary Magdalene, which shows that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple. In chapter 19, the identity of a real person was concealed, which shows that the fundamental information of the narrative is still truthful. In chapter 20, the narrative revolves around the assumption that there has already been an unnamed person presented before chapter 20, and therefore the narrative revolves around a fraudulent alteration, which shows that the narrative in chapter 20 is fraudulent as opposed to the narrative in chapter 19.
2. Luke 24:12 shows similar information as the narrative in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John but entirely omits the presence of an unnamed disciple, which shows that the presence of an unnamed disciple in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John is the presence of a fictional character, which shows that the mentioning of a beloved disciple as someone other than Mary Magdalene is entirely fraudulent, which shows that there was a specific effort to fraudulently portray the beloved as someone other than Mary Magdalene, which shows that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple.
3. The use of the word "we" in verse 2 when only Mary Magdalene is described shows later fraudulent alteration to a narrative that only presented Mary Magdalene at the tomb. That occurs in the same verse that the fictional unnamed character first appears, which shows that someone who was fraudulently altering information that only presented Mary Magdalene at the tomb also inserted the unnamed character, which shows that the presence of this unnamed character is entirely fraudulent, which shows that the mentioning of a beloved disciple as someone other than Mary Magdalene is entirely fraudulent, which shows that there was a specific effort to fraudulently portray the beloved as someone other than Mary Magdalene, which shows that Mary Magdalene is the beloved disciple.
4. John 20:2-9 present a strange sequence in which the unnamed character reaches the tomb before Peter, then Peter catches up and enters the tomb, and then the unnamed character believes. This appears to be an effort to present Peter as the first inside the tomb while avoiding presenting him as one of the initial witnesses of the empty tomb and as portraying him as not initially believing Mary Magdalene. That shows that the entire sequence is fraudulent, which shows that fraudulent alterations were made to chapter 20 of the Gospel of John to conceal information about Mary Magdalene, which supports the conclusion that the unnamed character in chapter 20 is a part of fraudulent attempts to suppress information about Mary Magdalene.
5. Verses 14-15 of chapter 20 appear to have been written by a different author than verse 16, which shows that there was a fraudulent attempt to present Mary Magdalene as not expecting the Resurrection. That shows that fraudulent alterations were made to chapter 20 of the Gospel of John to conceal information about Mary Magdalene, which supports the conclusion that the

unnamed character in chapter 20 is a part of fraudulent attempts to suppress information about Mary Magdalene.

6. Verse 17 of chapter 20 describes Mary Magdalene as having been prohibited from touching Christ. Verse 27 describes Thomas as having been allowed to touch Christ, which by itself shows that verse 17 is fraudulent and was added to suppress information about Mary Magdalene's relationship with Christ. Additionally, 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 portray Christ as God. All of that shows that fraudulent alterations were made to chapter 20 of the Gospel of John to conceal information about Mary Magdalene, which supports the conclusion that the unnamed character in chapter 20 is a part of fraudulent attempts to suppress information about Mary Magdalene.

The following points show further evidence that information about Mary Magdalene was suppressed.

1. 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, which shows that there was an effort to fraudulently present Mary Magdalene as if she wasn't a disciple at all.
2. The fact that the Gospel of Mark through verse 16:8 doesn't describe a single appearance of Christ after the Resurrection shows that the author didn't even want to describe an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection.
3. 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. There is one crucial detail, however, that is found in all four Gospels: Mary Magdalene is described as having been 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.
4. The fact that the Gospel of John excludes an explanation for why Mary Magdalene was at the tomb combined with the faulty explanations in the Synoptic Gospels is evidence that Mary Magdalene expected the Resurrection and that there was an effort to fraudulently present her as not expecting the Resurrection.

It has been shown that it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone, that Christ was crucified, that a religion based on Christ began spreading in the first century, that Peter is a real person who really disowned Christ leading up to the Crucifixion, and that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple of Christ and information about her was fraudulently concealed for the sake of fraudulently portraying Peter as the top disciple.

The following points show that Mary Magdalene spread the Christian Revolution in the first century.

1. Just based on the evidence that shows that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple of Christ, it's almost a forgone conclusion that she spread Christianity.
2. Mary Magdalene's presence in the most important narratives in the Gospels despite discrimination towards her and suppression of information about her shows that the authors of the Gospels felt the need to address her presence in society, which would only be the case if she had much of a presence in society and such a presence would presumably have come from her

spreading Christianity. If she hadn't spread Christianity or if she hadn't been successful at it, then there presumably wouldn't really be a need to address her presence in society.

3. The authors of the Gospels not only included her presence in the most important narratives but also specifically addressed information about a woman anointing Christ and they claimed that this information about this anointing would be spread wherever the Gospel is preached. Not only did they feel the need to address this information but they also specifically made the claim that this information would be spread wherever the Gospel is preached. That clearly shows that information about the anointing of Christ was widely circulated and that they had to address it. That is further shown by the fact that they weren't willing to name Mary Magdalene as the one who anointed Christ. That shows that they didn't want to write about her, yet they still did because they felt they had to.

The following points show that the Revolution that Mary Magdalene spread in the first century continued to spread for over half a millennium.

1. The Gnostic Gospels present Mary Magdalene as the top disciple of Christ, and one of them strongly suggests that she was the only one who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection. These writings have been dated to the second, third, and/or fourth centuries, which shows that the Revolution that she spread continued spreading for at least a century and probably a few hundred years if not more.
2. In the sixth century, Pope Gregory fraudulently claimed that Mary Magdalene was a sinful woman by conflating her with the sinful woman described as anointing Christ in Luke 7:36-50, which contributed to the misconception that she was a prostitute and centuries of portraying Mary Magdalene as a sinful prostitute. While it appears that Mary Magdalene anointed Christ, the narrative in Luke 7:36-50 is very distinguishable from the narratives in John, Mark, and Matthew about a woman anointing Christ in Bethany shortly before the Crucifixion. The narrative in Luke, in contrast to the other three Gospels, places this narrative towards the beginning of the Gospel rather than shortly before the Crucifixion narratives, doesn't place the narrative in Bethany, places the narrative in a Pharisee's home, and primarily describes the woman in the narrative as a sinner. All of those components contrast with the other three Gospels. So the narrative in Luke is obviously separate from the real anointing of Christ by Mary Magdalene shortly before the Crucifixion. Although, even if someone believed that the narrative in Luke referred to the same anointing as the other three Gospels, all of the Gospels distinguish Mary Magdalene from the references to a woman anointing Christ. Even though Mary Magdalene appears to have been the one who anointed Christ, that's not what the Gospels say. All three Synoptic Gospels describe an unnamed woman and the Gospel of John identifies the woman as Mary of Bethany. So all four Gospels appear to portray the woman who anointed Christ as someone other than Mary Magdalene. Even if someone confused Mary of Bethany with Mary Magdalene, all three Synoptic Gospels don't name the woman who they describe as anointing Christ, and it's the narrative in the Gospel of Luke that Pope Gregory used to claim that Mary Magdalene is a sinful woman. On the other hand, if Pope Gregory knew that Mary Magdalene was the one who anointed Christ, then he would have knowingly attacked someone of such great importance. If he didn't know that Mary Magdalene anointed Christ, then all four Gospels would simply suggest that the person who anointed Christ was someone other than Mary Magdalene and therefore describing Mary Magdalene as a sinful prostitute based on the narrative in Luke would have been based on zero evidence and so would apparently have been a deliberate attack; or if he did know

that Mary Magdalene anointed Christ, then he would have knowingly attacked someone of such great importance. Either way, it already appears that Pope Gregory went out of his way to attack Mary Magdalene. There are eight additional points that show that Pope Gregory was apparently trying to combat the fame of Mary Magdalene. Before getting to those points, it should be noted that some argue that maybe a tradition had already developed before Pope Gregory did this, but there doesn't appear to be any evidence of that, and regardless, the seventh point below shows that it wouldn't even matter anyway. The first additional point is that Pope Gregory's main conclusion was about someone being sinful and being forgiven despite their level of sin, and that conclusion is exactly what Luke 7:36-50 are about so there wouldn't have been any need to relate that narrative to Mary Magdalene unless his main intention was to simply describe Mary Magdalene as a sinful woman, which would have been useful for him if Mary Magdalene was still famous like she had been in the centuries leading up to then, and she apparently was to a certain extent. The second point is that it's very unlikely that the pope would just randomly assume that Mary Magdalene is such a sinner and relate her to a story about sinfulness unless he had specific intentions related to Mary Magdalene. This is the pope we're talking about so it's very unlikely that he would have randomly made such an error on a whim. It is obviously much more likely that this was a calculated move. The third point is that it's very unlikely that this idea would have just randomly popped up out of nowhere after over 500 years of that narrative already having been in circulation. For over 500 years to have passed before this happened, there would obviously probably have been some kind of specific motive rather than just a random error. The fourth point is that Mary Magdalene is clearly distinguished from the unnamed sinner in Luke 7:36-50 by being mentioned right afterward as a part of a group of women in Luke 8:1-3. Mary Magdalene appears in a list of names of women in the second verse right after the narrative that Pope Gregory referred to in the sixth century. For anybody who knew the Gospel of Luke, particularly the pope, to have asserted that Mary Magdalene is a sinner because of the narrative in Luke 7:36-50, it would have been much more likely that their reasoning for doing so revolved around specific intentions related to Mary Magdalene rather than just a random mistake. To know verses 7:36-50 and then completely disregard verses 8:1-3, especially with there being absolutely no text in between, would obviously be much more likely to have been about specific intentions related to Mary Magdalene rather than just a random mistake. Some argue that Mary Magdalene's presence right after Luke 7:36-50 could have influenced Pope Gregory to make that mistake, but there is a list of multiple women in Luke 8:1-3 so he still would have had to have singled out Mary Magdalene with no basis for doing so other than specific intentions related to Mary Magdalene, and the next point provides further support for the assertion that he would have known better. The fifth point is that Mary Magdalene is named multiple times in the Gospel of Luke and the sinner goes completely unnamed. Since Mary Magdalene is identified multiple times, she obviously wouldn't be the unnamed character in Luke 7:36-50. There appears to be instances in the Gospel of John that conceal Mary Magdalene's name but they appear to do so in a way that conceals her importance. The same is not the case with the Gospel of Luke, and particularly not in Luke 7:36-50 where a woman is primarily described as a sinner. Someone going unnamed when being described as a sinner obviously doesn't conceal their importance in the way that the Gospel of John does. The Gospel of John describes an unnamed beloved disciple who was present during the Crucifixion. The Gospel of Luke, on the other hand, describes an unnamed sinner. So the identification of Mary Magdalene at all in the Gospel of Luke clearly

distinguishes her from the unnamed sinner in Luke 7:36-50. The sixth point is that Mary Magdalene appears to have been well-known by many as the most important disciple for hundreds of years leading up to Pope Gregory's statements and the "orthodox church" (also known as the Catholic Church by that point) fought hard against people who they called heretics. Pope Gregory would have been very aware of Mary Magdalene's fame and importance, which clearly shows that it is even more likely that his claim about the supposed sinfulness of Mary Magdalene was about specific intentions related to Mary Magdalene rather than just a random mistake. The seventh point is that the Catholic Church also ended up labeling Mary Magdalene as a prostitute, which is not a label used in Luke 7:36-50 and was completely invented outside of that narrative without any evidence at all, and the Catholic Church kept that label in place until 1969. It's one thing for one pope to make a random mistake once, as unlikely as that appears to be in this particular case, but it's entirely something else when the Catholic Church then adds the specific label of prostitute, which has nothing specific to do with Luke 7:36-50 and is not supported by any evidence at all, and then keeps that label in place for over 1,300 years. Some argue that the description in Luke 7:36-50 of the sinfulness of this woman implies that she was a prostitute. However, sinfulness could relate to anything, including adultery. Furthermore, if the sinfulness was only specifically related to being a prostitute, then the woman could have been specifically referred to as a prostitute. Matthew 21:31-32 use the Greek word πόρναι ("pornai"), which means "prostitutes". Those verses also refer to tax collectors. So those verses specifically call out two different specific accusations. If someone was to be known for one thing, then that one thing can be specifically described instead of just being generally referred to as sinfulness. So for someone to be generally referred to as just a sinner, that's a far cry from a specific reference to prostitution. The specific label of prostitute and that label staying in place for over 1,300 years without any evidence at all clearly shows that this effort goes far beyond Pope Gregory, and that shows that it doesn't even matter whether Pope Gregory was the first to do it. The eighth point is that for the Roman Catholic Church to have admitted their mistake in 1969 and to have taken the label of prostitute away means that the Catholic Church has known about this mistake since the mistake was first made. Otherwise, the portrayal of Mary Magdalene as a prostitute would have just been another old tradition like so many others. The traditions that have been passed down have been kept unless there is a specific reason for a tradition not to be kept. In this case, the tradition that Mary Magdalene is a prostitute was passed down for over 1,300 years. To suddenly reverse course on that after over 1,300 years would realistically mean that information to the contrary was passed down as well. So the Catholic Church had known that they made a mistake for over 1,300 years and kept it in place that entire time, which shows that that there was specific effort to discredit Mary Magdalene for at least 1,300 years. In conclusion, the attack by Pope Gregory in the sixth century is evidence that the pope attempted 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 following points show that Christianity was widely spread among different groups of women in the first few centuries, which supports the conclusions just previously reached that Mary Magdalene spread the Christian Revolution and that the Revolution that she spread continued to spread for hundreds of years. These points don't show direct evidence of those conclusions, but they show that someone began a

movement that was separate from the "orthodox church" (later to be known as the Catholic Church) that led to the wide spreading of Christianity among groups of women, which strongly supports the conclusions that Mary Magdalene spread the Christian Revolution and that the Revolution that she spread continued to spread for hundreds of years.

1. 2 John conceals the identity of a woman who is described as "the elder" and as a "chosen sister", conceals the identity of another woman who is described as a "chosen lady", and refers to "children" who were apparently students of the woman who the letter is addressed to. Therefore, this letter shows evidence that there were multiple female Christian leaders.
2. 2 Corinthians conceals the identity of someone who was apparently praised in the gospel through all "the churches" and that person was probably a woman, which shows evidence that a woman was praised in the gospel through all "the churches", or at least a lot of "the churches" that represented true Christianity.
3. The letter that has been labeled the First Epistle of Clement refers to a group of Christian women who were tortured and murdered.
4. Origen's "Contra Celsum" refers to sects of Christianity that were formed by women, and that writing appears to have been produced in the third century.

It has been shown that it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone, that Christ was crucified, that a religion based on Christ began spreading in the first century, that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple of Christ and spread the Christian Revolution in the first century, and that the Revolution that she spread continued to spread for at least a half of a millennium. That doesn't necessarily show that Christianity is the true religion, but it provides the base needed to move forward with the assessment that shows that Christianity is the true religion.

The Revolution that Mary Magdalene began spreading in the first century appears 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.

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 appears to have been money, power, politics, and violence. But that doesn't appear 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 appears to have been spread mostly among the lower class. There doesn't appear to have been any ruling power gained from the Revolution. Instead, it appears that those who tried to conceal information about her Revolution were seeking power, and that in turn involves politics. There also doesn't appear 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 as God. 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 appear to have been 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 appears that the 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 appear 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 represent the truth through the logic of Christ's teachings. That is apparently 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 appears to have been able to reach a large portion of the population simply by spreading the truth of Christ's teachings.

Since it appears to have been Christ's teachings that allowed Mary Magdalene to be so successful, it appears 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 religion. Since Christ's teachings appear to have been the catalyst for the successful spread of Christianity, it appears that a man could have been successful at spreading the teachings. Hypothetically, if Christ was merely a man, 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. However, Christ teaching people led to very different results than Mary Magdalene teaching people. As of the day of the Crucifixion, Christ was being crucified and only a few people remained with Christ. As previously shown, the information about Peter and others disowning Christ appears to be reliable information because it's very incriminating and would potentially be problematic in the spreading of a religion, so it is not likely that someone would want to falsely make up that information. Additionally, the information about only a few people remaining with Christ also appears to be reliable because that is also not likely information that would be advantageous to falsely make up. If anything, that information could be problematic in spreading a religion. Any information about doubting a religion would be counterproductive to spreading that religion. Therefore, the information about Peter and others disowning Christ and the information about only a few people remaining with Christ is fairly reliable. So the result of Christ teaching people not only led to Christ being crucified but also led to only a few people remaining with Christ.

Christ took a path that led to Christ being crucified and only a few people remaining with Christ. That is incredibly different than the result of Mary Magdalene spreading the Revolution that spread information about her being the top disciple of Christ for over 500 years. As of the day of the Crucifixion, Christianity only remained with a few people, and only if Mary Magdalene wasn't the only person who understood the teachings. If Mary Magdalene was the only person who understood the teachings, then there would have been only one Christian on the day of the Crucifixion. The main point being that the spread of Christianity had hit an extremely low point on the day of the Crucifixion. That was a result of Christ's

Ministry. Christ took a path that led to the spread of Christianity hitting an extremely low point and Christ being crucified, but that path also led to someone who Christ taught spreading the Revolution that spread information about her being the top disciple of Christ for over 500 years. So there was an extremely low point on the day of the Crucifixion, and then someone who Christ taught launched the Revolution that spread for over 500 years. So obviously there was quite a turnaround after the Crucifixion, and such a turnaround was led by a woman who was taught by Christ and who spread the teachings of Christ.

Throughout history, women have been imprisoned and murdered for trying to spread a revolution or to spark some kind of change in society. That's not to say that just because a woman successfully spread a revolution that she must be spreading the truth. However, without money, violence, or ruling power, it would have been incredibly unlikely that a poor woman on her own would have been so successful in the first century. We're not just talking about having a small following or being a local celebrity. We're talking about generations of people for over a half of a millennium exalting Mary Magdalene as the top disciple of Christ all the while a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government worked very hard to suppress information about her. Those exact dynamics are incredibly unique. There have been women who launched revolutions, even in ancient times, but Mary Magdalene did it without wealth, violence, and ruling power and she did it to the extent that generations of people exalted her as the top disciple of God for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. All of this from a woman who was taught by Christ. That shows clear evidence that the teachings of Christ allowed Mary Magdalene to be successful at driving results that lasted for over 500 years.

Given that this incredible success of Mary Magdalene can be attributed to the teachings of Christ, then Christ could have been that successful even if Christ was merely a man. Hypothetically, if a man and a woman would have spread the same religion in the first century separately from each other, it would obviously have been far more likely that the man would have been more successful. Additionally, it would have been far more likely that the woman would have been imprisoned or murdered. If one was to be successful and the other was to be murdered, the obviously probable scenario would have been that the man would have been successful and the woman would have been murdered. Hypothetically, if Christ was merely a man, then a man would have been crucified and a woman who was a student of that man would have launched a revolution that spread information about her generation after generation for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. That scenario is incredibly unlikely. Therefore, it is incredibly unlikely that Christ was merely a man. Therefore, it is incredibly unlikely that Christ is not God. That shows defining evidence that Christ is God.

Additionally, given that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple of Christ, it appears that she would have had a similar strategy as Christ unless Christ deliberately took a different path than the path that Mary Magdalene was taught to take. The teachings themselves would have been the same, but the strategies appear to have been far different. Christ taught Mary Magdalene, and yet Christ appears to have implemented a different strategy than Mary Magdalene. We will go into further detail in Part 4 about why exactly anyone wanted Christ crucified and how there is a much more specific reason than what the Gospels describe. Regardless of the exact reason, something happened that led to the Crucifixion and then there were only a few people remaining. What Christ exactly did that influenced anyone to want Christ crucified is not exactly what Mary Magdalene did. If Mary Magdalene had done exactly what Christ had

done, then she realistically would have been murdered with only a few people remaining if anyone. So the difference in results shows clear evidence that different strategies were taken. That conclusion combined with the conclusion that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple of Christ shows evidence that Mary Magdalene was taught to implement a different strategy. All of that shows evidence that Christ deliberately took a path that led to the Crucifixion and deliberately taught Mary Magdalene to take a different path that led to her launching the Revolution that spread generation after generation for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. 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.

Three main conclusions have been reached that show that Christianity is the true religion.

1. Without money, violence, or ruling power, it would have been incredibly unlikely that a poor woman on her own would have been so successful that generations of people would have exalted her as the top disciple of God for over 500 years all the while a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government suppressed information about her. The only realistic way that could have been accomplished is if the truth taught by God was spreading.
2. Hypothetically, if a man and a woman were to spread the same religion in the first century separately from each other, it would obviously have been far more likely that the man would have been more successful. Additionally, it would have been far more likely that the woman would have been imprisoned or murdered. If one was to be successful and the other was to be murdered, the obviously probable scenario would have been that the man would have been successful and the woman would have been murdered. Hypothetically, if Christ was merely a man, then a man would have been crucified and a woman who was a student of that man would have launched a revolution that spread information about her generation after generation for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. That scenario is incredibly unlikely. Therefore, it is incredibly unlikely that Christ was merely a man. Therefore, it is incredibly unlikely that Christ is not God. That shows defining evidence that Christ is God.
3. Regardless of the exact reason for why anyone wanted Christ crucified, something happened that led to the Crucifixion and then there were only a few people remaining. What Christ exactly did that influenced anyone to want Christ crucified is not exactly what Mary Magdalene did. If Mary Magdalene had done exactly what Christ had done, then she realistically would have been murdered with only a few people remaining if anyone. So the difference in results shows clear evidence that different strategies were taken. That conclusion combined with the conclusion that Mary Magdalene was the top disciple of Christ shows evidence that Mary Magdalene was taught to implement a different strategy. All of that shows evidence that Christ deliberately took a path that led to the Crucifixion and deliberately taught Mary Magdalene to take a different path that led to her launching the Revolution that spread generation after generation for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. 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.

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 significant 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, John 21:24 then appears to be fraudulent as well. However, it's not 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, which by itself shows that the Gospel of John appears to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene. Additionally, there appears to have been a major 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 were opposed to that. That shows additional 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 appear as though it is based on the testimony of an unnamed disciple who is not Mary Magdalene. Again, it's not 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's not 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" 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's very far-fetched. It would obviously make so much more sense if the person who gave this testimony was one of those four people who are specifically mentioned as having been present during the Crucifixion. 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 conclude 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 possesses 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. Similar to John 20:16, 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 was placed on John 20:16 because of the other Resurrection narratives in the Gospel of John, and so there appears 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 appears that less importance was placed on this testimony. As a result, it appears 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 unless the original testimony is true testimony. Therefore, the presence of only one person rather than multiple people as well as that person being presented anonymously 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 appears overwhelmingly 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 appear 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 appears to be truthful. The fundamental information in John 19:26-27 appears to represent real eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene of communication between Christ, Mother Mary, and Mary Magdalene during the Crucifixion. That assessment also provides evidence that Mary Magdalene appears 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 possesses fragments of the Testimony of Mary Magdalene and there has been evidence shown that Mary Magdalene's name has 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 an apparently 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 appears to be in line with the first main possibility, and the presence of an unnamed disciple in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John appears to be in line with the second main possibility. Mary Magdalene's identity appears to have been concealed in John 19:26-27, and the presence of an unnamed disciple in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John appears 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 appear to be in line with.

In John 1:38-39, there isn't any theological agenda that appears 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 Gospels, there doesn't appear to be any serious claims being made. There doesn't appear 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 signaled their partners in the other boat to come and help them, and they came and filled both boats so full that 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 son of Zebedee, 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 son of Zebedee, and John are all fishermen; Peter and Andrew are brothers; James son of Zebedee and John are brothers; the father of James son of Zebedee and John is named Zebedee; James son of Zebedee 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 son of Zebedee, 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 son of Zebedee 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 in these narratives, 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 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" came and ate with him and his disciples. When the Pharisees saw this, they asked his disciples: "Why does your teacher 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 sitting at his tax booth. "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 far 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 1:43-51
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."

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, 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 a person becoming a disciple 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 about a person becoming a disciple. With the set of narratives about a person becoming a disciple and the set of narratives about the Resurrection, we see one account in each set of narratives that is about a disciple making a choice for themselves to be with Christ without being verbally told to and all of the other narratives in each set either describe a disciple as being verbally called to be a disciple or describe Christ physically appearing after the Resurrection 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 without being verbally told to: one is about the

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 around 60 minutes and the first hour would be around 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 appears to have been common to describe events as having occurred at the third, sixth, or ninth hour. At the very least, we can see that it was common among the Gospel writers. 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 was 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 those verses also show an example of diverting from that pattern by describing the eleventh hour. So the narrative follows 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 the second-to-last-hour so it is the last hour to look for workers before the last hour of daytime. The twelfth hour marks the last hour of daylight and therefore the last hour of work, so the eleventh hour marks the last hour to get workers. So the narrative goes by 3's until it reaches the last hour to get workers, 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 appears that John 4:52 follows the societal significance of the number 7. With the number 7 symbolizing completion, this narrative describes a fever leaving someone at the seventh hour. So there appears 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 appear 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 Ραββουνι ("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 do that. It appears that it was common to just use the word "Rhabbi" or "Rabbouni" without any explicit equivalency to the word "Didaskale". Therefore, there appears 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 conveying 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 by itself. "Didaskale" is used in plenty of other instances in the Gospels without an explicit equivalency to "Rhabbi" or "Rabbouni". "Didaskale" and "Rhabbi" are used plenty in the Gospels 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 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 sabachthani?" – 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 sabachthani?" – 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 apparently represent real eyewitness testimony from Mary Magdalene. Mary Magdalene appears 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 15:34 and Matthew 27:46 would obviously appear to be fraudulent, and therefore these verses apparently don't represent real eyewitness testimony. Additionally, these verses appear 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 of Mark and Matthew appear 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 expression in combination with an explicit equivalency to the Greek translation shows a certain special significance to that expression. In these instances, that special significance does not appear to be that of real eyewitness testimony. Instead, that special significance derives from the special significance that the author or authors saw in that particular expression from the Hebrew Bible. "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?" appears to have been an important expression among the Jewish population and it comes from the Hebrew Bible. That is apparently where the special significance comes from. So the use of a Hebrew or Aramaic expression 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 wouldn't appear to be that significant unless those verses represent real eyewitness testimony. The importance of the exact wording of the quoted dialogue in John 1:38-39 and John 20:16 apparently comes from these verses representing real eyewitness testimony. If those verses don't represent real eyewitness testimony, then the exact wording wouldn't be of that much importance. Mark 15:34 and Matthew 27:46 are different in that they place importance on specific wording by placing importance on an expression from the Hebrew Bible. So the use of a Hebrew or Aramaic expression 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 appear to represent real eyewitness testimony because it appears that those verses include an explicit equivalency to a Greek translation rather than just using "Didaskale" by itself 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 this verse appears to represent 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 also that person was a woman. That provides very significant evidence that John 20:16 represents real eyewitness testimony.

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 portrayed 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 portrays as appearances to supposedly 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 appears 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 an effort to present multiple people instead of just one 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 appear to have been fraudulently altered to conceal Mary Magdalene's name and to include a fictional second person, it appears 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 represent real eyewitness testimony about 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 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 appear to have been the source for a lot of the most important information considering a lot of that information involves her.

Nevertheless, the apparent 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 apparent 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 appears to have been somewhat of an obsession with John the Baptist, and portraying 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 apparently fraudulent verses in chapter 20. So we have already seen that there appears to be some verses describing an unnamed disciple that represent real history and that there appears 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 appears to be multiple examples of an unnamed disciple in narratives that exalt Peter. That was probably a natural strategy because those who did that appear to have wanted to exalt Peter and conceal information about Mary Magdalene. So it appears 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. Whoever fraudulently altered this narrative in the Gospel of John obviously 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 and since it's the Last Supper the setting already involves several people anyway; but in John 18:15, the presence of an unnamed disciple takes attention away from Peter and Peter would otherwise be the only person mentioned, unlike the narrative about the Last Supper. 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 appears 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 appears 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, elders, and teachers of the law 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. The combination of the strangeness and irrelevancy of this information about the nakedness of some unnamed man, the fact this person is described as following Christ around the time of the arrest but is also described as fleeing once the arrest took place, the fact that this information comes right before Peter is

described as following Christ after the arrest, and the presence of a second person described in the Gospel of John as following Christ after the arrest shows that such a description in the Gospel of Mark appears to be a response to the presence of a second person in the Gospel of John in an effort to explain the presence of a second person while leaving Peter as the only one described as continuing to follow Christ after the arrest. Again, we will go into more detail in Part 5 about how the Gospels respond to information contained in each other and how the original version of the Gospel of John was circulating before the Gospel of Mark was produced, and we will also see other examples of the Gospel of Mark responding to information contained in the Gospel of John. 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 described in the Gospel of John as following Christ after the arrest.

So the apparent scenario is that the original version of the Gospel of John described someone other than Peter as having followed Christ after Christ was arrested, and then the Gospel of John was 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 the high priest's servant. 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 the high priest's servant. It may be true that Peter cut off the ear of the high priest's servant 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 previously shown, there is an unnamed disciple described in chapter 20 as having run to the tomb and then there are a few instances of an unnamed disciple in chapter 21. As also 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 appears 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 he 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 μαριαμ ("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 her 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. More specifically, the translation should really be "the Magdalene" rather than just "Magdalene". So really she is being called "the Magdalene" in the Bible, which is different than using "Magdalene" as an extension of her name. We will go into more detail in Part 6 about the name "Magdalene" and where she was from. For now, we can see that the name "Magdalene" really comes from her being labeled as "the Magdalene" and that label is probably a reference to the city where she was from, and therefore it appears that "Magdalene" should not be considered a part of her 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 those assertions and with the knowledge that there appears to have been fraudulent concealment of information about Mariam, we can review all of the instances that explicitly refer to Mariam, all of the instances in which there is a reference to an unnamed disciple that appears to 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 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 appears 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 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 few days of Christ's Ministry appear 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 supposedly identified as "the Son of God". Because of this specific timing, we can see that either the Gospel of John or the Synoptic Gospels apparently 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 appear 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 narrative 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? One could argue that maybe Christ told this information to disciples. However, if that were the case, such a narrative would have likely turned out like a lot of the narratives in the Gospels in that it would be described that Christ was telling these stories. Many narratives in the Gospels describe Christ telling people certain information, and there are several narratives that describe Christ telling a story. So any story told by Christ would likely have been written in a way that describes Christ telling that information. Therefore, it really does remain a mystery as to how the baptism of Christ or the temptation of Christ narratives ended up in any of the Gospels. 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 appears 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 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 if Christ is God? 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 Christ 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. How could Christ have ever been baptized for repentance for the forgiveness of sins if Christ is God? How could God have ever been baptized for repentance for the forgiveness of sins? It doesn't appear to make sense for Christ to have been baptized by John the Baptist. Instead, the baptism of Christ narratives appear to simply be 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 appear 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, how could Christ have been tempted for 40 days in the desert if Christ is God? How could 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 God 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 portray Christ's will as separate from God's will. They both portray 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, how could there be anything for God to be forgiven for and how could God ever be tempted for 40 days in the desert? Both of these sets of 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 appear 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, specifically 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. The fundamental difference is that the

Synoptic Gospels portray the baptisms themselves as granting forgiveness and Josephus explains that the baptisms merely represented symbolism of the transformation a person already went through. 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. Luke doesn't specifically describe Christ as coming from Galilee before the baptism narrative and describes John the Baptist preaching to all the country around the Jordan River, so Luke provides a description that could include John the Baptist having been in Galilee; but both Mark and Matthew specifically place John the Baptist only in Judea in terms of his preaching and baptizing, and Luke first describes John the Baptist in the desert, which would realistically refer to Judea or further south where the desert was rather than the more fruitful land of Galilee. In other words, the Synoptic Gospels as a whole portray Christ as leaving Galilee and going to be baptized by John the Baptist who is described as preaching and baptizing mainly in Judea. However, the Synoptic Gospels describe John the Baptist as having spoken out against Herod Antipas and describe Herod Antipas as having ordered the arrest and execution of John the Baptist. Herod Antipas ruled over Galilee, which means that John the Baptist probably mainly resided in Galilee, not Judea. Furthermore, Josephus also describes Herod Antipas as having ordered the arrest and execution of John the Baptist. So both the Synoptic Gospels and Josephus describe Herod Antipas as having ordered the arrest and execution of John the Baptist, and the Synoptic Gospels appear to contradict themselves by describing John the Baptist as having preached and baptized mainly in Judea and then describing John the Baptist as having been arrested and executed according to the orders of 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, which leaves no explanation for how those narrative ever ended up in any of the Gospels; the theology in the baptism of Christ and the temptation of Christ narratives appears 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 these narratives is fraudulent; and there is evidence that John the Baptist mainly resided in Galilee and the baptism of Christ narratives 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 son of Zebedee and John as the third and fourth. Luke describes Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John as the first three disciples of Christ and excludes Andrew. 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's 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. For one of these must become a witness with us of his resurrection."

Acts 1:21-22 describe the selection process of a so-called "twelfth apostle" since Judas was no longer with them. It is explained 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 appears 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 appear that at least twelve of Christ's disciples became disciples of Christ while John the Baptist was still actively baptizing. Otherwise, how could any of those twelve men have been a disciple "beginning from John's baptism"? So it appears, according to Acts 1:21-22, that Christ would have had at least twelve disciples 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 appears, 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 disciples 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 son of Zebedee and John as in the Gospel of Luke. What if Acts 1:21-22 are 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? Since that was mentioned, it's being supposed that there was 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 disciple of Christ or a part of "the Twelve" 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. It was previously asserted in Part 2 that the fundamental structure of John 1:38-39 appears to be authentic and likely originally derived from real eyewitness testimony. Therefore, it appears 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 appear to contradict the timing of the narrative in the Gospel of John about the first disciple; the narratives in the Synoptic Gospels about the supposed calling of the first disciples also contradict 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 preached and baptized mainly in Judea, the contrast that the Synoptic Gospels show in relation to Acts 1:21-22, and the evidence that shows that John 1:38-39 likely originally derived from real eyewitness testimony all give merit to the conclusion that the Gospel of John is likely truthful, at least to a certain extent, in describing the first disciple of Christ and 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 evidence that there is probably somewhat truthful testimony about the first disciple in the Gospel of John, that the original 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, the only Gospel that doesn't include a narrative about the supposed baptism of Christ, and 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 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 were 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 1:43-45
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."

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 even 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 in Part 2 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 the introduction of Peter. 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 appears 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 appears to have forced that information into the text to exalt Peter. Given the assessment of the four points just previously stated, it appears that John 1:40-42 are fraudulent.

Not only were Andrew and Peter apparently 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 apparently 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 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."
So they went and saw where he was staying, and spent that day with him. It was about the tenth hour.

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 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 in doing so, 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 appears 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's not until Philip enters the scene that it's described that Andrew and Peter were from Bethsaida. Why wasn't Bethsaida mentioned when Andrew and Peter were first introduced? 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 appears to be 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" appear 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 appear to be fraudulent. So it has been shown that information about Mariam has been concealed and that "the Twelve" appear to have been fraudulently given attention. So the incredible attention that Philip, one of "the Twelve", receives in the Gospel of John appears to be fraudulent. Therefore, that is even further evidence that the supposed calling of Philip as described in the Gospel of John is 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: 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 son of Zebedee, 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 just one person as having become the first disciple of Christ; the fundamental structure of John 1:38-39 is truthful and represents real eyewitness testimony; 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 having John the Baptist executed. 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, it appears 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 appears that there was only a small group of people who followed Christ during Christ's Ministry and people continued to follow John the Baptist. For these reasons, it appears 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 11:2-3
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 7:18-19
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 appears 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 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 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."

Luke 3:19-20
But when John rebuked Herod the tetrarch because of Herodias, his brother's wife, and all the other evil things he had done, Herod added this to them all: He locked John up in prison.

These verses claim that John the Baptist was arrested for supposedly speaking out against Herod's marriage to Herodias. In Mark and Matthew, there is also the claim that John the Baptist 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". 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 narratives that describe the supposed reason for the execution of John the Baptist appear to be fraudulent. Through all of the narratives about John the Baptist, the Gospels tell a dramatic story that is not only very different but also 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 appears 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. It had already been shown that the Bible appears 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 preaching and baptizing mainly in Judea. Now we can see that the Bible also appears to be fraudulent in the way that it describes John the Baptist as having prepared the way for Christ. There might not be a single narrative in the Gospels about John the Baptist that isn't fraudulent. John the Baptist appears 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 apparently 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 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 27:1-2
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 is described as having been 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 appears 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. The first day of the week of unleavened bread is an annual Sabbath day and occurred on the day after the Crucifixion (we will get into the timing of the first day of the week of unleavened bread shortly), so carrying out an arrest and then keeping a prisoner for multiple days through an annual Sabbath day and into a week-long festival would have been so severely against Jewish law and how the Jewish priests of the temple operated with everything going on in Jerusalem during that time that it's not realistic to believe that happened. Christ having been arrested during the night is evidence that the priests wanted to do everything quietly, which would mean that they probably also wanted to do everything quickly. Therefore, it appears unrealistic for more than 24 hours to have passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. The simplest and what appears to be the most 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 appears to have been only one morning involved in this sequence, which would mean that it appears that no more than 24 hours passed. More evidence will be assessed later to show that it appears 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 appears that less than 24 hours passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. The same general sequence, which appears to have 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 correct?

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 includes information about what is described as the Passover and the exodus of Israelites out of Egypt. We will also assess certain verses from Genesis, Leviticus, and Numbers.

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 (there is both a religious and civil 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 instructions for families to get a lamb on the tenth day to sacrifice later. Exodus 12:6-8 describe instructions for people to sacrifice those lambs on the fourteenth day "at twilight" and to have a feast "that same night", which implies that this feast was supposed to occur during the night on the fourteenth day after the sacrificing of lambs. 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 that "the Lord's Passover" was supposed to occur on "that same night". So the sacrificing of lambs occurred on the fourteenth day "at twilight", and "the Lord's Passover" as well as the preceding feast of "the Lord's Passover" occurred during the night on the fourteenth day after the sacrificing of lambs.

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 אַךְ ("ak") בַּיּוֹם ("bayyowm") הָרִאשׁוֹן ("harisown") (Hebrew is read from right to left but the order of words here goes from left to right). 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") can mean "but", which could represent a contrast with what was previously said (it's translated as "except" in Exodus 12:16). 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". Furthermore, the most defining way to show how Exodus 12:15 should be interpreted is the difference between a preparation day and a Sabbath day. Preparation days occur before a Sabbath day to prepare for that Sabbath, and no work is supposed to be done on a Sabbath. So the removal of leaven, which would be preparation as well as "work", should occur on a preparation day rather than a Sabbath day. Therefore, the day to remove leaven would be the day before the first day of the week of unleavened bread.

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 וּבַיּוֹם ("ubayyowm") הָרִאשׁוֹן ("harisown"). 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 "before" or "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 Sabbath day.

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 Sabbath. There is to be no work on a Sabbath day. So the preparation day should not be on the same day as a Sabbath. The preparation day is for the preparation of a Sabbath and should not be on the same day as a Sabbath. It is typical and 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. According to the book of Exodus, 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, and also specifically the first day of the week of unleavened bread, would then appear to be the fourteenth day. So the preparation day for the week of unleavened bread would then be 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 appear to be the first evening of unleavened bread, after leaven was removed earlier. According to Exodus 12:18, that evening would 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 current common belief regarding 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 as happening before the “morning” that is described. 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 or evening. 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 appears 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 isn’t 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 while sunset and evening had not yet been described. Therefore, when day and night are first described, it is day and so it appears 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 a night and morning is within a day, but evening is not all of a night and morning is not all of a day. Evening refers to an early part of a night and morning refers to an early part of a 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 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 appears 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 or evening 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 or evening 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 appears 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 appears to be that morning precedes evening within a given calendar day.

We can more closely examine verses 6-8, 11, and 12-14 of chapter 12 of Exodus for more specific guidance.

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."

Exodus 12:6-8 outline that the slaughtering of lambs is to take place on the 14th day "at twilight"; and then afterward, on "that same night", a dinner is to be eaten that is referred to in verse 12:11 as "the Lord's Passover". Verses 12:12-14 then describe that every firstborn in Egypt who would not be passed over would be struck down "on that same night". So the order of events is the slaughtering of lambs, the eating of the Passover Seder, and the striking down of every firstborn who would not be passed over. So the Passover Seder definitely occurred in between the slaughtering of lambs and the striking down of every firstborn who would not be passed over. Furthermore, chapter 12 of Exodus goes on to describe the Pharoah of Egypt letting the Israelites go following the described striking down of firstborns, and the day that the Israelites are described as first leaving Egypt is described as the 15th day of Nisan, the first day of the week of unleavened bread, which is an annual Sabbath. Therefore, the period of daylight immediately following the eating of the Passover Seder is that of the 15th day. So it can't be the case that evening precedes morning and that the Passover Seder is eaten during the evening of the 14th day because then the period of daylight immediately following the Passover Seder would be that of the 14th day. So it has to be the case that the period of daylight immediately after the Passover Seder is that of the 15th day. The next question then becomes about whether it was still the 14th day when the Passover Seder was eaten, which would reflect morning preceding evening, or if the 15th day had already begun, which would reflect evening preceding morning.

The phrase "that same night" in verse 12:8 can be more appropriately translated as "on that night". The use of the word "that" is a reference to something that has already been established. In other words, the phrase "that night" would refer to a day that has already been referenced. Otherwise, the use of the word

"that" would be useless and would really be incorrect. If "that" wasn't being used to reference a day that has already been referenced, then a phrase like "at night" or "in the night" would have likely been used instead of "that night". The use of the word "that" is an indication of something that would already have been recognized. The day that had been just previously recognized was the 14th day when the slaughtering of lambs was described. Therefore, the reference in verse 12:6 to sacrificing lambs at "twilight" on the 14th day appears to refer to the same day as the eating of the Passover Seder, which shows that the Passover Seder is eaten on the 14th day rather than the 15th day.

Exodus 16:11-12 and 29:38-39 provide examples of how a part of a day would be referred to if that day had not been previously referred to.

Exodus 16:11-12
The Lord said to Moses, "I have heard the grumbling of the Israelites. Tell them, 'At twilight you will eat meat, and in the morning you will be filled with bread. Then you will know that I am the Lord your God.'"

Exodus 29:38-39
"This is what you are to offer on the altar regularly each day: two lambs a year old. Offer one in the morning and the other at twilight."

Both Exodus 16:11-12 as well as Exodus 29:38-39 use the phrase "in the morning". If the phrase "that morning" was used, then that would suggest that the day that encompasses that morning was already referred to, but the phrase "in the morning" doesn't necessarily. These verses present examples of what it looks like to refer to a part of a day when that day hasn't already been referred to. So the first conclusion about these verses shows further support for the conclusion that the phrase "on that night" appears to refer to a day that had been previously referred to as opposed to describing a day that has not been referenced at all, which shows that the Passover Seder takes place on the same day as the sacrificing of lambs, the 14th day.

The second conclusion is that Exodus 16:11-12 describe eating happening during "twilight". There is debate about what exactly the Hebrew word that gets translated as "twilight" means. It's debated whether that word should be translated as "afternoon", "twilight", or "evening". Since that word is used here in association with eating dinner, then we can derive the conclusion that dinner takes place during this part of the day. Furthermore, going back to Exodus 12:8, that verse describes eating the Passover Seder "that night". Exodus 16:11-12 say "at twilight, you will eat meat" and Exodus 12:8 says "that night they are to eat the meat". So those are both referring to eating meat for dinner, which means that they are referring to the same part of the day. One refers to that part of the day as "twilight" and the other uses "night". That shows that "twilight" is a part of "night", which shows that the sacrificing of lambs at "twilight" on the 14th day occurred on the same day as the Passover Seder "that night".

The third conclusion is in relation to the idea that the Hebrew words that get translated as "at twilight" should really be translated as "between evenings". Some argue that the phrase should be "between evenings", which would indicate a time before night, like afternoon for example. However, Exodus 16:11-12 and 29:38-39 both distinguish between morning and the part of the day represented by these Hebrew words that get translated as "at twilight". Since those verses separate morning from that part of

the day and since morning occurs between evenings, the phrase should not be translated as "between evenings". Therefore, "at twilight" is a more correct translation.

The fourth conclusion is in relation to the ordering of morning and twilight. Exodus 29:38-39 say "This is what you are to offer on the altar regularly each day: two lambs a year old. Offer one in the morning and the other at twilight." Those verses refer to a daily ritual, and therefore would realistically describe the different parts of the day in chronological order. Exodus 16:11-12 describe twilight before morning but the setting of those verses is in the middle of the day, so in that story the next evening would have come before the next morning. The daily instructions in verses 29:38-39 simply refer to order within a given day and name morning before twilight, which shows further that morning precedes evening given that twilight has already been shown to be a part of night.

We can now turn to Leviticus.

Leviticus 23:5-8
"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."

These verses say that "the Lord's Passover begins at twilight on the fourteenth day". The Hebrew words that are translated as "the Lord's Passover" are sometimes translated as referring specifically to the sacrifices that take place on the fourteenth day, not "the Passover" or the Passover Seder. However, while a reference to "the Lord's Passover" could refer to the sacrifice for Passover, that isn't explicitly stated and such an interpretation ignores the Passover Seder. Although, regardless of the exact interpretation, it has already been shown that "twilight" is a part of night and that the sacrifices and the Passover Seder both occur on the 14th day. Furthermore, the most obvious interpretation of Leviticus 23:5 is simply that the Passover Seder takes place on the 14th day, and that shows further evidence that the Passover Seder occurs on the 14th day, not the 15th day, and therefore that morning precedes evening.

Numbers 9:3
"Have the Israelites celebrate the Passover at the appointed time. Celebrate it at the appointed time, at twilight on the fourteenth day of this month, in accordance with all its rules and regulations."

Numbers 9:10-11
"Tell the Israelites: 'When any of you or your descendants are unclean because of a dead body or are away on a journey, they may still celebrate the Lord's Passover. They are to celebrate it on the fourteenth day of the second month at twilight. They are to eat the lamb, together with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. They must not leave any of it till morning or break any of its bones. When they celebrate the Passover, they must follow all the regulations."

Numbers 9:3 refers to observing the Passover "in accordance with all its rules and regulations", which refers to everything related to Passover and so wouldn't just refer to the sacrifices, and that verse also specifically states that all of that should happen "at twilight on the 14th day". Numbers 9:3 shows defining

evidence that the Passover Seder is eaten on the 14th day, not the 15th day, and therefore that morning precedes evening.

Numbers 9:10-11 refer to people observing the Passover a month after the usual time because they were supposedly "unclean" for the original observance. These verses state that the observance should occur on the 14th day of that month at twilight, mirroring the usual observance of the Passover on the 14th day of the previous month, and these verses state that such observance is about eating the lamb, which shows clear evidence that the Passover Seder occurs on the 14th day, not the 15th day, and therefore that morning precedes evening.

So now we can return to Exodus 12:18, the verse previously shown that describes eating unleavened bread from the evening of the 14th day to the evening of the 21st day. If the beginning of a day was considered to be evening, then the evening of the 14th day, which is supposed to be the first evening of unleavened bread according to Exodus 12:18, would have occurred before the removal of leaven on the 14th day. So the first evening of unleavened bread would occur before the removal of leaven, which doesn't make as much sense as removing leaven before the first evening of unleavened bread. Additionally, the evening of the 14th day would stand alone apart from the Passover Seder and the week of unleavened bread that would begin with the evening of the 15th day in this scenario. There would be the evening of the 14th day, which would be the first evening of unleavened bread according to Exodus 12:18; and then after that would be the period of daylight on the 14th 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 15th day, the first day of the week of unleavened bread; and then on the 21st 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 21st 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 21st day, which would then mean that Exodus 12:18 mysteriously stops short by a half of a day, which wouldn't make sense. 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 14th 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 21st 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 14th day would occur before the evening of the 14th day. In that case, the removal of leaven would occur before the evening of the 14th day. Also, the Passover Seder would then be on the 14th day instead of the 15th day. The week of unleavened bread would begin with the morning of the 15th day and end with the evening of the 21st day. In this scenario, there are seven full days of unleavened bread beginning with the morning of the 15th day and ending with the evening of the 21st day, and the evening of the 14th day is an evening of unleavened bread that comes after the removal of leaven and before the first day of the week of unleavened. The evening of the 14th day being an evening of unleavened bread is not only in accordance with Exodus 12:18 but also 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 from the evening of the 14th day to the evening of the 21st day. If a day begins with morning, then the removal of

leaven would occur during the period of daylight on the 14th day, then the Passover Seder would be eaten with unleavened bread during the evening of the 14th day, and then the week of unleavened bread would begin with the morning of the 15th day and end with the evening of the 21st day. That would meet all of the requirements as previously set forth. There would be unleavened bread beginning with the evening of the 14th day and ending with the evening of the 21st day in accordance with Exodus 12:18, and the removal of leaven would occur before the evening of the 14th day.

Leviticus can provide further support.

Leviticus 23:26-27
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
"It is a sabbath of rest for you, and you must deny yourselves. From the evening of the ninth day of the month until the following evening you are to observe your Sabbath."

Verses 26-27 show 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 would need 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 are 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 with 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 verses 26-27 lay 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 verses 26-27 as well as verse 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 shown before, the right interpretation of Genesis does appear 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 14th day, not the 15th day.

A change in interpretation appears 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. It was the center of the Jewish population. 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 strictly adhere to traditions that came straight from the Hebrew Bible before the destruction of the temple in 70 than afterwards, and therefore more likely to deviate from those traditions after the destruction of the temple in 70 than before. 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 appears to have involved morning preceding evening. So for most of the first century, if not all of the first century, the Passover Seder appears to have been eaten on the fourteenth day, not the fifteenth day.

The fourteenth day is a preparation day for the week of unleavened bread, and specifically the first day of the week of unleavened bread; and then by evening, which would have still been the fourteenth day, the Passover Seder is supposed to be eaten along with unleavened bread. It is the fifteenth day, beginning with the following morning, that is considered the first day of the week of unleavened bread and is a Sabbath. So there are a full seven days, days fifteen through twenty-one, on which unleavened bread is supposed to be eaten. Unleavened bread is also supposed to be 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.

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 leaven is to be removed and 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 Sabbath. The twenty-first day is to be the seventh day of seven full days of unleavened bread and is also to be a Sabbath. 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 on which the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ was supposedly placed in a tomb, which was apparently the same day as the Crucifixion, as "Preparation Day". The Gospel of John describes the day on which the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ was supposedly placed in a tomb as "the day of Preparation of Passover Week" and "the Jewish day of Preparation", and portrays the day of the trial described, which was also apparently the same day as the Crucifixion, as "the day of Preparation". Most of those descriptions are a little ambiguous but they all are references to a preparation day and 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. 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.

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, Leviticus, and Numbers to analyze the sequences described in each Gospel regarding the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. All of the Synoptic Gospels portray 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 appear to portray Christ as having been crucified sometime during the period of daylight that immediately followed the Passover Seder, which would apparently 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 night of the Passover Seder 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 show evidence 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 appears to have happened on the preparation day for the week of unleavened bread ("the Passover week"), and all of the Synoptic Gospels describe the Crucifixion as having happened on a preparation day. So it does appear 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 according to the Synoptic Gospels.

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, the 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 at first 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. It's proposed that 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 was 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 have eaten the Passover Seder on the thirteenth day of Nisan. Even if this theory has any merit, it would only

apply to people who were far away from Jerusalem. This 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 could even be possibly 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 portrays 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" and it appears that less than 24 hours passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. So the Gospel of John appears to portray 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 appears 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 appear to have wanted to do 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 apparently 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, which by itself shows very definitively how unrealistic the timelines in the Synoptic Gospels are.

In conclusion, there were apparently less than 24 hours that passed between the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, which shows that the Synoptic Gospels appear 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 appear 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 appears much more reliable in relation to the timing of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, and the Synoptic Gospels appear to fraudulently portray 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 appear to describe the day of sacrificing lambs 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 22:7-8
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."

All of the Synoptic Gospels are discussing the day that 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 appears as though the Synoptic Gospels refer to the day that leaven is removed on 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" in Mark and Matthew can be more appropriately translated as "the first day of the unleavened". The Greek text that gives way to the translation of the phrase "the day of the Unleavened Bread" in Luke can be more appropriately translated as "the day of the unleavened". Some could argue that the phrases "the first day of the unleavened" and "the day of the unleavened" could be interpreted as the day to remove leaven, which is the day that the Passover is to be eaten with unleavened bread. Also, as shown earlier, Exodus 12:18 states that unleavened bread should be eaten from the evening of the fourteenth day to the evening of the twenty-first day. From that perspective, one could argue that the fourteenth day is "the first day of the unleavened". However, the fifteenth day is specifically designated as the first day of the week of unleavened bread and there is supposed to be a clear distinction between the Passover Seder and the week of unleavened bread. The Passover Seder is to commemorate what is described as the Passover, which relates to the story about the supposed deaths of firstborn sons in Egypt. "Passover" refers to being passed over in that Israelites who put blood on their homes would supposedly be passed over from the death that was to be brought upon Egypt. The next day is described as the beginning of "the exodus" and that is what the first day of the week of unleavened bread commemorates. Furthermore, the fourteenth day is when leaven is to be removed, so technically the fourteenth day is not necessarily a full day of the absence of leaven. The fifteenth day is though. Also, specifically about the narrative in Luke, it refers to the fourteenth day as "the day of the unleavened" as if there is only one day of unleavened bread, which is definitely incorrect. So while it may seem like it could be argued that the fourteenth day could represent "the first day of the unleavened" or "the day of the unleavened", it's technically incorrect and therefore shows error on the part of the people who produced these narratives, which 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 apparent 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 appears 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 apparent 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. So 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 appear to have had to have the Crucifixion of Christ completed sooner appears 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, which shows that this information in the Gospel of John is much more likely to have come from real eyewitness testimony than much of the information in 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 sabachthani?" – 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 sabachthani?" – which means, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"

As shown in Part 2, these verses appear to have been copied from the Hebrew Bible.

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 further evidence that Mark and Matthew are fraudulent but also shows that the authors appear 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, which generally shows further evidence of the fraudulent nature of the Synoptic Gospels.

The Gospel of John clearly appears to provide the most reliable account of the Crucifixion, which appears 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 appears 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 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 appears 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 appears much more reliable than the Synoptic Gospels. Additionally, the Synoptic Gospels don't just appear less reliable than the Gospel of John, they appear to be very unreliable as a whole and particularly in the most important narratives, including those about the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, two of the most important kinds of narratives in the entire Bible. So, given how unreliable the Synoptic Gospels appear to be, it appears that the Synoptic Gospels were fraudulent upon their original production. In contrast, it appears 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 again.

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 γενεὰ ("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 entire human race would die, 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 entire human race would die. 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 supposedly occur before the entire human race would die, 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 die, so it appears obvious that it would be inherently implied that the events being described would supposedly occur before the entire human race would die. 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 supposedly occur before the entire "race" would die because such information wouldn't really be relevant to a Jewish audience or any other human audience otherwise. So it appears 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 statement “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”. Since Matthew 10:23 is referring to the concept of 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 did 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, assuming that it’s implied that there supposedly wouldn’t continue to be more and more generations born during “the end times”. 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 and specifically refers to the destruction of the temple. 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 the 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, none of the Gospels describe Peter as having been present during the Crucifixion, and three of the Gospels don't describe Peter as 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. Additionally, there is a lot of evidence showing that Mariam was the top disciple of Christ. So it obviously appears 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 top 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."

With these verses, both Matthew and Luke claim that "the Twelve" will sit on thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. Additionally, Luke describes "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 are extreme and obviously appear to be fraudulent. Furthermore, the description of Judas betraying Christ shows by itself how ridiculous it is to say that "the Twelve" will sit on twelve thrones. These verses are basically saying that Judas, someone described in all of the Gospels as betraying Christ, will sit on a throne judging the twelve tribes of Israel, and Luke adds that a kingdom will be conferred just as a kingdom was conferred to Christ. But aside from Judas, these are ridiculous statements to say about any of "the Twelve" and are obviously 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, none of them list the "Twelve", and all three of those references appear to be later fraudulent additions.

The Synoptic Gospels as a whole 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 17:24-27
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 of 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 statement is presented as a clever comeback to outsmart those who are described as having tried to trap Christ. What appears much more likely is that these are political statements intended to better a relationship with the Roman government. The statement 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 statement attempts 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 statement 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 appears that the Synoptic Gospels are suggesting that people should pay taxes to Caesar, which realistically 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 appears 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 17:24-27. Interestingly, Peter takes center stage in this narrative and appears to be enthusiastic about paying the temple tax. Similar to the narratives that appear to be attempts to better a relationship with the Roman government, the narrative that contains Matthew 17:24-27 appears 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 or a church 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 appear to include attempts to better a relationship with the Roman government by suggesting that people should pay taxes to Caesar, Matthew appears 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 appear to include attempts to influence people to give money to the temple treasury or a church treasury 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, which shows evidence that the Synoptic Gospels in general are fraudulent. Additionally, Mark and Matthew appear 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 contradictory transitions in Mark and Matthew show evidence that these narratives are fraudulent, which shows evidence that the one from Luke is fraudulent 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 portray Christ as separate from God. Meanwhile, the Gospel of John portrays 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, portray 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 the temple treasury or a church treasury even if they are poor and even if it's all the money that they have. For all of those reasons, it appears that the Synoptic Gospels are massively fraudulent and should not be considered to represent true Christianity. They were apparently fraudulent upon their original production. The Gospel of John, on the other hand, while apparently containing a lot of text that does not represent true Christianity, also appears to possess 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, Matthew beginning with Abraham and Luke going all the way back to Adam, and both Gospels carry the genealogy all 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, or at least Abraham in the case of the Gospel of Matthew, was carried forward all 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 and population disbursement. Chapter 11 leaves off with Abraham, Sarah (Abraham's wife), and Lot (Abraham's nephew) as the main people of focus. The rest of Genesis carries the genealogy from Abraham to Isaac, Jacob and Esau, and Joseph and his brothers. Exodus describes Moses leading the Israelites out of slavery in Egypt. Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy all portray Moses as the leader of the people, and he is described as giving the ten commandments and other laws to the people. 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 relatively shortly 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 was 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 that many of the people of the kingdom of Judah were taken captive and exiled to Babylon. It is believed that the Babylonian Exile began towards the beginning of the 6th century BCE and that Israelites 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 21:20-21

"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 jealously come over her husband and he suspects his wife and she is impure – or if he is jealous and suspects her even though she in 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, condones 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 will not be "purified" 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. Additionally, David is portrayed in the Bible as having been from Bethlehem and Elhanan is described as "the Bethlehemite". Both stories describe a battle with the Philistines, describe someone named Goliath from Gath being defeated, describe their respective Goliath with a spear shaft like a weaver's rod, and portray the person who supposedly defeated Goliath as someone from Bethlehem. The only main difference is that David is the victor in one story and Elhanan is the victor in the other, although both are portrayed as being from Bethlehem. With so many key details being the same, it appears obvious that at least one of these stories is fraudulent and that one was copied from the other one. There doesn't appear 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 components of the Old Testament that we should now analyze are 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 Jews 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". 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 that was originally used to refer to the pantheon of Canaanite "gods" shows the presence of polytheistic and Canaanite influence. The use of the word "Elohim" shows that there was Canaanite influence on the Israelite community even to the point that the Hebrew language functioned in a way that used a plural and polytheistic Canaanite word to refer to God.

Additionally, the name "Israel" comes from the Hebrew word יִשְׂרָאֵל ("yisra'él"); and the Hebrew word אֵל ("el"), which is shown at the end of the Hebrew word for "Israel", originally came from the name of the chief Canaanite "god" named "El".

The Hebrew word for Israel is made up of two words, one of which is "El", and the other derives from the Heberw word שַׂר ("sar"), which has multiple meanings that we are about to get into. Chapter 32 of Genesis gives the Bible's version of how the name Israel came to be.

Genesis 32:27-28
The man asked him, "What is your name?"
"Jacob", he answered.
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."

These verses are a part of a narrative that describes God appearing to Jacob with a physical appearance that looked like a man and the narrative goes on to describe Jacob wrestling with God. The Hebrew word שָׂרִיתָ (“sarita”) gives way to the translation of “you have struggled”. “Sarita” derives from the Hebrew word שָׂרָה (“sara”), which can mean “to struggle”. However, “sara” has multiple meanings. As a verb, it can mean “to struggle” or “to become great”. As a noun, it can mean “lady”, “princess”, or “queen”, and it is also used for the name “Sarah”. “Sara” as a noun is the feminine form of the Hebrew word שַׂר (“sar”). As a noun, “sar” can mean “ruler”, “chief”, “prince”, or “captain”, which are masculine equivalents of the meanings of “sara” as a noun.

Based on Genesis 32:27-28, we began with “sarita”, which immediately brought us to “sara”. We would only be dealing with “sar” if we’re dealing with “sara” as a noun. According to Genesis 32:27-28 “sarita” is being used as a verb, which gives way to the meaning of “to struggle”. However, as we have already seen and will see even more as we continue, history has been recorded incorrectly. We know the name Israel exists and that a narrative was produced to explain the meaning of the name, but that doesn’t mean that the narrative is correct. Furthermore, the meaning of “to struggle” doesn’t make sense in this narrative, and this narrative as a whole doesn’t make sense. It’s really a ridiculous narrative. It actually describes a human being wrestling with God. Just based on how ridiculous of an idea that is, we can already conclude that this narrative is fraudulent and was simply used to explain a name in a different way than it was really intended for. The narrative claims that “Israel” means “to struggle with God and with men and overcome”. It doesn’t make sense to name a nation with a name that represents struggling with the “god” (El in this case) that the people worship. Furthermore, whatever is being said in relation to El is mostly likely being said about El rather than the people who worshipped El. While it would make sense for a group of people to come up with a name that represented them as a people, apparently the Israelites chose to say something about El. It’s the name “El” that appears in “Israel”, so something is being said about El, which would then mean that the reference to struggling would refer to El struggling and that obviously wouldn’t make sense either. So either way, the meaning of “to struggle” doesn’t appear to make sense here. Additionally, if we were to take the other meaning presented for “sara”, we would be dealing with the meaning of “to become great”. That doesn’t make much sense either because it wouldn’t make sense to refer to a “god” as becoming great. In this case, the word would be a verb so it would refer to the process of becoming great, which is to say that such a “god” was previously not great before becoming great. So that meaning isn’t realistic either. We are going to get into much more detail about the development of ancient Israel and how this name really came to be. For now, we’re just trying to understand the meaning of the name Israel. We can safely conclude that the meanings of “to struggle” and “to become great” don’t really make sense here, which then leads to the conclusion that we should turn to the meanings of “sara” as a noun.

As previously shown, the meaning of “sara” as a noun refers to leadership, and the masculine form “sar” can specifically mean “ruler” or “chief”. Therefore, the meaning of “Israel” appears to be “ruler El” or “chief El”. Meanwhile, “El” was the name of the chief Canaanite “god”. So it appears that Israel was named “chief El” after the chief Canaanite “god” El.

One objection could be related to the first letter of the Hebrew word יִשְׂרָאֵל (“Israel”). There are five Hebrew letters in the Hebrew word יִשְׂרָאֵל (“Israel”). The word שָׂר (“sar”) consists of the second and third letters of “Israel”. The word אֵל (“el”) consists of the last two letters. The first letter looks as small as an apostrophe. That letter, which is called “yod”, could have simply been added because a new word was

being formed as sometimes the exact letters or the pronunciation of words can change when combining multiple words into one or even if just one word is used to represent a name. For example, the Hebrew name יְהוָֹה (“Yahweh”) is apparently derived from the Hebrew word אֶהְיֶה (“eh-yeh”), which means “I am” and “to be”. The Hebrew name יְהוָֹה (“Yahweh”) is very similar to the Hebrew word אֶהְיֶה (“eh-yeh”) but is somewhat different. The second and fourth letters of each are the same but the first and third letters of each are different. This is an example of how one word that gets used for a name gets changed in the process of forming that name. Likewise, when combining multiple words into one, the lettering and pronunciation can change somewhat. In the case of “Israel”, multiple words are being combined into one word and that resulting word is being used as the name of a nation, so the first letter is not necessarily a part of one of the original base words that make up “Israel”. So the question then becomes about whether that first letter is a part of one of the original base words.

If the first letter is a part of one of the original base words, the first word would be יָשָׁר (“yashar”), which can mean “straight”, “correct”, “honestly”, or “immediately”. The meaning of “immediately” wouldn’t make sense. The meaning of “straight” simply refers to the shape of something not being crooked, so that doesn’t make sense either. The meaning of “honestly” as an adjective to be combined with “El” is to say that El is honestly, which maybe makes a little more sense than “immediately” or “straight” but still doesn’t really make that much sense. That leaves us with “correct”, which refers to justice in this case, so to say “correct” is to say “just” as in justice. So one could argue that “Israel” could mean “correct with El” or “just with El” or “justice with El”, but the meaning would probably be “correct El” or “just El” if we were to use the meaning of “correct” or “just”. It’s somewhat plausible to assert that “Israel” could mean “just El” or “justice with El”. However, there are three points that show that it’s improbable. First and foremost, the Bible identifies the other original base word besides “el” as “sara” or “sar” (given the use of “sarita”). While the narrative as a whole appears to be fraudulent, the author nevertheless identified the word “sara” or “sar” when viewing the name “Israel”, which shows evidence that the Israelite society viewed the name “Israel” that way. Second, while one could make somewhat of a case that “just El” or “justice with El” could make sense, neither appears to really apply. “Justice with El” would refer to a subject other than El or the people, that subject being “justice”. The nation itself would refer to justice and would really only credit El to the extent that people feel justice has been served by El. Instead, with religion, especially in ancient times, people felt subject to the religion and followed laws and made sacrifices to be in accordance with that religion. So a community of people are more likely to simply worship a “god” rather than specifically calling out justice for the people as something that they want from a “god”. “Just El” would be more realistic because that simply says something about El rather than something that people want from El. While “just El” is the most realistic possibility if “yashar” was to be used, it’s much more likely that a nation would simply be named for a “god” rather than a specific adjective being attributed to that “god” because referring to a specific adjective actually limits the meaning of the name. “Just El” describes El with one specific characteristic apart from all other possible characteristics, thereby specifically excluding all other possible characteristics. So “just El” is also unlikely to be the meaning of “Israel”. This now brings us to the third point, which is that “chief El” makes a lot more sense than the other possibilities, especially since El was the chief Canaanite “god” and the name “chief El” simply refers to El and gives El the title of chief of all supposed divine beings, which is how Canaanites viewed El. Therefore, it appears that the name “Israel” means “chief El”.

So the name Israel means “chief El”, “El” was the name of the chief Canaanite “god”, and the Bible often refers to God with the Hebrew word “Elohim”, which is a plural word that was originally used to refer to

the pantheon of Canaanite "gods". So we can see that the Bible is riddled with terminology that was somehow influenced by Canaanites and polytheism. As we will go into more detail on later, the nation that eventually became Israel was within a region that had previously been known as Canaan and was populated by polytheists, and we can clearly see that reflected in the name Israel and in some of the words the Bible uses to refer to God.

One objection is that the word "Elohim" and the name "El" were eventually adopted as monotheistic terms. Even if that was 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, that Biblical writing would apparently have had 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, as previously explained, 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 in some way.

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 "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".

Some of the authors of the Hebrew 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 worshipping idols and practicing polytheistic rituals. Additionally, there have been idols found in archaeological excavations, clearly showing that there was polytheistic worshipping by the population in Israel. So 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 appear 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 appears to have been written hundreds of years, probably 600-900 years, 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, probably 600-900 years, 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 apparently wasn't aware of the concept of the Trinity and was really writing from a polytheistic perspective. Additionally, as has been shown and will be shown more 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 apparently written without any awareness of the concept of the Trinity and includes polytheistic references.

There are other references in the Bible that show that some authors of the Hebrew Bible appear 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 narratives about Noah. 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. So it appears 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, the 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 "the God of Israel". An alternative translation follows.

Genesis 33:20
There he set up an altar and called it El the God of Israel.

Genesis 33:20 claims 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 connected 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 (the order of the words below is from left to right but Hebrew is read from right to left).

מִזְמוֹר ("mizmowr") לְאָסָף ("leasap") אֱלֹהִים ("elohim") נִצָּב (nissab") בַּעֲדַת־ ("ba-a-dat") אֵל ("el") בְּקֶרֶב ("beqereb") אֱלֹהִים ("elohim") יִשְׁפֹּט׃ ("yispot")

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" 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, that

by itself shows that polytheistic theology is involved, and so "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 subordinate divine beings stand in the assembly of El and that they will be judged by El. 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 in this polytheistic writing the name "El" is used. Psalm 82:1 expresses that there are multiple divine beings and that subordinate divine beings stand in the assembly of El and 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 "El 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 claims that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew God by the name of the chief Canaanite "god" El. The writing in of the name "El" appears to have been an attempt to convince people to use the name "Yahweh" instead of the name "El" and to relate the name "Yahweh" to people who knew 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". So 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” and to relate the name “Yahweh” to people who knew the name “El”. That shows evidence of conversion tactics. Such tactics are still used today. Christian missionaries in foreign lands often use religious concepts of the native people to explain Christianity to them. Exodus 6:3 shows an attempt to convince people to be more in line with the use of the name “Yahweh” and it does so in a way that related to people who knew the name “El”. 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 still in the Bible today.

The Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament describe 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 13th century BCE or before. As previously mentioned, Canaan encompassed a larger area than just the land that became Israel. There were several relatively heavily populated cities throughout Canaan, which were mostly in the lowlands as opposed to a city like Jerusalem that is in the highlands. 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 13th century BCE. Ramses II appears 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 appears 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 would show that Israel was established as a community by the end of the 13th 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, archaeological findings from Israel show that a unique community developed in the highlands of Israel. 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" appear to be more connected to the kingdom of Israel than to the kingdom of Judah.

If the use of the word "Elohim" and the name "El" 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 8th century BCE. After that, the kingdom of Judah became the main kingdom in Israel. In the 6th century BCE, the kingdom of Judah was attacked by the Babylonian Empire and the temple in Jerusalem was destroyed. Many of the Israelites were taken captive and sent into exile. 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 the lands of the Babylonian Empire to maintain their culture amongst the Babylonian society, and that some of those documents were Yahwehist documents and some were Elohimist documents.

An example of the combination of the name "Yahweh" and the word "Elohim" is the flood narratives about Noah. 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 6:3
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 mirror verses 6:5-7. Verses 6:5-7 and verses 6:12-13 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

combination of the redundancy among them and the different terminology used in each of them shows evidence that they were 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 appears that a biblical author was very unlikely to have used both the name "Yahweh" and the word "Elohim" to refer to God. So the use of the name "Yahweh" and the word "Elohim" to refer to God within the same narrative shows evidence that writing from different documents that used different terminology was 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 further evidence that writing from different documents that used different terminology was 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 Yahweh 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 Elohim said to him, "As for me, this is my covenant with you: You will be the 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 Elohim."

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. Furthermore, chapter 35 contains two different instances of the naming of Bethel, so between chapter 28 and 35 there are three different instances of that city being named 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 revealed 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 further evidence that different sources were combined together.

Based on the difference between the use of the name "Yahweh" and the use of 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 appears to have happened 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 appears that different pieces from different documents that used different terminology were spliced together. Those who compiled what eventually became the Hebrew Bible appear to have taken information from different sets of documents in an attempt to create a fuller set of narratives. Some documents had the same information and some documents had different information, so different pieces of information appear to have been combined together to present more narratives and fuller narratives. The flood narratives about Noah are a great example of that.

So far, we can see that writing from different documents from different sources that used different terminology was combined together to form what eventually became the Hebrew Bible, which later went into 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 and confusing their language so that they wouldn't understand each other, and then explains that the town is called Babel because there God supposedly confused the language of the whole 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 Babylon as the place where God supposedly confused the language of the whole world, which is obviously insulting to Babylon and that shows a negative attitude towards Babylon that is representative of the Babylonian Exile. The Hebrew word that means "to confuse" is בָּלַל ("balál"), which is similar to "babel". So one could argue that Babylon was not intentionally insulted but that this narrative simply serves as an explanation for the naming of the city and the name of the city is similar to the word that means "to confuse". However, the mere fact that there is a narrative that focuses on Babylon like this, for it to be such a fundamental narrative that it attempts to explain why there are people with different languages throughout the world, and for it to be such an introductory narrative that it appears as earlier on as chapter 11 of Genesis shows that Babylon was a main focus of the people around the time that this narrative was produced. That shows evidence that the Tower of Babel (Babylon) narrative was produced during or after the Babylonian Exile and was heavily influenced by the Babylonian Exile.

Another example in chapter 11 of Genesis that shows writing that was apparently produced during the Babylonian Exile is the description of Abraham being 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 being from Ur and Ur appears to have been relatively close to Babylon and a part of the Babylonian Empire at some point, so the mentioning of Ur is evidence that this writing was produced during the Babylonian Exile. Additionally, Ur is described as "Ur of the Chaldeans". "Chaldeans" comes from the Hebrew word כַּשְׂדִּים ("kasdim"). 2 Kings 25:10-11 can give us a good understanding of what the word "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 refers to “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”. Additionally, historians believe that the Babylonian Empire took over the land of the Chaldeans. Therefore, “Ur of the Chaldeans” can be interpreted as “Ur of the Babylonians” or can at least be viewed as a location that was within the Babylonian Empire, which would make sense anyway since Ur appears to have been relatively close to Babylon and a part of the Babylonian Empire. That shows further evidence that the description of Abraham as having been from Ur appears to have originated during the Babylonian Exile.

Another example of writing that appears to have been 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 Babylonian emperor, 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 the Babylonian Empire. 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 the Babylonian Empire 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 portray the Persian emperor Cyrus as a messiah, provides an example of writing that was apparently written towards the end of the Babylonian Exile or afterwards.

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 refers to the Persian emperor Cyrus who ended the Exile of the Israelites. So Isaiah 45:1 appears to have been written towards the end of the Babylonian Exile or afterwards; and since the book of Isaiah is proposed to have been written long before then, Isaiah 45:1 appears to serve as an example of a fraudulent addition that was written 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 or after 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? Did the tree of life and the tree of knowledge exist? 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 only after the supposed sins had already occurred. That could only be true if God didn't 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 appears to be 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 apparent 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 appears to have 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 apparently was not combined together from different sources but was 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 provide such an incredible example of what appears 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 chapters 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 appears 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 appear 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 appears 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 would likely have formed through the process of compiling documents together because it’s the different terminology in the different documents that results in the need for a bridge, and there couldn’t really be a bridge without a compilation of these documents because the documents wouldn’t otherwise be a part of the same book. Meanwhile, such a compilation appears to have occurred during the Babylonian Exile.

Furthermore, 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 are consistent pieces of evidence that show that the authors of the Hebrew Bible don’t appear to have usually changed the wording of previously written material. They apparently added and subtracted material and combined material from different sources, but they don’t appear 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 would probably appear more often throughout the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. So that shows further evidence that the use of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name was 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 appears to have been 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 probably 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 apparently produced after the original production of the book of Exodus because that contrast appears to take into account information that is found in chapter 3 of 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 appears to take into account that introduction in Exodus of the name "Yahweh" by avoiding describing any character as knowing the name "Yahweh". Therefore, it appears that the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were originally produced sometime after the original production of the book 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 have had to have existed long before the story told in Exodus if it was a true story that had really been passed down through the generations. 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 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 in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis is not necessarily an indication that those narratives were produced after the initial production of the book of Exodus. If that was 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. 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 4, 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, 14 different characters are described as having spoken the name "Yahweh" in Genesis: Eve (in chapter 4, not in chapters 2 and 3), Noah, Abraham, Sarah, a servant of Abraham's, 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 idea that the name "Yahweh" was not known to the people described in the narratives in Genesis, 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 passed down in a way that did not account for the idea that the name "Yahweh" was not known to the people described in the narratives in Genesis. So it appears that the exclusion of the name "Yahweh" in quoted dialogue in the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis 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 of Genesis 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", Geneses 2:15 describes Adam being in Eden and being assigned the responsibility of taking care of Eden. Taking care of Eden can be specifically compared to being ordained as a "guardian cherub", and both refer to someone being in Eden. 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

less known. 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 as 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 appears 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” appears to be the Pool of Siloam, which is described as having been near the “King’s Garden”. So the Gihon appears 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 10:4-5
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 10:4-5 describe Daniel being exiled in the Babylonian Empire and 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”. The Babylonian Empire covered an area that was around and between the Tigris and the Euphrates so we can view those rivers as the “rivers of Babylon”.

Neither the Tigris nor the Euphrates runs through Israel and there doesn’t appear to be any connection between the Gihon and the Tigris or the Euphrates like the one described in chapter 2 of Genesis. Therefore, it appears that real bodies of water were used to describe a fictional river system. There appears 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. Although chapter 2 of Genesis describes the Gihon as running “through the entire land of Cush” and connected to the Tigris and the Euphrates, the Gihon was apparently in Israel according to all of the other descriptions of it in the Hebrew Bible and it doesn’t appear to have been connected to the Tigris or the Euphrates. Therefore, the description of the Gihon in chapter 2 of Genesis appears to be influenced by the Gihon spring that was in Israel. So the description of the river system in chapter 2 of Genesis appears to have been influenced by both Israel as well as the Babylonian Empire. That shows that the author of Genesis 2:10-14 was apparently an Israelite who was exiled in the Babylonian Empire and that Genesis 2:10-14 were probably written during the Babylonian Exile. So not only does the evidence 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 appears to be an allegorical reference and that chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis were apparently written during the Babylonian Exile, the exile from the Garden of Eden appears to allegorically represent the Babylonian Exile. Therefore, the Garden of Eden appears to represent 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 appears to be characteristic of a writing style during the Exile when certain authors of the Hebrew Bible appear to have taken on a more shameful and repenting attitude, which appears 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 than it is in chapters 2 and 3. As a result, 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 have been more characteristic of writing produced sometime before the Exile rather than during or after the Exile.

There have been several pieces of evidence presented that show that the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis are 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 appears to be 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 appears to have been falsely made up during that process; the use of the word “Elohim” by itself in quoted dialogue contrasted with the use of the name “Yahweh Elohim” as one name outside of quoted dialogue shows that those narratives appear to have been produced after the original production of the book of Exodus, which shows that the information contained in those narratives appears to have been fraudulently made up sometime after the original production of the book 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 appear to be 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 apparently 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 apparently an Israelite who was exiled in the Babylonian Empire; and the comparison of Adam to the ground and the emphasis on sin both show a writing style that is apparently representative of a time-period during the Exile, which shows that those narratives were apparently 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, Rezeph, 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, Rezeph, and Tel Assar are all believed to have been in Mesopotamia and in locations that were controlled by the Babylonian Empire. So it appears that Eden was a real place that was at some point controlled by the Babylonian Empire and probably provided inspiration during the Babylonian Exile to the author of the Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis, and it would make sense that the place of inspiration was in the Babylonian Empire.

The Adam and Eve narratives in chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis also provide evidence that documents were compiled together during the Exile. First, the use 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 those Adam and Eve narratives 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 those Adam and Eve narratives 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, and more specifically that some of them were fraudulently produced during the Babylonian Exile. 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 apparent fraudulent nature of the Adam and Eve narratives, we should now turn to the rest of Genesis and then to Exodus.

Genesis and Exodus

We'll start with the very beginning of the Bible and analyze chapter 1 of Genesis before moving forward with the rest of Genesis and Exodus. 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 appears to be representative of a worldview of a human being. People in ancient times saw water on the ground and water coming down from the sky. As a result, day 2 in chapter 1 appears to be representative of human observation. Third, day having been separated from night is described in both day 1 and day 4, which wouldn't be the case if this was truthful writing because that would only need to happen once, so that happening in the description of day 1 as well as in the description of day 4 shows evidence of fraudulent writing. Fourth, Genesis 1:26 describes God as having said "Let us make man

in our image", which 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. As previously shown, some Christians propose that this is evidence of the concept of the Trinity. However, chapter 1 of Genesis appears to have been written hundreds of years, probably 600-900 years, 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, probably 600-900 years, 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. 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 apparently wasn't aware of the concept of the Trinity and 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 apparently written without any awareness of the concept of the Trinity and includes polytheistic references. Fifth, the human race is incredibly exalted in chapter 1, which appears to be representative of fraudulent human writing. For these reasons, chapter 1 of Genesis appears to be a fraudulent production.

It has already been shown that Adam and Eve appear to be fictional characters, so chapters 2-4 appear to be fraudulent. Chapter 5 of Genesis refers to Adam and Eve and carries forward a genealogy that begins with Adam and Eve, so that alone shows that chapter 5 appears to be fraudulent. Chapter 5 also references chapter 1, which has been shown to appear to be fraudulent, so that also shows that chapter 5 appears to be fraudulent. Additionally, chapter 5 leads into chapter 6, which has been shown to appear to be fraudulent, so that shows further evidence that chapter 5 appears to be fraudulent. So far, chapters 1-5 of Genesis all appear to be fraudulent.

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 supposedly a part of the "divine council" as described elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. Any polytheistic narrative 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 narratives in the Bible are the same as the Epic of Gilgamesh, which is a narrative that circulated in ancient Mesopotamia. That shows evidence that the flood narratives in the Bible copied details from a flood narrative that circulated in ancient Mesopotamia. The third is that the theology of the flood narratives in the Bible present God as if God does not have foreknowledge. Chapter 6 describes God as regretting 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. So there is false theology in chapters 6-9, which clearly

shows the presence of fraud. 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.

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. Given the evidence that chapters 6-9 are fraudulent, any text that is based on the narratives in chapters 6-9 would appear to be fraudulent as well. Since chapter 10 depends on a genealogy stemming from apparently fraudulent information in chapters 6-9, chapter 10 appears to be entirely fraudulent. Additionally, chapter 10 lists Babylon first in a list of areas that the supposed mighty hunter Cush ruled over, and that serves as evidence that chapter 10 was produced during the Babylonian Exile, which in turn serves as additional evidence that chapter 10 appears to be fraudulent.

As previously shown, Chapter 11 presents the Tower of Babel narrative, which describes people building a tower and then God changing their language to confuse them. Like the Adam and Eve narratives and the flood narratives, 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 people with different languages throughout the world. 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 description of Abraham being from Ur in chapter 11 appear to be products of the Babylonian Exile, and therefore appear to be fraudulent.

So far, evidence has been shown that 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. We will first take a look at narratives about Jacob and Esau.

Genesis 25:23-26
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 can 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 consists of descendants of Jacob, the Edom population consists of descendants of 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 consist of 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 incredible improbability of that being true. If taken allegorically, then Jacob and Esau are probably 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 are 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 society. The second reason is that Jacob and Esau are described as representing two nations, which appears 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 appears 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 information related to Esau being described as having been older and having sold his birthright and Jacob being described as having stolen Isaac's blessing. That information probably represents which population was established as a nation first and why Israel is considered the favored nation despite being younger, which is also representative of some kind of political relationship. 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". 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. Also, since Esau represents Edom, it would make sense that Esau also represents Mount Seir because it is described that Edom was the land of 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 appear to relate to Mount Seir and Edom, and Edom is described as the land of Seir. Additionally, a baby is unlikely to be that hairy upon birth, especially to the extent that they are named for their hairiness. So the name Esau being used in this way to describe someone's hairiness in what appears to be an attempt to connect Esau to Mount Seir shows clear evidence that these narratives appear to be fraudulent, and therefore that they should be taken allegorically rather than literally. 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 apparent allegorical nature of the narrative. So the color of the stew that Esau supposedly ate appears to allegorically represent how the region of Edom got its name, but the real reason for the naming of Edom is likely because of 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. For these reasons, it appears that Jacob and Esau are not real people and are allegorical characters.

When we turn to Lot we see something similar.

Genesis 19:36-38
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 apparently 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 19:36-38 obviously reflect that by insulting them. So the information about Lot's descendants giving way to the Moabites and the Ammonites appears to be fraudulent and was realistically written 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 additional evidence that they are fraudulent. Furthermore, there is evidence that those genealogies were added to explain certain population disbursements, which shows even more evidence that they are fraudulent.

It's been established that Jacob, Esau, and Lot are apparently not real people and that those characters were apparently used to explain population disbursement. So a precedent has been set in this analysis that

shows that fictional characters were apparently 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 realistic to believe that Abraham is not a real person simply because Jacob and Esau are apparently not real people. Jacob is the one described as being named Israel and 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 as well. Additionally, as previously shown, the description of Abraham being from Ur appears to be fraudulent and was apparently 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, which shows further evidence that Abraham isn't a real person and is a fictional character as has been previously shown for Adam, Eve, Noah, Lot, Jacob, and Esau.

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 be fictional characters that 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? Obviously, he realistically wouldn't have been because it doesn't make sense for someone to be called "father" before they're a father. Similar to Adam having a name that means "man", Abraham having a name that refers to being a father before he is a father clearly shows that Abraham appears to be an allegorical character, and more specifically it shows that the purpose of Abraham's presence in the first place was to create a patriarch. So 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 bless her and will surely 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 שַׂר ("sar"), which as shown earlier can be translated as "chief" or "ruler". "Sarah" is translated from the Hebrew word שָׂרָה ("sara"), which as shown earlier is the feminine form of "sar". "Sarai" is the plural form of "sar" and "sara" is the feminine form of "sar". So "Sarai" represents the plural form of the word that "Sarah" represents the feminine form of. The word that connects "Sarai" to "Sarah" can be translated as "chief" or "ruler", and the main difference between "Sarai" and "Sarah" is plurality versus singularity. So the name change from "Sarai" to "Sarah" appears to represent a change in leadership and that change appears to be reflective of a change from plurality to singularity. That could be

representative of a change in human leadership, as in a change from multiple leaders to an individual leader, or could be representative of a change from polytheism to monotheism. Whatever this name change exactly represents, it appears 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 apparently is allegorical and represents much more than just one person as that also appears to be the case with Abraham, Lot, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, and Esau.

For more evidence of false narratives that were apparently produced to explain population disbursement and/or political results, we can turn to three different stories in Genesis that all appear 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 of 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 not only because it is so odd and unique but more specifically because it is the reason given for the conflict in each story. That shows that details appear to have been copied among these stories, and therefore these stories appear to be fraudulent narratives produced to explain political relationships.

The presence of two different foreign rulers described among these three stories shows that there appears to be two different political situations represented among these three stories. The two that describe Abimelech appear to be related to a political relationship with the Philistines. We also saw a political relationship with the Philistines 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 and specifically involves the pharaoh.

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 was 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 there is fraudulent information in the book of Exodus.

The writing that spans from 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 previously mentioned as well as 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 other 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 apparently fictional characters given that Jacob is described as having been their father and Jacob is apparently a fictional character. Therefore, the narratives in chapters 37-50 of Genesis are all apparently 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 appear 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 fictional characters; 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 have several other aspects in common with each other. Given all of that evidence, it appears that all or almost all 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 and comprised of fictional characters, the genealogy leading up to Moses appears to be fraudulent and comprised of fictional characters, and that alone shows that there is a good possibility that Moses is a fictional character. 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 a conflict with 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 had 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 appears 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 as appears to be the case with the narrative in chapter 12 of Genesis. Fourth, there are similarities between the tradition of the week of unleavened bread and certain Canaanite celebrations related to unleavened bread and the harvest of barley, which shows evidence that the book of Exodus was probably influenced by preexisting traditions that were practiced by Canaanites. 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.
There the Lord made a decree and a law for them, and there he tested them.

Exodus 17:2-7
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."
The Lord answered Moses, "Walk on ahead of the people. 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. 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 20:2-6
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. Additionally, three of the stories describe the people complaining specifically about being taken out of Egypt, and two of the stories refer to testing. The

similarities among these different stories can be compared to the repetition previously discussed of narratives about a conflict with a foreign ruler. That shows evidence 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, and therefore appear to be fraudulent. 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 a fictional character, 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 about a conflict with the pharaoh of Egypt and the pharaoh having been frightened by an act of God. Both chapter 12 of Genesis and the book of Exodus 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 that time-period and many of the surrounding communities suffered at the behest of the Egyptian Empire. Canaanite cites 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. All or almost all of Genesis is apparently fraudulent, several specific aspects of the book of Exodus have been shown to appear to be fraudulent, Moses is probably a fictional character, 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.

Yahwehism and the Development of Ancient Israel

There have been 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 in Nubia that has been dated to the 14th and 15th centuries BCE. That list appears to have then been copied in the 13th 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 or semi-nomadic. One of the groups is the Shasu of YHW (can be pronounced as "Yahwa"). 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 and the context. 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".

The Canaanite cities were mostly in the lowlands of Canaan. Archaeological evidence shows that smaller communities appear to have developed in the highlands of Israel during different periods of time through hundreds of years. Eventually, Israel was established as a community in the highlands apart from the already existing Canaanite cities mostly in the lowlands. If the Merneptah Stele really does refer to Israel, then that would show that Israel was established as a community by the end of the 13th century BCE.

So there is evidence that there was a nomadic or semi-nomadic group of people worshipping Yahweh in the 14th or 15th century BCE, and there is evidence that a community called Israel was established in the highlands of Israel by the 13th century BCE. It has already been shown that the name "Israel" appears to mean "chief El" and has polytheistic and Canaanite origins. That by itself shows evidence that the initial community of Israel was comprised of polytheistic Canaanites, which would make the most sense anyway since Israel was in Canaan and Canaanites were polytheists. The name "Yahweh" appears to have derived from the Hebrew word אֶהְיֶה ("eh-yeh"), which means "I am" and "to be". To refer to God with a name that means "I am" and "to be" is to simply say that God exists, and more specifically that only one God exists. Therefore, the name "Yahweh" appears to inherently be a monotheistic name, which is in contrast to the polytheistic origins of the name "Israel". Additionally, the name "Yahweh" is in direct contrast to the name "El" because "Yahweh" is the name that would have been used instead of "El". So a Yahwehist community realistically would not have used the name "El" to come up with a name for their community because they used the name "Yahweh", and therefore they realistically would not have come up with the name "Israel". As will be shown in more detail shortly, the only realistic way that a Yahwehist community would have used a polytheistic Canaanite name like "Israel" is if that name already existed as the label of the area in which the Yahwehist community was being established. A Yahwehist community realistically would not have come up with the name "Israel" because they worshipped Yahweh, not El; but a monotheistic community could have instead adopted the name "Israel" if that area was already identified as Israel. Furthermore, as will also be shown in more detail shortly, the use of the names "El" and "Elohim" realistically wouldn't have been used by a Yahwehist community unless that community

was immersed in a polytheistic Canaanite society, which Judah was. As shown earlier, Exodus 6:3 appears to have been an attempt to convince people to use the name "Yahweh" instead of the name "El" and to relate the name "Yahweh" to people who knew the name "El". That shows further evidence that monotheists associated with Judah were trying to convert polytheistic Canaanites to monotheism, or more specifically to Judaism. So it was specific circumstances of the society that Judah was immersed in that influenced a monotheistic community to use the names "Israel", "El", and "Elohim"; but the main takeaway is that the monotheistic community that was centered in Judah apparently didn't make those names up themselves, they simply were using preexisting words that appealed to people around them. What this all shows is that the initial community that worshipped Yahweh appears to have developed independently from the initial community of Israel because a Yahwehist community realistically wouldn't have come up with the name "Israel". Just based on that, we can derive the conclusion that the initial community that worshipped Yahweh probably first developed somewhere outside of Israel, and therefore that Yahwehist beliefs were probably somehow later imported into Israel whether through Yahwehists having migrated to Israel or Yahwehists simply having shared their beliefs with Israelites. The evidence of the presence of the Shasu of YHW supports the conclusion that the initial community that worshipped Yahweh first developed somewhere outside of Israel because they were nomadic and not connected to Israel; but even if the Shasu of YHW didn't worship Yahweh or even if we didn't have those inscriptions about the Shasu of YHW, we can still come to the same conclusion just based on the difference between the meaning and use of the name "Yahweh" versus the meaning and use of the name "Israel".

The book of Exodus provides support for the conclusion that the initial community that worshipped Yahweh first developed somewhere outside of Israel. While the book of Exodus is mostly fictional, it still appears to represent certain real history through an allegorical way, much like the book of Genesis. Like a lot of the Bible, fictional narratives were used to allegorically represent real history. The part of the book of Exodus that we should pay attention to here is the travel path Moses is described as taking after the exodus is described. The book of Exodus describes the people wandering the desert for 40 years before going to Israel. More specifically, Moses is described as talking to God in Midian and receiving information from God about the name "Yahweh" as described in Exodus 3:13-15. For the introduction of the name "Yahweh" to be described as having happened in Midian, a place outside of Israel, it almost seems like a forgone conclusion that there must be real significance to a place outside of Israel in relation to the name "Yahweh". That shows strong evidence that the initial community that worshipped Yahweh first developed somewhere outside of Israel. Additionally, the 40 years of not going to Israel likely represents real history that occurred outside of Israel for a relatively long time (maybe much more or much less than 40 years, not necessarily exactly 40 years or close to it). Furthermore, the extensive travel path described in the book of Exodus appears to represent a nomadic nature, which would align with the evidence found about the Shasu of YHW. So the book of Exodus supports the conclusion that the initial community that worshipped Yahweh was a nomadic or semi-nomadic community that first developed somewhere outside 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 and other historical evidence is very unfavorable to the idea that Israelites violently defeated Canaanites in multiple cities. More specifically, archaeological evidence shows that there probably wasn't a developed enough of a community in the highlands of Israel in the 13th century BCE to have had an organized military that would have been able to conquer Canaanite cites in the way that the Bible describes. Additionally, there is plenty of evidence that shows that

Canaanite cites 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 apparent fraud. The obviously probable scenario is that Canaanites settled in the highlands of Israel without the magnitude of violence described in the Bible and without conquering any Canaanite cities, they developed a unique polytheistic community there called Israel after the chief Canaanite "god" El, and Yahwehist beliefs were somehow imported into that polytheistic-dominated area at some point.

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 sometime 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 appear to 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 appear to be 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 appears 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 evidence that Egypt attacked certain Canaanite cites. 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 cites. The Merneptah Stele is one piece of evidence that boasts about Egyptian attacks, and those attacks included an attack on what appears to have been 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 cites. 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 sometime 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 appears to have suffered economically during this time-period. Regarding Israel, it appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 cites were mostly in the lowlands of Canaan, and a smaller agricultural and/or pastoral community called Israel appears to have been in the highlands of Israel. The population in the highlands of Israel appears 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 cites in 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 10th century BCE than in the 13th 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 Canaan after that destruction. Their society wasn't completely wiped out. However, it appears that in or around 926 BCE, the Egyptian Empire again launched an 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 cites likely eventually led to economic growth in the highlands of Israel. We can see that the economic system in Israel appears to have developed substantially during and after this time-period because there is archaeological evidence that shows that the kingdom of Israel was apparently established within about 50-100 years from then. That archaeological evidence shows that the kingdom of Israel appears to have existed in the 9th century BCE, and maybe even within the first half of that century.

The Bible portrays the kingdom of David as the first united monarchy of Israel, the kingdom of Israel later splitting off and becoming an independent northern kingdom that was involved with polytheism, and the kingdom of Judah being the remaining southern kingdom that carried on the legacy of David. There are two points right away that should be recognized about this. The first is related to the point previously made that a Yahwehist community realistically would not have used the name "El" to come up with a name for their community because they used the name "Yahweh", and therefore they realistically would not have come up with the name "Israel". With that in mind, we can see that it's problematic to assert that

the kingdom of David was the first Israelite kingdom. The first Israelite kingdom appears to have been a pagan kingdom because the name "Israel" is a polytheistic name. The first Israelite kingdom would have been the first kingdom to establish Israel as a nation-state. According to the Bible, the kingdom of David did that. However, that would mean that the kingdom of David used a pagan name to establish a Jewish kingdom, which doesn't make sense. Instead, it obviously would make much more sense if the kingdom of Israel was the first Israelite kingdom and established Israel as a nation-state with the pagan name "Israel". A Jewish kingdom would likely only use a pagan name like "Israel" if the land was already identified as Israel. So that is presumably why the kingdom of Judah used the name "Israel", but it apparently first came from the kingdom of Israel rather than the supposed kingdom of David. The second point is that a kingdom that split off from the original kingdom wouldn't likely take the name of the nation with them while the original kingdom changed their name, which is what is proposed to have happened according to the Bible. In the Bible, the kingdom of Israel split off from the original united monarchy and was named for the nation of Israel while the kingdom in the south, which supposedly represented the original united monarchy, was named the kingdom of Judah instead of Israel. If a nation is to be called Israel, then that name would have likely been kept by the original kingdom that used the name "Israel" and some new name would have been used by the rogue kingdom that split off. So whichever kingdom was named after "Israel" would probably have been the original kingdom. Therefore, it appears that the kingdom of Israel was the first Israelite kingdom and that the kingdom of Judah rose up after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire. These two points both show clear evidence that the kingdom of David didn't exist as the Bible describes and that the kingdom of Israel was the first Israelite kingdom.

The Tel Dan Stele, which is an archaeological finding that has been dated to the 9th and 8th centuries BCE, shows an inscription that appears to include references to both the kingdom of Israel and the "House of David", and there have been other inscriptions found that show evidence of the House of David. So the character of David in the Bible may actually be based on a real person and the kingdom of David may actually be based on some sort of real government. As we will get into more detail on shortly, some of the south does appear to have been separate from the north, and that is further evidenced by the Tel Dan Stele referencing both the kingdom of Israel as well as the "House of David". So some of the south may have had their own local government. However, as we will also get into more detail on shortly, such a local government appears to have been relatively small, not likely much of a kingdom. According to the Tel Dan Stele, the House of David appears 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 some of the southern highlands. The real House of David appears to have been a smaller local government that was only in the southern highlands and existed during the same time-period as the kingdom of Israel, and as we are about to get into, was also overshadowed by the kingdom of Israel.

One objection could be that the House of David was a united monarchy but that foreign powers still recognized the kingdom of Judah as the House of David even after the kingdom of Israel supposedly split off. In that case, it could be argued that the reference to the House of David on the Tel Dan Stele could be a reference to a government that was previously a united monarchy. However, hypothetically, even if the kingdom of David really did exist as a united monarchy and then was diminished to approximately two twelfths of what it used to be, then it wouldn't really be the same entity. According to the Bible, there were twelve tribes of Israel and only Judah and Benjamin remained after the supposed splitting off of the

kingdom of Israel. So just using that as some sort of base for estimating how much of the united monarchy would have gone to the kingdom of Israel, we would be talking about approximately ten twelfths. If a united monarchy lost ten twelfths of itself and the ten twelfths formed a united kingdom, then the two twelfths remaining wouldn't really be the same kingdom or governmental entity. At that point, the kingdom of Israel would be more of the previously existing House of David than the kingdom of Judah would be. Furthermore, when a former ruler's name is used to refer to a government, like in the case of the House of David, that usually refers to some sort of dynasty. A lot of the time, a dynasty would represent a continuous bloodline from ruler to ruler. The kingdom of Israel had a dynasty called "the House of Omri". The House of David, like the House of Omri, was probably a dynasty that involved a bloodline from ruler to ruler. But even if that bloodline no longer continued, if the government was still referred to as the House of David, then it would realistically at least be a similar form of government as when David ruled. Otherwise, David's name probably wouldn't be used anymore. For a government to be named by someone who is no longer ruling, the current government would be recognized as the same kind of government as when that person was ruling. However a foreign government viewed the House of David when David was ruling would realistically be very similar to how they viewed the House of David after David's time if they continue to use the name House of David. So from the perspective of a foreign government producing the Tel Dan Stele, if they viewed the government in Jerusalem as the House of David during a time that the kingdom of Israel was reigning, then the House of David appears to have been recognized as a smaller local government in the midst of the larger kingdom of Israel and was probably never a united monarchy as the Bible describes. Meanwhile, the kingdom of Israel is the kingdom that had the name of the nation of Israel. So the kingdom of Israel appears to have been a nation-state while the House of David appears to have been a smaller local government like a city-state.

The kingdom of David is thought to have existed in the 10th century BCE. That is mostly because there is solid evidence that the kingdom of Israel existed in the 9th century BCE (the Tel Dan Stele contributes some of that evidence but there is other evidence that makes it clear) and the Bible claims that the kingdom of David existed for a relatively long time before the kingdom of Israel even began. Furthermore, there are inscriptions at the Temple of Karnak in Egypt that describe military campaigns by the Egyptian pharaoh Shoshenq I around 926 BCE and there might be a reference to the "House of David". It's controversial and there isn't a consensus on it. If this inscription at the Temple of Karnak is in fact a reference to the House of David, then it would appear that the House of David did exist in the 10th century BCE. However, that doesn't mean that the House of David was a united monarchy that encompassed all of Israel. It would simply mean that the House of David was some sort of established government, which could refer to a relatively small government like a city-state. Additionally, the Merneptah Stele appears to show evidence that Israel existed as an established community by the 13th century BCE. Both the Merneptah Stele and the inscriptions at the Temple of Karnak are Egyptian. So there is evidence that Egypt recognized Israel in the 13th century BCE and recognized the House of David in the 10th century BCE. So that by itself shows evidence that Israel likely existed before the House of David. Nevertheless, the main point is that the evidence of the House of David existing in the 10th century BCE is simply evidence of existence in the 10th century BCE and doesn't make any kind of specific claim as to the size or power of the House of David.

Moving further, archeological evidence shows that there wasn't likely a kingdom ruled from Jerusalem in the 10th century BCE and that the kingdom of Israel was the first kingdom in the highlands of Israel. The population level appears to have been relatively low in the southern highlands of Israel. The north appears

to have been much more populated. The communities in the highlands of Israel probably eventually mostly depended on agriculture, even though that may not have been the case earlier on when Israel was a smaller community. The land in the northern highlands was much more fruitful and appears 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 appear to have given 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 contrast, vegetation was relatively scarce in the south.

Given the different conditions in the north versus the south, two different economic systems appear to have developed in the highlands of Israel. As a result of the different conditions, the population level in the north appears to have been much higher than in the south. Eventually, population growth combined with favorable conditions in the north appears to have resulted in economic growth in the northern highlands, which in turn apparently resulted in the formation of the kingdom of Israel. So not only does archaeological evidence and other 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 and other evidence shows that the population level in the southern highlands appears to have grown much more after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire.

One of the most defining pieces of evidence that the kingdom of Israel was the first Israelite kingdom is the fact that it is named "Israel". The Merneptah Stele shows evidence that a community named Israel likely existed by the 13th 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 that referred to its people as Israelites. 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 to refer to its people as Israelites. 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 probably 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 but referred to its people as Israelites, and then for there to have been a kingdom that split off afterward that went back to the name "Israel" leaving the supposed original southern kingdom without the name of the nation that was Israel. Instead, it is much more likely that the first kingdom adopted the name "Israel" that already existed amongst that community. In addition to all of the other evidence already shown that the kingdom of Israel was the first Israelite kingdom, 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 Israelite kingdom and that the kingdom of David didn't exist as the Bible describes.

There have been three six-chamber gates found in Israel that can further our understanding of the dynamics of the development of ancient Israel. These six-chamber gates have been found in Gezer, Hazor, and Megiddo. The biggest significance to these findings is their similar structure that suggests that they were all built by the same government. The reason why that is so significant is because two of those

locations are in the north and one is in the south, which shows evidence that the same government was operating in both the north and the south. Hazor was in Galilee, Megiddo was in the Jezreel Valley (in between Galilee and Samaria), and Gezer was in Judah and relatively close to Jerusalem. This evidence has been used to assert that the kingdom of David did actually exist by asserting that the gates were constructed in the 10th century BCE. So it is asserted that these gates show evidence that a united monarchy existed in the 10th century BCE before the kingdom of Israel began and therefore the gates belonged to the kingdom of David. However, the dating of the 10th century BCE is controversial with some believing that the construction of the gates should be dated to the 9th century BCE. So the gates are either dated to the 10th century BCE and associated with the kingdom of David or dated to the 9th century BCE and associated with the kingdom of Israel.

Plenty of evidence has already been shown that the kingdom of Israel was the first Israelite kingdom, the kingdom of David did not exist as the Bible describes, the House of David existed during the same time-period as the kingdom of Israel, and the House of David was overshadowed by the kingdom of Israel. Therefore, dating the six-chamber gates to the 10th century BCE and attributing them to the kingdom of David appears to be incorrect. Instead, if there was ever an overarching government that had control in both the north and the south during the 9th or 10th century BCE, it apparently would have been the kingdom of Israel in the 9th century BCE. So it appears that the kingdom of Israel had control in both the north and the south. Additionally, according to the Tel Dan Stele, it appears that the House of David existed during the same time-period as the kingdom of Israel. Therefore, the House of David appears to have existed during a time-period in which the kingdom of Israel had control in both the north and the south. The six-chamber gate in the south is in Gezer, which was relatively close to Jerusalem. It appears that Jerusalem was not under the control of the kingdom of Israel; but even if that was the case, it appears that the kingdom of Israel was at least close by in Gezer. There are three possibilities: Jerusalem was entirely independent of the kingdom of Israel, Jerusalem was a part of the kingdom of Israel, or Jerusalem was somewhat independent but still acted as a vassal of the kingdom of Israel. According to the Tel Dan Stele, it appears that the House of David had at least some degree of independence from the kingdom of Israel. So either Jerusalem was a vassal of the kingdom of Israel or it was entirely independent; but even if it was entirely independent, it appears that the House of David didn't go far beyond Jerusalem if at all since the kingdom of Israel appears to have been so close by in Gezer. So the six-chamber gates show evidence that the kingdom of Israel had control in both the north and the south, and that the House of David was either a vassal of the kingdom of Israel and/or was so small that it didn't go far beyond Jerusalem if at all.

The Bible does reference the building of defensive structures in those specific cities as shown below.

1 Kings 9:15
Here is the account of the forced labor King Solomon conscripted to build the Lord's temple, his own palace, the supporting terraces, the wall of Jerusalem, and Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer.

This is the Bible claiming that the supposed kingdom of David under Solomon's rule built "the wall" of Jerusalem, Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer. It has already been shown that the three six-chamber gates in Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer appear to have been those of the kingdom of Israel. Additionally, we've seen plenty of false claims in the Bible, and more specifically we've seen plenty of false claims about the supposed kingdom of David or the kingdom of Judah having accomplished things that they didn't. So the

reference to these gates in 1 Kings 9:15 simply shows evidence that these gates existed. Meanwhile, the kingdom of Israel appears to have been the first Israelite kingdom. Therefore, 1 Kings 9:15 appears to be a fraudulent claim to take ownership of what was built by another kingdom, much like other claims we've seen. The reference to "the wall" of Jerusalem likely refers to something that was built by the kingdom of Judah if it really existed and maybe the information about forced labor building "the wall" of Jerusalem, the temple, the palace, and supporting terraces is accurate; but the information about the supposed kingdom of David building the gates in Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer appears to have been fraudulently added to take credit for gates that had been built by the kingdom of Israel.

More specifically about "the wall" of Jerusalem in 1 Kings 9:15, there has been a four-chamber gate found in Jerusalem. Some argue that this shows evidence that the six-chamber gates were built by the same power that ruled from Jerusalem. First off, even if the gate in Jerusalem was identical to the three six-chamber gates, that wouldn't necessarily mean that the power in Jerusalem ruled all of Israel. The House of David may have been a vassal of the kingdom of Israel or at least probably shared in strategy to a certain extent. There is evidence in the Bible that the kingdoms of Israel, Judah, and even Edom worked together at times. So it's certainly possible for Judah to have built a gate and to have copied the dimensions of gates in the kingdom of Israel. However, it's striking that the gate in Jerusalem is specifically four chambers instead of six chambers. If a power in Jerusalem built all of these gates and any of them were bigger or smaller than any of the others, it would be expected that Jerusalem would have the biggest or at least not the smallest. Instead, the gates in Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer are six-chamber gates while the one in Jerusalem is specifically smaller as a four-chamber gate, which shows further evidence that Jerusalem was not the ruling center of a power that controlled all of Israel and built all of these gates. Although, even if a six-chamber gate is found in Jerusalem at some point, that still wouldn't show that there was a ruling power in Jerusalem that controlled all of Israel and built all of these gates because it has already been shown that it appears that the kingdom of Israel was the first Israelite kingdom and that the gates in Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer appear to have been built by the kingdom of Israel regardless of what happened in Jerusalem.

As previously stated, in contrast to the Bible, the real House of David appears to have been 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 shows that the House of David may have been a vassal for the kingdom of Israel. Furthermore, the 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 people in the kingdom of Judah, which supposedly carried on the legacy of the House of David, 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 apparently grew into the kingdom of Judah, and the kingdom of Judah appears 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 appears 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, or even if neither of those possibilities occurred, 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 the Babylonian Empire.

Remnants of the Real Ancient Israel

There are a few pieces of archaeological evidence that can be connected to certain verses in the Bible. We should first revisit the attacks carried out by the Egyptian Empire in or around 926 BCE. These attacks appear to have included some Israelite territory. There was an Egyptian stele found in Megiddo (as previously mentioned, an ancient city in northern Israel) that shows the name of the Egyptian pharaoh Shoshenq I, which not only shows evidence that Pharoah Shoshenq I had some level of control in that city but also shows evidence of a military campaign by the Egyptian Empire given that Megiddo was a Canaanite/Israelite city and therefore a military campaign would likely have occurred to bring the city under some level of control by the Egyptian Empire. Additionally, there are accounts of military campaigns carried out by Pharoah Shoshenq I carved into walls of the Temple of Karnak in Egypt. These accounts include many names of cities supposedly conquered by Pharoah Shoshenq I. Among those names are Arad, Beth-She'an, and Megiddo. Arad was relatively close to Jerusalem, and Beth-She'an and Megiddo were in northern Israel. That shows evidence of attacks against multiple Israelite cities including both the north and south. Additionally, as explained earlier, it's possible that these inscriptions at the Temple of Karnak include a reference to the House of David. It's not definitive but it is at least a good possibility. The Bible includes the following verses that can be connected to these attacks.

1 Kings 14:25-26
In the fifth year of King Rehoboam, Shishak 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.

2 Chronicles 12:2
Because they had been unfaithful to the Lord, Shishak king of Egypt attacked Jerusalem in the fifth year of King Rehoboam.

These verses mention a king named "Shishak" and that name apparently refers to King Shoshenq I. So the likely scenario is that these verses do refer to the actual attacks by King Shoshenq I. The Bible claims that Jerusalem was included and there is at least a good possibility that one of the accounts at the Temple of Karnak refers to the House of David. On the other hand, the Bible is obviously very inaccurate in a lot of ways so we can't necessarily trust these verses and we don't know if the House of David is referred to at the Temple of Karnak. So Jerusalem may or may not have been included in these attacks. Regardless, these verses at least recognize the presence of attacks that were apparently going on according to Egyptian inscriptions at the Temple of Karnak.

The Mesha Stele, which has been dated to the second half of the 9th century BCE, describes relations between the House of Omri and Moab. As mentioned earlier, Omri was a king of the kingdom of Israel

and the kingdom of Israel appears to have continued to be called the House of Omri after his reign much like appears to have been the case with the House of David. It was previously mentioned that the Bible describes Moabites as descendants of Lot and claims 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 appear 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". However, the Mesha Stele portrays Mesha as more dominant and victorious and the Bible describes Mesha losing the battle until the kidnapping of a son of the king of Edom. Additionally, the Mesha Stele says that Omri was the ruler of Israel and the Bible says that Joram of Israel was ruling (Joram was a part of the same dynasty as Omri). Either could be wrong, but a foreign government would be more likely to make an error like that. With the similarities from two different sources, it appears that both contain fragments of truth, but either could be false to a certain extent.

Another important point is that the Mesha Stele is about a conflict with Israel and considers "the vessels of Jehovah" as a part of Israel. "Jehovah" is a reference to Yahweh. Meanwhile, the Mesha Stele refers to Omri who was a king of the kingdom of Israel. So we're definitely dealing with the kingdom of Israel, but somehow "the vessels of Jehovah" are considered a part of the same kingdom. The text states "I took from it the vessels of Jehovah". The word "it" refers to the enemy that Moab was fighting against, which was previously described as Israel and the kingdom that Omri ruled over. If "the vessels of Jehovah" are considered a part of the kingdom of Israel, then it appears that Judah was considered a part of the kingdom of Israel. A foreign government seemingly recognizing Judah as a part of the kingdom of Israel shows evidence that Judah was either a part of the kingdom of Israel or at least a vassal of the kingdom of Israel. It's certainly not definitive proof, especially since a foreign government could misunderstand the exact relationship between Israel and Judah or make any other error, like naming Omri instead of Joram, but it's nevertheless strong evidence that Judah was somehow tied to the kingdom of Israel with the kingdom of Israel being the overarching entity.

The Tel Dan Stele, which as mentioned earlier has been dated to the 9th and 8th 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 slewing of seventy kings, the killing of Jehoram ("Joram" in the Bible) son of Ahab king of Israel, and the killing of Ahazaiahu ("Ahaziah" in the Bible) 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 10:1-3

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 Ahaziah son of Jehoram king of Judah 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 somewhat different. One difference relates to the Bible describing Jehu king of Israel as having ordered those killings, while the Tel Dan Stele appears to portray King Hazael of Aram as the one who ordered those killings.

There are also Sennacherib's Annals, which are annals of the Assyrian emperor Sennacherib and they have been found inscribed on clay prisms. They describe a siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib during the reign of King Hezekiah of the kingdom of Judah. The following verse shows that the Bible appears to address the attack described on the clay tablets that show Sennacherib's Annals.

2 Kings 18:13
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 appears that the kingdom of Judah became a vassal of the Assyrian Empire and that also appears to have been the case with the kingdom of Israel before it was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire. Sometime after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed, the Assyrian Empire apparently attacked the kingdom of Judah and King Hezekiah appears 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 the Egyptian pharaoh Shoshenq I attacking Israel, a battle between Israel and Moab, the killings of Joram son of Ahab king of Israel and Ahaziah son of Jehoram king of Judah as well as seventy sons of the house of Ahab, and the attack of the kingdom of Judah by the Assyrian emperor

Sennacherib. So there appears to be some historical truth in these biblical narratives, but they also appear 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 the production of 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 900-600 BCE. Additionally, as previously shown, there appears to have been a number of narratives first recorded during the Babylonian Exile, approximately in the time-period of 600-500 BCE, and there also appears to have been narratives first recorded after the Babylonian Exile. So we can already see that a lot of the writing in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament appears to have been first produced in the time-period of 900-500 BCE and that there continued to be narratives produced even after that time-period.

Additional evidence can be found in chapter 12 of Genesis.

Genesis 12:6-9
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 and pitched his tent, with 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 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 12:6-9 we can see that the kingdom of Judah appears 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 ever 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 to a certain extent. All of Israel appears to have been engulfed by the Assyrian Empire, but the kingdom of Judah was left to be its own state within the Assyrian Empire or at least a vassal for the Assyrian Empire. As we will see in more detail later, a similar situation existed between Judea (Judah was later called "Judea") 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 or as a vassal of a foreign empire. This also appears to have been the case between the kingdom of Judah and the Assyrian Empire. As a result, it appears that 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 pushed 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. The simplification of details in Genesis that match a much more extravagant story in the book of Exodus shows that those details in Genesis were probably copied from the book of Exodus and therefore probably produced after the original exodus story was produced. Facing off with the pharaoh of Egypt is a major story and wouldn't likely be described in such a brief way unless the author was copying details from the book of Exodus to fulfill some sort of technicality. That technicality likely being that Abraham needs to be the first to have done certain things because he is portrayed as the patriarch of the Jewish religion and the one who is portrayed as having a covenant directly with God. Just as chapter 12 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. So chapter 12 appears to serve the purpose of portraying Abraham as the first to have gone to Shechem and Bethel and the first to have faced off with the pharaoh of Egypt. Portraying Abraham as having done something specifically before Moses would be of importance in trying to convert non-Jewish people to Judaism. For someone who was already Jewish, it wouldn't matter so much if Abraham or Moses was the first to have faced off with the pharaoh of Egypt because Abraham and Moses would both be considered a part of the Jewish religion. But to someone who wasn't Jewish, they would need to accept Abraham as the patriarch. When trying to convert non-Jewish people to Judaism, selling Abraham becomes much more important, and with that comes the motivation to place Abraham specifically above Moses on the issue of facing off with the pharaoh of Egypt. 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 by making him the first to have gone to Shechem and Bethel and the first to have faced off with the pharaoh of Egypt. In terms of dating, describing Abraham as having faced off with the pharaoh of Egypt shows evidence that such writing was apparently produced after certain narratives about Moses and the supposed exodus were produced.

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 appears to be an attempt to convince people to use the name "Yahweh" instead of the name "El" and to relate the name "Yahweh" to people who knew 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 appears 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 appears to have been dominant in northern Israel and a monotheistic kingdom in the south appears to have tried to expand into the north while using words that were familiar to polytheists in the targeted areas. That's not to say that every conversion tactic or expansion strategy involved the use of the word "Elohim" or the name "El". For example, chapter 12 of Genesis uses the name "Yahweh" but the narratives in chapter 12 still appear to be a part of conversion tactics and an expansion strategy. It appears that different people at different times used different strategies. So it wasn't always the case that the word "Elohim" and the name "El" were used, but they were used in chapter 17.

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 writing during the reign of the kingdom of Judah after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed, likely in the time-period of 720-600 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 the kingdom of Israel as splitting off as its own kingdom. As already shown, the kingdom of David apparently didn't exist as the Bible describes and instead the kingdom of Israel was apparently the first kingdom. 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 that's mentioned in the Bible. 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.

Some of the narratives about David were probably used as a part of an expansion strategy into the north. However, certain narratives appear to have been produced before the kingdom of Israel was destroyed.

1 Kings 12:19
So Israel has been in rebellion against the house of David to this day.

1 Kings 12:19 appears to have been written while the kingdom of Israel was still intact because the verse is describing Israel as independent from the House of David "to this day". Based on the use of the phrase "to this day", it appears that the kingdom of Israel was still around when that writing was produced. As mentioned before, David appears to have been a real person who ruled Judah, however big or small it was at that time. So fabricated narratives exalting David could have been produced during his reign or anytime afterward. The general legend of David would have begun during his reign and then it continued to grow even afterward. So there was probably a lot of writing about him after his reign, and more specifically some of that was probably a part of an expansion strategy. In addition to that, there was probably writing during his reign and afterward before the kingdom of Israel was destroyed, and 1 Kings 12:19 is specific evidence of that. Evidence has been shown that Judah may have been a vassal for the kingdom of Israel. It would have been advantageous for the government of Judah to convince the population in Judah that Judah was somehow better than the kingdom of Israel and was the original government before the kingdom of Israel was established. A strategy like that fuels loyalty and pride in the people. That kind of strategy was used by a lot of governments in ancient times and is used by countries in today's world as well. Judah was smaller, weaker, and less prosperous in the midst of an overarching pagan kingdom of Israel, and we can see that there appears to have been strategies implemented to control and influence the people to remain loyal to Judah and to be prideful.

So what we've seen so far in the dating of Old Testament narratives is that Abraham and David were apparently used to try to claim all of Israel as the kingdom of Judah and to specifically claim that such control over all of Israel was already in place before the kingdom of Israel ever existed. Furthermore, some of that was apparently a part of an expansion strategy into northern Israel after the kingdom of Israel had been destroyed by the Assyrian Empire.

We can turn to Isaiah 7:14-17 for 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 physically appearing in the first century. However, these verses do appear to be about a coming messiah. How could these verses be about a coming messiah but not about Christ physically appearing in the first century? Well, it appears that there was someone who isn't Christ who wanted to be viewed as a messianic figure.

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 of Assyria."

Isaiah 8:8
"And sweep on into Judah, swirling over it, passing through it, and reaching up to the neck. Its outspread wings will cover the breadth 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 supposed prophecy is given for the name of the son, that supposed prophecy goes on to describe the destructions of two kingdoms by the Assyrian Empire, and it is described that the destructions of those kingdoms would happen 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.

The two kingdoms that are referenced appear to be the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus. The kingdom of Aram-Damascus was northwest relative to the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, and north of the kingdoms of Ammon and Moab. The capital of the kingdom of Israel was Samaria and the capital of the kingdom of Aram-Damascus was Damascus, and both Samaria and Damascus are specifically referred to in Isaiah 8:3-4 so those verses are apparently referring to the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus. Isaiah 7:14-17 doesn't explicitly refer to a specific kingdom but simply says "the land of the two kings you dread". However, Isaiah 7:1 says "King Rezin of Aram and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel marched up to fight against Jerusalem", and that sets the stage for the narrative that Isaiah 7:14-17 are a part of. Additionally, both the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus were destroyed by the Assyrian Empire within a relatively short time-span with both of them apparently having been destroyed in the time-period of 720-740 BCE. Meanwhile, the other neighboring kingdoms of Edom, Ammon, and Moab were attacked but not destroyed by the Assyrian Empire. So it appears that the information in Isaiah 7:14-17 is referring specifically to the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus just like Isaiah 8:3-4. So Isaiah 7:14-17 and 8:3-4 appear to share common information about the destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus, which shows further evidence that one was apparently copied from the other.

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 it appears to have been 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 statement עִמָּנוּ ("Immanu") אֵל: ("El"), which can be translated as "God with us". Such similar wording, particularly with the specific use of the word "El" within writing that specifically 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 supposed prophecy is given for the name of the son, that supposed prophecy goes on to describe the destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus by the Assyrian Empire, it is described that the destructions of those kingdoms would happen before the son learns either right from wrong or how to say "My father" or "My mother", and the statement "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”, appears to specifically refer to the destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus 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 destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus, but chapter 7 goes further by placing special importance on “the boy”. Chapter 8 is really focused on the destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus and the name of “the boy” even appears to refer to the destructions of those kingdoms. Therefore, the destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus are the main focus of chapter 8. Chapter 7, on the other hand, puts some focus on the destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus 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 destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus, there wouldn’t appear to be much motivation to copy that narrative to produce a new narrative about the destructions of those kingdoms because that would simply be 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 appears to have been copied from the narrative in chapter 8 because both narratives put some focus on the destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus but chapter 7 expands to put exalted focus on “the boy”. Chapter 8 appears to use the name of “the boy” to refer to the destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus, so “the boy” appears to take a backseat to the main focus of chapter 8. Meanwhile, chapter 7 exalts “the boy” while still placing focus on the destructions of the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus. So it appears that the author of Isaiah 7:14-17 copied the statement “Immanu El” and specifically used it to exalt “the boy”.

Additionally, as previously mentioned, it’s particularly telling that Isaiah 7:14-17 use the word “El” within writing that specifically 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 exalt the kingdom of David or the kingdom of Judah. To see the word “El” in Isaiah 7:14-17 given that those verses specifically refer to the House of David strongly suggests that the part about the name “Immanuel” came from writing that already existed.

So it appears 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 evidence that shows 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 fraudulently 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 7:10-17
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 my 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 the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus. 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 kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus 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 the kingdoms of Israel and Aram-Damascus.

The Hebrew word that gets translated as "virgin" comes from the Hebrew word הָעַלְמָה ("alma") and that word doesn't really specifically mean "virgin" but instead refers to a young 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 King 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 King Ahaz is the father of "the boy". The Bible describes King Hezekiah as a son of King Ahaz. Therefore, "the boy" described in Isaiah 7:14-17 is apparently 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 appears to have been a current event during the reign of King Hezekiah and that shows evidence that a false supposed prophecy about the destruction of the kingdom of Israel would have likely been produced during the reign of King Hezekiah.

More 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, in the book of Isaiah as well as in 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles, Isaiah is described as having been around during the reign of King Hezekiah. Just based on that, any false supposed prophecy about a specific king 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 supposed prophecy contained in Isaiah 7:14-17. Isaiah 7:3 describes the "Upper Pool" existing during the reign of King Ahaz, Hezekiah's father. However, 2 Kings describes a pool having been built during the reign of King Hezekiah and 2 Chronicles describes a water system having been 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?

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.

These verses not only show that Hezekiah had a pool built during his reign but also show that the building of that pool is specifically mentioned in concluding statements about King Hezekiah's reign. 2 Kings 20:20 generally refers to "all his achievements" and only specifically refers the building of "the pool and the tunnel by which he brought water into the city". So the building of this pool and tunnel are being portrayed as Hezekiah's top achievement. Meanwhile, the book of Isaiah appears to refer to the same pool but describes that pool as having existed before Hezekiah became king. That shows evidence that a fraudulent narrative was produced when that pool already existed and that the pool was mistakenly

described as existing before it actually did, which shows evidence that the author was making a fraudulent retroactive account about conversations that never happened. That shows evidence that Isaiah 7:3 was fraudulently produced during the reign of King Hezekiah and therefore shows further evidence that the apparently false supposed prophecy in Isaiah 7:14-17 was produced during the reign of King Hezekiah.

Now that we've seen an example of a false supposed prophecy that was produced to fraudulently exalt King Hezekiah, we can now turn to an example related to King Josiah.

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.' "

Chapter 12 of 1 Kings describes King Jeroboam as having golden calves built in Bethel and Dan. 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. Given all of the fraudulent writing so far and especially the fraudulent supposed prophecy about King Hezekiah being a messianic figure, we can easily conclude that 1 Kings 13:2 is apparently fraudulent and was likely produced either shortly before or sometime after King Josiah had those golden calves destroyed. 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 apparent fraud committed in relation to a king of Judah and shows specific evidence that fraudulent writing was produced either during the reign of King Josiah or sometime afterward if someone was trying to use King Josiah to denounce the golden calves as we will get into more detail on later.

We can now turn to Isaiah 45:1.

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."

Earlier here in Part 3, it was explained that Isaiah 45:1 appears to have been produced during or after the Babylonian Exile because it refers to Cyrus, the Persian emperor who freed the Israelites, which shows further evidence that it is fraudulent because the book of Isaiah is proposed to have been written long before then; but of course we could already see that it is fraudulent because it refers to Cyrus as God's "anointed". So there's two points right away to recognize. One is simply that this verse is fraudulent. The other is specifically in relation to dating the writing to during or after the Babylonian Exile.

Isaiah 45:1 appears to refer to Cyrus as a messiah. The Hebrew word מָשִׁיחַ ("mashíakh"), which means "anointed", 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 there were supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah, a reference to "God's anointed" was a reference connected to supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah. From that perspective, Isaiah 45:1 appears to refer to Cyrus, a Persian emperor, as the coming Messiah. So shortly before or shortly after the Babylonian Exile ended, writing was produced that fraudulently portrayed the Persian emperor Cyrus, who freed the Israelites, as God's "anointed", which appears to portray Cyrus as the coming Messiah.

We will get into more details about supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah in Part 4. For now, the conclusions we need to move forward with about Isaiah 45:1 are that it is fraudulent and that it was produced shortly before or shortly after the Babylonian Exile ended.

Moving further, there are three main classifications for dating Old Testament narratives: the first temple period (the reign of the kingdom of Judah), the Babylonian Exile, and the second temple period. So far, we have seen examples of writing that was produced during the first temple period and writing that was produced during the Babylonian Exile, and in the case of Isaiah 45:1 writing that was maybe produced shortly after the Babylonian Exile ended. After the Israelites were freed by the Persian Empire and allowed to go to Israel, a second temple was built and so began the second temple period that lasted until 70 CE when the Roman Empire destroyed that temple during the Jewish-Roman War.

In assessing what writing could have been produced during the second temple period, there are two main factors to consider. One is writing that is focused on the functioning of the temple. One key example is writing about blood sacrifices. The other main factor is writing that focuses on the authority of Jewish priests, particularly the Levites. Any writing that focuses on the temple is likely to have been written in the first or second temple period rather than during the Babylonian Exile. Any writing that focuses on the authority of Jewish priests, particularly specific references to the Levites, is likely to have been written during the second temple period. The reason for that is related to the shift in the power dynamics going from the first temple period to the Babylonian Exile to the second temple period. First there was a king ruling over the kingdom of Judah; and like most kingdoms and empires in ancient times, the government ruled over the religion. In today's world, we're more familiar with the concept of the separation of church and state. That's a relatively modern concept. In ancient times, religion was regularly used to govern the people. When the kingdom of Judah was destroyed by the Babylonian Exile, that particular style of government disappeared for the Jewish population. They no longer had a king ruling over the kingdom of Judah. It was up to Jewish priests to maintain the Jewish religion. As a result, the authority of the priests increased in a way among the Jewish population. Without a Jewish king, the Jewish priests were left to fill the void. That began to take shape in the wake of the destruction of the kingdom of Judah and continued to develop throughout the Babylonian Exile and afterward. So when the second temple period began, the Jewish priests were in complete control of Judaism. From a governmental perspective, they had to adhere to the Persian Empire; but from a religious perspective, they had a Jewish state and a Jewish temple without a Jewish king to have to adhere to. While there was an overarching empire ruling over them throughout the second temple period, whether the Persian Empire, the Macedonian Empire, or the Roman Empire, the Jewish priests were still able to control the religion of Judaism without a Jewish king, and religion controlled so much of the ancient world.

Now that it has been established that any writing that focuses on the authority of the priests is likely to have been written during the second temple period, it should now be recognized that much of the law of Moses was probably written during the second temple period. The law of Moses ruled the land of Judea in the second temple period, and the people who made sure of that were Jewish priests. It was shown earlier that Abraham and David were used by the kingdom of Judah to implement an expansion strategy into northern Israel after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed. There appears to have been a shift in strategy going from the first temple period to the second temple period. That shift was from the kingdom of Judah in the first temple period using Abraham and David as a part of an expansion strategy to Jewish priests in the second temple period using Moses to implement Jewish law.

The following verses show one of the most glaring examples of the priests taking control.

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."

These verses gave Levites a license to profit from offerings that people made to God. According to these verses, any offerings that were kept from the fire went straight to Levites, which shows that these verses were obviously apparently produced by a Levite so that Levites could fraudulently profit from offerings people made to God. For further evidence of that, we can turn to verses about the offerings in the book of Exodus.

Exodus 25:1-9
The Lord said to Moses, "Tell the Israelites to bring me an offering. You are to receive the offering for me from each man whose heart prompts him to give. These are the offerings you are to receive from them: gold, silver, and bronze; blue, purple, and scarlet yarn and fine linen; goat hair; ram skins dyed red and hides of sea cows; acacia wood; olive oil for the light; spices for the anointing oil and for the fragrant incense; and onyx stones and other gems to be mounted on the ephod and breastpiece.
Then have them make a sanctuary for me, and I will dwell among them. Make this tabernacle and all its furnishings exactly like the pattern I will show you."

Exodus 25:1-9 demand that people give among other things gold, silver, bronze, onyx stones, "other gems", and fine linen. Obviously, these are material possessions of wealth that probably wouldn't be demanded from God. Such material possessions of wealth wouldn't realistically be important to the true religion, but human beings want material possessions of wealth. Human beings want gold, silver, bronze, onyx stones, "other gems", and fine linen, so obviously these verses were fraudulently made up by a human being. Additionally, they also demand that people give acacia wood, olive oil for light, and spices, all of which would be concerns of human beings and would not be essential for the true religion. So not only can we see fraud in Numbers 18:8-9 with those verses giving way to priests profiting from offerings made by people to God, but we can also see fraud in Exodus 25:1-9 with the ridiculous demands that are obviously really about wealth and luxury. We can further see that Exodus 25:1-9 are fraudulent given that priests were profiting from these offerings as shown in Numbers 18:8-9.

The following verses take it to an even greater extreme.

Numbers 35:1-3
"Command the Israelites to give the Levites towns to live in from the inheritance the Israelites will possess. And give them pasturelands around the towns. Then they will have towns to live in and pasturelands for their cattle, flocks and all their other livestock."

Numbers 35:7
In all you must give the Levites forty-eight towns, together with their pasture lands.

These verses propose that the Levites are supposed to receive land in addition to all of the material possessions of wealth previously mentioned. Additionally, the Levites were supposed to receive so much

land that they were supposed to have control over 48 towns. Obviously, not only demanding land for the Levites but also to such a magnitude would have been a demand made by Levites, not a king.

We saw some other laws earlier here in Part 3 as well as in the introduction of this book that show clear evidence of fraudulent attempts to control the people. The verses below are ones that specifically relate to the priests.

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 jealously come over her husband and he suspects his wife and she is impure – or if he is jealous and suspects her even though she in not impure – then he is to take his wife to the priest."

The focus on the priests is evidence that these laws came from priests rather than a king. In a kingdom, the king rules over everybody and everything, including the religion. In that way, everybody is subject to the king, including priests and others who had a job within the religion of the kingdom. Going back to the verses from Numbers, a king would be focused on profiting for themselves and for the kingdom, not so much specifically for the priests. Numbers 18:8-9 show clear evidence that the priests were trying to profit from offerings people made to God and Numbers 35:1-3 and 35:7 show clear evidence that the Levites demanded land from the people. In the case of Leviticus 21:9, a king is unlikely to care so much about what a daughter of a priest does, but the priest obviously would care a lot more, so Leviticus 21:9 obviously apparently came from a priest. Numbers 5:12-15 serve the purpose of making priests authority figures about adultery. Again, this is unlikely to be an order of a king as a king wouldn't be so focused on individual marriages. Instead, that is obviously something the priests would want for themselves in the process of trying to control the people of Judea, which is what they did during the second temple period.

The book of Exodus goes on to give very specific instructions about building the ark made of pure gold, an atonement cover made of pure gold, a table of acacia wood overlayed with pure gold, a lampstand made of pure gold, the tabernacle, and a courtyard for the tabernacle. First off, a king wouldn't even need this in writing, they would just have it done. Second, the reason why the tabernacle takes such importance and why it needed a courtyard is because that represented the center for the priests. In other words, the temple was their center. The tabernacle wouldn't need such focus from a king, but the priests were obsessed with it. Third, some of these verses demand that materials be provided by the people, which wouldn't need to be the case in a kingdom but would need to be the case in the second temple period when the priests were trying to be in charge but weren't wealthy like a king would have been. We can see this specifically about the lampstand as shown by the following verse.

Exodus 27:20
"Command the Israelites to bring you clear oil of pressed olives for the light so that the lamps may be kept burning."

This instruction obviously wouldn't be needed in a kingdom. Instead, during the second temple period, the priests had limited resources and they were fine with using and controlling the people to get what they wanted.

Going back to the point about the temple being the center for the priests, we can see how far they were willing to go by the following verses.

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."

Exodus 30:16
"Receive the atonement money from the Israelites and use it for the service of the Tent of Meeting. It will be a memorial for the Israelites before the Lord, making atonement for your lives."

Exodus 30:12 says that a plague will come upon people if they don't give to the priests, Exodus 30:16 shows that this was for "the Tent of Meeting", which represented a place of worship like the temple, and the idea of atonement is how this demand is presented to the people.

There also are verses that focus on priestly garments, which obviously the priests would care much more about than any king; and a king wouldn't need something as silly as instructions about priestly garments to be in writing the way that the book of Exodus displays it.

Exodus 28:2-5
"Make sacred garments for your brother Aaron, to give him dignity and honor. Tell all the skilled men to whom I have given wisdom in such matters that they are to make garments for Aaron, for his consecration, so he may serve me as a priest. These are the garments they are to make: a breastpiece, an ephod, a robe, a woven tunic, a turban, and a sash. They are to make these sacred garments for your brother Aaron and his sons, so they may serve me as priests. Have them use gold, and blue, purple, and scarlet yarn, and fine linen."

These verses are a part of a set of verses that take up all of chapter 28 and span 43 verses, and it's all about priestly garments. Such a ridiculous level of detail about priestly garments obviously came from priests, not a king.

There have been several specific verses presented that show clear evidence that certain laws came from priests, not a king; and priests wouldn't have been making laws like that during the reign of a king, but they would have during the second temple period. So this analysis so far not only shows who made these laws, but also when they did it. Additionally, the miniscule details that are provided show that a king wouldn't have made these laws. There is an incredible degree of micromanaging going on with these laws. A king had a grander vision of what they wanted for themselves and for the kingdom. The priests during the second temple period, however, had a much smaller domain of power. They were not in charge of a kingdom but were instead in charge of a religion in a relatively small area that was a part of a larger empire. The wider of a scope someone's power has, the more they need to prioritize because they don't have enough time and energy to go over every little detail. The smaller of a scope someone's power has, the more likely they are to micromanage because they don't have as much to take control of. So the

micromanaging that goes on with these laws shows further evidence that they came from priests of the second temple period rather than a king.

Now that we've seen several pieces of evidence that the priests of the second temple period fraudulently made up laws, we should now turn towards the beginning of the book of Exodus to see the presence of the Levites there.

Exodus 2:1
Now a man of the house of Levi married a Levite woman, and she became pregnant and gave birth to a son.

Exodus 2:1 describes the birth of Moses and portrays both of his parents as Levites. Presenting Moses as a pure Levite is further evidence that the Levites of the second temple period used Moses as their star to implement their control.

We've reached the conclusions that the second temple period emphasized the Levites and Moses' law. Furthermore, a lot of the law that we've examined so far comes from the book of Exodus, which contains the most exciting narratives about Moses, including those about the supposed exodus and parting of the Red Sea. The verses below show evidence that someone who fraudulently altered the book of Exodus also fraudulently altered 1 Kings.

Exodus 32:4-6
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.

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.

The account in the book of Exodus describes Aaron as having built a golden calf for people to worship, and the account in 1 Kings describes King Jeroboam as having golden calves built for people to worship. The account in the book of Exodus describes Aaron as having built an altar, and the account in 1 Kings describes King Jeroboam as having made a sacrifice on an altar. 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", and the account in 1 Kings describes King Jeroboam as having said "Here are your gods, O Israel, who brought

you up out of Egypt". These accounts are so similar that they were probably written by the same author. The next most realistic possibility is that one was copied from the other. The Levites are exalted in the story in 1 Kings by saying "appointed priests from all sorts of people, even though they were not Levites", which shows evidence that a pro-Levite author wrote that. Meanwhile, it's already been established that the Levites appear to have written a lot of Moses' law, which the book of Exodus contains a large portion of, so it would make sense if these verses from the book of Exodus and 1 Kings were written by the same author or if one of these accounts was copied from the other. As we are about to see more evidence of, it appears that a pro-Levite party fraudulently altered narratives about King Josiah. If these verses were written by the same author, that would be in line with the other evidence that shows that a pro-Levite party made up a lot of Moses' law and that they fraudulently altered narratives about King Josiah. If the verses from 1 Kings were copied from the book of Exodus, that would show that a pro-Levite party fraudulently altered 1 Kings in a way that is pro-Levite. If the verses in the book of Exodus were copied from 1 Kings, that would show that someone used a pro-Levite narrative to alter the book of Exodus, which is dominated by pro-Levite writing that even portrays Moses as a pure Levite. What this all shows is that, regardless of the exact circumstances, it appears that pro-Levite writing went into fraudulently altering both the book of Exodus as well as narratives about King Josiah, and that in the case of the specific verses above it's probable that both sets of verses were fraudulently produced or altered by the same pro-Levite party.

The following verses show further evidence that a pro-Levite author fraudulently altered narratives about King Josiah.

2 Chronicles 34:8
In the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, to purify the land and the temple, he sent Shaphan 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 Chronicles 34:9
They went to Hilkiah the high priest and gave him the money that had been brought into the temple of God, which the Levites who were the doorkeepers had collected from the people of Manasseh, Ephraim, and the entire remnant of Israel and from all the people of Judah and Benjamin and the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

2 Chronicles 34:10
Then they entrusted it to the men appointed to supervise the work on the Lord's temple. These men paid the workers who repaired and restored the temple.

2 Chronicles 34:11-13
They also gave money to the carpenters and builders to purchase dressed stone, and timber for joists and beams for the buildings that the kings of Judah had allowed to fall into ruin.
The men did the work faithfully. Over them to direct them were Jahath and Obadiah, Levites descended from Merari, and Zechariah and Meshullam, descended from Kohath. The Levites – all who were skilled in playing musical instruments – had charge of the laborers and supervised all the workers from job to job. Some of the Levites were secretaries, scribes, and doorkeepers.

Verses 8, 9, and 10 have been separated from verses 11-13 to show differences in writing styles. Verses 8, 9, and 10 all refer to the Jewish temple but do so in different ways. Verse 8 says "the temple of the Lord his God", which is translated from the Hebrew words בֵּית ("bet") יְהוָה ("Yahweh") אֱלֹהָיו: ("Elohaw"). Verse 9 says "the temple of God", which is translated from the Hebrew words בֵּית־ ("bet") אֱלֹהִים ("Elohim"). Verse 10 says "the temple of the Lord", which is translated from the Hebrew words בְּבֵית ("bebet") יְהוָה ("Yahweh"). So verse 8 uses "Yahweh Elohaw", verse 9 uses "Elohim", and verse 10 uses "Yahweh". Each of those is different showing three different writing styles, which shows evidence that three different sources are involved in these verses. There's a lot of exaltation of the Levites in these verses and in some strange ways that seem irrelevant. Verses 11-13 say that the Levites supervised the work of the temple, which isn't that strange since they were generally in charge of the temple, but then these verses go on to describe all Levites as being skilled in musical instruments, which is an irrelevant side note that only exalts the Levites, then the narrative goes back to talking about supervision of the work being done on the temple, and then the last verse oddly ends by saying "some of the Levites were secretaries, scribes, and doorkeepers", which is another irrelevant side note that only serves the purpose of boasting about how great the Levites supposedly were. These verses were obviously written by a pro-Levite author and some of these details are removed from the fundamentals of the narrative, which is really about construction on the temple, not how great the Levites supposedly were. That shows clear evidence that this narrative was fraudulently altered by a pro-Levite author.

As we examine verse 9, there are two conclusions that can be derived. One is that the word "Elohim" is used, which not only is in contrast to verses 8 and 10 but is also characteristic of older writing. The word "Elohim" was much more likely to have been used during the reigns of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. As time went on, "Elohim" appears to have been somewhat phased out and the name "Yahweh" was usually used. Also as time went on, new words were combined with "Yahweh" that had the same root as "Elohim" but different suffixes, like "Elohe", "Elohaw", and "Elohenu". So the use of the word "Elohim", especially without the name "Yahweh", is more characteristic of older writing. Meanwhile, the other conclusion that can be reached about verse 9 is that there is also exaltation of the Levites. Verse 9 describes the Levites as doorkeepers who collected money from everyone. The high status of the Levites in general is not characteristic of the presence of a Jewish king. When there was a king, the king was exalted far beyond any priest and was looked upon as the primary leader of all Jews. From that perspective, any of this exaltation of the Levites is likely to have occurred after there was no longer a Jewish king. So describing the Levites as doorkeepers who collected money from everyone is more characteristic of a later fraudulent alteration after there was no longer a Jewish king; and as previously explained, the use of the name "Elohim" is more characteristic of writing that was produced when there was a king. Therefore, verse 9 appears to be the product of two different sources. The pro-Levite alterations appear to begin in the middle of verse 9 and extend through verse 13. So these verses serve as evidence that that there was fraudulent pro-Levite writing that occurred at a relatively later time, and that a pro-Levite party fraudulently altered narratives about King Josiah.

Now that we've seen that this narrative from chapter 34 of 2 Chronicles was fraudulently altered by a pro-Levite party, we can see more of what they were trying to accomplish when we continue with the text right after the verses just previously shown.

2 Chronicles 34:14-15

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.

These verses show that the fraudulent alterations center around the supposed discovery of "the book of the law". Furthermore, these verses say "the temple of the Lord" while only using the name "Yahweh" without "Elohim" or "Elohaw", which is characteristic of verses 11-13 and those verses were shown to be pro-Levite fraudulent alterations, so we can see that verses 14-15 about the law appear to have been written by the same pro-Levite party, which would make sense since the law is very beneficial to the Levites. It had already been shown that a pro-Levite party made up most of Moses' law and that a pro-Levite party fraudulently altered narratives about King Josiah. Now we can see that fraudulent alterations to narratives about King Josiah are about the law, which as we've seen was very beneficial to Levites.

The same kind of narrative is in chapter 22 of 2 Kings as well. That narrative is also about the supposed discovery of "the book of the law". However, that one doesn't exalt the Levites the way that the one in 2 Chronicles does. Nevertheless, we've already seen evidence that a pro-Levite party fraudulently altered narratives about King Josiah, so it's already likely the case that the same is going on in the narrative in 2 Kings as well. The main point is that the supposed discovery of "the book of the law" is probably just a fraudulent introduction to the presence of the new law that the Levites came up with rather than a book that was actually discovered during the time of King Josiah. Additionally, a king wouldn't likely want that kind of law that is so ridiculously favorable to priests being implemented in the kingdom. Furthermore, as previously explained, a king wouldn't likely micromanage as much as Moses' law does, but priests of the second temple period would have. So the supposed discovery of the book of the law during the reign of King Josiah probably never happened. Meanwhile, the law appears to have been made up by Levites who produced it in a way that Levites could profit from offerings that people made to God and could obtain a relatively massive amount of land all the while controlling and micromanaging the Jewish population.

So King Josiah appears to have been used to set the stage for Moses' law, which was the primary arsenal of the Jewish priests of the second temple period. There appears to have been a shift in strategy going from the first temple period to the Babylonian Exile to the second temple period. Abraham and David were used during the first temple period to try to lay claim to all of Israel. In contrast, King Josiah was the king they used to be the one to represent that the law was being brought into use after previously not being used while retroactively attributing the implementation of the law to a past king after there wasn't a king anymore, which set the stage for Moses to be the star of the law. There was a change from mainly using Abraham and David during the first temple period with a king and opportunity to advance into the north to mainly using Moses and Josiah in the second temple period without a king and as a part of larger empire. Meanwhile, one likely possibility is that Moses became the star because of the Babylonian Exile. It may have been the case that Moses became much more popular during the Exile because Israelites could relate to the stories about being taken from home and being in a foreign land. The imprisonment of the Exile gave way to a whole new chapter of Judaism; and when the Exile ended, the new Judaism expanded even further and the second temple period reigned in with control given to the Jewish priests while adhering to a larger empire.

It was previously asserted that a lot of the writing in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament was probably produced during the reign of the kingdom of Judah or during the Babylonian Exile, in the time-period of 900-500 BCE, and that there continued to be narratives produced even after that time-period. There was one verse shown, 1 Kings 12:19, that appears to have been produced during the reign of the kingdom of Israel, likely in the time-period of 900-720 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 Elohimist 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 appears 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. We saw that there appears to have been a fraudulent supposed prophecy about King Hezekiah being a messianic figure, which was probably produced during the 8th or 7th century BCE. 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 apparently produced during the Babylonian Exile in the 6th century BCE. Different documents were apparently compiled together during the Babylonian Exile and those documents appear to have continued to be edited during and after the Exile. Some writing appears 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 emperor who released Israelites, as a messianic figure, was obviously produced around the time that the Exile ended. Although the original legends of Moses, the supposed exodus, and the week of unleavened bread may have been around before the kingdom of Judah was ever established, it appears that major portions of the writings related to those legends as well as a lot of Moses' law was produced during the second temple period. 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 2nd century BCE.

The Formation of Judaism

It appears that the presence of Yahweism originated somewhere outside of Israel sometime by the 15th century BCE. At some point, Yahwehist beliefs entered Jerusalem. It's not clear how that happened and it's not clear how Yahwehist beliefs began. Given the monotheism of Yahwehism in a polytheistic world, it's very possible that there was a direct message from God to a human being. On the other hand, it's also possible that someone was simply smart enough to believe in monotheism. However Yahwehism began, Yahwehist beliefs appear to have been imported into Jerusalem at some point.

The name "Judaism" comes from the same root as the name "Judah", so "Judaism" is "Judah-ism". In other words, Judaism is the religion of Judah. Furthermore, Judaism is distinct from the original Yahwehism. So Judaism was formed in Judah using Yahwehist beliefs that were imported into Judah at some point from somewhere outside of Israel.

The House of David appears to have been established by the 10th century BCE, however big or small it was at that time. So it appears that some version of Judaism was formed by the 10th century BCE.

Through the 9th century BCE and most of the 8th century BCE, Judaism appears to have been a budding religion and Jerusalem appears to have been a city-state that was in the midst of the pagan kingdom of Israel. After the kingdom of Israel was destroyed in or around 722 BCE, the kingdom of Judah rose up and advanced into the north, becoming the main kingdom in Israel.

Towards the beginning of the 6th century BCE, the Babylonian Empire destroyed the kingdom of Judah and the first temple in Jerusalem, and then Israelites were exiled and so began the Babylonian Exile. During this time, Yahwehist writing was combined with Elohimist writing and many of the narratives were edited while new narratives were produced, forming a new chapter of Judaism.

Towards the end of the 6th century BCE, after the Persian Empire defeated the Babylonian Empire, the Persian emperor Cyrus freed Israelites who were in captivity. After the Exile, a new temple was built in Jerusalem, the priests had taken control, and there wasn't a king among the Jews. Judea was a vassal for the Persian Empire; but among the Jews, the priests took control. During the second temple period, Jewish priests brought a new order to the Jewish people and that new order formed yet another new chapter of Judaism as the priests took control in the new Jewish state of Judea. From then on, Judaism progressed and so much of Israel's real history was buried.

Eventually, the Roman Empire took over much of the area surrounding the Mediterranean Sea with Judea 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

As explained in the introduction of this book, 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.

In terms of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, Matthew begins with Abraham and Luke goes all the way back to Adam (the genealogy in Matthew is at the very beginning and the genealogy in Luke is in chapter 4 and goes in reverse order). Going in historical order, Abraham is the first name that is in both Gospels. Matthew and Luke have the same exact order going from Abraham to King David. After that, the lists take very different paths. After King David, Matthew has 26 more names and Luke has 41 more names. Of the 26 other names in Matthew and the 41 other names in Luke, only 4 names are the same: Shealtiel, Zerubbabel, Matthan (Matthat in Luke), and Joseph. That means that there are 22 names in Matthew that contradict Luke and 37 names in Luke that contradict Matthew. 14 of the 26 other names in Matthew are names of kings of Judah leading up to the Babylonian Exile as described in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament: Solomon, Rehoboam, Abijah, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, Masseh, Amon, Josiah, and Jeconiah. Luke takes a different path all together and names Nathan after Kind David instead of Solomon. So Luke does not follow the path of kings of Judah that Matthew does. So obviously, these genealogies in Matthew and Luke are irreconcilable.

First and foremost, given that the genealogies in Matthew and Luke contradict each other, it's definitely the case that at least one of them is fraudulent. Additionally, they both include Abraham, Jacob, Isaac, and King David, and Luke also includes Adam and Noah. As has been shown, Adam, Noah, Abraham, Jacob,

and Isaac all appear to be fictional characters and David apparently wasn't the kind of king that the Bible describes him as having been. So the genealogies in Matthew and Luke both appear to be fraudulent.

As for the Christmas narratives, Matthew and Luke take very different paths on that as well. Matthew contains narratives that aren't in Luke about the supposed visit of the Magi and the supposed escape to Egypt; and Luke contains narratives that aren't in Matthew about the supposed foretelling of the birth of John the Baptist, Mother Mariam supposedly visiting the mother of John the Baptist, the birth and circumcision of John the Baptist, and the supposed circumcision of the physical appearance of Christ. Luke even claims that John the Baptist is a biological cousin of Christ, which is not mentioned at all in any of the other three Gospels. The differences between Matthew and Luke with these narratives already shows that a lot of that information appears to be fraudulent.

We will first move forward from here by analyzing specific details about the narratives in Matthew and then move to Luke.

After the genealogy in Matthew 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 verses describe 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 7:14-17 are fraudulent provides evidence that the reference to Isaiah 7:14 in the Gospel of Matthew is fraudulent. Additionally, as previously shown, Isaiah 7:14-17 are about a supposed prophecy about the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by the Assyrian Empire, so the supposed prophecy contained in Isaiah 7:14 does not appear to be a prophecy about Christ physically appearing in the first century 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 is apparently 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. Additionally, these verses from Matthew being about the supposed foretelling of the supposed physical "birth" of the physical appearance of Christ as well as being about the meaning of the name "Jesus" also shows that these verses are foundational to the narrative.

Therefore, the evidence that shows 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 apparently wasn't a king in the way that the Bible describes. Therefore, the exaltation of Bethlehem in the Gospel of Matthew is apparently 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 at every threshing floor.

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 is 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 is fraudulent. Therefore, the narrative about the supposed escape to Egypt in the Gospel of Matthew 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 then moves on to describing the ministry of John the Baptist. So 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 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 narratives about the birth of John the Baptist supposedly being foretold, John the Baptist supposedly being a biological cousin of Christ, John the Baptist being circumcised, Mother Mariam supposedly singing a song, the physical appearance of Christ supposedly being circumcised, and Christ supposedly being in the temple as a "young boy". None of those narratives are in any other Gospel. The extremes that the Gospel of Luke goes to show the 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, and it has been shown here in Part 3 that Moses appears to be a fictional character. Therefore, Aaron is likely a fictional character as well, so Zechariah and Elizabeth are probably either fictional characters or they are real people but they probably weren't descendants of Aaron because Aaron as described as the brother of Moses is probably a fictional character. So the beginning of these extreme narratives already appears fraudulent.

After the narrative about the birth of John the Baptist supposedly being foretold, Chapter 1 goes on to describe Joseph as a descendant of David in verse 1:27. The Jewish population continued to have quite an obsession with David in the second temple period mostly because the people were expecting a messiah while they were under the rule of a foreign empire. 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 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 laws of Moses, which appears to be fraudulent because it appears that Moses is a fictional character and the laws of Moses are fraudulent. Both chapters 1 and 2 place importance on circumcision, which exalts the fraudulent narratives in Genesis about a supposed covenant with Abraham about circumcision, and so those narratives in Luke 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 evolved over the course of hundreds of years. Therefore, the description of the Jewish temple as Christ's "Father's house" is obviously 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. So 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 has it been shown that several characters in these genealogies appear to be fictional, but also, these genealogies stop with Joseph. The genealogies are used to connect Adam, Abraham, David and many others to Christ, but such a connection ends with Joseph. The genealogy is entirely based on genetic relation and that genetic relation 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, David and others to Christ, but ultimately, they stopped short of what they were really trying to accomplish. The fact that these genealogies stop with Jospeh and don't connect to Christ shows that such genealogies are useless to the Gospels and are 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 appear 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 portrays Christ differently than the Synoptic Gospels. The Synoptic Gospels portray Christ as "the Son" of the Creator of the world while the Gospel of John portrays 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 the Creator of the world.

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 all of 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 portrays 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 appears to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam and the other three Gospels are 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 appears 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, the Resurrection, 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 at all instead of absolute non-existence, or in other words, why God exists?

Why?

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 appears to have been a beginning to the existence of the cosmos that we live in, but there also appears 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, any form of being that always existed would have existed because the existence of that form of being is necessary.

If the existence of a form of being is inherently necessary, then that form of being is not dependent on anything that exists beyond that form of being and so can't exist for any reason that is dependent on anything that exists beyond that form of being. Therefore, the existence of that form of being must encompass the reason for the existence of that form of being, so that form of being must be 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 be inherently 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. It is logically necessary that the form of being that always existed 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". As also shown in Part 1, John 1:1 should really be translated with the

statement “God was the Word” rather than “the Word was God”. The following is an alternative translation.

John 1:1
In the beginning was the Logic, and the Logic was with God, and God was the Logic.

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 potential 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 potential 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 potential 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 potential 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 because nothing exists; 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. Fundamentally, it is logically necessary for logic to always exist and it is logically impossible for logic to ever not exist. Therefore, it is justified to believe that logic always existed and it is unjustifiable to believe that logic didn't always exist.

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, logic necessarily and inherently existed, 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, which would mean that it would sometimes be true that logic didn't necessarily and inherently exist. So for logic to actually necessarily and inherently exist without exception, logic must necessarily and inherently exist throughout all 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 at all, 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, which means that 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 identifies 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 be conscious. 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. God is described as the Logic in John 1:1.

John 1:1
In the beginning was the Logic, and the Logic was with God, and God was the Logic.

The Logic is with God and 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 couldn't ever 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, 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 was 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 was 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, since God necessarily and inherently exists, 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? How could the state of existence change from the necessary and inherent form of existence? Why wouldn't the necessary and inherent form of existence stay the same forever? 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 that is logically possible.

All knowledge exists abstractly, which means that all knowledge exists conceptually. 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. All that is logically possible exists conceptually in abstract form. Concrete existence can be viewed as the existence of realized possibilities. Earth is an example of a realized possibility that concretely exists. All of concrete existence also exists conceptually in abstract form. 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 that is logically possible, God can perceive anything that is logically possible. God knows all knowledge and can perceive anything that is logically possible. God necessarily and inherently exists and possesses the ability to perceive anything that is logically possible.

With knowledge of all that is logically possible 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 light nor total darkness 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 choose whether to think or 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 abilities to think about a triangle and 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 that exists abstractly exists in the form of knowledge possessed by God. Necessarily and inherently, God possesses all knowledge of all that is logically possible. Necessarily and inherently, God is self-aware. God is aware of all of the knowledge that God possesses. God is aware of all that is possible 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 that is possible. 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 that is possible, 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 a 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 everybody's life. 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 finite 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 finite 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 finite 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 and our finite realms of knowledge are 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 of individual units is logically impossible. A hypothetical infinite amount of individual units would be an undefined amount of individual units because infinity is limitless and so would not be able to be defined as a specific amount of individual units. A defined amount of individual units has the property of being able to be counted. A hypothetical infinite amount of individual units cannot be counted because infinity is limitless and does not specifically refer to a static amount, so an infinite amount of individual units cannot exist concretely. However, there is limitless capability in terms of all that is logically possible, so infinity can exist as limitless capability. That limitless capability cannot concretely exist within more than one being because only one being can encompass all of existence. 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 all that is logically possible. God possesses all knowledge of all that is logically 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 was a part of existence that was separate from God, then God would be finite in at least one way. If Creation was 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, God is the Logic of God, and 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 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 do 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 evidence specifically for the Resurrection of Christ.

The Case for the Christian Revolution

It was already shown in Part 3 that Judaism is a fraudulent religion. To add to that, the destruction of the Jewish temple in 70 CE provides very clear and defining evidence that Judaism is a fraudulent religion. Judaism calls for the temple to be destroyed while the Messiah is present in this world. The book of Daniel specifically claims that the people of the Messiah will destroy the city and the sanctuary, that the Messiah will put an end to sacrifice and offering, and that the Messiah will set up an abomination that causes desolation on the temple. All of that was supposed to happen with the destruction of the temple, but none of that happened. Instead, Christ was crucified, Christ resurrected, and the temple was destroyed by the Roman Empire about 40 years after the Resurrection without any of the other specific major events described by Judaism happening surrounding the destruction of the temple. Therefore, the destruction of the temple in 70 by itself shows that Judaism is a fraudulent religion.

Additionally, both Judaism and Islam appear to be kingdom-generated religions, meaning that they were formed in association with the ruling power of a kingdom. We saw plenty of evidence of that with Judaism in Part 3. One very clear example that was shown in Part 3 is Isaiah 7:14, which appears to have been an attempt by King Hezekiah to appear to be a messianic figure. Islam also appears to have been formed in association with the ruling power of a kingdom. Islam spread relatively quickly through the Middle East and northern Africa in the seventh and eighth centuries CE. Several kingdoms were involved with the spread of Islam. A religion that is formed in association with the ruling power of a kingdom can easily be viewed as a fraudulent religion just based on that. We don't see the same with Christianity. Although ruling power became involved later on, the origin and formation of Christianity was not a part of any ruling power of a kingdom or empire. So just from this analysis so far combined with the analysis presented in Part 2, we can already conclude that Christianity is the true religion and that Judaism and Islam are false religions.

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 appear 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 power. 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 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's unlikely that someone already in power would have formed a false religion that proposed that the one true God, or "the Son of 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, or "the Son of God", was crucified because that kind of religion would suggest that an emperor, king, or some other kind of leader 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 assert that the one true God, or "the Son of God", was 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 appears to have been some in the works in or around the first century with all of the hatred towards the Roman Empire. There appears to have been a revolt led by a Jew who has been called "Judas the Galilean" around 6 BCE and there was the Jewish-Roman War that appears 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 appear to have anything like those examples having gone on in the first

century. If there was a violent war or even a small battle between the Christian movement and the Roman Empire in the first century, then that would cast some suspicion. However, there doesn't appear to be anything like that in Christianity's early history. Additionally, there is plenty of violence in the later history of Christianity, which serves as evidence that centuries of historians didn't feel the need to omit details about violence and that in turn shows further evidence that the 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 appears to be 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 Hudaybiyyah is believed to have been signed between Mecca and Muslims in or 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 is certainly plausible and appears to be the case 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. The history of Judaism is riddled with people having fallen into the temptation of worshipping 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 appear as though Christianity was, then it's 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 more specifically 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 appears to have been present in Christianity's early history. We can already see from this argument so far 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 shows 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 shows 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 true and wasn't widely circulated, then a group of people trying to spread a false religion probably would have been willing to exclude Mariam's name entirely. Her presence in the Gospels, particularly in narratives about the discovery of the empty tomb and the Resurrection, shows evidence that the Resurrection did happen and that information about her seeing Christ after the Resurrection 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 appear 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 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 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 appears 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 would have been a lot less likely to 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 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 was being formed from the beginning, that religion likely wouldn't include narratives about "disciples" having lost faith. The inclusion of such narratives would be counterproductive 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 appears miraculous and spectacular. The description of "disciples" having lost their faith would make a false religion appear less miraculous and spectacular and would be very counterproductive 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. Furthermore, 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 supposed resurrection that didn't actually happen, then they probably would have been bold enough to omit the part about them having turned away. So much like the inclusion of Mariam's name in narratives in the 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 that information being true and the Resurrection actually having happened, and that information about "disciples" having turned away may have also been widely circulated. If the Resurrection hadn't happened or if that information about "disciples" having turned away wasn't true, then that information about "disciples" having turned away would probably have been excluded, especially if it wasn't widely circulated or at least known among a certain group of people. 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, someone looking to overthrow someone already in power would have been unlikely to have started a religion like Christianity, and there doesn't appear to have been any violence, ruling power, or political revolution associated with the formation of Christianity. So it appears 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 appear to have been acting corrupt during those days don't appear to have been organized and sophisticated enough to have been very successful on their own. Instead, it appears that something else happened. Therefore, that is evidence that the success of true Christianity in the first century was separate from those who were acting in such a corrupt way.

The apparent concealment in the New Testament of Mariam's importance as the most faithful disciple of Christ is evidence that Mariam was the true human leader of Christianity at the very beginning of the Christian movement after the Resurrection of Christ. Therefore, it appears 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 supposed 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 was 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 appears 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 apparently appealed to a mass population because of the truth that Christianity represents, the real justification for belief in Christianity. When a person focuses on fundamentals, they can be led to truth. That is apparently how true Christianity was spread in the early days.

The spreading of Christianity through teachings of a woman in the first century is further 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 was, 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 further 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 that Christianity is the true religion.

In the process of showing that Christianity is the true religion, we will begin with what we know. We know that we have the text in the Bible. Regardless of what information in the Bible is true and what isn't, we know that the Bible exists. We know that the Bible claims that Christ was crucified, that Christ resurrected, that Peter was appointed by Christ, that Peter is "the rock" on which Christ's Church will be built, that Peter disowned Christ, that Mariam was present during the Crucifixion and during the first appearance of Christ after the Resurrection, and that there is someone who witnessed the Crucifixion who is "the disciple whom Jesus loved".

The fact that Christianity is about Christ shows evidence that Christ taught someone. If Christ hadn't taught anyone, then it is incredibly unlikely that Christianity would have been formed based on Christ. Therefore, it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone.

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. Therefore, it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone and that Christ was crucified.

Christianity did in fact spread. We know that Christianity exists today and we can be reasonably confident that the spreading of Christianity began in the first century. Therefore, it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone, that Christ was crucified, and that a religion based on Christ began spreading in the first century.

From here, we should examine how Christianity began spreading in the first century. The Bible claims that Peter was appointed by Christ and that he is "the rock" on which Christ's Church will be built. The Bible also claims that Peter disowned Christ. Since the Bible exalts Peter as the top disciple, the fact that the Bible also discredits him by describing him as disowning Christ shows that he likely really did disown Christ. It's very unlikely that someone who is exalted so much in the Gospels would also be discredited in such a way unless that was truthful because it is counterproductive to the exaltation. Therefore, it is more likely than not that Peter is a real person who really disowned Christ.

The following points show that Peter was not appointed by Christ and was not the top disciple of Christ.

1. Discipleship is a choice, so the narratives describing the appointment of Peter are fraudulent. Therefore, Peter was not appointed as the top disciple of Christ or as "the rock" on which Christ's Church will be built.

2. Discipleship is a choice and Peter disowned Christ, so Peter was not even a disciple anymore. Therefore, if Christianity is the true religion, then someone other than Peter began the spread of true Christianity after the Resurrection.
3. John 19:25-27 show that someone other than Peter was the top disciple of Christ.
4. Mariam was more advanced than Peter in terms of discipleship.
5. Paul's presence at all in the history of Christianity shows that Peter was not even the most successful among men.
6. According to Paul's letter to the Galatians, Peter was trying to force people to follow customs that he didn't even follow himself, he was only willing to eat with gentiles as long as certain people didn't find out, and he was so afraid of certain people finding out that he immediately drew back as soon as certain people showed up, which shows that he was more concerned about adhering to someone else's standards than following Christ's teachings, which would obviously not be characteristic of the top disciple of Christ.

It has been shown that it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone, that Christ was crucified, that a religion based on Christ began spreading in the first century, that Peter is a real person who really disowned Christ leading up to the Crucifixion, and that someone else was the top disciple of Christ.

The following points show that Mariam appears to have been the top disciple.

1. The Gospels of Mark, Matthew, and John all name Mariam as having been present during the Crucifixion.
2. All four Gospels name Mariam as the first person or one of the first people to have discovered the empty tomb.
3. The Gospels of Mark and John name Mariam as the first person to have seen Christ after the Resurrection while Matthew names her as one of the first people to have seen Christ after the Resurrection.
4. In the Gospel of John, Mariam is one of only four people named as having been present during the Crucifixion, she is the only person named as having first discovered the empty tomb, and she is the only person named as having first seen Christ after the Resurrection.
5. The Gnostic Gospels present Mariam as the top disciple of Christ, and one of them strongly suggests that she was the only one who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection.

Those points by themselves show strong evidence that Mariam was the top disciple of Christ, and that's even without considering the presence of the beloved disciple in John 19:26-27. When we consider the presence of an unnamed person who is described as the beloved disciple and how that person appears to be Mariam, we can see even more so that Mariam appears to have been the top disciple of Christ.

The presence of an unnamed person in John 19:26-27 shows the likely presence of two different authors. It is not likely the case that so much importance would have originally been placed on an unnamed person. Therefore, it is more likely than not that John 19:26-27 were fraudulently altered.

Since John 19:26-27 were likely fraudulently altered but were not entirely deleted, it is more likely than not that the person who fraudulently altered those verses wanted to preserve a part of the testimony that was originally there. When that assertion is combined with the assertion that it is more likely than not that Christ really was crucified, that shows that it is more likely than not that the original form of John 19:26-

27 represented real eyewitness testimony of the Crucifixion. Therefore, it is more likely than not that there was real eyewitness testimony of the Crucifixion that was later fraudulently altered.

Additionally, since the presence of an unnamed person shows evidence that John 19:26-27 were fraudulently altered, that in turn shows evidence that someone's identity was fraudulently concealed, and more specifically someone who is portrayed as the top disciple of Christ. Therefore, it is more likely than not that there was real eyewitness testimony of the Crucifixion that was later fraudulently altered to conceal the identity of someone who is portrayed as the top disciple of Christ.

Given that the Bible claims that Peter was the top disciple, that the portrayal of Peter as the top disciple is likely fraudulent, and that it is likely that the identity of someone else who is portrayed as the top disciple of Christ was concealed, it is more likely than not that the identity of this person was concealed for the sake of fraudulently portraying Peter as the top disciple.

It has been shown that it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone, that Christ was crucified, that a religion based on Christ began spreading in the first century, that Peter is a real person who really disowned Christ leading up to the Crucifixion, that someone else was the top disciple of Christ and their identity was fraudulently concealed for the sake of fraudulently portraying Peter as the top disciple, and that Mariam appears to have been the top disciple of Christ even without considering the presence of the beloved disciple in John 19:26-27.

The following points show that Mariam is the person whose identity was fraudulently concealed in John 19:26-27.

1. She is one of only four people mentioned in the Gospel of John as having witnessed the Crucifixion.
2. She is the only person named in the Gospel of John as having first discovered the empty tomb.
3. She is the only person named in the Gospel of John as having first seen Christ after the Resurrection.
4. The person whose identity was concealed in John 19:26-27 appears to be one of the four people mentioned in the Gospel of John as having witnessed the Crucifixion, and the beloved disciple probably wasn't Mother Mariam or Mother Mariam's sister and probably wasn't married. Therefore, Mariam is the only person who would likely be the beloved disciple.

The following points show that a fictional character was inserted into chapter 20 of the Gospel of John to further conceal that Mariam is the beloved disciple, which shows further evidence that Mariam is the beloved disciple.

1. The unnamed disciple is first called "the other disciple" as if the reader is supposed to know who that is, which shows that the narrative was formed with the assumption that an unnamed beloved disciple is already a part of the Gospel of John prior to chapter 20, which shows that the narrative in chapter 20 was altered in that way after the narrative in chapter 19 had already been altered to conceal the identity of the beloved disciple, which shows that the mentioning of a beloved disciple in chapter 20 was a later fraudulent alteration, which shows that the mentioning of a beloved disciple as someone other than Mariam is entirely fraudulent, which shows that there was a specific effort to fraudulently portray the beloved disciple as someone other than Mariam, which shows that Mariam is the beloved disciple. In chapter 19, the identity of a real person was concealed, which shows that the fundamental information of the narrative is still truthful. In

chapter 20, the narrative revolves around the assumption that there has already been an unnamed person presented before chapter 20, and therefore the narrative revolves around a fraudulent alteration, which shows that the narrative in chapter 20 is fraudulent as opposed to the narrative in chapter 19.

2. Luke 24:12 shows similar information as the narrative in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John but entirely omits the presence of an unnamed disciple, which shows that the presence of an unnamed disciple in chapter 20 of the Gospel of John is the presence of a fictional character, which shows that the mentioning of a beloved disciple as someone other than Mariam is entirely fraudulent, which shows that there was a specific effort to fraudulently portray the beloved as someone other than Mariam, which shows that Mariam is the beloved disciple.
3. The use of the word "we" in verse 2 when only Mariam is described shows later fraudulent alteration to a narrative that only presented Mariam at the tomb. That occurs in the same verse that the fictional unnamed character first appears, which shows that someone who was fraudulently altering information that only presented Mariam at the tomb also inserted the unnamed character, which shows that the presence of this unnamed character is entirely fraudulent, which shows that the mentioning of a beloved disciple as someone other than Mariam is entirely fraudulent, which shows that there was a specific effort to fraudulently portray the beloved as someone other than Mariam, which shows that Mariam is the beloved disciple.
4. John 20:2-9 present a strange sequence in which the unnamed character reaches the tomb before Peter, then Peter catches up and enters the tomb, and then the unnamed character believes. This appears to be an effort to present Peter as the first inside the tomb while avoiding presenting him as one of the initial witnesses of the empty tomb and as portraying him as not initially believing Mariam. That shows that the entire sequence is fraudulent, which shows that fraudulent alterations were made to chapter 20 of the Gospel of John to conceal information about Mariam, which supports the conclusion that the unnamed character in chapter 20 is a part of fraudulent attempts to suppress information about Mariam.
5. Verses 14-15 of chapter 20 appear to have been written by a different author than verse 16, which shows that there was a fraudulent attempt to present Mariam as not expecting the Resurrection. That shows that fraudulent alterations were made to chapter 20 of the Gospel of John to conceal information about Mariam, which supports the conclusion that the unnamed character in chapter 20 is a part of fraudulent attempts to suppress information about Mariam.
6. Verse 17 of chapter 20 describes Mariam as having been prohibited from touching Christ. Verse 27 describes Thomas as having been allowed to touch Christ, which by itself shows that verse 17 is fraudulent and was added to suppress information about Mariam's relationship with Christ. Additionally, 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 portray Christ as God. All of that shows that fraudulent alterations were made to chapter 20 of the Gospel of John to conceal information about Mariam, which supports the conclusion that the unnamed character in chapter 20 is a part of fraudulent attempts to suppress information about Mariam.

The following points show further evidence that information about Mariam was suppressed.

1. 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, which shows that there was an effort to fraudulently present Mariam as if she wasn't a disciple at all.

2. The fact that the Gospel of Mark through verse 16:8 doesn't describe a single appearance of Christ after the Resurrection shows that the author didn't even want to describe an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection.
3. 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. There is one crucial detail, however, that is found in all four Gospels: Mariam is described as having been 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.
4. The fact that the Gospel of John excludes an explanation for why Mariam was at the tomb combined with the faulty explanations in the Synoptic Gospels is evidence that Mariam expected the Resurrection and that there was an effort to fraudulently present her as not expecting the Resurrection.

It has been shown that it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone, that Christ was crucified, that a religion based on Christ began spreading in the first century, that Peter is a real person who really disowned Christ leading up to the Crucifixion, and that Mariam was the top disciple of Christ and information about her was fraudulently concealed for the sake of fraudulently portraying Peter as the top disciple.

The following points show that Mariam spread the Christian Revolution in the first century.

1. Just based on the evidence that shows that Mariam was the top disciple of Christ, it's almost a forgone conclusion that she spread Christianity.
2. Mariam's presence in the most important narratives in the Gospels despite discrimination towards her and suppression of information about her shows that the authors of the Gospels felt the need to address her presence in society, which would only be the case if she had much of a presence in society and such a presence would presumably have come from her spreading Christianity. If she hadn't spread Christianity or if she hadn't been successful at it, then there presumably wouldn't really be a need to address her presence in society.
3. The authors of the Gospels not only included her presence in the most important narratives but also specifically addressed information about a woman anointing Christ and they claimed that this information about this anointing would be spread wherever the Gospel is preached. Not only did they feel the need to address this information but they also specifically made the claim that this information would be spread wherever the Gospel is preached. That clearly shows that information about the anointing of Christ was widely circulated and that they had to address it. That is further shown by the fact that they weren't willing to name Mariam as the one who anointed Christ. That shows that they didn't want to write about her, yet they still did because they felt they had to.

The following points show that the Revolution that Mariam spread in the first century continued to spread for over half a millennium.

1. The Gnostic Gospels present Mariam as the top disciple of Christ, and one of them strongly suggests that she was the only one who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection. These writings have been dated to the second, third, and/or fourth centuries, which shows that the Revolution

that she spread continued spreading for at least a century and probably a few hundred years if not more.

2. In the sixth century, Pope Gregory fraudulently claimed that Mariam was a sinful woman by conflating her with the sinful woman described as anointing Christ in Luke 7:36-50, which contributed to the misconception that she was a prostitute and centuries of portraying Mariam as a sinful prostitute. While it appears that Mariam anointed Christ, the narrative in Luke 7:36-50 is very distinguishable from the narratives in John, Mark, and Matthew about a woman anointing Christ in Bethany shortly before the Crucifixion. The narrative in Luke, in contrast to the other three Gospels, places this narrative towards the beginning of the Gospel rather than shortly before the Crucifixion narratives, doesn't place the narrative in Bethany, places the narrative in a Pharisee's home, and primarily describes the woman in the narrative as a sinner. All of those components contrast with the other three Gospels. So the narrative in Luke is obviously separate from the real anointing of Christ by Mariam shortly before the Crucifixion. Although, even if someone believed that the narrative in Luke referred to the same anointing as the other three Gospels, all of the Gospels distinguish Mariam from the references to a woman anointing Christ. Even though Mariam appears to have been the one who anointed Christ, that's not what the Gospels say. All three Synoptic Gospels describe an unnamed woman and the Gospel of John identifies the woman as Mariam of Bethany. So all four Gospels appear to portray the woman who anointed Christ as someone other than Mariam. Even if someone confused Mariam of Bethany with Mariam, all three Synoptic Gospels don't name the woman who they describe as anointing Christ, and it's the narrative in the Gospel of Luke that Pope Gregory used to claim that Mariam is a sinful woman. On the other hand, if Pope Gregory knew that Mariam was the one who anointed Christ, then he would have knowingly attacked someone of such great importance. If he didn't know that Mariam anointed Christ, then all four Gospels would simply suggest that the person who anointed Christ was someone other than Mariam and therefore describing Mariam as a sinful prostitute based on the narrative in Luke would have been based on zero evidence and so would apparently have been a deliberate attack; or if he did know that Mariam anointed Christ, then he would have knowingly attacked someone of such great importance. Either way, it already appears that Pope Gregory went out of his way to attack Mariam. There are eight additional points that show that Pope Gregory was apparently trying to combat the fame of Mariam. Before getting to those points, it should be noted that some argue that maybe a tradition had already developed before Pope Gregory did this, but there doesn't appear to be any evidence of that, and regardless, the seventh point below shows that it wouldn't even matter anyway. The first additional point is that Pope Gregory's main conclusion was about someone being sinful and being forgiven despite their level of sin, and that conclusion is exactly what Luke 7:36-50 are about so there wouldn't have been any need to relate that narrative to Mariam unless his main intention was to simply describe Mariam as a sinful woman, which would have been useful for him if Mariam was still famous like she had been in the centuries leading up to then, and she apparently was to a certain extent. The second point is that it's very unlikely that the pope would just randomly assume that Mariam is such a sinner and relate her to a story about sinfulness unless he had specific intentions related to Mariam. This is the pope we're talking about so it's very unlikely that he would have randomly made such an error on a whim. It is obviously much more likely that this was a calculated move. The third point is that it's very unlikely that this idea would have just randomly popped up out of nowhere after over 500 years of that narrative already

having been in circulation. For over 500 years to have passed before this happened, there would obviously probably have been some kind of specific motive rather than just a random error. The fourth point is that Mariam is clearly distinguished from the unnamed sinner in Luke 7:36-50 by being mentioned right afterward as a part of a group of women in Luke 8:1-3. Mariam appears in a list of names of women in the second verse right after the narrative that Pope Gregory referred to in the sixth century. For anybody who knew the Gospel of Luke, particularly the pope, to have asserted that Mariam is a sinner because of the narrative in Luke 7:36-50, it would have been much more likely that their reasoning for doing so revolved around specific intentions related to Mariam rather than just a random mistake. To know verses 7:36-50 and then completely disregard verses 8:1-3, especially with there being absolutely no text in between, would obviously be much more likely to have been about specific intentions related to Mariam rather than just a random mistake. Some argue that Mariam's presence right after Luke 7:36-50 could have influenced Pope Gregory to make that mistake, but there is a list of multiple women in Luke 8:1-3 so he still would have had to have singled out Mariam with no basis for doing so other than specific intentions related to Mariam, and the next point provides further support for the assertion that he would have known better. The fifth point is that Mariam is named multiple times in the Gospel of Luke and the sinner goes completely unnamed. Since Mariam is identified multiple times, she obviously wouldn't be the unnamed character in Luke 7:36-50. There appears to be instances in the Gospel of John that conceal Mariam's name but they appear to do so in a way that conceals her importance. The same is not the case with the Gospel of Luke, and particularly not in Luke 7:36-50 where a woman is primarily described as a sinner. Someone going unnamed when being described as a sinner obviously doesn't conceal their importance in the way that the Gospel of John does. The Gospel of John describes an unnamed beloved disciple who was present during the Crucifixion. The Gospel of Luke, on the other hand, describes an unnamed sinner. So the identification of Mariam at all in the Gospel of Luke clearly distinguishes her from the unnamed sinner in Luke 7:36-50. The sixth point is that Mariam appears to have been well-known by many as the most important disciple for hundreds of years leading up to Pope Gregory's statements and the "orthodox church" (also known as the Catholic Church by that point) fought hard against people who they called heretics. Pope Gregory would have been very aware of Mariam's fame and importance, which clearly shows that it is even more likely that his claim about the supposed sinfulness of Mariam was about specific intentions related to Mariam rather than just a random mistake. The seventh point is that the Catholic Church also ended up labeling Mariam as a prostitute, which is not a label used in Luke 7:36-50 and was completely invented outside of that narrative without any evidence at all, and the Catholic Church kept that label in place until 1969. It's one thing for one pope to make a random mistake once, as unlikely as that appears to be in this particular case, but it's entirely something else when the Catholic Church then adds the specific label of prostitute, which has nothing specific to do with Luke 7:36-50 and is not supported by any evidence at all, and then keeps that label in place for over 1,300 years. Some argue that the description in Luke 7:36-50 of the sinfulness of this woman implies that she was a prostitute. However, sinfulness could relate to anything, including adultery. Furthermore, if the sinfulness was only specifically related to being a prostitute, then the woman could have been specifically referred to as a prostitute. Matthew 21:31-32 use the Greek word πόρναι ("pornai"), which means "prostitutes". Those verses also refer to tax collectors. So those verses specifically call out two different specific accusations. If someone was to be known for

one thing, then that one thing can be specifically described instead of just being generally referred to as sinfulness. So for someone to be generally referred to as just a sinner, that's a far cry from a specific reference to prostitution. The specific label of prostitute and that label staying in place for over 1,300 years without any evidence at all clearly shows that this effort goes far beyond Pope Gregory, and that shows that it doesn't even matter whether Pope Gregory was the first to do it. The eighth point is that for the Roman Catholic Church to have admitted their mistake in 1969 and to have taken the label of prostitute away means that the Catholic Church has known about this mistake since the mistake was first made. Otherwise, the portrayal of Mariam as a prostitute would have just been another old tradition like so many others. The traditions that have been passed down have been kept unless there is a specific reason for a tradition not to be kept. In this case, the tradition that Mariam is a prostitute was passed down for over 1,300 years. To suddenly reverse course on that after over 1,300 years would realistically mean that information to the contrary was passed down as well. So the Catholic Church had known that they made a mistake for over 1,300 years and kept it in place that entire time, which shows that that there was specific effort to discredit Mariam for at least 1,300 years. In conclusion, the attack by Pope Gregory in the sixth century is evidence that the pope attempted 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 following points show that Christianity was widely spread among different groups of women in the first few centuries, which supports the conclusions just previously reached that Mariam spread the Christian Revolution and that the Revolution that she spread continued to spread for hundreds of years. These points don't show direct evidence of those conclusions, but they show that someone began a movement that was separate from the "orthodox church" (later to be known as the Catholic Church) that led to the wide spreading of Christianity among groups of women, which strongly supports the conclusions that Mariam spread the Christian Revolution and that the Revolution that she spread continued to spread for hundreds of years.

1. 2 John conceals the identity of a woman who is described as "the elder" and as a "chosen sister", conceals the identity of another woman who is described as a "chosen lady", and refers to "children" who were apparently students of the woman who the letter is addressed to. Therefore, this letter shows evidence that there were multiple female Christian leaders.
2. 2 Corinthians conceals the identity of someone who was apparently praised in the gospel through all "the churches" and that person was probably a woman, which shows evidence that a woman was praised in the gospel through all "the churches", or at least a lot of "the churches" that represented true Christianity.
3. The letter that has been labeled the First Epistle of Clement refers to a group of Christian women who were tortured and murdered.
4. Origen's "Contra Celsum" refers to sects of Christianity that were formed by women, and that writing appears to have been produced in the third century.

It has been shown that it is more likely than not that Christ taught someone, that Christ was crucified, that a religion based on Christ began spreading in the first century, that Mariam was the top disciple of Christ and spread the Christian Revolution in the first century, and that the Revolution that she spread continued to spread for at least a half of a millennium. That doesn't necessarily show that Christianity is the true

religion, but it provides the base needed to move forward with the assessment that shows that Christianity is the true religion.

The Revolution that Mariam began spreading in the first century appears 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.

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 appears to have been money, power, politics, and violence. But that doesn't appear 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 appears to have been spread mostly among the lower class. There doesn't appear to have been any ruling power gained from the Revolution. Instead, it appears that those who tried to conceal information about her Revolution were seeking power, and that in turn involves politics. There also doesn't appear 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 as God. The Revolution that Mariam spread appears to have included information about her being the top disciple, but that simply means she was a student of Christ and that doesn't make any claim about her being a prophet like the claims about Muhammed and Joseph Smith. Ultimately, the Revolution that she spread is about Christ.

So there doesn't appear to have been 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 appears that the 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 appear 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 represent the truth through the logic of Christ's teachings. That is apparently 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 appears to have been able to reach a large portion of the population simply by spreading the truth of Christ's teachings.

Since it appears to have been Christ's teachings that allowed Mariam to be so successful, it appears 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 religion. Since Christ's teachings appear to have been the catalyst for the successful spread of Christianity, it appears that a man could have been successful at spreading the teachings. Hypothetically, if Christ was merely a man, 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. However, Christ teaching people led to very different results than Mariam teaching people. As of the day of the Crucifixion, Christ was being crucified and only a few people remained with Christ. As previously shown, the information about Peter and others disowning Christ appears to be reliable information because it's very incriminating and would potentially be problematic in the spreading of a religion, so it is not likely that someone would want to falsely make up that information. Additionally, the information about only a few people remaining with Christ also appears to be reliable because that is also not likely information that would be advantageous to falsely make up. If anything, that information could be problematic in spreading a religion. Any information about doubting a religion would be counterproductive to spreading that religion. Therefore, the information about Peter and others disowning Christ and the information about only a few people remaining with Christ is fairly reliable. So the result of Christ teaching people not only led to Christ being crucified but also led to only a few people remaining with Christ.

Christ took a path that led to Christ being crucified and only a few people remaining with Christ. That is incredibly different than the result of Mariam spreading the Revolution that spread information about her being the top disciple of Christ for over 500 years. As of the day of the Crucifixion, Christianity only remained with a few people, and only if Mariam wasn't the only person who understood the teachings. If Mariam was the only person who understood the teachings, then there would have been only one Christian on the day of the Crucifixion. The main point being that the spread of Christianity had hit an extremely low point on the day of the Crucifixion. That was a result of Christ's Ministry. Christ took a path that led to the spread of Christianity hitting an extremely low point and Christ being crucified, but that path also led to someone who Christ taught spreading the Revolution that spread information about her being the top disciple of Christ for over 500 years. So there was an extremely low point on the day of the Crucifixion, and then someone who Christ taught launched the Revolution that spread for over 500 years. So obviously there was quite a turnaround after the Crucifixion, and such a turnaround was led by a woman who was taught by Christ and who spread the teachings of Christ.

Throughout history, women have been imprisoned and murdered for trying to spread a revolution or to spark some kind of change in society. That's not to say that just because a woman successfully spread a revolution that she must be spreading the truth. However, without money, violence, or ruling power, it would have been incredibly unlikely that a poor woman on her own would have been so successful in the first century. We're not just talking about having a small following or being a local celebrity. We're talking about generations of people for over a half of a millennium exalting Mariam as the top disciple of Christ all the while a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government worked very hard to suppress information about her. Those exact dynamics are incredibly unique. There have been women who launched revolutions, even in ancient times, but Mariam did it without wealth, violence, and ruling power and she did it to the extent that generations of people exalted her as the top disciple of God for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. All of this from a woman who was taught by Christ. That shows clear

evidence that the teachings of Christ allowed Mariam to be successful at driving results that lasted for over 500 years.

Given that this incredible success of Mariam can be attributed to the teachings of Christ, then Christ could have been that successful even if Christ was merely a man. Hypothetically, if a man and a woman would have spread the same religion in the first century separately from each other, it would obviously have been far more likely that the man would have been more successful. Additionally, it would have been far more likely that the woman would have been imprisoned or murdered. If one was to be successful and the other was to be murdered, the obviously probable scenario would have been that the man would have been successful and the woman would have been murdered. Hypothetically, if Christ was merely a man, then a man would have been crucified and a woman who was a student of that man would have launched a revolution that spread information about her generation after generation for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. That scenario is incredibly unlikely. Therefore, it is incredibly unlikely that Christ was merely a man. Therefore, it is incredibly unlikely that Christ is not God. That shows defining evidence that Christ is God.

Additionally, given that Mariam was the top disciple of Christ, it appears that she would have had a similar strategy as Christ unless Christ deliberately took a different path than the path that Mariam was taught to take. The teachings themselves would have been the same, but the strategies appear to have been far different. Christ taught Mariam, and yet Christ appears to have implemented a different strategy than Mariam. We will go into further detail later here in Part 4 about why exactly anyone wanted Christ crucified and how there is a much more specific reason than what the Gospels describe. Regardless of the exact reason, something happened that led to the Crucifixion and then there were only a few people remaining. What Christ exactly did that influenced anyone to want Christ crucified is not exactly what Mariam did. If Mariam had done exactly what Christ had done, then she realistically would have been murdered with only a few people remaining if anyone. So the difference in results shows clear evidence that different strategies were taken. That conclusion combined with the conclusion that Mariam was the top disciple of Christ shows evidence that Mariam was taught to implement a different strategy. All of that shows evidence that Christ deliberately took a path that led to the Crucifixion and deliberately taught Mariam to take a different path that led to her launching the Revolution that spread generation after generation for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. 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.

Three main conclusions have been reached that show that Christianity is the true religion.

1. Without money, violence, or ruling power, it would have been incredibly unlikely that a poor woman on her own would have been so successful that generations of people would have exalted her as the top disciple of God for over 500 years all the while a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government suppressed information about her. The only realistic way that could have been accomplished is if the truth taught by God was spreading.
2. Hypothetically, if a man and a woman were to spread the same religion in the first century separately from each other, it would obviously have been far more likely that the man would have

been more successful. Additionally, it would have been far more likely that the woman would have been imprisoned or murdered. If one was to be successful and the other was to be murdered, the obviously probable scenario would have been that the man would have been successful and the woman would have been murdered. Hypothetically, if Christ was merely a man, then a man would have been crucified and a woman who was a student of that man would have launched a revolution that spread information about her generation after generation for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. That scenario is incredibly unlikely. Therefore, it is incredibly unlikely that Christ was merely a man. Therefore, it is incredibly unlikely that Christ is not God. That shows defining evidence that Christ is God.

3. Regardless of the exact reason for why anyone wanted Christ crucified, something happened that led to the Crucifixion and then there were only a few people remaining. What Christ exactly did that influenced anyone to want Christ crucified is not exactly what Mariam did. If Mariam had done exactly what Christ had done, then she realistically would have been murdered with only a few people remaining if anyone. So the difference in results shows clear evidence that different strategies were taken. That conclusion combined with the conclusion that Mariam was the top disciple of Christ shows evidence that Mariam was taught to implement a different strategy. All of that shows evidence that Christ deliberately took a path that led to the Crucifixion and deliberately taught Mariam to take a different path that led to her launching the Revolution that spread generation after generation for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. 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.

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 appears 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 except the later addition to Mark 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 calendar 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 calendar 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. Furthermore, less than 48 hours pass from Friday afternoon/evening to Sunday

morning. 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 calendar 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 calendar 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 calendar days as whole 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 18th 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 20th year of the reign of Jeroboam. That shows that Abijah was the king of Judah from the 18th to the 20th year of the reign of Jeroboam. Today, we would count two years as having passed from the 18th year to the 20th 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 are translated 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") in Mark, Luke, and John, and Matthew translates it from μίαν ("mian") σαββάτων ("sabbaton"), which is 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 ἡμέρᾳ ("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 ("pempti")

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.

πρώτῃ (“prote”) σαββάτου (“sabbatou”)

Mark 16:9 uses the Greek word σαββάτου (“sabbatou”), which is a singular word that means “Sabbath”. Mark 16:9 also uses the Greek word πρώτῃ (“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”. That shows further that “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 apparently writing based on popular tradition rather than writing to coordinate with the language shown in Mark 16:2. The author of Mark 16:9 apparently based that verse on popular tradition rather than on the information that was already contained in the Gospel of Mark not only because it was apparently written about a century or so later but also because of the fact that Mark 16:9 contains information that is in the Gospel of John but isn’t anywhere else in the Gospel of Mark. Additionally, the author of Mark 16:9 used the singular form of “sabbatou” instead of the plural form of “sabbaton” that is in Mark 16:2, which shows further evidence that the author of Mark 16:9 was basing their writing on popular tradition rather than the exact wording in Mark 16:2. 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 further that the author of Mark 16:9 was apparently drawing from popular tradition rather than from what was already in the Gospel of Mark. Additionally, Mark 16:9-20 appear to be an attempt to harmonize with the other Gospels and with Acts. So the author of Mark 16:9 appears to have altered the Gospel of Mark to better fit with other information, and therefore they were apparently more influenced by other information than they were by the Gospel of Mark. So the information in Mark 16:9 appears to have come 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 within 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 can refer 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" or "sabbatou" 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 appropriate 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", neither of which is directly translated from a Greek word but both are simply added based on context when translating to English. The other difference is between the plural form of "Sabbaths" and the singular form of "Sabbath".

So it appears 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 verses in Mark and Matthew that refer to a supposed prophecy about the Resurrection happening after three days.

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" can 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 appear 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" within the Gospel of Matthew.

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 appears 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 appears 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.

The first sentence of Acts 28:13 describes leaving a location that they were previously at to sail to Rhegium and that they arrived at Rhegium. The second sentence then describes sailing to another location, and it is specifically described that there was a south wind and that they arrived at Puteoli on the

day after that. The second sentence describes a two-day sequence with day one being the day that they left Rhegium and the day that there was a south wind, and day two being the day that they arrived at Puteoli. In the second sentence, "the next day" is translated from the Greek words μετὰ ("meta") μίαν ("mian") ἡμέραν ("hemeran"), 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 left 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 left 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 (the first day would be the day that they left Rhegium). 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 in Matthew and Luke that refer to a supposed 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; he has risen! 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 24:46-47
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 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 2:1-2
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 explicitly 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 explicitly 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 explicitly 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 explicitly 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 references to a supposed 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 on “the third day” is the only instance in Luke that explicitly 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 reference to a supposed 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 appear that Luke 24:20-21 refer to a three-day sequence in contrast to the four-day sequence described in Mark and Matthew, but Luke 24:20-21 are specific and the other references to “the third day” aren’t and so they could still possibly refer the third day of the week. So Luke is ambiguous about whether the third day of the week is being referred to in those verses. 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 a 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 spanning multiple days. Furthermore, the reference to "the third day" would appear 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 "the 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 appear 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 references to a supposed prophecy 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 appear to be taking this ancient Jewish tradition that applied to human beings and they appear 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.

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 skips a beat in relation to this narrative. That's evidence that the author of these verses in the Gospel of Mark didn't really understand that the narrative in the Gospel of John was about the Resurrection and they ignorantly focused on disputing information contained in John 2:18-21. 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, and those verses even refer specifically to the Jewish temple by stating "this manmade temple". Furthermore, that information is only contained in the Gospel of Mark so it presumably came directly from the Gospel of John.

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 appears 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, that priests accused Christ of having claimed that Christ would build a temple in three days, and that such an accusation is false. So the Gospel of Mark rejects that any miraculous sign will be given and specifically claims that information in John 2:18-21 is false. 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, the Gospel of Mark refers to specific information contained in John 2:18-21 that is only in the Gospel of John so that information presumably came directly from the Gospel of John, and the Gospel of Mark specifically claims that such information contained in John 2:18-21 is false. Therefore, the Gospel of Mark appears to take information directly from the Gospel of John to claim that it's false, so the Gospel of Mark obviously appears to be 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 appears 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 26:59-61
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 specifically dispute information that is only 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 appears 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 appears to have had some version of the other three Gospels and certain information was changed 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 the Gospel of 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, which shows evidence that the Gospel of Luke responds to the narrative about Jonah in the Gospel of Matthew because Matthew's version includes four calendar days. That in turn 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 appears 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” in verse 16:2. The phrase “very early” comes from the Greek words λίαν (“lian”) πρωὶ (“proi”), which are 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 realistically be portraying spices being available for sale before the new day even began or right at the beginning of the day. 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” appears 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 has been previously mentioned and 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 specifically refers 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 that shows further evidence that "mia ton sabbaton" in Mark means "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 appears that Matthew 27:62 describes 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, but 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 describes a day that is not a Sabbath day, which would mean that Matthew 27:62 is referring 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 appears 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 and including 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 appears 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 apparently shouldn't be translated as "one of the Sabbaths". Therefore, "mian sabbaton" in Matthew 28:1 apparently should 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 isn't really any need to use both "after the Sabbath" and "one from the Sabbath". Because there isn't really any need to use both phrases, it appears 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", so the redundancy in Matthew 28:1 that appears 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 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 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 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 caused a serious religious issue for Jews and that appears 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. We previously saw that the Gospel of Matthew appears to respond to the narrative in the Gospel of Mark about no miraculous sign being given. As we will see more in Part 5, there are a number of details in Mark that are changed in Matthew. One example that we saw of that was about the narrative in Mark about no miraculous sign being given. Another example that we can now see is the description in Mark of the Resurrection having occurred on a Sabbath day.

Additionally, the change in the four-day sequence going from Mark to Matthew shows supporting evidence that changes were made in the final narratives going from Mark to Matthew. It was previously shown that Mark describes two Sabbaths and they are presented as the second day and the fourth day, and that Matthew describes one Sabbath and it is presented as the third day. That alone shows that changes were made in the final narratives going from Mark to Matthew. So the context of the final narratives changed going from Mark to Matthew, which shows supporting evidence that the context of the narrative about the Resurrection changed as well. That shows further that Matthew portrays the Resurrection as having happened on a day that was not a Sabbath day in contrast to Mark.

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 then 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 would have been in response to such a belief having caused a serious religious issue among the Jewish population.

As will be shown in Part 5, some of the same people who were involved with the production of the Gospel of Mark were also apparently involved with the production of the Gospel of Matthew, and these people appear 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears to be a difference between how 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. It has been shown that there are shifts in context in the final narratives going from Mark to Matthew and specifically in terms of whether the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day. So there was a shift specifically about the day that “sabbaton” is used to describe, whether it’s a Sabbath day in Mark or a day after a Sabbath in Matthew, and that shift includes a change from a plural use to a singular use. So with all of the changes in the final narratives going from Mark to Matthew, there was also a specific change from the use of “sabbaton” as a plural word in Mark to the use of “sabbaton” as a singular word in Matthew, and that is specifically related to shifting from Mark portraying the Resurrection as having happened on a Sabbath day to Matthew portraying the Resurrection as having happened on a day after a Sabbath. Therefore, 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 appears 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. But instead of using the correct word, the Gospel of Matthew ended up taking the same word that is used in the Gospel of Mark and specifically used it in an incorrect way when the singular form would have otherwise been used, which in combination with the redundant use of “after the Sabbath” shows evidence that a deliberate effort was made to change information that came from the Gospel of Mark about whether the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day.

To further show that the Gospel of Matthew began a trajectory of Christians using the plural form of “sabbaton” in a singular way, we can look specifically at what gets combined with “sabbaton” to form the meaning of “one from the Sabbath”. In Matthew, the Greek words used are μίαν (“mian”) σαββάτων (“sabbaton”). Mark, Luke, and John all use “mia ton sabbaton” and Matthew uses “mian sabbaton”. It may seem like a very slight difference, but it actually appears to have significant meaning.

It has already been established that “mia ton sabbaton” in Mark should be interpreted as “one of the Sabbaths”. As we have already seen and will see more in Part 5, the original version of the Gospel of John appears to have been circulating before any of the Synoptic Gospels were produced, which is evidenced by the Synoptic Gospels appearing to respond to the Gospel of John, particularly the Gospel of Mark in relation to the three days mentioned in the Gospel of John. So “mia ton sabbaton” was probably in John before it was in Mark, and the switch from “one of the Sabbaths” to “one from the Sabbath” appears to have happened going from Mark to Matthew. Therefore, that change apparently had not yet occurred

when “mia ton sabbaton” was written into the Gospel of John. So “mia ton sabbaton” should be interpreted as “one of the Sabbaths” in both Mark and John. As we will see more of in Part 5, because of the way that the Gospel of Luke was produced, “mia ton sabbaton” in Luke was probably copied from Mark and/or John, and therefore disregarded the switch going from Mark to Matthew. Additionally, “mia ton sabbaton” appears in Acts and Acts was probably written by the same author as Luke, which will be shown in Part 5. So John and Mark appear to have used “mia ton sabbaton” before Matthew was produced, and then Luke and Acts use “mia ton sabbaton” because the author was copying the phrase from Mark and/or John. Aside from Luke and Acts, it appears that people followed the example set by Matthew.

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.

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!”

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.

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.

Didache (Chapter 8)
For they fast on the second and fifth day of the week.

Matthew 28:1 contains the Greek words μίαν (“mian”) σαββάτων (“sabbaton”), John 20:19 contains τῇ (“te”) μιᾷ (“mia”) σαββάτων (“sabbaton”), 1 Corinthians 16:2 contains κατὰ (“kata”) μίαν (“mian”) σαββάτου (“sabbatou”), Mark 16:9 contains πρώτῃ (“prote”) σαββάτου (“sabbatou”), and the Didache contains δευτέρα (“deftera”) σαββάτων (“sabbaton”). With all of these, the word (“ton”) does not appear before the word “sabbaton” or “sabbatou”.

First, it has already been explained that Mark 16:9 was added later on, probably in the second century. Second, the Didace also appears to have been produced in the second century. Third, as will be shown in Part 5, 1 Corinthians 16:2 was probably not written by Paul. A lot of 1 Corinthians probably was written by Paul, but it will be shown that verse 16:2 is a later fraudulent addition. So that means that the use of “mian sabbatou” in verse 16:2 was first written at a relatively later time. Fourth, it was shown in Part 2 that most of chapter 20 of the Gospel of John is comprised of later fraudulent additions, but that John 20:1 and John 20:16 contain truthful information. John 20:1 uses “mia ton sabbaton”, and that was probably a part of the original version of the Gospel of John. John 20:19, which appears to have been fraudulently altered, uses “te mia sabbaton”. What shows that “te mia sabbaton” is a later addition to John is the evidence that shows that it wasn’t originally a part of John 20:19. The verse begins by saying “on the evening of that first day of the week”, which is an incorrect translation. John 20:19, much like Matthew

28:1, contains redundancy. John 20:19 first says τῇ (“te”) ἡμέρᾳ (“hemera”) ἐκείνῃ (“ekeine”), which means “the same day”. Right after that, John 20:19 says “te mia sabbaton”, which is presumably intended to mean “one from the Sabbath”. The phrase “the same day” simply continues the day that has already been established by John 20:1 and makes it so there doesn’t need to be any further clarification. However, since John 20:1 says “mia ton sabbaton”, which really means “one of the Sabbaths” and apparently was only later interpreted as “one from the Sabbath”, there appears to have been motivation to alter what day the phrase “the same day” was referring to. Originally, it appears that “the same day” referred to “one of the Sabbaths” as established by John 20:1. After the addition of “te mia sabbaton” to John 20:19, “the same day” now appears to refer to “one from the Sabbath”. Long story short, “te mia sabbaton” in John 20:19 appears to be a later fraudulent alteration because “te mia sabbaton” appears to be useless given the phrase “the same day” except that “te mia sabbaton” is altering the understanding of what day is being referred to. Meanwhile, John 20:1 appears to have been originally produced at an earlier time when people believed that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath.

The main conclusion about the four points just previously stated is that “te mia sabbaton” in John 20:19, “kata mian sabbatou” in 1 Corinthians 16:2, “prote sabbatou” in Mark 16:9, and “deftera sabbaton” in the Didace all appear to have been later writings after the production of the Gospel of Matthew. Meanwhile, “mia ton sabbaton” in John 20:1 and Mark 16:2 both appear to have been originally written before the Gospel of Matthew was produced. Luke and Acts contain “mia ton sabbaton” and were produced after Matthew, but they contain “mia ton sabbation” presumably because that phrase was copied from Mark and/or John (we will go into more detail in Part 5 about how the Gospel of Luke was produced and how narratives were copied from other Gospels). Besides Luke and Acts, John 20:1 and Mark 16:2 show the use of “mia ton sabbaton” before Matthew was produced and John 20:19, 1 Corinthians 16:2, Mark 16:9, and the Didache show the exclusion of “ton” before “sabbaton” or “sabbatou” after Matthew was produced. That shows that the use of “mian sabbaton” in the Gospel of Matthew instead of “mia ton sabbaton” appears to have marked a pivot that led to a consistent effort to align with the Gospel of Matthew in relation to what day the Resurrection occurred on, which led to the misunderstanding that “sabbaton” means the singular “Sabbath” rather than the plural “Sabbaths” and that led to people using “sabbaton” to refer to days of the week even when not referring to the day of the Resurrection as can be seen by 1 Corinthians 16:2 and the Didache. Furthermore, the Gospel of Matthew is the only Gospel that excludes the word “ton”, and it would have been more natural to align with three of the Gospels rather than only one of the Gospels unless there was a specific reason to align with the lone Gospel that excludes “ton”, and that specific reason appears to be related to the desire to portray the Resurrection as having happened on a day that was not a Sabbath.

It had previously been shown that Matthew 28:1 is redundant in saying both “after the Sabbath” and “one from the Sabbath”, and that such redundancy appears to be for clarification, which would only be needed if people believed that “mia ton sabbaton” means “one of the Sabbaths”. So Matthew 28:1 was apparently written to specifically try to change what people thought in relation to the phrase “mia ton sabbaton”; and with Matthew being the only Gospel that excludes the word “ton”, it appears that there was a change to the wording to try to display further clarification by distinguishing from “mia ton sabbaton”. The author continued to use the word “sabbaton”, probably because it was already well-known in association with the day of the Resurrection, but the author made a slight change by not using the word “ton”. That may seem like a small difference, but when we see how earlier writing used the word “ton” and later writing didn’t,

we can see that there was a shift, and such a shift staying consistent through different pieces of writing shows that such a shift was likely deliberate.

So first the original version of the Gospel of John was produced using “mia ton sabbaton” in John 20:1, meaning “one of the Sabbaths”. Then the Gospel of Mark was produced using “mia ton sabbaton” in Mark 16:2, meaning “one of the Sabbaths”. Then the Gospel of Matthew was produced, making many changes from Mark, one of those changes being the use of “mian sabbaton” in Matthew 28:1, meaning “one from the Sabbath”. By then, it was being asserted that the Resurrection occurred on a day after a Sabbath rather than on a Sabbath. Then Luke and Acts were produced with “mia ton sabbaton” being copied from Mark and/or John but still being in line with Matthew in terms of portraying the Resurrection on a day after a Sabbath with the use of the phrase “after the Sabbath”. After all of that, “te mia sabbaton” in John 20:19 was added to the Gospel of John and “prote sabbatou” in Mark 16:9 was added to the Gospel of Mark, both appearing to mirror the assertion from Matthew 28:1 that the Resurrection occurred on a day after a Sabbath rather than on a Sabbath. At some point, not in relation to the Resurrection, 1 Corinthians 16:2 was added to 1 Corinthians showing another example of using the word “Sabbath” when describing a day of the week when the Jewish population typically just assigned a number to the day and didn’t use the word “Sabbath”. The Jewish population would typically say “the first day” and 1 Corinthians says “one from the Sabbath”. So while 1 Corinthians 16:2 correctly uses the singular form of “sabbatou” instead of the plural form of “sabbaton”, it still provides an example of the foundation established by Matthew 28:1, which was that the first day of the week should be described with the word “one” and the use of the word “Sabbaths” or “Sabbath”. There are two key differences. One is the use of “Sabbaths” or “Sabbath”. The other is the use of the word “one” rather than “first”. The Jewish population would typically use the word “first” and not use the word “Sabbaths” or “Sabbath”, as in “the first day”. Matthew 28:1, John 20:19, and 1 Corinthians 16:2, use “mia” or “mian” and use “sabbaton” or “sabbatou”. Mark 16:9 uses “sabbaton”, but uses “prote”, which means “first”. Mark 16:9 is a good example of how the language developed for Christian writing. Mark 16:9 is much like the Didache in that the Didache uses the Greek words for “second” and “fifth” instead of “two” and “five” while Mark 16:9 uses the word for “first” instead of “one”, and both the Didache and Mark 16:9 use either “sabbaton” or “sabbatou”. The word for “first” began to be used because it was more appropriate than the word for “one”. So that shows development in the writing, but it was still combined with “sabbaton” or “sabbatou”, which is a specific departure from Jewish writing and is representative of the foundation established by Matthew 28:1.

All of this shows further evidence that the Gospel of Matthew made a pivot from Mark and the original version of John, and that there was a deliberate effort to portray the Resurrection as having happened on a day after a Sabbath rather than on a Sabbath, which shows further evidence that people initially believed that the Resurrection happened on a Sabbath, which in turn also shows further evidence that the Resurrection did happen on a Sabbath.

There appears 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 appears to be incorrect because it appears that such a belief only spread to better align with Judaism, which shows evidence that such a belief did not arise from truth. That provides evidence that the Resurrection 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 appears to represent an earlier time-period in the development of Gospel narratives. As a result, it appears 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 portrayal in Mark about the Resurrection having occurred on a Sabbath day and the portrayals 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 appears unlikely that Mark would describe the Resurrection as having occurred on a Sabbath day unless that was 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 appears 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 because Matthew 28:1 appears to have been specifically formed in a way that attempts to combat that belief, and there likely wouldn’t have been initial efforts to spread the belief that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day if it didn’t come from truth because it would have been a serious issue in relation to Jewish law. Therefore, it appears that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day, and that Matthew and Luke fraudulently portray the Resurrection as not having occurred on a Sabbath day to appeal to Jewish law.

Additionally, it has been mentioned that Mark appears to have been produced before Matthew and Luke, and that the original version of John appears to have been produced before all of the other Gospels, all of which will be shown in more detail in Part 5. So the first two Gospels produced appear to be the original version of John and then Mark. Both John and Mark use the Greek phrase “mia ton sabbaton”, and the correct way to translate that phrase is as “one of the Sabbaths”. It appears to only be later Christian

writing that changed the interpretation of “sabbaton” from the plural “Sabbaths” to the singular “Sabbath”. More specifically, that change appears to have begun with Matthew. So the use of “mia ton sabbaton” by default should be “one of the Sabbaths”, and that interpretation should especially be established for the two Gospels, John and Mark, that were apparently produced before Matthew. Meanwhile, Luke appears to have been produced after Matthew and appears to fall in line with Matthew in terms of portraying the Resurrection as having occurred on a day that was a Sabbath day. So the default position is to translate “mia ton sabbaton” as “one of the Sabbaths”, and the switch to interpreting that as “one from the Sabbath” appears to have only come into play after the original version of John and Mark were produced. Therefore, both John and Mark claim that the Resurrection occurred on a Sabbath day.

Since there doesn’t appear to have been much motivation to describe the Resurrection as having occurred on a Tuesday, it does appear 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, but 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 appears 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 first day of the week of unleavened bread, which presumably was the day after the Crucifixion, and it does appear 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 15th day of Nisan (the first day of the week of unleavened bread), 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 the others will use the Gospel of Luke. All of those analyses will relate back to the conclusions already reached about the Resurrection likely having occurred on a Tuesday, on the 15th 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 the reign of Herod I. It appears 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 of the narrative that John 2:20 is a part of.

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 18th 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 (counting 107 years backwards starting with 70 CE as the 107th year) and the beginning of the construction to 20 BCE (counting 18 years forward starting with 37 BCE as the first year). There is also other evidence that Herod's reign began in 37 BCE. Again using inclusive counting, 46 years as mentioned in the Gospel of John 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 appears 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 appear 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 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 was the ripening of barley. Additionally, there is writing that has been dated to the fourth century CE 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.

As tradition says, 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 Bible indicates that months were scheduled according to new moons but doesn't specifically say how exactly the first day of each month was determined. It's tradition that says that the exact first day of a month was determined based on the sighting of a sliver of the moon after 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 14th, the new moon in March is scheduled to have occurred on March 15th, and the new moon in April is scheduled to have occurred on April 13th. 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 14th was unlikely to have been the end of Adar and April 13th was unlikely to have been the beginning of Nisan. If Adar didn't end in February, then it would have ended in March; and if Nisan didn't begin in April, then it would have begun in March. Therefore, it already appears that both the end of Adar and the beginning of Nisan occurred in March in 28. That conclusion also shows that there apparently 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 23rd in the early morning. So if the 14th 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 23rd, and the beginning of Nisan would appear to have been no earlier than March 10th. The shortest amount of days for a Jewish year is 353 days. If March 10th is used as a start date in 27 and 353 days are used as the length of the year, then the 353rd day of that year would have been February 25th in 28. That shows that February 14th was apparently too early of a date for the end of Adar in 28. Therefore, that is further evidence that the end of Adar in 28 apparently occurred in March.

The new moon in March of 28 is scheduled to have occurred on March 15th and so that is the likely date that Adar ended in 28. The spring equinox in 28 is scheduled to have occurred on March 22nd in the morning. If Nisan in 28 began on March 16th, then the spring equinox would appear to have occurred on the 7th 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 not have been added and so the beginning of Nisan would have been correlated with the new moon in March.

A third path to conclude that Nisan in 28 apparently began in March is by assessing which month appears to have placed the 15th day of Nisan on a Tuesday.

If Nisan in 28 began on February 15th, then the 15th day of Nisan would have been February 29th (28 was a leap year according to the Julian calendar), which was a Sunday. Therefore, if Nisan in 28 began in February, then the 15th day of Nisan probably wouldn't have been a Tuesday. Potentially, if a sliver of the moon wasn't seen on February 15th or February 16th, then the next month could have begun on February 17th, which would have then made the 15th 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 apparently 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 14th, then the 15th day of Nisan would have been April 28th, 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 15th day of Nisan. Therefore, if Nisan in 28 began in April, then the 15th day of Nisan probably wouldn't have been a Tuesday.

On the other hand, if Nisan in 28 began on March 16th, then the 15th day of Nisan would have been March 30th, which was a Tuesday.

There have now been three different paths that lead to the conclusion that Nisan in 28 apparently began in March. The next question then becomes about whether Nisan in 28 would have begun specifically on March 16th.

The new moon that is scheduled to have occurred on March 15th, 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 15th 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 16th. 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 15th or in the early morning of March 16th. By 4:30 p.m. on March 16th, 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 16th. If the moon was first seen on March 16th, then March 16th would apparently have been included in the new month, making it the first of the month. Even though it wasn't necessarily known at the beginning of March 16th that it would have been the first of the month, the day would have eventually been declared the first of the month because it would apparently have been included in the new month if it was the first day that the moon was seen. Therefore, it is justified to believe that the first day of Nisan in 28 was March 16th. As previously shown, if March 16th was the first day of Nisan in 28, then the 15th day of Nisan in 28 would have been March 30th. As also previously shown, March 30th, 28 was a Tuesday.

It is justified to believe that the Resurrection occurred on Tuesday, March 30th, 28. It is then also justified to believe that the Crucifixion occurred on Monday, March 29th, 28 and that Christ's arrest occurred late on Sunday, March 28th, or early on Monday, March 29th.

There are also other ways to get to March 30th, 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 doesn'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 Traconitis, 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 15th year of the reign of Tiberius. According to archaeological and other historical evidence, it appears that Tiberius became co-emperor sometime in the time-range of 11-13 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 four of those years. Given 11-14 for the time-range of when the first year was, the 15th year would have been in the time-range of 25-28. 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 15th 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 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 for when the Gospel of Luke appears to portray the Resurrection as having occurred.

Given a time-period of 25-30, the evidence showing that the Gospel of Luke appears to view the Resurrection as having occurred on a Tuesday, and the evidence showing that the Resurrection likely occurred on the 15th 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 15th day of Nisan was a Tuesday. The only years in the time-period of 25-30 in which the 15th 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 obviously appears 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 30th, 28.

Another approach is to be less conservative and more exact when it comes to assessing the reference to the 15th 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 appears unlikely that the author would specifically exclude the years in which Tiberius was co-emperor, and therefore the author of Luke appears 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 15th year of the reign of Tiberius, the author of Luke also portrayed two different people as reining as high priest in Jerusalem. Annas and Caiaphas are both named as high priests. Annas was older and on his way out as the high priest. 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.

Tiberius became co-emperor in the time-range of 11-13, which would make the 15th year fall in the time-range of 25-27. Adding two years to 25-27 would bring us to 25-29 for the year in which the Gospel of Luke appears to portray the Resurrection as having occurred.

A third avenue is to consider the possibility that the reference to the 15th 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 15th 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 15th 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 15th 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 15th 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 15th 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" and the supposed physical "childhood" of the physical appearance of Christ, and is the only Gospel that has a narrative about 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 15th 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 appear 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 15th year of the reign of Tiberius is responding to the Gospel of John is that the narrative that refers to the 15th 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 the narrative that references the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius 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 appears to be responding to John. However, Luke also appears to specifically disagree with John because John appears 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 apparently portraying 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 appears to specifically disagree with John. John appears to be describing the year 26 CE as a part of Christ's Ministry while Luke appears 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 15th year of the reign of Tiberius in the time-range of 25-28. It has also been shown that the reference about the 15th 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 15th 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 appears 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, 25-29, and 26-28, with 26-28 being the most precise. For the ranges 25-30 and 25-29, 25 and 28 are the only years in which the 15th 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 30th, 28 for the dating of the Resurrection.

We have now established multiple analyses that all conclude that the Resurrection likely occurred on Tuesday, March 30th, 28.

One objection can relate to the execution of John the Baptist and a battle that took place between Herod Antipas, who was the king of Galilee, and Aretas, who was the king of Nabataea. Aretas' daughter was married to Herod and then Herod divorced her to marry his brother Philip's wife, Herodias. The Synoptic Gospels all connect the marriage between Herod and Herodias to the execution of John the Baptist.

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".

Luke 3:19-20
But when John rebuked Herod the tetrarch because of Herodias, his brother's wife, and all the other evil things he had done, Herod added this to them all: He locked John up in prison.

As shown by these verses, the Synoptic Gospels all reference King Herod's (Herod Antipas) relationship with his brother Philip's wife Herodias. These verses also show that the Synoptic Gospels all describe the reason for the execution of John the Baptist to be that he spoke out against King Herod for his marriage to Herodias. In addition to that, as shown in Part 3, Josephus wrote the following.

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.

The first part of that writing refers to Herod's army being defeated by Aretas, and that the people thought Herod's defeat was divine punishment for Herod having John the Baptist executed. In terms of dating the Resurrection, some argue that the execution of John the Baptist occurred shortly before this battle, and therefore that the Resurrection occurred around that time. The battle between Herod and Aretas has been dated to 36 CE, so some argue that the Resurrection could have occurred around 36 CE. 34-36 is an approximate time-range that some assert could be when the Resurrection occurred. Additionally, the 15th day of Nisan was a Tuesday in both 34 and 35. So one could combine the assertion that the Resurrection occurred on a Tuesday and the 15th day of Nisan with the argument that the Resurrection occurred around the time of the battle between Herod and Aretas to argue that the Resurrection occurred in 34 or 35.

First off, there has already been substantial evidence that the Resurrection occurred in 28. So we would have to reject all of that evidence to accept 34 or 35. Both the Gospel of Luke and the Gospel of John make a reference to a specific year. Even if one were to come to a different year than 28, the evidence makes it quite unrealistic that the Resurrection occurred outside of the mid-to-late-twenties. From that perspective, 34 and 35 are relatively far removed from all of the other evidence.

Second, as we will go into more detail on in Part 5, Paul provides evidence that the Resurrection occurred before 34. In Paul's letter to the Galatians, he describes a period of three years and a period of 14 years, which combine to serve as the amount of time that passed from Paul's conversion to the council at Jerusalem. Due to the exact language used, it's not clear if the reference to three years would refer to the third or fourth year in relation to Paul's conversion and it's not clear if the reference to 14 years would refer to the 14th or 15th year in relation to Paul's conversion. It's also not clear if there is any overlap between the reference to three years and the reference to 14 years. Because of all of that, the amount of time described by Paul could be anywhere in the range of 16-19 years.

To apply all of that from Paul's letter to the Galatians to try to figure out the year in which the Resurrection occurred, we can turn to what has been called the "Delphi Inscription" or the "Gallio Inscription". This inscription shows writing from the Roman Emperor Claudius and it mentions a proconsul of Achaia named Gallio. This is important because chapter 18 of Acts refers to Gallio, so the Gallio Inscription can be used to date chapter 18 of Acts, which can then be combined with Paul's letter to the Galatians to eliminate possibilities in the process of dating the Resurrection.

The Gallio Inscription also mentions the 26th acclamation of Claudius, which is dated to 52 CE. Proconsuls usually served one-year terms. Since the Gallio Inscription shows that Gallio was a proconsul in Achaia in 52, his term would realistically have been 51-52 or 52-53. Many assert that his term was 51-52 instead of 52-53, but it's possible that his term was 52-53. So we'll first use 52-53 to be conservative and then later analyze the result using 51-52.

The most conservative approach would be to use 53 as a starting point and to use a duration of 16 years from Paul's letter to the Galatians. If the reference to Gallio in chapter 18 of Acts refers to 53, then Paul would appear to have arrived in Corinth no later than the first half of 52 because chapter 18 explains that Paul was in Corinth for a year and a half and the reference to Gallio occurs towards the end of the part about Paul in Corinth.

There are three other considerations to take into account. One is that the conclusion that Paul could have arrived in Corinth as late as June of 52 assumes that Gallio's term could have lasted until the very end of 53, which is certainly possible, but it's also possible that his term ended much sooner than that. For example, if Gallio's term ended in June of 53, then the conclusion would be that Paul arrived in Corinth no later than 51. The second consideration is that the council at Jerusalem is described in chapter 15 of Acts and Paul's arrival in Corinth is described in chapter 18. So there was some time that passed in between the council at Jerusalem and Paul's arrival in Corinth, which provides reason to exclude the first half of 52 and settle on 51 as the latest year in which Paul would have realistically arrived in Corinth. The third consideration is that the conclusion that Paul arrived in Corinth no later than the first half of 52 was derived using a starting point of 53. Even if Gallio's term was 52-53, the reference to Gallio in Acts could refer to 52 instead of 53, in which case the conclusion would be that Paul arrived in Corinth no later than 51. Additionally, the popular dating of Gallio's term is 51-52. If 51-52 is used instead of 52-53, then the reference to Gallio in Acts would refer to 51 or 52, in which case the conclusion would be that Paul arrived in Corinth no later than 51. With all of that being considered, we will move forward with the conclusion that Paul arrived in Corinth no later than 51.

Counting 16 years backwards and inclusively from 51 would bring us to 36. Through this analysis so far, the latest year in which Paul would have converted would be 36. If Paul converted in 36, it's unlikely that the Resurrection occurred in 34 or 35. It's certainly possible that Paul converted within 1-2 years of the Resurrection, but it's a tight window. Furthermore, we can take a less conservative approach and be more realistic. We can move forward with a term of 51-52 for Gallio instead of 52-53, which would date Paul's arrival in Corinth to 50 instead of 51. Additionally, the council at Jerusalem is described in chapter 15 of Acts and Paul's arrival in Corinth is described in chapter 18. If we were to say that at least a year passes from council at Jerusalem to Paul's arrival in Corinth, then the council at Jerusalem would be dated to 49. Counting 16 years backwards and inclusively from 49 would bring us to 34.

If Paul converted in 34, then Paul would have had to have converted in the same year as the Resurrection for the Resurrection to have taken place in 34, which is quite unlikely. Also, that's only if we use 16 years as the duration from Paul's conversion to the council at Jerusalem. If we were to just use 17, then 33 would be the latest year in which the Resurrection occurred. But even still using 16 years, if we were to assume that Paul's conversion didn't occur in the same year as the Resurrection, then 33 would be the latest year in which the Resurrection would have occurred according to this analysis.

This analysis shows that it appears that the Resurrection occurred before 34, which by itself shows that the Resurrection appears to have not occurred in 34 or 35. In addition, plenty of evidence has been shown that the Resurrection occurred in 28, or at least sometime in the mid-to-late-twenties. Therefore, the writing from Josephus, the execution of John the Baptist, and the dating of the battle between Herod Antipas and Aretas to 36 should not be used to date the Resurrection.

The most likely scenario is that John the Baptist was executed around 27 and people still remembered him 9 or so years later in 36 when Herod was defeated by Aretas. People have remembered so-called "prophets" for hundreds, even thousands, of years. If people really believed that John the Baptist was a prophet as Josephus says, then he could have very well been remembered just 9 years later.

With that objection now eliminated from consideration, it is firmly established through multiple paths that the Resurrection appears to have occurred on March 30, 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. 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 appear 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 30th, 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 about a supposed resurrection. 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 about a supposed resurrection 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 appears 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 appears 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 supposed 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, or "the Son of God", as having been crucified because that would suggest that an emperor, king, or some other kind of leader 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 appear to represent anything like that. Power does not appear to have been a motive for the people who were spreading true Christianity in the first century.

The division, disorganization, and confusion described among the male "disciples" and others shows that they don't appear to have been organized or sophisticated enough to carry out such an elaborate plan that would lead to Christianity spreading throughout 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 shows evidence that there was someone who spread true Christianity before such a divided, disorganized, and confused group of people got very far.

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 important 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 was being formed, that religion wouldn't likely include narratives about disciples having lost faith.

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, someone looking to overthrow someone already in power would have been unlikely to have started a religion like Christianity, and there doesn't appear to have been any violence, ruling power, or political revolution associated with the formation of Christianity. So it appears 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.

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 appear to have been acting corrupt during those days don't appear to have been organized and sophisticated enough to have been very successful on their own. Instead, it appears that something else happened. Therefore, that is evidence that the success of true Christianity in the first century was separate from those who were acting in such a corrupt way. Additionally, the apparent concealment in the New Testament of Mariam's importance as the most faithful disciple of Christ is evidence that Mariam was the true human leader of Christianity at the very beginning of the Christian movement after the Resurrection of Christ. Therefore, it appears 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.

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 or offering a blood sacrifice but sacrificing oneself for God, is evidence of the validity of Christianity because a false religion is more likely to focus on prosperity, other benefits, sacrifice for a human-formed institution, or offering blood sacrifices rather than sacrificing oneself for God.

So it appears 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 apparently appealed to a mass population because of the truth that Christianity represents, the real justification for belief in Christianity. When a person focuses on fundamentals, they can be led to truth. That is apparently how true 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 was, 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 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 fraudulently claimed that Mariam was a sinful woman by conflating her with the sinful woman described in Luke 7:36-50, which contributed to the misconception that she was a prostitute and over 1,300 years of portraying Mary Magdalene as a sinful prostitute. Such an 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. Additionally, the evidence shown from 2 John, 2 Corinthians, the First Epistle of Clement, and Origen's "Contra Celsum" supports the conclusions reached that Mariam spread the Christian Revolution and that the Revolution that she spread continued to spread for hundreds of years.

Given the evidence that Mariam spread the Revolution and that the Revolution continued to spread for over 500 years, three main conclusions can be reached that show that Christianity is the true religion.

1. Without money, violence, or ruling power, it would have been incredibly unlikely that a poor woman on her own would have been so successful that generations of people would have exalted her as the top disciple of God for over 500 years all the while a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government suppressed information about her. The only realistic way that could have been accomplished is if the truth taught by God was spreading.
2. Hypothetically, if a man and a woman were to spread the same religion in the first century separately from each other, it would obviously have been far more likely that the man would have been more successful. Additionally, it would have been far more likely that the woman would have been imprisoned or murdered. If one was to be successful and the other was to be murdered, the obviously probable scenario would have been that the man would have been successful and

the woman would have been murdered. Hypothetically, if Christ was merely a man, then a man would have been crucified and a woman who was a student of that man would have launched a revolution that spread information about her generation after generation for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. That scenario is incredibly unlikely. Therefore, it is incredibly unlikely that Christ was merely a man. Therefore, it is incredibly unlikely that Christ is not God. That shows defining evidence that Christ is God.

3. Regardless of the exact reason for why anyone wanted Christ crucified, something happened that led to the Crucifixion and then there were only a few people remaining. What Christ exactly did that influenced anyone to want Christ crucified is not exactly what Mariam did. If Mariam had done exactly what Christ had done, then she realistically would have been murdered with only a few people remaining if anyone. So the difference in results shows clear evidence that different strategies were taken. That conclusion combined with the conclusion that Mariam was the top disciple of Christ shows evidence that Mariam was taught to implement a different strategy. All of that shows evidence that Christ deliberately took a path that led to the Crucifixion and deliberately taught Mariam to take a different path that led to her launching the Revolution that spread generation after generation for over 500 years despite a hierarchy of bishops and later the Roman government having suppressed information about her throughout that time. 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.

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.

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.

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. 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 appear 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 30th, 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 about a supposed resurrection. 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 about a supposed resurrection 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.

The origin within Creation of information about Christianity is Christ, and Christ is God. In Part 3, Judaism was shown to be a fraudulent religion. It has been shown here in Part 4 that the origin within Creation of information about Islam is fraudulent and appears to have come from human beings who sought to form a false religion to gain power. Christianity is the true religion, and 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 sinful prostitute for over 1,300 years if not longer than that. Mariam set 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 fetters”.
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 refer 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 (Mount Zion is in 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' ", which shows that they were apparently 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 who portrayed themselves as the Messiah.

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 Jews 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 supposed prophecy about the coming Messiah being like David or being a "Son of David" would appear to be obviously fraudulent.

Psalm 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 viewed 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, and 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. So either Christ is God and encompasses all of existence or Christ doesn't encompass all of existence, in which case Christ would be finite and not God. To be human is to be finite, and therefore not God. So 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, one could argue that 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 appears 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 honor 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. Mariam is naturally exalted because of her discipleship and her discipleship is in service to God. The exaltation of Mariam simply comes from recognizing truth. The anointing of Christ was an action. It represented a specific decision to worship 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 must 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 appear 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 appears 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 appear 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 appears 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 could 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 directly 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. Jews often slaughtered animals for forgiveness of their sins and there are plenty of instructions and descriptions related to blood sacrifices in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. 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 was 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, and the consistency throughout the ancient world of different societies making blood sacrifices shows that this is how the human race naturally responded to existing in this world. Societies throughout the ancient world that never knew each other existed naturally responded in the same way to their own existence by making blood sacrifices. That shows that these blood sacrifices

were simply a human practice and did not directly result in forgiveness or pretty much anything else that people in the ancient world thought they did. 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 it was specifically implemented into Judaism, 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 appears 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 needed 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 insight into 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 around 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 appears 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 ἀββᾶ ("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 instructions allegedly 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 Jewish theology in general related to blood sacrifices and forgiveness, but also specifically from 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 and taking care of others 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, 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 Ἰησοῦς (“Lesous”); and “Lesous” derives from the Hebrew name יְהוֹשֻׁעַ (“Y’hoshua”), which is often translated to English as “Joshua”. For example, the name “Joshua” in the book of Joshua in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament comes from the Hebrew name “Y’hoshua”; and the Septuagint, which is a Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, translates “Y’hoshua” in Hebrew to “Lesous” in Greek, which is the same name that Greek manuscripts of the New Testament use for the name that gets translated into English as “Jesus”. So the Hebrew name that eventually led to a translation of “Jesus” in reference to Christ is the same Hebrew name that elsewhere gets translated as “Joshua”.

First off, even if Christ was called “Y’hoshua” in the first century, “Y’hoshua” is a different pronunciation than “Jesus”. Christ was not likely ever called “Jesus” in the first century even if Christ was called “Y’hoshua” because “Jesus” is an English name.

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 “Y’hoshua”, we must question whether “Y’hoshua” is the right name to use in reference to Christ. The first point against using the name “Y’hoshua” in reference to Christ is that fraudulent Jewish theology appears to be the basis for the use of that name. The Hebrew name “Y’hoshua” is a name that refers to saving and Matthew 1:21-23 explicitly claim that name is used because of the concept of people being saved from their sins. Given the fraudulent theology that portrays Christ as a sacrificial lamb for the forgiveness of sins, we can see why a name that refers to savings was used, and we can also see that the reason for using that name is fraudulent because the selection of that name is connected to fraudulent theology. The second point is that “Y’hoshua” was a name that was used for human beings. It’s not really appropriate to use a name for Christ that is used for humans. It wouldn’t be appropriate to call Christ “Joshua”, which is the common English translation of “Y’hoshua”. The third point 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 statement “I am” comes from the Hebrew word אֶהְיֶה (“eh-yeh”). As explained in Part 3, “eh-yeh” appears to be 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, Yahwehism likely has a truthful origin in some way given that the name “Yahweh” appears to derive from a statement 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 statement “I am”. The name “Yahweh” appears to derive from the most fundamental principle of all of existence: God necessarily and inherently exists. Therefore, Yahwehism likely has a truthful origin in some way.

Going back to the name “Y’hoshua”, the point being made about Exodus 3:14 shows further that it’s not really appropriate to refer to God with a name that is limited like the name “Y’hoshua”. “Y’hoshua” 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 appear to have called Christ “Y’hoshua” or the Greek version “Lesous”, neither of those names appears to be appropriate, which shows that the people who used those names appear to have been 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 explained 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 evil and suffering exist within Creation. 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 false 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? There doesn’t appear to be any need for that because it doesn’t lead to any other result. So the most realistic possibility is that everyone lives forever and that there isn’t any kind of everlasting punishment. Hypothetically, if that wasn’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 factor in.

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 it’s either more disciples of God or less disciples 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 specific purpose as a part of our overall purpose to have a relationship with God 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: the Resurrection and fundamental analysis of what makes sense. More specifically, the Resurrection confirms the conclusion of that fundamental analysis.

We should also explore the concept of original sin, which has been attributed to the Adam and Eve narratives. It has already been shown that it appears that chapters 2 and 3 of Genesis are fraudulent and that Adam and Eve are fictional characters; but even if that wasn’t the case, 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 thinking is 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. Dying means passing on to the next chapter of your life after death. You will awake after you die. 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 the letter 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 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 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 letter 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 the letter shows that regardless of whether the letter is authentic. Nothing should take you away from your faith. Nothing should take you away from being a disciple of God.

People are raped, kidnapped, imprisoned, enslaved, tortured, and murdered on a regular basis all over the world. No matter how much suffering one endures, Christ's teachings are always true 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. A confession can't be exchanged for forgiveness and forgiveness is not dependent on confessing to a priest. Furthermore, 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 supposed prophecies in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament about the coming Messiah and the supposed 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 supposed prophecies in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament about the coming Messiah and the supposed 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 supposed prophecies, we will also specifically examine the relationship between sacrifice and looking forward to a new kind of world.

The supposed 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.

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."

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."

Jeremiah 23:5-6
"The days are coming declares the Lord, when I will raise up to David a righteous Branch, a King who will reign wisely and do what is just and right in the land. In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will live in safety. This is the name by which he will be called: The Lord Our Righteousness."

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 worshipped 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."

2 Samuel 7:12-14 claim that there will be a king who will be a descendant of David and have a kingdom established by God forever. 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 it appears to have been used here to refer to God. So "Immanuel" can be more appropriately translated as "God with us". Isaiah 9:6-7 describe a child being born and reining 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. Jeremiah 23:5-6 describe a king who will come from the succession of David and claim that Judah will be saved in his days. 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 come during "the end" when the city and the sanctuary are being destroyed and who will put an end to sacrifice and offering. These verses combined together present a view of the coming Messiah as a chosen servant of God and a descendent of David who would come during "the end" when the city and the temple were being destroyed, bring justice, put an end to sacrifice and offering, and reign on David's throne and over his kingdom forever.

That view gave way to many Jews 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. Many people expected more than teachings and did not expect the coming Messiah to be crucified. So there was a very big difference between what actually happened in the first century and what many people in the first century were expecting from the coming Messiah.

The expectations of the people were based on the Jewish writings, and these writings are very different than how Christ appeared in the first century. So there appears to be a lot wrong with these supposed prophecies. One may think that maybe there was just a simple misunderstanding or the supposed prophecies can be interpreted in a certain way, and that the supposed prophecies still represent true prophecies. However, the specificity of these supposed prophecies shows the detail of their inaccuracies. There isn't a just a slight misunderstanding. These supposed prophecies are extremely different than how Christ appeared in the first century. There appears to have been an obsession with kings and kingdoms, specifically about David, and a lot of that comes from the first temple period, which shows that it was being written in the context of a physical kingdom like the kingdom of Judah, but that can be seen anyway by the writing itself. Such extreme attention on a human king and a physical kingdom shows that these supposed 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 supposed prophecies that relate to what appears to be an obsession with David. David is not Christ, and Christ is not a descendant of David. Christ is God and David is a human being (assuming David is a real person). Supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah that emphasize David or any human king obviously appear to be fraudulent. Furthermore, it was shown in Part 3 that the kingdom of David appears to not have existed as the Bible describes, which shows further evidence that any supposed prophecy that emphasizes David is fraudulent.

Looking again at Isaiah 7:14 and Psalm 2:1-12 can bring us further in our understanding of what's going on with these supposed prophecies.

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."

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 fetters".
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.

As shown in Part 3, Isaiah 7:14 appears 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 appear 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, supposed 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 supposed 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 prime examples of that.

The evidence showing that kings wanted to be portrayed as a messiah shows that a lot of the supposed prophecies about a coming messiah were produced during the first temple period. The obsession with David goes along with that as well. As shown in Part 3, there was more of a focus on David in the first temple period and more of a focus on Moses and Josiah in the second temple period. Additionally, one of the main ideas of the kingdom of David is that the supposed kingdom would last forever; so once the destruction of the kingdom of Judah and the Babylonian Exile happened, there was an issue with how the kingdom of David was portrayed. That's not to say that there wasn't still focus on David during the Exile or the second temple period. There has pretty much always been a focus on David from the first temple period all the way to now. However, there is still an issue because of the idea of an everlasting kingdom beginning with David given that the kingdom of Judah was destroyed along with the first temple and then there was the Babylonian Exile. The supposed prophecies specifically reference a succession from David and a descendant of David reigning on David's throne and over his kingdom. That writing doesn't really leave any room for a kingdom to get destroyed and for there to be an exile. There was supposed to be a succession from David that would last forever. One example is Jeremiah 33:17 that says "David will

never fail to have a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel". So there clearly wasn't supposed to be a break in the succession from David. Therefore, the destruction of the kingdom of Judah and the Babylonian Exile are major issues for these supposed prophecies, which shows clear evidence of the fraudulent nature of them and also shows that the writing appears to have been written before the destruction of the kingdom of Judah and the Babylonian Exile. So a lot of the focus on David and there being an everlasting kingdom that gets carried on by a descendent of David is not only fraudulent but more specifically is much more likely to be from the first temple period. The verses below are a specific example of writing that appears to have been written during the first temple period.

Ezekiel 37:15-19
The word of the Lord came to me: "Son of man, take a stick of wood and write on it, 'Belonging to Judah and the Israelites associated with him.' Then take another stick of wood, and write on it, 'Ephraim's stick, belonging to Joseph and all the house of Israel associated with him.' Join them together into one stick so that they will become one in your hand. When your countrymen ask you, 'Won't you tell us what you mean by this?' say to them, 'This is what the Sovereign Lord says: I am going to take the stick of Joseph – which is in Ephraim's hand – and of the Israelite tribes associated with him, and join it to Judah's stick, making them a single stick of wood, and they will become one in my hand.' "

Ezekiel 37:22
"I will make them one nation in the land, on the mountains of Israel. There will be one king over all of them and they will never again be two nations or be divided into two kingdoms."

These verses refer to joining Judah and Ephraim into one kingdom ruled by one king and that "they will never again be two nations or be divided into two kingdoms". That is obviously a reference to the separation between the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, and referring to Ephraim was a common way to refer the kingdom of Israel. There having been two kingdoms and the idea of joining them into one kingdom was a main concern of the first temple period, not the Babylonian Exile or the second temple period. There was one kingdom (the kingdom of Judah) after there was previously a different kingdom (the kingdom of Israel) during the first temple period, and there wasn't any Jewish kingdom during the Exile or the second temple period. So obviously this idea of joining the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah into one kingdom appears to have been a product of the first temple period.

The following verses provide another example and go deeper into specific politics of the first temple period.

Isaiah 22:15-19
This is what the Lord, the Lord Almighty, says:
"Go, say to this steward, to Shebna, who is in charge of the palace:
What are you doing here and who gave you permission to cut out a grave for yourself here, hewing your grave on the height and chiseling your resting place in the rock? Beware, the Lord is about to take firm hold of you and hurl you away, O you mighty man. He will roll you up tightly like a ball and throw you into a large country. There you will die and there your splendid chariots will remain – you disgrace your master's house! I will depose you from your office, and you will be ousted from your position."

Isaiah 22:20-22

"In that day I will summon my servant, Eliakim son of Hilkiah. 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 22:15-19 describe that Shebna, a steward of the kingdom of Judah, was being taken out of his position. Isaiah 22:20-22 describe that Eliakim son of Hilkiah would take over that position. Hilkiah was apparently a priest during the time of King Josiah, and his son Eliakim is described as taking a position over from Shebna. This is all described as coming from instructions from God. So even politics away from the king was getting involved in fraudulent writing. More specifically, that shows evidence that this writing is from the first temple period.

The following verses from Jeremiah provide an example of what appears to be writing that was from the first temple period that was edited probably during the second temple period or maybe during the Babylonian Exile.

Jeremiah 33:14-22
" 'The days are coming', declares the Lord, 'when I will fulfill the gracious promise I made to the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days and at that time I will make a righteous Branch sprout from David's line; he will do what is just and right in the land. In those days Judah will be saved and Jerusalem will live in safety. This is the name by which it will be called: The Lord Our Righteousness.' "
"For this is what the Lord says: 'David will never fail to have a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel, nor will the priests, who are Levites, ever fail to have a man to stand before me continually to offer burnt offerings, to burn grain offerings, and to present sacrifices.' "
The word of the Lord came to Jerimiah: "This is what the Lord says: 'If you can break my covenant with the day and my covenant with the night, so that day and night no longer come at their appointed time, then my covenant with David my servant – and my covenant with the Levites who are priests ministering before me – can be broken and David will no longer have a descendant to reign on his throne. I will make the descendants of David my servant and the Levites who minister before me as countless as the stars of the sky and as measureless as the sand on the seashore.' "

First and foremost, the intense focus on David in general is evidence that at least some of this writing was originally written during the first temple period. Second, the claim that "David will never fail to have a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel" is very clear evidence that at least some of this writing was produced during the first temple period. During the Babylonian Exile and the second temple period, there wasn't a king, so it's almost a forgone conclusion that the claim that there will always be a king was produced during the first temple period. Third, the differentiation between the house of Israel and the house of Judah is further evidence of writing from the first temple period.

It's fairly easy to come to the conclusion that at least some of Jeremiah 33:14-22 were produced during the first temple period. However, an even closer examination will show that these verses were apparently altered sometime after the first temple period. First, the exaltation of Levites in general shows evidence of that. Second, the Levites are defined twice in these verses. Verse 18 says "the priests, who are Levites" and verse 21 says "the Levites who are priests ministering before me". The Levites, or simply priests, don't need to be defined in these verses. It was already well-known what the Levites were. Since they were the priests, people knew who they were. It's not like they really needed to be randomly defined in

verses that shouldn't even really be about them. On top of that, they are defined twice. There didn't need to be any explanation of what a Levite is or that priests are Levites, and it happened twice in these verses. That shows a very specific focus on the Levites. Third, the exaltation of the Levites occurs right along with the exaltation of David. It's one thing to give attention to the Levites, it's another to put such focus on them when the focus is supposed to be on David. These verses are supposed to be about David and his succession, and then there are these out-of-place insertions about Levites right after talking about David. It happens twice. Verse 17 claims that there will always be a king from David's line and then verse 18 claims that there will always be a Levite; and then, verse 21 describes a covenant with David and then claims that there is a separate covenant with the Levites. So that shows that the Levites are being exalted right along with David, which is not only evidence of later editing but also specifically that the edits came from a Levite. Fourth, the mere claim that there is a covenant with Levites shows further evidence that a Levite altered this writing sometime after the first temple period. Fifth, verse 22 claims that the Levites will be "as countless as the stars of the sky and as measureless as the sand on the seashore". The beginning of verse 22 claims that the descendants of David will be countless, which is more on par with the rest of the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament. Genesis makes the claim that the covenant supposedly made with Abraham was about the descendants of Abraham being countless. That kind of claim is typical of Jewish writing. However, to not be generally talking about descendants but to be specifically making this kind of claim about Levites shows evidence that such writing was produced after the first temple period by a Levite.

So in conclusion, Jeremiah 33:14-22 appear to include writing produced during the first temple period as well as writing produced afterward. More specifically, these verses show evidence that supposed prophecies about a messiah were fraudulently altered by Levites.

Moving further, Isaiah 45:1 provides very defining evidence of later fraudulent writing about a supposed prophecy by claiming that Cyrus, the Persian emperor who released Jews from 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."

As previously explained, the Hebrew word מָשִׁיחַ ("mashíakh"), which means "anointed", 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" was used in fraudulent ways. This verse is obviously fraudulent by referring to Cyrus the Persian emperor as God's "anointed". Additionally, since this verse refers to Cyrus, not only is it obviously fraudulent but also it was obviously written long after the book of Isaiah is proposed to have been written. Just from the mention of Cyrus, it appears to have been written either towards the end of the Babylonian Exile or sometime after the Exile. 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 that included fraudulent information related to a supposed messiah.

When we look at the book of Isaiah as a whole, we can see even more evidence that there are contributions from multiple authors. We already saw in Part 3 that Isaiah 7:14-17 appear 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 further evidence of the 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 further evidence of the presence of multiple authors. Fourth, different words are used to refer to God. In Isaiah 1:24, a Hebrew word pronounced as “Ha-a-down” is translated as “the Lord”, and there is a Hebrew word pronounced as “se-ba-owt” that is translated as “of hosts”. “Ha-a-down” comes right before the name “Yahweh” and “se-ba-owt” comes right after for a full translation of “the Lord Yahweh of hosts”. Isaiah 8:10 refers to God as “El”. Isaiah 17:6 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 has been translated as “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 appear to have contributed to the book of Isaiah. Fifth, both Assyria and Babylon are mentioned several times. That shows evidence 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, and those attacks by each empire occurred over a century apart from each other. So each of those sets of narratives appears to have been written by different authors in different time-periods. All of this shows clear evidence that there were multiple authors who contributed to the book of Isaiah and that major portions of the book of Isaiah are fraudulent.

We can also see a change in the kind of information that was being produced in relation to a supposed messiah. We previously saw supposed prophecies about a king reining forever. The verses below outline a much different outlook.

Isaiah 53:1-12
Who has believed our message and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed? He grew up before him like a tender shoot, and like a root out of dry ground. He had no beauty or majesty to attract us to him, nothing in his appearance that we should desire him. He was despised and rejected by men, a man of sorrows, and familiar with suffering. Like one from whom men hide their faces he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he took up our infirmities and carried our sorrows, yet we considered him stricken by God, smitten by him, and afflicted. But he was pierced for our transgressions, he was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him, and by his wounds we are healed. We all, like sheep, have gone astray, each of us has turned to his own way; and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed and afflicted, yet he did not open his mouth; he was led like a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is silent, so he did not open his mouth. By oppression and judgment he was taken away. And who can speak of his descendants? For he was cut off from the land of the living; for the transgression of my people he was stricken. He was assigned a grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, though he had done no violence, nor was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it was the Lord’s will to crush him and cause him to suffer, and though the Lord makes his life a guilt offering, he will see his offspring and prolong his days, and the will of the Lord will prosper in his hand. After the suffering of his soul, he will see the light of life and be satisfied; by his knowledge my righteous servant will justify many and he will bear their iniquities. Therefore I will give him a portion among the great, and he will divide the spoils with the strong, because he poured out his life unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors. For he bore the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors.

These verses from the book of Isaiah describe a suffering servant, a supposed suffering messiah. These verses could have been written after the Babylonian Exile began and they could relate to a real king, in which case they would be a later fraudulent addition looking back at past events while portraying that king as a messiah. On the other hand, they could represent a supposed prophecy about the future, in which case that would show that later fraudulent writing was used to portray a supposed suffering messiah in contrast to the glorious descriptions in other supposed prophecies. We are about to go into more detail about why that would be advantageous to the priests, which is mostly about them not wanting people to expect a glorious king as described in other supposed prophecies. Nevertheless, these verses show evidence not only of later fraudulent writing related to a supposed messianic figure but they also show evidence that there was a shift in the kind of information that was being produced in relation to a supposed messiah.

We can see more evidence of this shift in the following verses from the book of Zechariah. More specifically, these verses were definitely written during the second temple period because the book of Zechariah specifically references Darius who was a Persian emperor and apparently the third one after Cyrus. That's not to say that this writing was definitely written during Darius' reign, it could have been written anytime afterward, but the references to Darius at least show that his reign would have been the earliest possible time-period in which a reference to him as the emperor would have been written, which places this writing firmly in the second temple period regardless of the exact timing.

Zechariah 1:1
In the eighth month of the second year of Darius, the word of the Lord came to the prophet Zechariah son of Berekiah, the son of Iddo.

Zechariah 12:10
"And I will pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem a spirit of grace and supplication. They will look on me, the one they have pierced, and they will mourn for him as one mourns for an only child, and grieve bitterly for him as one grieves for a firstborn son."

Zechariah 13:1-3
"On that day a fountain will be opened to the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, to cleanse them from sin and impurity. On that day, I will banish the names of the idols from the land, and they will be remembered no more", declares the Lord Almighty. "I will remove both the prophets and the spirit of impurity from the land. And if anyone still prophesies, his father and mother, to whom he was born, will say to him, 'You must die, because you have told lies in the Lord's name.' When he prophesies, his own parents will stab him.

Zechariah 13:7-9
"Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man who is close to me!" declares the Lord Almighty. "Strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered, and I will turn my hand against the little ones. In the whole land", declares the Lord, "two-thirds will be struck down and perish; yet one-third will be left in it. This third I will bring into the fire; I will refine them like silver and test them like gold. They will call on my name and I will answer them; I will say, 'They are my people', and they will say, 'The Lord is our God.' "

Zechariah 14:1-2

A day of the Lord is coming when your plunder will be divided among you. I will gather all the nations to Jerusalem to fight against it; the city will be captured, the houses ransacked, and the women raped. Half of the city will go into exile, but the rest of the people will not be taken from the city.

As previously explained, while many supposed prophecies that include a reference to David are from the first temple period, David still remained relatively popular and Judea was still looked at as "the house of David" in the second temple period to a certain extent even though there wasn't a kingdom anymore. We previously saw much more extravagant claims about a descendent of David that appear to be from the first temple period, but a reference simply to the house of David is not necessarily from the first temple period; and in this case, we've already seen that the book of Zechariah was produced during the second temple period.

Zechariah 12:10 claims that "a spirit of grace and supplication" will come upon the house of David and Jerusalem, and that people "will mourn for him as one mourns for an only child, and grieve bitterly for him as one grieves for a firstborn son". This begins to outline the view that Jewish priests of the second temple period were trying to push onto the people about the coming Messiah. The shift from supposed prophecies about a glorious king and kingdom to supposed prophecies about suffering, mourning, and grieving appears to be attributed to the shift from the first temple period to the second temple period. As we will get into much more detail on shortly with the book of Daniel, Jewish priests of the second temple period were trying to shift expectations about the coming Messiah. They didn't want people to look for a king in the present day. They wanted people to expect that "the end" would happen around the time that the Messiah would come. From that perspective, the priests would maintain control of the Jewish population until "the end". Furthermore, there were people who tried to appear to be a messiah, which was a problem for the priests of the temple. As a result, a part of their solution appears to have been to portray the coming Messiah as suffering to make it challenging for anyone to appear to be a messiah, and the portrayal of the coming Messiah as not coming until "the end" adds to that. Zechariah 12:10 is in line with that portrayal by describing mourning and grieving for the coming Messiah. Zechariah 13:1-3 claim that no one is supposed to be a prophet anymore, which obviously would theoretically shut down any legitimacy to any supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah from the perspective of the priests. In this way, they appear to have tried to stop the flow of ideas about the coming Messiah. They went as far as to say that anyone trying to promote a new supposed prophecy should be considered a liar and be killed, and even that their parents will stab them. They actually tried to promote parents killing their children if they try to spread a new supposed prophecy. These verses are obviously ridiculous, extreme, and fraudulent and are simply an attempt to stop ideas from being exchanged about the coming Messiah. Zechariah 13:7-9 claim that "the shepherd" will be struck with a sword, "the sheep" will be scattered, two-thirds of the population will be struck down and perish, and one-third will be left remaining to be refined. To go along with that, Zechariah 14:1-2 claim that Jerusalem will be captured, houses will be ransacked, the women will be raped, and half of the city will go into exile. Zechariah 13:7-9 and 14:1-2 outline a major attack against the Jewish population. This not only was an attempt to strike fear into the people but there is specifically the claim that "the shepherd" will be struck by a sword and that two-thirds of the population will die. So with all of these verses from Zechariah combined together, there is the following outline: the coming Messiah will be struck by a sword and be mourned and grieved, two-thirds of the population will die, Jerusalem will be captured, houses will be ransacked, the women will be raped, and half of the city will go into exile. That is a terrible set of circumstances that would make it very hard for anyone to appear to be a messiah; and then on top of all of that, there is the demand that anyone

claiming to be a prophet must die, and more specifically there's the claim that they would be stabbed by their parents. Obviously, priests of the second temple period were trying to prevent anyone from appearing to be a messiah to protect their power, and they even demanded that anyone claiming to be a prophet must die and claimed that such a person would be stabbed by their parents to try to shut down any new ideas about the coming Messiah.

As we move forward with the book of Daniel, we will see a similar outline but with much more specific details. The book of Daniel focuses on a kingdom being ruled by a committee of saints, and the Messiah coming during "the end" when the city and the temple would be destroyed and sacrificing and offering would end. The book of Daniel describes a kingdom ruled by saints, not one king, until "the end", and the coming Messiah as not coming until "the end". Hypothetically, that would have put Jewish priests in charge until "the end", which is similar to what we just saw from the book of Zechariah and shows the apparent motivation to add such fraudulent verses.

Some biblical historians 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. The second is that there are historical inaccuracies about the Babylonian kings and those inaccuracies appear to be an indication that the author was not familiar enough with the Babylonian Empire, which shows that the author probably wasn't in the Babylonian Empire 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 the 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 appears that some of the book of Daniel was originally produced in Aramaic, which was a language that was more commonly used by Jews 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 appears to have been originally produced at least two centuries after the Babylonian Exile. The Babylonian Exile was during the 6th 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. So the main point is that the book of Daniel is a production of the second temple period.

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".

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 these verses 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 would happen after the first 7 "sevens", so these verses appear 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 appears to refer to the rebuilding that gave way to the second temple period, which began shortly after the Babylonian Exile, probably mostly in the 5th 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". Supposedly, 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" 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" 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 appears to suggest that Daniel would be the one to open the scroll. Although that is not explicitly stated, it is explicitly stated that Daniel should "close up and seal the words of the scroll until the time of the end"; so according to that, Daniel appears to be portrayed as the one who would unseal the scroll, in which case the scroll is portrayed as having been unsealed around the end of the Babylonian Exile when there were plans to rebuild Jerusalem, which shows further that the 70 "sevens" are portrayed as having begun around the end of the Exile. Even if Daniel 12:4 doesn't mean to express that, Daniel 12:4 still appears to indicate that the public circulation of the book of Daniel would occur after or around the same time as the beginning of the 70 "sevens". 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 שִׁבְעִים ("sibim") and the Hebrew word that is translated as "sevens" is שָׁבֻעִים ("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 שָׁבוּעַ (“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 units 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 representation 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 representation of time that is so far completely unidentified.

First, the Hebrew word that actually means “weeks” (multiple periods of 7 days) is שבועות “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 there 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” and 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. 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” appears to be a made-up word that doesn’t have any known meaning, so the use of the word “sabuim” appears to set up an ambiguous timeline. Additionally, if that wasn’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 hypothesizes about 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 appears to express that the process of “the end” 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” had already begun. That would have been effective in instilling fear into the people. Meanwhile, the process of “the end”, according to the book of Daniel, would continue on until sometime after sacrifice and offering ended and the temple was destroyed. Until then, Jewish priests were in control; and with people thinking that the process of “the end” 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 evidence 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 supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent. One is that there are supposed prophecies that describe exile as punishment. As shown earlier, punishment appears to be 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 supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent. This has been shown through the inaccuracy of the supposed prophecies, their focus on human kings and physical kingdoms, their specific focus on David, the evidence that shows that the kingdom of David didn’t exist 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 claims of an everlasting kingdom combined with the fact that the kingdoms of ancient Israel were all destroyed, the ridiculous exaltation of the Levites in some of the verses, the description of Cyrus as God’s “anointed”, the presence of Cyrus at all in the book of Isaiah being a later addition, the evidence that shows that there were contributions to the books of supposed

prophets at different times from different authors with different beliefs, the change in the content of the supposed prophecies going from the first temple period to the second temple period, the presence in some of the supposed prophecies of attempts to make it challenging for anyone to appear to be a messiah, the descriptions in some of the supposed prophecies of the coming Messiah as not coming until "the end", the demands that anyone claiming to be a prophet must be killed, the control that some of the supposed prophecies gave to Jewish priests, the presence in the book of Daniel of an ambiguous timeline related to descriptions about when the Messiah would come, 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 supposed 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 apparent scenario is that all of the supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent and God appeared as Christ in the first century. The apparent scenario is that God fulfilled, or retired, fraudulent supposed prophecies and in a different way than the authors had imagined, which gave way to the Messiah being very different than the expectations of many people. That would explain why expectations about the coming Messiah were so different than how Christ appeared in the first century.

We should think of the following expression: "Be careful what you wish for, you might just get it." Jewish priests pretended that a messiah was coming and produced fraudulent writing about that to manipulate people, and then the Messiah appeared in the first century. It appears that fraudulent supposed prophecies were used to try to control the people and then God fulfilled/retired them. It's not as important that fraudulent supposed prophecies were apparently fulfilled/retired as it is important that they assisted in setting the stage heading into the first century. Corrupt human beings produced fraudulent supposed prophecies about a messiah to try to control the people, and so the people were expecting the coming 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 appears that those supposed prophecies are fraudulent and that fraudulent supposed prophecies were a part of God's Plan. It appears that people had different expectations than how Christ appeared in the first century because of fraudulent supposed prophecies that were fulfilled/retired by God in a different way than the authors had imagined. Fraudulent supposed prophecies appear to have provided an avenue for a part of God's Plan. These fraudulent supposed prophecies helped 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 supposed prophecies appear to have been used as a part of God's Plan.

The fulfillment/retirement of fraudulent supposed prophecies also exposed corruption. Those supposed prophecies were produced to manipulate and control the people. The fulfillment/retirement of those supposed prophecies exposes corruption and in a way mocks the people who produced them. The Crucifixion also exposed corruption and in a way mocked the leadership of Judaism. The mere fact that Jewish priests were involved in the plot to have Christ crucified shows that Christianity is separate from Judaism. The Crucifixion exposed the corruption of the leadership of Judaism. God physically appeared

in this world and then the leaders of Judaism influenced the Roman government to crucify God. Even if one were to argue that the Jewish priests didn't know that Christ is God, the mere fact that they wanted a crucifixion at all shows their corruption. Even if we were talking about a human being instead of God, the Jewish priests still shouldn't have been trying to get someone crucified. So regardless of what exactly the Jewish priests knew about Christ, the Crucifixion exposed the corruption of the leadership of Judaism. Furthermore, God decided that the Crucifixion would happen. Therefore, God decided to have Jewish priests influence the Roman government to crucify God. For God to allow the Jewish priests to do that shows that the Jewish priests were being exposed. Both the Crucifixion as well as the fulfillment/retirement of supposed prophecies exposed corruption and mocked human beings.

Thousands of years ago, fraudulent supposed prophecies were made up about a messiah by corrupt people, and today we have Christianity. Those fraudulent supposed prophecies appear to have been a part of God's Plan, and today we have Christianity.

To see further how fraudulent supposed prophecies were a part of God's Plan, we will move on to an analysis of what happened with these fraudulent supposed prophecies in the first century.

Why They Wanted 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 form 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 portrayed 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 is portrayed as having 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 portray the priests as having accused Christ of 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 any more 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 22:70-71
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 out 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 are described earlier in the Gospels as having already wanted Christ crucified before that charge

came forward. 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 your 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" are described as having replied in a way that avoided directly answering his question. They are described as having accused Christ of being a criminal, but there is no mention of any specific charge. Obviously Pilate would have been able to see that they were presenting Christ as a criminal. That's why he is described as asking about the charge. The described response to Pilate's question shows that there doesn't appear to have been a charge. Pilate is then described as suggesting 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 they are described as responding 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 they 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. It was believed by many that the Messiah would be a warrior-king. If Christ explicitly claimed to be the Messiah to a person who believed that the Messiah would be a warrior-king, then such a claim would have been about 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 concept of the Messiah to be about a warrior-king, then communication about the Messiah to a Jew who believed that about the Messiah would involve the misunderstanding of that communication to be about 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 or what the Messiah is. Furthermore, it has been shown that the supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent, so an explicit claim in accordance with that fraudulent information would have been inaccurate. 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 by their law. However, the priests don't appear 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 described response by them: "But we have no right to execute anyone". The priests appear to have taken Christ to Pilate because they hadn't charged Christ with any crime. But regardless of the reason why the priests took Christ to Pilate and even if it had anything to do with the priests fearing Christ's supposed popularity, right now we're more trying to specifically assess the reason why the priests wanted Christ crucified rather than why exactly they chose to go to Pilate, and the main point here is that there doesn't appear to have been a specific charge that caused the priests to want Christ crucified. Therefore, there appears to be some other reason.

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 appear 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 out 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.

Additionally, 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 appears to have been quite a local celebrity in the first century. So even if there were a lot of people following Christ (we don't know if there were), there still would appear 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 Jewish priests appear to have specifically wanted Christ arrested and specifically wanted Christ to be crucified, the arrest and the insistence that Christ be crucified appears to have been mostly driven by Jewish priests rather than the Roman government, which shows that there doesn't appear to have been a specific threat identified to the Roman government. If there wasn't a specific threat to the Roman government that was identified that could have been communicated to Roman officials, then the fear that the priests had about Christ doesn't appear to have been related to any potential consequences that might have come from 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 appears to have been affected so much that one of the most fundamental Jewish stories, the one about the supposed creation of the first human beings and the supposed 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 appear 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 Judea. Both the kingdoms of Israel and Judah appear to have been vassals of the Egyptian Empire and the Assyrian Empire at different times, the kingdom of Judah was a vassal of the Babylonian Empire before the Exile, and Judea was a vassal of the Persian Empire after the Exile. After the Roman Empire took over Judea in the first century BCE, Judea continued to not be an independent state but the Jewish population there was able to continue 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 suffering and as not coming until the end of an ambiguous timeline during "the end". The book of Daniel not only shifts expectations about the coming Messiah and uses the concept of "the end" to do so, but uses the concept of the destruction of the second temple to do so as well. Such a major shift and the use of the concept of "the end" and the concept of the destruction of the second temple to create such a major shift shows that there appears 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 appears that Jewish priests' solution included describing the Messiah as suffering and as not coming until the end of an ambiguous timeline during "the end". That made it a lot harder for someone to try to appear to be a messiah. This shows that not only were people expecting the Messiah to come, but also that priests didn't want people to think that the Messiah had come. If priests didn't want people to think that the Messiah had come and were willing to put forth fraudulent supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah, then priests were apparently aware that other supposed 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 supposed prophecies more seriously and then the book of Daniel and a lot of other writing from the second temple period related to supposed prophecies probably wouldn't have been produced in the way that such writing was. The fraudulent production of the book of Daniel and other supposed prophecies from the second temple period shows a desire to offset people's expectations about the coming Messiah, which shows evidence that there was awareness that older supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent because the priests otherwise would have expected the Messiah and wouldn't have worked against the people expecting the Messiah. Since the priests worked against the people expecting the Messiah, the priests themselves don't appear to have been expecting the Messiah, which realistically wouldn't have been the case if they believed in the supposed prophecies. So it appears that the priests didn't believe in the supposed prophecies, which realistically would only have been the case if they knew that the supposed prophecies are fraudulent. The fraudulent production of these

supposed prophecies from the second temple period also shows a disregard for authenticity in relation to supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah, and such a disregard probably wouldn't have existed in that way if there wasn't awareness that older supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent. Therefore, it appears that the priests of the temple were aware that supposed 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 supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah. The way that the arrest and the Crucifixion were apparently 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 a 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 a messiah, that still wouldn't explain why the priests wanted Christ crucified. They could have simply dismissed the claims that Christ is the Messiah; but instead, they wanted Christ crucified. Therefore, 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 supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent.

The book of Daniel appears 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 the first century CE, show the popularity of the book of Daniel. Of all of the material found, the book of Daniel appears 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 appears 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 supposed prophecies, Jewish priests knew that the supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah are fraudulent, Jewish priests didn't want people to think that the Messiah had come because they wanted to maintain the status quo, the book of Daniel and other writing from the second temple period was fraudulently produced to change people's expectations about the coming Messiah and for Jewish priests to claim power until "the end", the book of Daniel was very popular and accepted by the public, and people expected the Messiah to come during "the end" when the supposed new kingdom would supposedly bring justice.

The priests worked to manage diplomatic relations 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 a messiah. So if the priests saw miraculous powers being performed, then they had reason to fear the destruction of the temple because that's what would have to happen according to the book of Daniel.

There were several figures who people thought could have been a messiah. Ultimately, the supposed 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 14th day of Nisan. Daniel 9:25-27 express that sacrifice and offering would 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 apparently fear any possible stoppage of the sacrificing of lambs on the 14th 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 during the night right before the sacrificing of lambs.

During the reign of the kingdom of Judah, some fraudulent supposed prophecies were made up. After Jews were released from the Babylonian Exile and at home in Judea, Jewish priests didn't want people to think that the Messiah had come. As a result, they made up more fraudulent supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah, but this time, they were very different. In the first century, it appears that God fulfilled/retired those fraudulent supposed prophecies. Jewish priests in the first century appear to have known that the supposed prophecies are fraudulent. After Christ became known to them, they feared the destruction of the temple. After the raising of Lazarus, on the night right before the sacrificing of lambs, Jewish priests moved forward with the arrest of Christ. There doesn't appear to have been any charge brought against Christ, so Jewish priests brought Christ to Pontius Pilate to crucify Christ. The Resurrection appears 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 Jewish priests maintain control of the temple, Judea, and the Jewish population. Meanwhile, the people waited for the coming Messiah to bring a new kingdom. Daniel 9:25-27 were not only important to Jewish priests but were also important in debates in Judea about the validity of Christianity, which we will see shortly. People believed that the coming Messiah was going to fulfill supposed prophecies, some of those being in Daniel 9:25-27. If the temple was not destroyed, then Jewish priests and other Jews had a fairly strong argument against anyone who was trying to say that supposed prophecies had been fulfilled. With that in mind, we should now turn to the end of ages narratives in the Gospels.

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" 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 times 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 unequaled 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, unequaled from the beginning of the world until now – and never to be equaled 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 represented in 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" would be cut short so that there would be survivors, which indicates that "the end" was 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 that were to occur during the final "sabuim" within the ambiguous timeline. So according to the Synoptic Gospels as well as the timeline set up in 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. Also, 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 again.

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 did 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 will 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".

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 into 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 will not reflect from the moon, stars will fall, and "the heavenly bodies" will be shaken, and Luke 21:25-26 claim that there will be signs from 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 appears 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 referenced 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 appear to match what actually happened in 70. More specifically, those descriptions are incredibly far removed from what appears to have happened in 70. It doesn't appear 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 appear that anything that happened in the first century after the Resurrection would represent the worst times since the beginning of the world and will 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 obviously appear to have been produced before the destruction of the temple in 70.

Assuming that the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels 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" 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 appears that questions remained after the Resurrection about the destruction of the temple. These supposed prophecies call 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 appear to be responses to that apparent dilemma. Authors of the Synoptic Gospels appear 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 appears to have led to the end of ages narratives in the Synoptic Gospels 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 appears to be 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 portrays Christ as separate from God. The fourth is that an angel is described as having been sent to John. That is characteristic of Elohimist 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 portrayed 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, appears 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, appear 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, which as shown earlier is characteristic of fraudulent writing. 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 instead 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 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. Furthermore, Christ was crucified in Jerusalem and there has been plenty of evidence shown that exposes the corruption of Jewish priests of the temple in Jerusalem. So the focus on Jerusalem in the book of Revelation in the New Testament appears to be representative of fraudulent writing. The fourteenth 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 fifteenth point, and maybe the most obvious point, is that "the end" has not happened. The book of Revelation in the New Testament calls for "the end" and it is addressed to seven specific churches that existed in the first century. Nearly 2,000 years

after those seven specific churches apparently received these fraudulent supposed prophecies about “the end”, “the end” still hasn’t happened, 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 appear to have received this writing about “the end”; and meanwhile, this writing was apparently not intended for any other church and “the end” 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 supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah in the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, and in other books are all fraudulent; God fulfilled/retired some of those fraudulent supposed 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” based on fraudulent supposed prophecies in the New Testament that were based on fraudulent supposed prophecies in the Hebrew Bible.

Along with those fraudulent supposed prophecies was the idea of a physical kingdom that was going to bring justice and end oppression. That tradition began when these fraudulent supposed prophecies were first thought of and continued on into the first century. Generations of people believed in those fraudulent supposed prophecies because the tradition of believing in them 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 concepts of 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 appears to have occurred on a Tuesday, not a Sunday. That shows that the scheduling of Easter appears 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 appear 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 appear 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 with bread and wine 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 so-called "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.

Many believe that Christianity was originally a continuation of Judaism with some changes and certain Jewish supposed 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 Judahite religion practiced by Israelites was a fraudulent religion. We don't know how monotheism and other Yahwehist beliefs arose. There appears 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 supposed prophecies had been made up and it appears that God fulfilled/retired some of those fraudulent supposed 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, apparently fulfilling/retiring fraudulent supposed prophecies. Those supposed prophecies being fraudulent apparently in part led to the Crucifixion. The leadership of the supposedly chosen nation of Judah collectively over the course of hundreds if not thousands of years was dishonest with the people about religious information and then requested the Crucifixion of God.

As stated before, the mere fact that Jewish priests were involved in the plot to have Christ crucified shows that Christianity is separate from Judaism. The Crucifixion exposed the corruption of the leadership of Judaism. God physically appeared in this world and then the leaders of Judaism influenced the Roman government to crucify God. Even if one were to argue that the Jewish priests didn't know that Christ is God, the mere fact that they wanted a crucifixion at all shows their corruption. Even if we were talking about a human being instead of God, the Jewish priests still shouldn't have been trying to get someone crucified. So regardless of what exactly the Jewish priests knew about Christ, the Crucifixion exposed the corruption of the leadership of Judaism. Furthermore, God decided that the Crucifixion would happen. Therefore, God decided to have Jewish priests influence the Roman government to crucify God. For God to allow the Jewish priests to do that shows that the Jewish priests were being exposed.

The Crucifixion exposing the corruption of the leaders of Judaism is similar to God fulfilling/retiring certain supposed prophecies because those supposed prophecies were produced out of corruption. Those supposed prophecies were produced to manipulate and control the people. The fulfillment/retirement of those supposed prophecies exposes corruption and in a way mocks the people who produced them. The Crucifixion also exposed corruption and in a way mocked the leadership of Judaism. Both the Crucifixion

as well as the fulfillment/retirement of supposed prophecies exposed corruption and mocked human beings.

Furthermore, the Resurrection apparently having happened on a Sabbath further shows the separation between Christianity and Judaism. Given what a Sabbath stands for and how important Sabbaths were to Jewish society, the Resurrection apparently having happened on a Sabbath exposes Judaism as a false religion and shows clear separation between Christianity and Judaism.

The Crucifixion presents a view of how backwards this world is. God created the human race and gave human beings life, and then human beings crucified God. Furthermore, people went on to claim that the Crucifixion was a blood sacrifice for forgiveness of sins. So not only did human beings crucify God, human beings also portrayed the Crucifixion in a self-serving way as a gift to human beings that would grant them forgiveness for sins. That's all completely backwards. Human beings crucified the Creator who created them, and then other human beings portrayed this betrayal of the Creator who created them in a self-serving way. It's completely backwards. Instead, we need to follow God rather than go astray, and we need to sacrifice ourselves for God rather than serve ourselves. We need to love God and be grateful to God, and we need to sacrifice ourselves for 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 portrays Christ as God, and the Synoptic Gospels portray Christ 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". 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 the true teachings. The Catholic Church overshadowed the true teachings 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 the true teachings. 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 a physical church. That gave religious establishments power. The true teachings 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 God was the Logic.

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 thinking, 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 appears that John 1:1 is supposed to replace Genesis 1:1. It appears that the first verse in the Gospel of John should replace the very first verse in the Bible.

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 raped, kidnapped, imprisoned, enslaved, tortured, and murdered. Regardless of what happens to you, if you have the true religion then you know God. You can live forever all the while knowing God. 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

Dividing Lines

We have discovered that Mariam was the most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century, the Gospel of John appears 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 son of Mother Mariam 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 who are 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 appears 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 appears to have served from 37 to 41. There was also a high priest named Mattathias ben Theophilus who appears 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 appears to have come from somewhere outside of Jerusalem. There was also Theophilus of Antioch who appears 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 appears 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 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. 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 apparently 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 apparently 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 statements "Many have undertaken to draw up an account" and "I myself have carefully investigated everything from the beginning". These statements 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 statement "so that you may know the certainty of the things you have been taught" is apparently intended to address someone who already learned about Christianity. So the Gospel of Luke presents 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 appears unlikely that someone who was trying to produce a fraudulent gospel would write an introduction that appears 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 presentation of someone going to find out more information would likely make the document appear less authoritative. We must remember how much people view religious text as authoritative. When someone writes religious text, it's typically done with the intention that the writing would be followed. Hypothetically, if someone intentionally produced fraudulent religious text, then they would be intentionally trying to deceive people. The presence of fraud in religious text is typically associated with an attempt to appear authoritative. It would appear 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 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 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 presumably older than John and is listed before John in every other instance in the New Testament that lists them next to each other. Furthermore, John is named before his brother in narratives in Luke that are also in Mark and/or Matthew where John is named after his brother. So there are certain narratives that already named John after his brother and then there was a specific switch when that narrative was included in Luke and John was then placed before his brother. 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 show 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 appears that this journey began after the Resurrection. Therefore, the Gospel of Luke appears to represent second-hand information. Acts, however, leads us along a different path. At least a part of Acts appears to be first-hand 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 appears to represent first-hand 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. 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 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 appears to likely be a product of a real in-person observation because there doesn't appear to be any motivation to fraudulently add a name of a lawyer. 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.

There appears to be some of Acts that are later fraudulent additions. These later fraudulent additions provide further evidence that some of the writing from the original author of Acts is eyewitness testimony because the contrast of the different writing styles helps to highlight that the original author actually traveled with Paul. We can compare the simple details that seem otherwise irrelevant if they're not true in the verses just previously examined and elsewhere with the extravagant details from other narratives, some of which couldn't realistically be true. For example, chapter 25 describes a conversation between Festus and Herod Agrippa that the author of Acts realistically would have never known about. This supposed conversation between Festus and Herod Agrippa appears to only serve the purpose of embellishing and trying to make a grander storyline. So those details appear to be false. In contrast, Acts 27:2, one of the verses just previously presented, doesn't give any extravagant details and instead sticks to basic details. Additionally, the naming of Aristarchus would seem entirely irrelevant if not true. So Acts 27:2 sticks to basic details, some of which would seem entirely irrelevant if not true. If Acts 27:2 were fraudulent, then there probably wouldn't be the naming of a person who isn't important to the story and there probably would be details that serve some purpose other than simply telling the truth. So the simplicity of Acts 27:2 along with details in it that would otherwise be irrelevant if not true both show that Acts 27:2 probably represents real eyewitness testimony from the original author of Acts. Meanwhile, the supposed conversation between Festus and Herod Agrippa described in chapter 25 couldn't

realistically be true because the author of Acts wouldn't realistically have been able to obtain that information even if it was true, and those details appear to serve the purpose of trying to tell a grander story. The contrast between basic details and extravagant details and the contrast between details that would be irrelevant if not true and details that couldn't realistically be true both show evidence of contrasting writing styles and therefore show evidence of two different authors. Furthermore, that shows further evidence of real eyewitness testimony in verses that are basic and would seem entirely irrelevant if not true, like Acts 27:2.

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 mainly 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 simply 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, which is much more severe than just a disagreement and debate as simply described by Acts 15:1-2. 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.
Farewell.

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 that "certain men came from James" after Paul had already traveled back to Antioch and that Peter was already in Antioch with Paul. Acts describes that Peter and James son of Mother Mariam 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 they only requested that Paul, Barnabas, and Titus 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 and there are certain differences that show clear evidence that someone was dishonest. Given that the author of Acts appears to have been conducting an investigative report, there doesn't appear 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 appears 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 Antioch. 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 Antioch.

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 appears 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 or if you think that maybe neither of them applies, 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 is a natural divide between Acts 1-15 and Acts 16-28. Acts 1-15 appear to represent second-hand information, and Acts 16-28 appear 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 the information being provided shows further that there is 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 appear to represent second-hand information. Additionally, it appears 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 appears to have derived from someone else.

We can see further how Acts resulted in 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 appears to be in response to information that contradicts Paul's account. It wouldn't be 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 appears 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 appears 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 9:3-9
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 was an assassination attempt on Paul in Damascus, Paul went to Jerusalem and joined "the disciples", Paul preached in Jerusalem, there was an assassination attempt 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 he only spent 15 days with Peter, and then he left and went to Syria (where ancient Antioch was 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 providing a travel path like that shows that he appears to have been 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 appears very obvious that Paul was responding to the information contained in Acts. In the rest of the letter to the Galatians, Paul accused people of being spies, criticized Peter and James son of Mother Mariam, claimed that what they were doesn't matter to him, and then went on to tell a story of a time when 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 really 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 is an incredible focus on Peter and that focus begins very early on in Acts.

Acts 1:15-17
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 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 having said 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 said that he is 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 is 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 2:21-24

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 worshipped 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 at 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 worshipped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy. And they stayed continually at the temple, praising God.

There is 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 appears that the author 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, and the Crucifixion and the Resurrection both happened in Jerusalem. 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 worshipped 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 describes 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 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 have been 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 near the location where the Crucifixion and the Resurrection occurred. Additionally, 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 in the

Gospel of Matthew, and Jewish customs and Jewish law have a dominating presence. Matthew includes narratives about the fulfillment of the law, murder, adultery, oaths, an eye for an eye, prayer, and fasting that aren't in any other Gospel. Luke, on the other hand, while certainly giving a certain level of attention to Jewish customs and Jewish law does not do so to the extent that Matthew does. Furthermore, the Gospel of Luke is the most robust of any of the Synoptic Gospels in terms of the variety of narratives. Someone from Jerusalem would have likely been more focused on Jewish customs and Jewish law, especially when including the robust variety of narratives that are in the Gospel of Luke. The lesser degree of focus on Jewish customs and Jewish law in comparison to Matthew despite having a more robust variety of narratives suggests that the author of Luke 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 variety 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 variety 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 Judea, traveled to Jerusalem to investigate Christianity, and obtained information there from a source who wanted Peter exalted.

There is evidence that shows that the author of Luke and Acts sought to investigate Christianity and produce a report of their findings. There is evidence that shows that the first-person references in Acts are authentic, which shows that the author appears to have traveled with Paul. Additionally, Luke and Acts 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 apparently 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 underway.

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. One example is the narrative in

Matthew about the temple tax. Such a narrative 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 appear 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.

Historical evidence shows that the transition from Felix to Festus appears to have occurred around 59-60. So Paul may have been 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 no later than 54.

Going even further into it, as mentioned in Part 4, the Gallio Inscription shows writing from the Roman Emperor Claudius and it mentions a proconsul of Achaia named Gallio. This is important because chapter 18 of Acts refers to Gallio, so the Gallio Inscription can be used to date chapter 18 of Acts.

The Gallio Inscription also mentions the 26th acclamation of Claudius, which is dated to 52 CE. Proconsuls usually served one-year terms. Since the "Gallio Inscription" shows that Gallio was a proconsul in Achaia in 52, his term would realistically have been 51-52 or 52-53. Many assert that his term was 51-52 instead of 52-53, but it's possible that his term was 52-53. Since we're first analyzing the upper limit of the time-period in which the Gospel of Luke was produced, we will move forward with the spring of 53 as a starting point.

Chapter 18 of Acts claims that Paul was in Corinth for a year and a half. Additionally, the part of chapter 18 that refers to Gallio is towards the end of the part that places Paul in Corinth. So using 53 as a starting point, assuming that the interactions with Gallio took place towards the end of Paul's stay in Corinth, and assuming that Paul stayed in Corinth for a year and a half, Paul would then appear to have arrived in Corinth no later than the first half of 52.

There are three other considerations to take into account. One is that the conclusion that Paul could have arrived in Corinth as late as June of 52 assumes that Gallio's term could have lasted until the very end of 53, which is certainly possible, but it's also possible that his term ended much sooner than that. For example, if Gallio's term ended in June of 53, then the conclusion would be that Paul arrived in Corinth no later than 51. The second consideration is that the council at Jerusalem is described in chapter 15 of Acts and Paul's arrival in Corinth is described in chapter 18. So there was some time that passed in between the council at Jerusalem and Paul's arrival in Corinth, which provides reason to exclude the first half of 52 and settle on 51 as the latest year in which Paul would have realistically arrived in Corinth. The third consideration is that the conclusion that Paul arrived in Corinth no later than the first half of 52 was derived using a starting point of 53. Even if Gallio's term was 52-53, the reference to Gallio in Acts could refer to 52 instead of 53, in which case the conclusion would be that Paul arrived in Corinth no later than 51. Additionally, the popular dating of Gallio's term is 51-52. If 51-52 is used instead of 52-53, then the reference to Gallio in Acts could refer to 51 or 52, in which case the conclusion would be that Paul arrived in Corinth no later than 51. With all of that being considered, we will move forward with the conclusion that Paul arrived in Corinth no later than 51.

There are first-person references that precede chapter 18, so the author of Luke and Acts appears to have joined Paul by 51, and likely sooner than that.

Given the introductions in Luke and Acts, it appears 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 51 and produced Luke before they joined Paul, then Luke would appear to have been produced sometime by 51, 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 51. 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 three 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 rotation and orbit of Earth. According to the rotation and orbit of Earth, we experience a daily cycle of day and night and an annual cycle of days that goes through the four seasons.

With days being the most basic unit according to the cycles we experience, the use of the word “meta” would simply refer to something occurring after a given day is completed because using the most basic unit is the most precise measurement. 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, so the counting of years could be less precise than the counting of days. To say “after three days” is to simply refer to something that occurs after three days because there is no further breaking down those units into a smaller cycle according to the rotation and orbit of Earth. 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 and so the counting of years can be less precise. 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. Hypothetically, if “after three years” referred to something that occurred in the fourth year, then all of the days in the fourth year leading up to that occurrence would not be counted at all. The counting would stop at the end of the third year and then what’s being referenced would simply have occurred sometime during the following year. Not only is that strange in and of itself, but it would also violate inclusive counting. With inclusive counting, there is an emphasis on inclusion. Stopping the counting at three years and then just generally referring to something that happened in the fourth year would completely disregard all days in that fourth year leading up to that occurrence. Saying that something happened after a certain number of units of time is more reasonable to do with days than it is with years because days are the most basic unit of measurement according to the cycles of Earth. Therefore, in counting the duration of years, it’s not necessarily the case that each year must be completed when using the word “meta” as opposed to how the counting of days is treated. So while it’s possible that Paul was referring to a fourth year, it’s also possible that he was referring to an amount of time that only included three years. In conclusion, 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^{th} year. However, since we’re dealing with years rather than days, it may be the case that the 14^{th} year is referred to rather than the 15^{th} year. Therefore, the 14 years described in Galatians 2:1 is either referring to the 14^{th} or 15^{th} year in relation to the timeline described in chapter 1.

So there is a time-period 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), and 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 an amount of time that is in the range of 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 lower 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 appears that the earliest year in which the council at Jerusalem possibly happened would be 43 using inclusive counting starting from 28. It was previously shown that the author of Luke and Acts probably joined Paul by 51

and after the council at Jerusalem. So a wide range for when the council at Jerusalem probably occurred in is 43-51.

The author of Luke and Acts having joined Paul would probably have also occurred in the time-frame of 43-51 given that they probably met after the council at Jerusalem and probably by 51. 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 it appears that the author of Luke and Acts obtained information for the Gospel of Luke and Acts 1-15 in the time-period of 43-51 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 appear to have occurred in the time-period of 43-51.

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 appear to refer to a hypothetical future destruction of the temple as laid out in the Hebrew Bible. 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 appears 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 appears to contain responses to information contained in the Gospel of John; and based on the dating of the Gospel of Luke, that means that such information in the Gospel of John was apparently 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 appears to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, at least some of the information in the Gospel of John was presumably 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 appears 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 appear 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 appear to make a specific reference to the actual destruction of the temple in 70. They instead refer to text from the Hebrew Bible. There is evidence that the Gospel of Luke was probably produced in the time-period of 43-51 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 produced in the time-period of 43-51.

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 had been written. Furthermore, it appears that the author traveled extensively to find out information about Christianity. This person even appears 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 appears 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 appears to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam, it appears that some of the information in the Gospel of John originally came from Mariam. Although the vast majority of the Gospel of John appears to have come from someone else, certain important parts of it appear to have come from the Testimony of Mariam. The rest of it appears to be a compilation of different testimonies, truthful or not. We will go into more detail later about whose testimonies appear 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, the Gospel of Luke certainly appears to be a compilation of different narratives that were circulating back then and we will go into more detail about the productions of Mark and Matthew later here in Part 5.

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 43-51, which shows that a lot of the information that is contained in the Gospel of Luke was apparently 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 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's 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 apparently about 15-25 years after the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. So there was presumably 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 appears 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 appears to have been originally produced after Mark and Matthew, which shows that the information that Luke has in common with Mark and Matthew appears 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 appears to have been established before Luke was originally produced. So it appears 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 apparently 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 appears to have ended without a single description of an appearance of Christ after the Resurrection shows further evidence that Mark was produced before Matthew and Luke. The robustness of Luke and the process from which Luke was produced suggests that it was the last to be produced out of all of the Synoptic Gospels. The order in which the Synoptic Gospels were produced appears to have been the following: Mark, Matthew, and then Luke. More evidence will be shown later to support that conclusion.

So the probable scenario is that sometime in the time-period of 43-51, 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 43-51. Also, Paul describes the council at Jerusalem as having happened 16-19 years after his conversion. Since the council at Jerusalem probably occurred by 51 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 51. If Paul's conversion was in the time-period of 28-36, then Paul's trip to Jerusalem three years after his conversion likely occurred in the time-period of 30-38. 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, in which case 35 would be the latest year of the likely time-period for when Paul's conversion happened (counting backwards 17 years inclusively from 51); but then four years instead of three years would be counted starting with 35 to still arrive at 38 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 28-36 and his first trip to Jerusalem after his conversion appears to have occurred in the time-period of 30-38, 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 appear to have been in Jerusalem three years after Paul's conversion, likely in the thirties, and appear 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 appears to have been the home base for someone in that group if not the entire group, 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 around 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 appears 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 implies 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 appears to have obtained

information from a source in Jerusalem who wanted Peter exalted, and specifically appears to have done so during a time-period in which Peter's home was in Jerusalem.

It appears 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 forties or the early fifties 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.

It was previously asserted that Paul's letter to the Galatians appears to have been responding to information contained in Acts, and that Paul would have realistically found out about that information in Acts because the author of Acts traveled with Paul. The evidence that shows that Paul was responding to Acts combined with the criticisms he made of Peter and James son of Mother Mariam in his letter to the Galatians shows that Paul was not only responding to what he portrayed as dishonest information but was also specifically directing his emotions at Peter and James son of Mother Mariam while doing so. In chapter 1 of Galatians, Paul appears to be correcting information from Acts; and in both chapters 1 and 2, he heavily criticized Peter and James son of Mother Mariam. That means that the scope of chapters 1 and 2 mainly involves Paul correcting information from Acts while criticizing Peter and James son of Mother Mariam, which connects Peter and James son of Mother Mariam to the information in Acts. All at once, Paul is trying to set the record straight based on information he received from the author of Acts and expressing hostility and division about Peter and James son of Mother Mariam. Just from Paul's letter to the Galatians, it appears that Peter and James son of Mother Mariam were involved with providing information to the author of Luke Acts; and as shown just previously, we can come to that same conclusion through the evidence that shows that the author of Luke and Acts got information from a source in Jerusalem who wanted Peter exalted and did so during a time-period in which Peter and James son of Mother Mariam were living in Jerusalem.

The evidence so far shows that the author of Luke and Acts traveled to Jerusalem in the time-period of 43-51, gathered information about Christianity from Peter and James son of Mother Mariam that turned into the Gospel of Luke and much of the information in Acts 1-15, traveled with Paul, and gathered information from Paul and their own in-person observations while traveling with Paul that turned into much of the information in Acts 16-28 as well as some of the information in Acts 13-14. The evidence so far also shows that Paul learned of the information that Peter and James son of Mother Mariam gave to the author of Luke and Acts and then he produced his letter to the Galatians, which specifically contradicts the information from Acts and criticizes Peter and James son of Mother Mariam to the extent that he claimed that he didn't care what they were, that they meant nothing to his message, that he opposed Peter to his face, that Peter was so afraid of certain people that he drew back from gentiles as soon as certain people showed up, and that Peter was a hypocrite who forced others to follow Jewish customs that Peter didn't even follow himself.

The description in 1 Corinthians of who Christ appeared to after the Resurrection can provide further insight.

1 Corinthians 15:3-10

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. For I am least of the apostles and do not even deserve to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. But by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace to me was not without effect. No, I worked harder than all of them – yet not I, but the grace of God that was with me.

This account of who Christ supposedly 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 was 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 appears to be 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, and we've already seen clear evidence that Peter and James son of Mother Mariam gave false information to the author of Luke and Acts.

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, which aligns with the evidence that shows that he was involved with giving false information to the author of Luke and Acts. There are five 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 were at odds with Paul. The third is that James son of Mother Mariam appears 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? The fifth

point is that James son of Mother appears to have been involved with giving false information to the author of Luke and Acts, so there appears to have been a pattern of behavior of giving false information. Given all five of those points, it appears 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.

As we will go into more detail on later in Part 7, there appears to have been a process of unifying Peter's side with Paul's side after they both died. Obviously, to this day, Peter and Paul are thought of by many as the two biggest giants of early Christianity. However, as we've seen, there was plenty of division and conflict between them. More specifically, Peter's group demanded circumcision and Paul was in fierce dispute with that. Additionally, Paul didn't even try to meet Peter until around three years after his conversion, and then after that, he didn't go back to Jerusalem for around 14 years. Peter and Paul were not really on the same side and so them being unified would obviously have been a product of people's efforts after they died. Peter and Paul tried to get along and they did somewhat work together. Paul gives respect to Peter in his writing. It's not as if they were necessarily enemies. However, they were not unified in the way that people portrayed them as after they died. This relates to 1 Corinthians 15:3-10 because those verses are critical of Paul by saying that Paul was "abnormally born", is "least of the apostles", and does not even "deserve to be called an apostle". If Paul didn't write those statements himself, then it would appear that someone wanted to insult Paul, in which case that would have probably happened before Paul died because Peter's side and Paul's side appear to have been unified shortly after Paul's death, as soon as the sixties in the first century. Therefore, such criticisms of Paul wouldn't likely have been originally written into 1 Corinthians after Paul's death. Also, the reference to James son of Mother Mariam shows that he was likely involved with creating this information regardless of whether he verbally told it to Paul or later altered 1 Corinthians. So it appears that either Paul wrote 1 Corinthians 15:3-10, in which case it appears that Paul was given false information, or 1 Corinthians was later fraudulently altered.

First off, as previously mentioned, if 1 Corinthians was fraudulently altered to insult Paul, then such insults would have been more representative of feelings towards Paul before he died rather than after he died. But it's unlikely that 1 Corinthians would have been fraudulently altered before Paul died because he was still around to dispute that information; and since it's unlikely that anyone would have insulted Paul like that after he died, it appears that Paul wrote that information himself.

More support can be found for that conclusion when we look at how this information contradicts the Gospels. If Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, or anyone from their group, or anyone later on who was a part of the "orthodox church" or Catholic Church fraudulently altered 1 Corinthians, then they probably would have aligned that information with the Gospels. So the contradictions that we're about to examine show that Paul probably really wrote this information.

The first contradiction is about Peter being portrayed as the first person who Christ appeared to. That contradicts Mark, Matthew, and John. If one wanted to argue that such an assertion about Peter at least lines up with the Gospel of Luke, there would still be a problem because Luke describes Cleopas and an

unnamed man as also seeing Christ around the same time as the supposed appearance to Peter and 1 Corinthians doesn't make any mention of that despite all of the other details the letter contains about supposed appearances after the Resurrection.

The second contradiction is about the reference to "the Twelve". The information from 1 Corinthians says that Christ appeared to "the Twelve"; but as we know from the Gospels, it is claimed that Judas was gone and that the remaining men were called "the eleven". Therefore, this information is representative of someone who was not as familiar with the Gospels. Paul wasn't around during Christ's Ministry and didn't even bother to visit Peter until around three years after his conversion. Paul stands out as someone who wasn't around during Christ's Ministry, didn't know much about Christ's Ministry, and didn't bother to find out more for multiple years. If there's anyone who claimed to be a Christian teacher who was going to write about the Resurrection in a way that contradicts all of the Gospels, it would have likely been Paul. Anyone who was a part of Peter's group would have been very unlikely to have referred to "the Twelve" instead of "the eleven". Peter was the ring leader of "the Twelve" and "the eleven" so his group would have been very unlikely to have gotten that kind of information wrong. Therefore, the reference to "the Twelve" instead of "the eleven" is evidence that nobody from Peter's group wrote that, and therefore Paul appears to have written it.

Another important point showing that Paul appears to have written this information is that Paul is also exalted in these verses. He is both criticized and exalted. If these criticisms came from someone who wanted to insult Paul, then they likely wouldn't have exalted him as well. On the other hand, Paul could have easily criticized himself since, as these verses describe, he persecuted Christians before his conversion. Additionally, Paul was not shy about exalting himself and taking credit. So Paul is the only person who likely would have both criticized and exalted him. Therefore, the combination of criticism and exaltation for Paul is evidence that Paul wrote those verses himself.

The reference to Christ supposedly appearing to 500 people really takes the evidence to another level. That's such an extreme assertion compared to the Gospels. All of the Gospels end with descriptions of a supposed appearance to "the eleven" or an otherwise relatively small group of people. All four Gospels omit this idea about 500 people. Just from that, we can see how ridiculous this claim is. Such a claim doesn't even appear in Acts. There's a lot of different information in Acts and no mention of these 500 people. For this claim about 500 people to not be in any Gospel and not in Acts, it's almost a forgone conclusion that this claim is false.

Not only does the claim about 500 people provide significant evidence about the passing on of false information, but it also gives insight into how this information ended up in 1 Corinthians in the first place. As mentioned before, someone from Peter's group or the "orthodox church" or later the Catholic Church would have been unlikely to have contradicted the Gospels in a written document in the ways that 1 Corinthians does. The claim about 500 people doesn't necessarily contradict the Gospels, but it realistically opposes the Gospels because the Gospels would have obviously probably mentioned that if it was true. Although, Peter's group could have verbally passed on false information to Paul, which would have been very different than if Peter's group had written that information themselves. In written form that so many people could have seen or heard about, they wouldn't have likely contradicted the Gospels in those ways. However, when having a private conversation with Paul, someone they personally disagreed with, they are much more likely to tell any lie to advance their own position in relation to Paul.

Evidence has been shown that Paul wrote this information himself, which means that he appears to have gotten this information from someone, presumably Peter's group. There isn't much of a realistic possibility that Paul got this information from someone outside of Peter's group. Therefore, it appears that Peter's group intentionally gave Paul false information. They would have done that for the same reason that they lied about anything, for their own prestige. They lied about both Mariam and Paul. In addition to lying to people about Paul, it appears that they lied to Paul about the Resurrection. The lie about 500 people appears to be an attempt to prevent Paul from being too confident in the aftermath of him making his own claims about himself. The claim that Christ appeared to James son of Mother Mariam is further evidence that this false information came from Peter's group, and it's also evidence that James son of Mother Mariam was specifically involved. But generally speaking, if false information came from Peter's group, it's already almost a forgone conclusion that both Peter and James son of Mother Mariam were specifically involved in some way.

John was also named by Paul as a "pillar" along with Peter and James son of Mother Mariam. So it appears 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. There is one instance in Mark where John is named by himself, but it only happens once and he is grouped with his brother and placed specifically after his brother in every other instance that shows his name. Matthew sometimes uses the label "the sons of Zebedee" instead of showing their individual names, but John is placed specifically after his brother in every instance that shows his name. So Luke is the only Gospel that ever places John before his brother, which shows that something unique was going on that somehow gave priority to John in certain places. Furthermore, John is named before his brother in narratives in Luke that are also in Mark and/or Matthew where John is named after his brother. So there are certain narratives that already named John after his brother and then there was a specific switch when that narrative was included in Luke, and then John was placed before his brother. Additionally, chapter 12 of Acts describes the execution of James son of Zebedee, which by itself shows that he apparently had already been executed by the time that Luke and Acts 1-15 were produced, which also helps 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 presumably the younger brother and is sometimes described as if he is less important than his 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 appears that the author of Luke and Acts obtained certain information directly from John or someone who was associated with him.

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. There is even one instance that occurs in the Gospel of Luke. Mark and Matthew contain similar information in the same kind of narrative but they don't name anyone specific in their versions. So the Gospel of Luke takes the same kind of narrative that appears in Mark and Matthew that doesn't name

anyone specific among "disciples" and changes it to not only name someone specific but to also specifically place John with Peter while leaving out James son of Zebedee. To take a narrative that is in Mark and Matthew that doesn't name anyone specific and then change it to place John with Peter while leaving out James son of Zebedee is a major departure that shows that something unique was going on that somehow gave priority to John in certain places.

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."

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. As previously mentioned, Luke makes a major departure from Mark and Matthew by taking a narrative that is in both of them that doesn't name anyone specific and changing it to specifically place John with Peter while leaving out James son of Zebedee. As for all of the instances shown in Acts, 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 someone who was associated with him, then that would explain why John is so aggressively pushed as the number two right behind Peter while James son of Zebedee was left out 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" in which John is specifically placed before him, and the only other instance is in a verse about his death. For James son of Zebedee to only be named twice in Acts, for him to be placed specifically after his brother John in the only instance in Acts that names both brothers together, and for the only instance that he is named in Acts outside of the original list that names "the eleven" to be in a verse that describes his death while John is consistently named alone with Peter in several places shows that John was being unusually exalted far beyond his brother James.

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 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 of the original list that names "the eleven", but he is also described in relation to his brother, which is the opposite of what occurs in the Gospels where John is described in relation to James.

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 or someone who was associated with him presented him as number two to Peter. Additionally, as we will go into more detail on later, John appears to have never really gotten into the top two. After the death of James son of Zebedee, James son of Mother Mariam apparently 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 that is present when

comparing Luke and Acts with all of the other evidence shows that John or someone who was associated with him appears to have exalted him to the author of Luke and Acts. These narratives in Acts that exalt both Peter and John together were probably the product of both Peter and John giving false information to the author of Luke and Acts. Both Peter and John were probably present when this information was given to the author. Furthermore, we can derive the conclusion that these narratives are fraudulent just based on the fact that James son of Zebedee is missing from them because he was apparently involved in most of what was happening with this group during the time-period described in the Gospels and Acts 1-11, which is especially indicated by his consistent involvement as the second in command right behind Peter in all of the Synoptic Gospels except for a few narratives in Luke.

It appears that the Gospel of Luke was produced in the time-period of 43-51 and was largely influenced by Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John. We should now look closer into Mark and Matthew to show how Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and 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 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 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 very likely that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and 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 together. 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 enough by itself 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 gets a lot of attention in the Synoptic Gospels and it appears that Peter was from Capernaum (as we will see later, the Gospel of John claims that Peter was from Bethsaida but that will be shown to be false and the Synoptic Gospels indicate that he was apparently from Capernaum). For those reasons, it is already justified to believe that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and/or John were involved with the production of the Gospels of Mark and/or Matthew.

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 production of Mark and/or 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 appear 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 two and three 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 at certain times. 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 at least some of them appear to have been involved with the production of Mark and/or Matthew.

With the conclusion that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John were at the helm of spreading false narratives, we can better understand why the Synoptic 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 9:9-10
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's not 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, 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 died yet by the time of the production of that verse. Otherwise, Mark 9:1 would have been produced after all of "the Twelve" had died while claiming that the supposed physical kingdom as described in supposed prophecies would come before all of "the Twelve" die, 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 died yet, and therefore Mark 9:1 serves as further evidence that at least some of "the Twelve" appear to have been involved in the production of the Gospel of Mark.

We can see 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 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 apparently having disowned Christ and having abandoned Christ while Christ was crucified. It appears 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 goes even further than the Gospel of Mark as shown by the following verses.

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 appears 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" appears to be portrayed as a town 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 describes a town as Christ's "own town" that was apparently 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 further 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 apparently portraying Capernaum as Christ's "own town". Furthermore, as has already been shown, Matthew gives an elevated level of attention to Peter as well. 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: 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 died yet by the time of the production of that verse. Otherwise, Matthew 10:23 would have been produced after all of "the Twelve" had died while claiming that Christ would return before all of "the Twelve" die, 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 died yet, and therefore Matthew 10:23 serves as further evidence that at least some of "the Twelve" appear 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 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 been already rolled away when they are described as having gotten to the tomb. Matthew 27:65-66 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.

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 appears that they were left with what Mariam told them and the empty tomb. That would then likely 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 appears to be the Crucifixion, the burial, the Resurrection, Mariam's proclamation of the Resurrection, and then 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".

Luke 3:19-20
But when John rebuked Herod the tetrarch because of Herodias, his brother's wife, and all the other evil things he had done, Herod added this to them all: He locked John up in prison.

As shown by these verses, the Synoptic Gospels all reference King Herod's (Herod Antipas) relationship with his brother Philip's wife Herodias. It was shown in Part 4 that many people combine this information with writing from Josephus about the battle between Herod and Aretas to date the Resurrection, and that such a dating is inaccurate. 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 Gospels of 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 appears to refer to Herod Agrippa while "King Herod" who is referred to in the Gospels who was married to Herodias appears to have been Herod Antipas. Herod Antipas was a ruler of Galilee who appears 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 appears to have reigned from 41 CE to 44 CE.

Acts 12:1-2 appear to refer to Herod Agrippa, and therefore the execution of James son of Zebedee appears to have 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 exalt John over his brother James son of Zebedee while Mark and Matthew 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 1:19, Matthew 4:21, and Luke 5:10 relate to the calling of the first disciples.

Mark 1:19
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. They were in a boat with their father Zebedee, preparing their nets. Jesus called them.

Luke 5:10
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."

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.

Mark 14:12-13, Matthew 26:17-19, and Luke 22:7-8 relate to preparations for the Passover Seder.

Mark 14:12-13
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?" So he sent two of his disciples, telling them, "Go into the city, and a man carrying a jar of water will meet you. Follow him.

Matthew 26:17-19
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?" He replied, "Go into the city to a certain man and tell him, 'The Teacher says: My appointed time is near. I am going to celebrate the Passover with my disciples at your house.' " So the disciples did as Jesus had directed them and prepared 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."

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 lead 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 (it's not explicitly stated that James was older than John but that was presumably the case given that he is consistently named before John; but even if that wasn't the case, the norm within the Gospels was to name James before John). The naming of John before his brother is a clear indication that James son of Zebedee appears to have been already executed. Additionally, in the verses about preparation for the Passover Seder, Mark and Matthew don't name anyone specific among "the disciples", but in Luke, John is specifically placed alongside Peter while James son of Zebedee gets left out. Furthermore, in Acts 12:1-2, James son of Zebedee is specifically identified as "the brother of John", which is a total reversal from the situation in Mark and Matthew. First, in Mark and Matthew, John is placed after his brother in every list that includes both of their names, and John is often specifically identified in relation to his brother. Then, in Luke and Acts, John is sometimes named before his brother and is even specifically placed alongside Peter without James in several instances; and in one instance 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 his death. 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 appears 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 apparently

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 appears 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 appear to be because Andrew became more important but more because the sons of Zebedee were being demoted. The second difference 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 doesn't name the sons of Zebedee by their individual names 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 appear to have been involved in producing Gospel narratives.

So even a subtle change related to the sons of Zebedee 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 appears to be specifically related to John sharing the same name as John the Baptist and so John appears 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 individual names shows less of a personal relationship with these brothers, relating John to his brother when Mark doesn’t shows 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 appears to have been involved in the production of the Gospels of Mark and/or 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 doesn’t name the sons of Zebedee by their individual names in narratives that are in Mark in which Mark names them by their individual names. Fifth, Mark identifies John as simply “John” after the narrative about the death of John the Baptist and Matthew continues to identify John in relation to his brother, which can be seen in the so-called “transfiguration” narrative in Mark and Matthew.

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, and James is consistently named before John. In Matthew, they are still a part of a group of three that includes Peter, and James is still consistently named before John, 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 brother James, which is a major departure from Mark and Matthew and 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 apparently 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 appear to be the case that Andrew's status rose above theirs. Andrew's placement as second in the list of "the Twelve" appears to be more about the demotion of the sons of Zebedee than any promotion of Andrew. Andrew's place as second in that list appears 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 appear 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 appears 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, appears 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 appears 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, appears 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 appear 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", 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 appears 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 apparently 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 appears to have been far removed from being considered a top leader. Initially, "the eleven" are presented as the top eleven, so at the onset of the situation they found themselves in after finding out about the Resurrection, James son of Mother Mariam would 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", including James son of Mother Mariam. 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, although incorrectly identified as a "brother". 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 appears 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 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 verses, 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 appear to accurately reflect that when describing a scenario that was relatively soon after the Resurrection. Additionally, the Gospel of Mark appears to also reflect his lower status. Sometime after that, he was presented first in a list of “pillars” in Paul’s letter to the Galatians, 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 appears to have been produced no earlier than 39. Even if Mark was produced as early as 39, still over a decade would apparently 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 get into the top three was James son of Mother Mariam. So it appears 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 get into 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 appears 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 appear to have been closer than Peter and Andrew were, and Peter appears 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 appears very 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 probably both occurred after the death of James son of Zebedee.

The second way that the rise of James son of Mother Mariam can be directly connected to the death of James son of Zebedee is through Galatians describing Paul only seeing Peter and James son of Mother Mariam in Jerusalem when he went there around three years after his conversion. This trip appears to have occurred in the time-period of 30-38, and the Gospel of Mark appears to have been produced after that in the time-period of 39-44. So Paul's trip appears to have occurred before the production of the Gospel of Mark; and since the Gospel of Mark presents James son of Zebedee number two right behind Peter and refers to James son of Mother Mariam "James the younger", it appears that James son of Zebedee was still the number two at the time of Paul's trip. That 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 appear 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 didn't change until 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 appear to have both occurred after the death of James son of Zebedee. Since James son of Zebedee appears 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 appears to have been produced by 51, we can at least say that the Gospel of Matthew appears to have been produced by 51. Therefore, the likely time-period in which the Gospel of Matthew was produced is 41-51.

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 appears to have resulted 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 apparently 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 appears to have occurred after the death of James son of Zebedee and since that demotion can be seen going from Mark to Matthew, the Gospel of Mark appears to have been produced before the death of James son of Zebedee. Since James son of Zebedee appears 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 appears to have been executed in the time-period of 41-44. After that, the Gospel of Matthew was apparently produced in the time-period of 41-51. After that, the Gospel of Luke was apparently produced in the time-period of 43-51.

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 appears 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 like that 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 nickname. 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 scenes. 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 appears to have evolved after the death of James son of Zebedee.

As previously mentioned, the first of the Synoptic Gospels appears to have been 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 that is presented. As shown 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" appear 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 appears 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. Those concepts appear to show the misunderstanding and confusion of Peter and the rest of "the Twelve". Those men appear to have not understood that Christianity is about recognizing the presence of Christ within us. At least some of them appear to have still expected a physical kingdom or at least appear 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 appears 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 be fraudulent. Matthew also includes even further exaltation of Peter. Luke was then apparently 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 1:15-21
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 around 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 evidence 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 and wrote his letter to the Galatians with the specific intention of setting the record straight about what really happened.

The descriptions 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 11:25-26
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.

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 describes 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 ancient Antioch was 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 has been labeled as the first bishop of Antioch. Whether Peter or Paul was labeled as the first bishop of Antioch could have affected control over that Christian community, or it could have simply been about bragging rights. Plenty of the other lies that we have discovered have been very petty, so we shouldn't be surprised to find dishonest information about who started a Christian community. 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 11:18-22
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 11:32-33
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 the fragrance of the perfume.

Luke 10:38-42
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 said 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 makes 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 point 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 appears to be 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 describe 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 10:38-42 concentrate 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 a beggar covered with sores that even dogs came and licked, 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 and insulting 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 with 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 appears 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 contains. The Gospel of Luke appears 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 appears 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 portrayed as being at the feet of Christ. That 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 appears 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 the 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 appears to really be Mariam, not Mariam of Bethany. Since the Gospel of Luke appears 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 kinds of stories described in the Gospels about 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 the narrative about a widow's son. Instead, Lazarus is described as some beggar while someone else is described as rising from the dead. So the narrative in the Gospel of John about Lazarus rising from the dead appears 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 even that specific part in Luke appears to be a response to John. Therefore, 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 appear 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 appears 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 signaled their partners in the other boat to come and help them, and they came and filled both boats so full that 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 appears 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 Thaddaeus as one of "the Twelve". Mark and Matthew both name Thaddaeus instead of Judas son of James. So there is a shift from Mark and Matthew to Luke that takes out Thaddaeus 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 appears that the exclusion of Thaddaeus 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 appears 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 appears 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 9:51-56
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 appears to be a response to the narrative about Samaria in John. Additionally, the account in Luke doesn't appear to hold much important information to the average reader of the New Testament, which shows further evidence that such an account is only in Luke because of a response to the Gospel of John. Not only that, but Acts, which was apparently 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 8:14-17
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.

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 appears 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. That provides an explanation for the spreading of Christianity to Samaria while avoiding describing Christ as having gone to Samaria. Additionally, the mentioning of Philip as the one who went to Samaria shows further 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 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 8:14-17 describe 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 8:14-17 represent 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 8:14-17 show an extreme misunderstanding of Christianity and also represent an attempt to appear 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 "from 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 a fraudulent 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 of 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 described in Luke as someone whom seven demons had come out of and who only provided support rather than being a disciple, she is not described in Luke as having seen Christ after the Resurrection, and she is not mentioned a single time in all of Acts. Compare that point with the increased exaltation for Peter throughout Luke and Acts, and specifically with the 70 times that Peter's name appears in just the first 15 chapters of Acts.

Clear evidence has been shown that the Gospel of Luke exalts Peter, James son of Zebedee, and John; that the Gospel of Luke suppresses information about Mariam, Mother Mariam, Lazarus, Martha, and Mariam of Bethany; that the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, and John appear to have been in circulation before Luke was produced; and that it appears that the Gospel of John was circulating wherever the author of Luke and Acts was from and already contained fraudulent alterations before Luke was produced.

Authorship and Dating of the Gospel of John

We have already identified that the original version of the Gospel of John appears to have been altered, and therefore that there appears 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 likely 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.

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 an earlier version of the narrative about a first disciple was likely 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 supposedly 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 supposedly 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 than John 1:40-42 in that way shows that not only were there apparently 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 supposedly having been from Bethsaida provides evidence that John 1:43-51 were 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 supposedly 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 supposedly 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 appear to serve the specific purpose of exalting Nathanael, and Philip's name appears to have been used to carry out the exaltation of Nathanael. There are two points that can be derived 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 appears 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 narrative 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 appear 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 appears 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 appears to have been involved with altering the Gospel of John sometime after he was apparently 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 and has already been identified as fraudulent. 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 of 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: Simon 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 appear to include 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 apparently erroneously gathered by combining information from John 1:43-51 with information contained in chapter 2.

John 2:1-2
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.

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 isn't any indication before chapter 21 that Nathanael was from Cana. So the mentioning of Nathanael as supposedly having been from Cana in chapter 21 is apparently fraudulent and was apparently erroneously gathered from combining information in chapter 1 with information in chapter 2. That in turn shows that the author of chapter 21 is apparently a different author than the author of John 1:43-51. Additionally, the mentioning of Thomas and the mentioning of Thomas specifically as Didymus in chapter 21 was also probably gathered from text that was already a part of a prior version of the Gospel of John. It has already been shown that the author of chapter 21 appears to have taken preexisting material in a prior version of 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 appears 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 appear 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 appear to have been originally produced by the time verses 30-31 were and since all of chapter 21 appears 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 appears to be a different author than the author who wrote John 20:24-29, and therefore shows evidence that the author of chapter 21 is someone other than Thomas and that they altered the Gospel of John sometime after the layers that exalt Thomas were added.

Thomas would have probably exalted himself without Philip's or Andrew's involvement sometime after Philip and Andrew were apparently involved with him. So chapter 21 not only was likely produced after Thomas was exalted but also likely after Philip and Andrew were exalted. Additionally, chapter 21 focuses on Peter and so was probably not a part of the layer that exalted Nathanael, and it was already shown that the author of chapter 21 appears to have erroneously combined information from the narrative about Nathanael with information in chapter 2 to erroneously come to the conclusion that Nathanael is from Cana, which provides further evidence that the author of chapter 21 is someone other than Nathanael and that they altered the Gospel of John sometime after the layer that exalts Nathanael was added. All of that shows that chapter 21 appears 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 appears 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 appears to have been 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 all are 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 with 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 26:59-61
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 Jewish 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 26:59-61 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 26:59-61 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 skips a beat in relation to this narrative. That's evidence that the author of these verses in the Gospel of Mark didn't really understand that the narrative in the Gospel of John was about the Resurrection and they ignorantly focused on disputing information contained in John 2:18-21. 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 appears 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 Jewish priests accused Christ of having said that Christ would build a temple in three days. Furthermore, that accusation is specifically described as false. 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. So John 2:18-21 would have caused an issue for the Gospel of Mark because of the mentioning of three days, the Gospel of Mark goes against John 2:18-21 by expressing that no miraculous sign will be given, the Gospel of Mark specifically claims that the information contained in John 2:18-21 about three days is false, and that is the information that specifically caused an issue for the Gospel of Mark. 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 appears 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 presumably 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 clear evidence that the order of original productions of the Gospels was the following: the original version of John, Mark, Matthew, and then Luke.

In terms of dating, this analysis shows that the original version of the Gospel of John appears 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 right ear.

All of the Gospels describe someone cutting of 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 in the Synoptic Gospels 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" while none of the Synoptic Gospels do. The specific naming of Peter and Malchus shows evidence that John 18:10 likely represents real eyewitness testimony. Meanwhile, the Synoptic Gospels appear to 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 apparently 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, elders, and teachers of the law 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, and this time they are 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 had been following 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. Whoever fraudulently altered this narrative in the Gospel of John obviously appears 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 appears 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 appears 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. As previously shown, the Gospel of John is also the only Gospel that describes Peter as having been the person who cut off the ear of the high priest's servant. 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 the high priest's servant. It may be true that Peter cut off the ear of the high priest's servant 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 appears 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. 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 Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John appear to have been involved with the production of the Gospel of Mark, so it appears 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 appears 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 appear 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 around three years after his conversion. The Gospel of Matthew shows signs of progress in their operation and so do 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 appears 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 appears to respond to information contained in the Gospel of John and also slanders Levi. The Gospel of Mark appears to respond both to the Gospel of John as well as to Levi's presence in society. The Gospel of Mark appears to attack both the Gospel of John as well as Levi. The Gospel of Mark appears 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 eleven" 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 appears to have been involved with the production of the original version of the Gospel of John, it appears 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 appear 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 appear to have been a part of the original version of the Gospel of John, but the original version of the Gospel of John appears 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 appears that Martha did the same. Additionally, Martha is realistically the only person who would have expressed that about her. It doesn't appear 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 appears 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 apparently was at least in part compiled by Levi, includes testimony from Martha, and was 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, Thaddaeus, 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 appears 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 means 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 appears to describe three different people named James. However, the reference to James son of Mother Mariam as “the younger” shows that there appears 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 relative youth would be attributable to. For “the younger” to apply to only one person, relative youth must be identified within just one person and that would not be the case if there were more than one person who was younger than the oldest. So the reference to “the younger” appears to be an indication that only two people named James were involved. That means that James son of Alphaeus appears 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 appears to have existed between Peter and Levi; and a fictional character portrayed as a son of Alphaeus just like Levi 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears to have been very popular in Galilee. At least some of "the Twelve" appear 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 their religion. 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. 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.

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 appears to have been a need to describe a replacement for Judas. By the time that Acts was written, it doesn't even appear 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 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 appear like they even cared to actually have exactly twelve men by the time that Acts was written. The specific designation of twelve appears to only have been important in documentation by that time. As such, there appears 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 appears 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” appear to have been a group of men that included Levi, and at least some of them appear to have been big fans of John the Baptist before following Christ. Later on, it appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 appear 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 appears 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 appears 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 introduced. 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 appear to fraudulently describe John the Baptist as mainly preaching in Judea. He instead appears 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 (“Bēthaníā”) and Bethsaida is translated from the Greek word βηθσαιδαν (“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 appears 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 appear to have been plenty of confusion about “Bethany on the other side of the Jordan”, but there also appears 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 appears 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 appears that at least one of “the Twelve” was 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 appear 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 appears to have possessed the Gospels of John, Mark, and Matthew, so the early circulation of the Gospels appears to have included where the author of Luke and Acts was from. Furthermore, since the author of Luke Acts appears 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 all were circulating together. Furthermore, since Mark and Matthew respond to John and oppose John, it appears that the Gospels were competing with each other wherever they were circulating together. Since they all appear to have been circulating in the same place, it appears that the main place where all of the Gospels were circulating and competing with each other is the place where the author of Luke and Acts was from. Additionally, as already shown, the author of Luke and Acts appears to have traveled to Jerusalem from a place outside of Judea, so the author appears to have been from somewhere outside of Judea. Therefore, Judea was probably not the main place where John, Mark, and Matthew were all initially circulating together, and more evidence will be shown to support that conclusion.

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 and that they were spreading Christianity there. 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 what Acts says 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 appears 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 worshipped 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 appear 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 Jewish. 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 appear 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 appears that he mainly preached in Galilee and surrounding areas. However, people in Judea probably knew very well who John the Baptist was. He appears to have been quite the local celebrity. Nevertheless, specifically describing Judea rather than Galilee as the main place of his preaching appears 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 appear to have been mainly intended for areas in which John the Baptist was well-known, and

therefore the Gospels don't appear 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 appear 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 appears 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 followed, 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 14th day of Nisan) and the first day of the week of unleavened bread (the 15th 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 22:7-8
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."

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 appear to have not been mainly circulating in Judea, Samaria, Galilee, or surrounding areas, and that Mark and Matthew appear 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 appears to have been intended for a gentile audience and that later layers appear 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 appears to have been in support of Judaism. There are other narratives in the Gospel of John that also strongly favor Judaism. In contrast, the following verses show that the original version of the Gospel of John appears to have been intended for a gentile audience, and we can see that through the use of the phrase "the Jews" as if the author was talking to people who were not Jewish.

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 appear 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 appear 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 is quite strange. It doesn't appear 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 appear to have been well-versed in the geography of Tyre and Sidon because they appear 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 appear 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 ἀνὰ ("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 appears to be presented as a pass-through.

What this all shows is that it doesn't appear to have made much sense to have written Mark 7:31 the way that it is except that the author appears to have not known the geography of Tyre and Sidon, which in turn shows that the Gospel of Mark doesn't appear 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 on 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 6:1-2
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 6:16-17
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 verses 6:1-2 describe

traveling across the Sea of Galilee and verses 6:16-17 describe 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 6:1-2 describe 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 that would mean that the sequence begins and ends 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 6:35-36
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
The number of the men who had eaten was five thousand.

Mark 6:45
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 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, there isn't any description of leaving Galilee and 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 without any description of leaving Galilee, 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 that is described is on boat to a location that people followed on foot to and arrived at first, so that appears to have been a location that was still on the same side of the Sea of Galilee. For people to be described as having followed on foot, the location described would apparently have been on the same side of the Sea of Galilee, and so the route of the described boat traveling would have apparently been along the coast rather than across 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, in Mark 6:45, 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. More specifically, the Greek word πέραν ("peran") is used in Mark 6:45, which means "on the other side", "across", "beyond", or "opposite". So the English translation of Mark 6:45 previously shown incorrectly does not show the description of specifically going across the Sea of Galilee to the other side. The Greek work "peran" is also in John 6:1 and 6:17 previously shown, which both describe going across the Sea of Galilee, and is not in Mark 6:32-33, which appear to describe traveling along the coast of the Sea of Galilee. So with the correct translation of Mark 6:45, Bethsaida is described as being on the other side of the Sea of Galilee, which is further evidence that the feeding of the 5,000 narrative in Mark is on the west side. Additionally, that mentioning of Bethsaida is the beginning of the narrative that describes Christ walking on water. In John, Capernaum is specifically mentioned in 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 (4,000 instead of 5,000) 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 (the gentile 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 the described location of that 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 appear 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 appear to have been circulating in the same area, and since Mark doesn't appear 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 appear 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 already developed by a 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 none of "the Twelve" nor Paul were 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 initially mainly circulating.

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 during that time-period.

Paul appears to have had to deal with other people spreading different beliefs, and some of those people appear to have been a part of Peter's group, but these instances appear 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 around three years to meet Peter. That shows that Peter doesn't appear to have been much of a factor for Paul to contend with. Paul waited around 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 and there being false teachers 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 appear 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 appears to have been in a weaker minority position that didn't have much of a base in the places where Paul traveled to. They don't even appear 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 11:25-26
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.

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 appear 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 the main areas of operation for Peter's group. However, they appear 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 appears to have traveled to many places on the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea. He appears 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 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 foundation that was developed in the areas along the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea appears to have been developed by Paul. Additionally, the Gospels don't appear to have been mainly circulating in Judea, Samaria, Galilee, or areas nearby, Tyre, Sidon, or other areas to the near-north of Galilee, anywhere to the east of the Jordan River, or Rome. The Gospels don't appear to have been mainly circulating anywhere going from Judea all of the way to Rome, and also don't appear to have been mainly circulating anywhere east of the Jordan River. Meanwhile, Egypt was nearby to the southwest of Jerusalem (and west of the Jordan River) with a large population comprised of many gentiles as well as less conservative Jews. From the perspective of someone living in Jerusalem, if they didn't go north, didn't cross the Jordan River or any other body of water, and went past Idumea (the region of ancient Israel that was just south of Judea), then they would end up in Egypt. 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 relatively near Jerusalem and west of the Jordan River where any of the Gospels were mainly circulating. That provides strong evidence that John, Mark, and Matthew were circulating in Egypt. That in turn provides evidence that the author of Luke and Acts was from Egypt.

Furthermore, as we will go into more detail on shortly, Paul's initial traveling to Arabia as explained in his letter to the Galatians provides further evidence that Christianity was already spreading in Egypt. Paul was from Tarsus and appears to have been living in Damascus at the time of his conversion. He mostly traveled north and west in relation to Damascus, on the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea as previously mentioned. However, his initial move to Arabia right after his conversion is an outlier. He first went south to one area and then focused on going north and west in relation to Damascus after that. He first chose to go south, but not to Egypt, and then presumably didn't return and went in other directions. For Paul to have traveled south like that but to have not gone to Egypt where there was a bustling population with Alexandria as the capital city combined with Paul's desire to not build on anyone else's foundation as shown in Romans 15:20-22 provides evidence that Paul avoided Egypt because Christianity was already spreading there.

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 at every threshing floor.

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 is 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 and it obviously isn't. Since that narrative obviously appears to be fraudulent, it appears 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 appear to be much significance to that narrative other than the involvement of Egypt. So just based on the Egypt narrative, it appears that the Gospel of Matthew was mainly circulating in Egypt. That provides further evidence that the Gospels of John and Mark were also mainly circulating in Egypt. That also provides further evidence that the author of Luke and Acts was from 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. The presence of both the exaltation of Peter and the concealment of Mariam's importance in those verses 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 between them and 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 appears 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 appears 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 appear 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 appears to still have been 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 appears to have also been associated with a relationship that was previously closer. Unlike that, the conflict between Peter and Levi appears to have been much more hostile. The difference appears to be that Levi moved further away from Judaism and somewhat exalted Mariam while Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew appear to have stayed closer to Judaism, exalted Peter, and concealed information about Mariam. So while Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew appear to have been separated from Peter, it appears that their relationship with Peter was kept from being as hostile as Levi's relationship with Peter.

So Levi appears to have been in Egypt spreading the original version of the Gospel of John; then it appears that Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew were in Egypt spreading the first altered version of the Gospel of John; then Peter, James son of Zebedee, John, and James son of Mother Mariam 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 Zebedee, John, and James son of Mother Mariam. 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."

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 appeared to understand that the Crucifixion would take place, it doesn't appear that the authors intended to imply that this woman knew that the Crucifixion would take place. Instead, it appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 appear to have been present during the burial and Nicodemus doesn’t appear 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 appears 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, appears to have overreached in attempts to clarify information. For example, as explained earlier, chapter 21 claims that Nathanael was from Cana, which appears to be the product of combining 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 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 appear 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 appears 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 appears to have used the word "arōmatōn" shows that verse 39 appears to have been written by a different author than verse 40, and therefore is apparently a later fraudulent alteration. So verses 38 and 40 appear to have been a part of the original version of the Gospel of John and verse 39 appears 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 because verse 40 appears to have been a part of the original version of the Gospel of John and Nicodemus' presence appears to have not been. 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 appear to have been inserted by the author of this layer and verse 39 appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 because her name having been replaced with Nicodemus appears to have occurred afterward, and therefore Mariam was probably described as anointing Christ during the burial in that version.

Something different appears 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 appears 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 appears 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. Additionally, it would make sense that Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew were more concerned about the narrative about the anointing in Bethany than the narrative about the anointing during the burial because of what it meant to anoint Christ before the Crucifixion. They aimed to conceal information about Mariam and exalt Peter, and that meant concealing information about Mariam anointing Christ before the Crucifixion because that information showed the level of her faith in Christ. While the anointing during the burial also shows that, an anointing during the burial doesn’t stand out as much because there was often an anointing during burials. However, the same can’t be said about the anointing in Bethany. The anointing in Bethany definitely places Mariam above Peter all by itself while the anointing during the burial could be viewed by some as a typical anointing even though it really wasn’t.

So the original version of the Gospel of John appears to have portrayed Mariam as anointing Christ twice; and then the version from Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew appears 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 appears 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 detail to chapter 11 to emphasize that and then apparently 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. The end result still has obvious problems because the Gospel of John implies that the person who anointed Christ in Bethany also anointed Christ during the burial and the Gospel of John portrays two different people in each narrative. That problem appears to have also existed in the version that came from Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew as they appear to have portrayed Mariam of Bethany in one narrative and Mariam in the other. So obviously, at each stage of later fraudulent alterations, people made mistakes in the process of spreading fraudulent information. But we can see people making ridiculous mistakes not only in the Gospel of John

but in the Synoptic Gospels as well, so we shouldn't be surprised by these mistakes. 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 appear to have changed the burial narrative to compensate for the issue that remained from John 12:7.

So when the Gospel of Mark was produced, the version of the Gospel of John that Peter's group was responding to appears 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 appears to be the starting point in terms of the version of the Gospel of John that was presented to Peter, James son of Zebedee, John, and James son of Mother Mariam 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 appears that both the group of Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew as well as the group of Peter, James son of Zebedee, John, and James son of Mother Mariam 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 appears to have had knowledge of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection as soon as the night of that anointing, which contrasts with the idea that the Crucifixion and the Resurrection were surprises to everybody. Levi, on the other hand, appears 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 Zebedee, John, and James son of Mother Mariam 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 appear 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 appears to have 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 appear to have overlooked those details and appear 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 appears to have replaced Mariam's name in the burial narrative with Nicodemus to compensate for the issue that remained from John 12:7. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, 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 appear 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 appears 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 appear 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 appear to have done that out of respect because they don't appear 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 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 that originated from the Gospel of John, which shows evidence that

her strong presence there was 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, in the time-period of 28-44, 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 combining that with plenty of fraudulent information, including fraudulently portraying Mariam as if she wasn't a disciple and also fraudulently describing Christ as appearing to other people after the Resurrection. Third, in the time-period of 28-44, Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew fraudulently altered the Gospel of John and spread their version in Egypt. Fourth, in the time-period of 39-44, Peter, James son of Zebedee, John, and James son of Mother Mariam 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, in the time-period of 41-51, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and maybe also John produced the Gospel of Matthew and spread it in Egypt. Sixth, in the time-period of 43-51, 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 appear to have been poaching off of Paul's success as well. So there appears to be quite a pattern of Peter and his group trying to infiltrate areas where information related to 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 probably have been women. If Christianity initially mostly spread among the female population in Egypt, 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 religion disguised as 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 another man instead of a woman, 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, and documents containing truth were burned or otherwise destroyed.

Paul

It was previously shown that information about Paul was suppressed by Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John, and this was shown through an examination of Acts. So we've seen evidence that information about Paul was suppressed in the process of Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John giving information to the author of Acts. We've also seen other aspects of a conflict between Paul and Peter's group such as "spies" infiltrating Paul's ranks, people trying to pressure communities developed by Paul to get circumcised, a council in Jerusalem about whether it was acceptable for Paul to teach that Christians don't need to be circumcised, and a fierce argument between Peter and Paul in which Paul opposed Peter to his face and accused Peter of being a hypocrite who forced gentiles to follow Jewish customs that Peter didn't even follow himself. Also, as we have already seen and will go into more detail on shortly, there appears to have been fraudulent alterations to Paul's letters. We already saw that 2 Corinthians conceals the identity of someone who was apparently praised throughout all of the churches. Given all of this information, the best place to start with is Paul's letter to the Galatians because it is a letter that describes conflict and damaging information about Peter, and therefore it wasn't likely altered. Had Galatians been fraudulently altered, it probably wouldn't include such damaging information. That damaging information probably would have gotten taken out if anything was going to be fraudulently altered. So we can conclude that Galatians appears to be an authentic letter written by Paul, and therefore we can use Galatians to understand Paul's real position as he presented it to others.

Galatians 1:11-12
I want you to know, brothers, that the gospel I preached is not something that man made up. I did not receive it from any man, nor was I taught it; rather, I received it by revelation from Jesus Christ.

Galatians 1:13-14
For you have heard of my previous way of life in Judaism, how intensely I persecuted the church of God and tried to destroy it. I was advancing in Judaism beyond many Jews of my own age and was extremely zealous for the traditions of my fathers.

Galatians 1:15-17
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.

Galatians 1:11-12 lay out very clearly that Paul claimed that the gospel he preached was received by revelation from Christ. Galatians 1:13-14 explain that Paul was a zealous Jew and that he persecuted Christians prior to converting to Christianity. Galatians 1:15-17 claim that Paul was set apart from birth and called by God to spread Christianity to gentiles. So Paul claimed that he was a zealous Jew who persecuted Christians and that he received a revelation directly from Christ about spreading Christianity to gentiles.

The first point to make is that Christianity was apparently already spreading to gentiles. Presumably, Mariam was spreading Christianity to gentiles because Christianity is not a Jewish religion. Even if she was spreading Christianity to Jews, the information that she was apparently preaching was not Judaism and therefore a person wouldn't have to convert to Judaism to convert to Christianity, which would at least be compatible with spreading Christianity to gentiles. Also, the Gospel of John shows plenty of evidence that the original version was intended mainly for a gentile audience. However, Paul names Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John as the three reputed to be pillars in his letter to the Galatians, so Paul apparently viewed the top leaders as himself, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John, which excludes Mariam and anyone else who was spreading Christianity to gentiles. From that perspective, he viewed himself as leading the spread of Christianity to gentiles and viewed Peter's group as leading the spread of Christianity to Jews. That is what Paul alludes to in the verses below.

Galatians 2:7-8
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.

So Paul explicitly claimed that he was entrusted with spreading Christianity to gentiles and that Peter was entrusted with spreading Christianity to Jews. Paul was claiming that he had received a revelation directly from Christ about spreading Christianity to gentiles and then chose to speak to Peter about it rather than Mariam. However, Mariam is the true human leader of Christianity and she was presumably already spreading Christianity to gentiles. Additionally, the Gospel of John also shows that Christianity was apparently already being spread to gentiles by showing evidence that the original version of the Gospel of John targeted a gentile audience. So apparently, Paul claimed to have received a revelation directly from Christ about something that was already being done by the true human leader of Christianity and others, and then he chose to talk about that with someone who was in conflict with the true human leader of Christianity. Just with that, we can see that Paul's claim appears to be fraudulent. So we can already see that Paul was apparently spreading false information.

The second point is about the theology that Paul was spreading. As can be seen by Galatians 1:15-17 and other verses, Paul refers to Christ as the Son of God, which as shown in Part 4 appears to be fraudulent theology. In the following verses, Paul presents Christ as separate from God, refers to God as "the Father", and refers to the Crucifixion as a sacrifice for sins, all of which are foundational elements of the theology in the Synoptic Gospels and therefore apparently the theology of Peter's group.

Galatians 1:3-4
Grace and peace to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins to rescue us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father.

These verses as well as other verses show that much of Paul's theology appears to be the same as the theology of Peter's group, and such theology has been shown to be fraudulent. That means that Paul appears to have obtained fraudulent theology, which by itself shows evidence that Paul's claim about receiving a revelation from Christ is fraudulent, and that also means that Paul appears to have taken theology that he learned from information that was already circulating, which also shows that his claim about a revelation is fraudulent. So Paul appears to have learned his theology from information that derived from Peter's group.

Given that Paul appears to have taken theology that was already circulating and that he supposedly was persecuting Christians, it appears that such theology was spreading where Paul lived at the time. Since Paul says that he returned to Damascus after going to Arabia after supposedly converting to Christianity, it appears that Paul was previously living in Damascus. That shows that the theology of Peter's group appears to have been spreading in Damascus. That's not to say that the Gospels were circulating there. As previously shown, the Gospels were probably not circulating there or any of the places where Paul was mostly at. There appears to have been initial efforts by Peter's group in places like Galilee and Damascus, but they apparently didn't have much success and then moved to Jerusalem, and then at some point after that began to spread the Gospel of Mark in Egypt and then after that the Gospel of Matthew in Egypt. Therefore, while theology from Peter's group appears to have been spreading in Damascus, that doesn't mean that the Gospels were circulating there and they probably weren't during that time as previously shown. So prior to Paul's conversion, Paul was apparently living in Damascus and persecuting Christians. Then, according to Paul, he supposedly converted to Christianity and went immediately to Arabia before returning to Damascus.

The choice for Paul to go to Arabia is interesting. It's interesting because it's actually quite a strange decision. It's not clear why he decided to leave Damascus in the first place and it's also not clear why he picked Arabia. However, a few reasonable conclusions can be derived. Based on Romans 15:20-22, it appears that Paul didn't want to build on anyone else's foundation. Therefore, we can conclude that Paul chose Arabia at least partly because there wasn't a Christian foundation already there. Arabia is relatively far from Damascus and is in the opposite direction from the rest of Paul's travel path. With the exception of Arabia, Paul mostly traveled along the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea. In relation to that travel path, Arabia is an outlier. Paul went south, presumably southeast, before returning to Damascus, and then traveled north and west. So Paul's initial instinct was to go southeast instead of north or west. Paul was originally from Tarsus and was apparently living in Damascus at the time of his conversion. So before Paul's conversion, the two places we have information on about his whereabouts are Tarsus and Damascus. Damascus was north of Jerusalem in what was ancient Syria but is now a part of Turkey. Tarsus was in Turkey, northwest of Damascus. If we include Jerusalem in our assessment simply because Paul was a Jew and probably went to Jerusalem at some point in his life leading up to this, we would then have three locations in relation to Paul's whereabouts: Jerusalem, Tarsus, and Damascus, with Jerusalem being the farthest south and Tarsus being the farthest north. What was then Paul's current city, Damascus, was in between Tarsus and Jerusalem from a north-south standpoint. After his conversion, he decided to go south instead of north, which shows that Paul appears to have viewed Jerusalem as more of a center of his world than Tarsus. He immediately went to Arabia after his conversion, which was away from Damascus and Tarsus and closer to Jerusalem. From that perspective, Jerusalem appears to have been more of a center of his world at that time than Tarsus. He grew up in Tarsus, but moved south to

Damascus and moved further south to Arabia. So he appears to have centered his travels much more around Jerusalem than Tarsus. That appears to partly explain his initial move to Arabia.

We've established that Paul initially focused on moving southward rather than north or west in the immediate aftermath of his conversion. If Paul wanted to move south to begin his ministry, then Egypt would have probably made a lot more sense. Egypt was a bustling place with Alexandria as the capital city. But as we've seen, Mariam and some of "the eleven" appear to have been in Egypt, and all of the Gospels appear to have been eventually circulating there. Given that Romans 15:20-22 describe Paul not wanting to build on anyone else's foundation, Egypt appears to not be a place Paul would have wanted to go to. Egypt otherwise would have probably been the first place Paul would have gone to. So Paul choosing to go south but to go to Arabia instead of Egypt serves as additional evidence that Christianity was already spreading in Egypt, which provides further evidence that Mariam was in Egypt and that the Gospels were circulating in Egypt. What also shows support for that conclusion is that Paul appears to have not gone south of Jerusalem after he returned to Damascus and instead moved north and west. So his initial move was to go south while avoiding Egypt and then never went back that far south after returning to Damascus, which serves as evidence that Paul didn't feel that there was much for him south of Jerusalem, and he would apparently have felt that way with everything that appears to have already been going on in Egypt and his assertion that he didn't want to build on anyone else's foundation. All of that serves as additional evidence for the conclusion that Mariam was in Egypt and that the Gospels were circulating in Egypt.

We've already seen that Paul appears to have spread fraudulent information about a false supposed revelation and simply took theology that was spreading from Peter's group. Moving further, there is also the specific claim that Christ appeared to Paul. There's two different places that this claim shows up in: Acts and 1 Corinthians.

Acts 8:1-3
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. Godly men buried Stephen and mourned deeply for him. But Saul began to destroy the church. Going from house to house, he dragged off men and women and put them in prison.

Acts 9:1-9
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. 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.

1 Corinthians 15:3-10
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. For I am least of the apostles and do not even deserve to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. But by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace to me was not without effect. No, I worked harder than all of them – yet not I, but the grace of God that was with me.

The verses shown above from Acts are from chapters 8 and 9. The verses from chapter 8 describe supposed persecutions committed by Paul against Christians, and that carries forward into the verses in chapter 9. The verses in chapter 9 go on to describe that supposed appearance of Christ to Paul, or at least the voice of Christ speaking to Paul. The verses don't explicitly describe this scene as an appearance per se, but even just hearing Christ's voice and being able to communicate with Christ should be considered on approximately the same level as an appearance. These verses actually describe Christ explicitly communicating with Paul.

We've already seen plenty of evidence that fraudulent information was given to the author of Acts by Peter's group. More specifically, Paul is presented in Acts as adhering to Peter's group and first being in Jerusalem before going to Damascus. We've already seen that Paul categorically denies going to Jerusalem until around three years after his conversion and that he appears to have previously been living in Damascus before his conversion, which contradicts the claim in Acts that he was in Jerusalem first and then went to Damascus afterward. So we can easily conclude that these accounts in Acts about Paul hunting down Christians in Jerusalem and Paul communicating with Christ on his way to Damascus are fraudulent and are just more examples of fraudulent information having been given to the author of Acts. Paul admits to persecuting Christians, but it appears that he was persecuting Christians somewhere outside of Jerusalem, probably in Damascus or somewhere close to there.

Much like a lot of the information in the Gospels, Peter's group appears to have been responding to information that was already circulating about Paul. Much like they did in relation to information about Mariam, they also had to deal with information about Paul. If Paul's claim about a supposed revelation was already known to people and Peter's group already failed at trying to get rid of Paul, then Peter's group didn't have much of a choice but to deal with this information and they appear to have attempted to spin it to their favor as they did with information about Mariam. So in Acts, there ended up being a description about Christ communicating with Paul, but there is also false information surrounding that account about Paul persecuting Christians in Jerusalem and then adhering to Peter's group. In that way, the false information about Paul's claims spins to the favor of Peter's group in Acts.

As previously mentioned, it appears that Peter's group gave false information about the Resurrection to Paul, and 1 Corinthians 15:3-10 appear to be a product of that. Regardless of the apparent false information that was given to Paul, this writing, which as shown earlier Paul apparently wrote himself, claims that Christ appeared to him. So even though the other information was given to Paul, he apparently made a claim himself that Christ appeared to him. So regardless of the fraudulent information in Acts, we can still charge Paul with the crime of spreading fraudulent information about a supposed appearance of

Christ to Paul that never happened. We already saw that Paul appears to have lied about a supposed revelation he claimed to have received and simply took theology from Peter's group. Now we can see that Paul appears to have even lied about Christ supposedly appearing to him.

Two additional pieces of evidence are Paul's accommodations for Judaism in his writing and the results of the council at Jerusalem. Paul of course veered away from Judaism somewhat, but he still accommodates for Judaism in his writing. He's against forcing circumcision on gentiles, but he leaves room to allow for people to continue practicing Judaism. For example, Paul describes Peter as an apostle to the Jews as if Judaism is somehow in line with Christianity. Someone who really knew Christianity would have known that Judaism is not in line with Christianity. As for the council at Jerusalem, that actually shows evidence that both Peter and Paul weren't really in line with the truth. Neither of them should have been negotiating about what Christianity is. Such negotiations are the product of fraudulent behavior. A real Christian practices Christianity and it's no more complicated than that. Entering into negotiations with other parties about what is acceptable shows diversion from what is the standard truth. The true religion will always be the true religion and there's no negotiating for human beings on that. It's not up to human beings. It's up to God. Both Paul's writing that accommodates Judaism as well as the results of the council at Jerusalem provide further evidence that Paul was not in line with the truth and that he was spreading fraudulent information.

The Division

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 appears to have given way to the original version of the Gospel of John. Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas appear to have given way to an altered version of the Gospel of John. Peter, James son of Zebedee, John, and James son of Mother Mariam appear to have been involved with the production of the Gospel of Mark. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and maybe also John appear to have been based in Jerusalem, and they appear 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 John appear 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 appears to have been 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 appears 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 appears 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 named Mary is described as talking)
“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
“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 appears 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 appears 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 probably 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 appears to have existed during Christ's Ministry, and we can see from the information contained in the Gospels and in Acts that division appears 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.

We've also seen another branch of division from Paul. He was someone who was not around during Christ's Ministry and didn't really join forces with anyone who was. Additionally, it appears that he did not seek out Mariam to learn Christianity, he had division with Peter's group, and he made up his own theology and teachings. So Paul represented his own branch of division.

It was mentioned before that Paul used some theology that came from Peter's group, which shows that Peter's group appears to have reached Damascus or somewhere nearby. We've also seen that Paul was in Antioch and that Peter's group tried to infiltrate that community. So both Paul and Peter's group appear to have been around Damascus and Antioch. Additionally, Peter's group appears to have been in Galilee shortly after the Resurrection as shown by the verses below.

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.

While those verses appear to be fraudulent, they nevertheless show evidence that Peter's group ended up in Galilee at some point shortly after the Resurrection. That would make sense anyway because Peter and others appear to have been from Galilee. The Gospel of Luke and Acts describe Peter's group as having been in Jerusalem after the Resurrection and staying there. They may have been in Jerusalem initially but the description of them staying there rather than going to Galilee appears to be a product of the focus on Jerusalem in Luke and Acts. As shown earlier, that increased focus is in both Luke and Acts as compared to Mark and Matthew. So Mark and Matthew are more reliable in that way, which shows that Peter's group probably ended up in Galilee shortly after the Resurrection, even if they were just previously in Jerusalem. We don't necessarily know if Mariam directly told Peter and others of "the eleven" about the

Resurrection or where it happened if she did. It appears that she did and the two most likely places where that would have happened are Jerusalem and Galilee, and Jerusalem is the most likely. Regardless of whether Peter and others of the "eleven" found out about the Resurrection in Jerusalem or Galilee, at least some of them appear to have ended up in Galilee at some point shortly after the Resurrection.

The following verses show further evidence.

Mark 6:4
Jesus said to them, "Only in his hometown, among his relatives and in his own house is a prophet without honor."

Matthew 13:57
And they took offense at him.
But Jesus said to them, "Only in his hometown and in his own house is a prophet without honor."

Luke 4:24
"I tell you the truth", he continued, "no prophet is accepted in his hometown."

These verses show evidence in two different ways. Given that Peter appears to have been a leader of the group that produced Mark and Matthew and that he also appears to have influenced Luke, the verses above appear to reflect the feelings of Peter and his group. So these verses appear to serve as evidence that Peter and others went to Galilee after the Resurrection, and it would make sense anyway that they would go back home or near home. These verses also show evidence that they didn't have much success in Galilee. So they appear to have went to Galilee after the Resurrection and then didn't have much success there.

It appears that Peter and his group went to Galilee after the Resurrection, began to spread their religion in Galilee but didn't have much success, spread their religion around Galilee as far as Damascus, and eventually tried to infiltrate Paul's community in Antioch. Additionally, Peter and James son of Mother Mariam appear to have eventually moved to Jerusalem, and the Gospels appear to have begun circulating in Egypt at different times. Furthermore, Levi appears to have separated from Peter at an early stage; and then Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas appear to have been somewhat separated from Peter at some point. Levi, Philip, Andrew, and Thomas may have all been in Egypt, and that conclusion makes even more sense given the separation from Peter. Given the production and evolution of the Gospel of John, it is probably the case that at least one of them was in Egypt at some point.

While Peter's group eventually produced Gospels, that appears to have been a relatively later strategy. As shown, the Gospel of Mark appears to have been produced in the time-period of 39-44 and appears to have been the first Synoptic Gospel produced. So Peter's group appears to have turned to written material over a decade after the Resurrection and potentially up to 16 years after the Resurrection. Furthermore, it would make sense for Peter's group to be in a different area than Mariam. It was shown earlier and will be shown in more detail in Part 6 that Mariam appears to have been in Egypt after the Resurrection. It will also be shown in Part 6 that Mariam appears to have left Egypt at some point, probably by the early forties, which coincides with the probable time-period in which the Gospel of Mark was produced. If we assume that the Gospel of Mark was produced and spreading in Egypt sometime after Mariam left Egypt, then Mariam appears to have left Egypt by 44. So it would make sense that Peter's group began to make

efforts in Egypt at a relatively later stage. Prior to that, they appear to have been in Galilee, Jerusalem, and around Damascus. It's not clear when they would have first gone to Antioch, but they don't appear to have had much of a presence there and Paul was likely much more present there. So Peter's group appears to have initially focused on places that were north of Jerusalem, then moved to Jerusalem, and then later on began to spread Gospels in Egypt, probably after Mariam left Egypt.

With all of the division and all of the dishonesty, a question arises about what motivations there were for these men to spread false beliefs.

Acts 4:34-37
There were no needy persons among them. For from time to time those who owned lands or houses sold them, brought the money from the sales and put it at the apostles' feet, and it was distributed to anyone as he had need.
Joseph, a Levite from Cyprus, whom the apostles called Barnabas (which means son of encouragement), sold a field he owned and brought the money and put it at the apostles' feet.

Acts 5:1-2
Now a man named Ananias, together with his wife Sapphira, also sold a piece of property. With his wife's full knowledge he kept back part of the money for himself, but brought the rest and put it at the apostles' feet.

Acts 5:5
When Ananias heard this, he fell down and died. And great fear seized all who heard what had happened.

Acts 5:10-11
At that moment she fell down at his feet and died. Then the young men came in and, finding her dead, carried her out and buried her beside her husband. Great fear seized the whole church and all who heard about these events.

These verses from Acts propose that everyone was supposed to give all of their money to Peter. More specifically, if anyone didn't give all of their money from selling their property, they would drop dead. There is obviously no mistaking that these verses are fraudulent and were used to strike fear into people to get money from them. It's already been shown that Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and John all appear to have provided information to the author of Acts. It also appears that there were certain later fraudulent alterations to Acts, some of which will be examined in Part 6. So it's possible that these verses from Acts were later fraudulent additions. On the other hand, it's also very possible that these fear tactics to extract money from people came directly from Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and/or John. Furthermore, while there appears to have been some later fraudulent alterations to Acts, the alterations that will be examined in Part 6 appear to be edits to what was a previously existing narrative, so later alterations were less likely to be a completely new narrative and more likely to be edits to a previously existing narrative. The verses above from chapter 5 of Acts are fundamental details of the story told in that chapter, so they don't appear to be edits to a previously existing narrative. Instead, those details were probably a part of the original narrative, and since later additions were more likely to have been edits to a previously existing narrative rather than a completely new narrative, it appears that the verses above from chapter 5 of Acts were a part of the original version of Acts. Therefore, it appears that Peter, James son of

Mother Mariam, and/or John threatened that people would drop dead if they didn't give Peter all of their money.

We can see a continuation of this behavior in the verses below.

1 Corinthians 16:1-4
Now about the collection for God's people: Do what I told the Galatian churches to do. 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. Then, when I arrive, I will give letters of introduction to the men you approve and send them with your gift to Jerusalem. If it seems advisable for me to go also, they will accompany me.

First and foremost, it should be immediately recognized that it's strange to portray Paul as collecting money from people to take to Jerusalem. These verses propose that Paul was collecting money from people in different cities to give to Peter's group. That's very strange. Christianity is not about taking money from people to give to certain leaders. The mainstream storyline portrays Peter's group as really poor and struggling, so many people overlook the strangeness of taking money from people in different cities to give to Peter's group. Fundamentally, these verses portray Peter's group in Jerusalem as profiting off of people's faith in Christianity. So much like the verses from Acts just previously shown, we have another example of someone using fraudulent religious writing to profit off of people's faith.

Second, it's not only strange to portray Peter's group as profiting off of people's faith, it's also specifically strange that Paul is portrayed as the one collecting the money. Plenty of evidence has already been shown that Peter and Paul were in disagreement a lot of the time and that Peter and James son of Mother Mariam appear to have lied to Paul and lied about Paul to the author of Luke and Acts. So they weren't exactly on the same team, which shows pretty clear evidence that Paul wouldn't be collecting money for them. That shows specific evidence that Paul didn't write these verses and that they are fraudulent additions to Paul's letter.

Third, the beginning of the second sentence says "on the first day of every week", which as shown in Part 4 is translated from the Greek words κατὰ ("kata") μίαν ("mian") σαββάτου ("sabbatou"). It was explained in Part 4 that Jews simply referred to days of the week by the number of the day, as in "the first day", and that certain Christians referred to days of the week by the number of the day and a Greek word for either the singular form of "Sabbath" or for the plural form of "Sabbaths". Paul had been a Jew and using "Sabbath" or "Sabbaths" to identify the day of the week appears to have been an invention of Peter' group that initially appeared in the Gospel of Matthew and continued to be used from then on. So Paul was unlikely to have used "Sabbath" or "Sabbaths" to identify the day of the week and Peter's group was likely to. That shows specific evidence that Peter's group or someone who carried on the legacy of the "orthodox church" that Peter started fraudulently altered 1 Corinthians to profit off of people's faith. Given that Peter's group appears to have given information to the author of Luke and Acts about the claim that people would drop dead if they didn't give all of their money to Peter, it appears most likely that Peter's group fraudulently altered 1 Corinthians rather than someone doing that later on. Additionally, the focus on Jerusalem is likely reflective of a relatively early alteration because Rome became more of a focus than Jerusalem after Peter and James son of Mother Mariam died and maybe even before they died. As we will get into in Part 7, Peter appears to have died before James son of Mother Mariam, and Rome became more of a focus than Jerusalem for the "orthodox church" probably

by the sixties. So the focus on bringing money to Jerusalem probably means that James son of Mother Mariam was still in Jerusalem, and maybe Peter was also. That shows evidence that James son of Mother Mariam and/or Peter are responsible for not only fraudulently altering 1 Corinthians but also for profiting off of people's faith, which aligns with the evidence from chapter 5 of Acts that Peter's group claimed that people would drop dead if they didn't give all of their money to Peter.

Fourth, the first sentence says "do what I told the Galatian churches to do". How would the Corinthians know what Paul said to the Galatian churches? And why would the Galatian churches even need to be referenced? It wouldn't really have been natural for Paul to have said that. Instead, it appears that someone was trying to force influence and make it look like collecting money was a normal activity. That shows further evidence that Paul didn't write these verses and that they are fraudulent.

Fifth, verses 3-4 contradict the verses that come afterward.

1 Corinthians 16:3-4
Then, when I arrive, I will give letters of introduction to the men you approve and send them with your gift to Jerusalem. If it seems advisable for me to go also, they will accompany me.

1 Corinthians 16:5-9
After I go through Macedonia, I will come to you – for I will be going through Macedonia. Perhaps I will stay with you a while, or even spend the winter, so that you can help me on my journey, wherever I go. I do not want to see you now and make only a passing visit; I hope to spend some time with you, if the Lord permits. But I will stay on at Ephesus until Pentecost, because a great door for effective work has opened to me, and there are many who oppose me.

Verses 3-4 say that letters of introduction will be given to some men and they will go to Jerusalem and maybe Paul will go with them. Verses 5-9 explain that Paul will visit Corinth after he goes through Macedonia, that he might stay the winter with them, that he doesn't know where he's going next, and that he doesn't want to just make a passing visit.

The first point is that verses 5-9 explain that Paul will visit them after he goes through Macedonia, but verses 3-4 already assume that Paul was going to visit them even though that's not explained until afterward in verses 5-9. That shows that verses 3-4 were later fraudulent additions written by a different author. Second, Paul said that he doesn't want to just make a passing visit and that he might even spend the winter with them. Meanwhile, verses 3-4 suggest that Paul may leave right away to go to Jerusalem. That also shows that verses 3-4 were written by a different author and are fraudulent.

The verses from chapters 4 and 5 of Acts show that Peter's group was demanding money from people and even threatened that people would drop dead if they didn't give all of their money to Peter. The verses from 1 Corinthians show further efforts to extract money from people to be sent to Peter's group in Jerusalem. The following verse from Luke shows even further evidence that Peter's group was promoting the idea that people should give all that they have to the central religious establishment.

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."

Evidence has been shown that Peter's group was trying to extract money from people, fraudulently altered one of Paul's letters to Corinthians to further efforts to extract money from people, promoted people giving all that they have, and even threatened that people would drop dead if they didn't give all of their money to Peter.

There was division during Christ's Ministry. Around 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, others of "the Twelve", and James son of Mother Mariam.

All four Gospels appear to have been circulating in Egypt. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John appear to have been based in Jerusalem. Levi, Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas appear to have been in Egypt. It appears 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 was shown in Part 2 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 appears 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. It was shown in Part 5 that Mariam appears to have been in Egypt shortly after the Resurrection. We will go into more details about how long she may have been there and where she may have gone afterward.

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 appears 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 appears 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 Joses 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 appear to be 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 appears to be largely fraudulent, downplays female involvement more than any other Gospel, and refers to Mariam as someone whom seven demons came out of. So information related to women in the Gospel of Luke is obviously even less reliable than the other Gospels. 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. Those names were very popular so it's especially risky to make assumptions like that. 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 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 multiple "sects" of Christianity that were formed by women.

The following text is from the First Epistle of Clement (Chapter 6).

Through envy, those women, the Danaids and Dircæ, 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 specifically about separation between men and women and is described immediately after describing a particular group of women, that separation is apparently being attributed to that particular group of women,

especially since it would otherwise seem entirely irrelevant and confusing to relate separation between "husbands" and "wives" to the torture and murders of these 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 being tied to a bull. Long story short, it was obviously insulting to refer to someone as a "Danaid" or as "Dirce". In addition to all of that, the author also describes these women as "weak in body". In the same sentence that describes the torture and murders of these women, the author labeled them with the insulting names of "the Danaids" and "Dirce" that refer to fictional murderous women and described them as "weak in body"; and then the author complained about separation between men and women and appears to have blamed these women for that right after describing the torture and murders of these women and insulting them. So this author obviously viewed these women negatively and felt so negatively about them that he insulted, discriminated against, and blamed wrongdoing on them while describing their torture and murders.

There are two important conclusions to derive from what this author wrote. One is that the author viewed this group of women very negatively, so negatively that he insulted, discriminated against, and blamed wrongdoing on them the way that he did even while describing their torture and murders. The second conclusion is that this group of women appears to have consisted of independent women given that the author blamed these women for separation between men and women, and more specifically these women appear to have been independent women who were Christians given that the author obviously probably wouldn't have written about their persecution if they weren't Christians, especially since their persecution is mentioned shortly after the mentioning of the deaths of Peter and Paul (the mentioning of the deaths of Peter and Paul are in chapter 5 of the writing and is not included in the text shown above). Therefore, this letter shows clear 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 evidence that Peter and other men in the first century were involved with suppressing information about women and discrediting them. We can now see from the First Epistle of Clement that there appears to have been 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 appears to have given way to the original version of the Gospel of John; Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas appear 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 cumulatively as a group appear to have given way to the Gospels of Mark and Matthew and influenced the Gospel of Luke.

All four Gospels appear to have been circulating in Egypt, which had a large gentile population as well as a large Jewish population and appears to have been less conservative than Jerusalem in terms of Judaism.

At some point, Paul began his ministry and there was then another division that claimed to be Christianity. There appears 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 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.

With the recognition that Mariam is the beloved disciple, the information in John 19:26-27 suggests 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. More specifically, the translation should really be "the Magdalene" rather than just "Magdalene". So really Mariam is being called "the Magdalene" in the Bible, which is different than using "Magdalene" as an extension of her name. Some people believe that "the 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. So "the Magdalene" was probably not a name given out of respect. Additionally, John 20:16, the only apparently reliable verse about the Resurrection, does not use the name "the Magdalene", and neither does Romans 16:6, which we will go into more detail on shortly. "The Magdalene" was probably a name given in relation to where she was from. There appears to have been a Migdol in Galilee and a Migdol in Egypt. So Mariam was probably from Galilee or Egypt.

There is plenty of archaeological evidence for Migdol in Galilee; and the popular belief is that Mariam was from Migdol in Galilee 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 in Egypt. Many believe that mentions of "Migdol" in the Old Testament 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 a town as the first and last verses indicate. Verse 35 states "The fortified cites 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 a town. Therefore, "Migdal El" appears to have been a city or a town.

Joshua 19:35-39 describe an area that was considered to have been Naphtali, which appears to have encompassed a part of Galilee near the Sea of Galilee. So the Migdol referred to in Joshua 19:35-39 probably refers to the Migdol in Galilee. The following verses, on the other hand, 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

Additionally, 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, even if a tower or fortress influenced the name of the city or town. These verses specifically indicate that there was a city or town called Migdol. Furthermore, the verses from the books of Ezekiel and Jeremiah show that Migdol in 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 Ezekiel and Jeremiah were likely written in the time-period of 900-500 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 very possible that Migdol in Egypt was a city or town for 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 the Gospels were initially mainly circulating in Egypt and that they all respond to Mariam's strong presence there. The Gospels appear to have followed Mariam to Egypt, which appears to have been the initial main 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 probably from Migdol in Egypt rather than Galilee.

Additionally, as also explained in Part 5, Peter appears to have been in Galilee shortly after the Resurrection and then moved to Jerusalem at some point after that. Peter's group appears to have reached as far north as Damascus, and at some point visited Antioch. However, Peter's group appears to have not had much success in Galilee, Damascus, or Antioch. They don't appear to have had much success anywhere north of Jerusalem. Nevertheless, Peter's group appears to have initially concentrated on Galilee relatively shortly after the Resurrection. If Mariam was in Galilee, then Peter wouldn't have had much of a chance to oppose her, and he could have been successful if he aligned himself with her. So the combination of his opposition towards her and his lack of success shows that Mariam probably wasn't in Galilee. One objection could be that the lack of success in Galilee for Peter's group could have been because Mariam was there. However, the narratives about a prophet not being honored in his hometown show that the issue appears to have been that people from Peter's hometown who knew him didn't respect what he was saying, which is an issue that is entirely separate from Mariam. Furthermore, as already established, Peter wouldn't have had much room to be dishonest if Mariam was close by so Peter's dishonesty is evidence that Mariam wasn't close by, and if he wasn't initially dishonest and Mariam was with him in Galilee then he would have likely had a lot more success, so the evidence strongly shows that Mariam probably wasn't in Galilee. Simply put, if they were both in Galilee, it's much more likely that Peter would have worked with Mariam because there just wouldn't have been much room to oppose her if she was that close by, and then Peter would have likely been much more successful. So the exact dynamics that revolved around Peter in Galilee regarding his opposition to Mariam and his lack of success show strong evidence that Mariam wasn't in Galilee.

Paul looking to Peter as the leader of the group that was around during Christ's Ministry also shows that Mariam probably wasn't in Galilee during that time-period. As shown, the Revolution Mariam was spreading appears to have continued to spread information about her into at least the sixth century. She obviously had tremendous success while Peter appears to not have had much success at all. It should also be noted that information about Mariam continuing to spread is very different than information about Peter continuing to spread because Mariam was a woman and Peter was a man. Peter being famous after his death is not really a product of how great he supposedly was. It's a product of a combination of false beliefs spreading, division, dishonesty, and men suppressing information about women. It wasn't nearly as difficult for Peter to become famous. He didn't have much success on his own and he still became famous for nearly 2,000 years after his death. Mariam, on the other hand, having been a woman, faced a very different kind of challenge than Peter did. The societal circumstances were in Peter's favor, but not in Mariam's. So her being famous for over half of a millennium is more of a product of her efforts as a disciple of God and the true human leader of Christianity. So for Mariam to have had all of that success, it doesn't appear realistic that Paul would completely ignore her being in Galilee if she was there. Paul having gone to Peter and thinking he was the leader of the group that was around during Christ's Ministry shows evidence that Mariam probably wasn't in Galilee during that time-period.

Also about Paul, his letter to the Galatians describes him as having gone to Arabia right after his conversion. In Part 5, Paul's traveling path was examined and it was concluded that Paul mostly focused on places north and west of Damascus. Arabia was presented as an outlier. It was also explained that Paul having initially gone south and having avoided Egypt was strange because Egypt was a bustling place with Alexandria as the capital. Given that Paul expressed in his letter to Romans that he didn't want to build on someone else's foundation, Paul avoiding Egypt and going to Arabia instead shows evidence that there was someone already spreading Christianity in Egypt. He otherwise would have probably gone to

Egypt. So just based on Paul avoiding Egypt and going to Arabia instead, there appears to have been a lot going on in Egypt related to the spread of Christianity. For there to be much going on with the spread of Christianity in Egypt, Mariam was probably there because it doesn't appear that any of the men who were around during Christ's Ministry had much success. Therefore, Paul's avoidance of Egypt and going to Arabia instead shows evidence that Mariam was in Egypt.

Additionally, the relationship and interactions between Peter and Paul would have likely been very different if Mariam was in Galilee. It's telling enough that Paul saw Peter as the leader instead of Mariam, but in addition to that, Paul continued to look to Peter as the leader and had multiple interactions with him, all of which appear to have excluded Mariam. Two examples are the council at Jerusalem about circumcision and Peter visiting Paul in Antioch. Paul was negotiating with Peter about circumcision and then was dining with Peter with the community in Antioch. It appears that Mariam was not consulted on any religious matters and wasn't invited to dine with Paul and the community in Antioch. For Peter to have had this kind of relationship with Paul and for Mariam to be completely absent shows evidence that Mariam probably wasn't nearby. Peter was in Jerusalem and Paul was further north with Galilee in between them. So if Mariam lived in Galilee, the dynamics between Peter and Paul would have likely been different. Instead, Mariam appears to have been southwest in Egypt and she doesn't appear to have been involved in any of the interactions between Peter and Paul or the development of their relationship. The dynamics of the relationship between Peter and Paul serve 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 was 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 at 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 the 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 and then going to Achaia. Acts 19:1-7 describe Apollos as having been in Corinth when Paul is described as having returned to Ephesus. Acts 19:10 describes that Paul stayed in Ephesus 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 to learn from him. That's quite an unusual description for Paul. There's plenty of evidence that he was very passionate and quite intense about spreading his religion. 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 Ephesus for two years, so it's hard to believe that he was all of a sudden in too much of a hurry to talk to people who wanted to learn from him. The second point is that Paul is described in chapter 18 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 appears to be something wrong with several aspects of this storyline, which shows strong evidence that there were fraudulent alterations made to an already existing story.

Apollos is described as a learned man who knew scripture well and taught about Christ accurately, but then he is also described as having only known "John's baptism" and Aquila and Priscilla are described as having "explained to him the way of God more adequately". That doesn't make sense. If Apollos was a learned man who knew scripture well and taught about Christ accurately, then he would have known a lot

more than just "John's baptism" and he wouldn't have needed Aquila and Priscilla to teach him about Christianity. 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 shows evidence that there is writing in this narrative from multiple authors. The description of Aquila and Priscilla teaching Apollos furthers that conclusion. The reference to only knowing "John's baptism" and the description of being taught by Aquila and Priscilla were 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. So there are obviously two different images of Apollos being represented within this narrative, which shows opposing influences. It was previously shown that there appears to be something wrong with this narrative and therefore that there appears to have been fraudulent alterations made to an already existing story. 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 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.

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 18:27 claims that Apollos wanted to go to Achaia (Corinth was in Achaia) and Acts 19:1 claims that Apollos was in Corinth while Paul was in Ephesus. However, 1 Corinthians 16:12 expresses that Apollos was unwilling to go to Corinth, even when urged by Paul. The contrast between the information in Acts 18:27 and 19:1 and the information in 1 Corinthians 16:12 shows that Apollos doesn't appear to have been in Corinth as Acts describes. An easy objection could be that 1 Corinthians 16:12 could represent a different time-period than chapters 18 and 19 of Acts. A more detailed analysis will show that 1 Corinthians appears to have been written during the time-period represented in chapter 18 of Acts, and therefore that Apollos wasn't in Corinth as Acts describes, which would mean that Apollos' name was apparently used to conceal someone else's identity in relation to meeting Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus and going to Corinth afterwards.

The following verses show that 1 Corinthians appears to have been written during a time-period in which Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla were all together in Ephesus.

1 Corinthians 16:5-9
After I go through Macedonia, I will come to you – for I will be going through Macedonia. Perhaps I will stay with you awhile, or even spend the winter, so that you can help me on my journey, wherever I go. I do not want to see you now and make only a passing visit; I hope to spend some time with you, if the Lord permits. But I will stay on at Ephesus until Pentecost, because a great door for effective work has opened to me, and there are many who oppose me.

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.

Verses 16:5-9 show that Paul was in Ephesus when he wrote 1 Corinthians and that he planned to stay there until Pentecost, then travel through Macedonia, and then travel to Corinth and maybe stay the winter there. Verse 16:19 shows that Aquila and Priscilla were with Paul when he wrote 1 Corinthians. So Paul was in Ephesus with Aquila and Priscilla when he wrote 1 Corinthians and planned to stay there until Pentecost, which is in the spring-time, then travel through Macedonia, which is traveling west from Ephesus, then travel to Corinth and maybe stay the winter there.

The following verses show a very similar sequence as the travel plan described in 1 Corinthians 16:5-9.

Acts 20:1-3
When the uproar had ended, Paul sent for the disciples and, after encouraging them, said good-bye and set out for Macedonia. He traveled through that area, speaking many words of encouragement to the people, and finally arrived in Greece, where he stayed three months. Because the Jews made a plot against him just as he was about to sail for Syria, he decided to go back through Macedonia.

Acts 20:6
But we sailed from Philippi after the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and five days later joined the others at Troas, where we stayed seven days.

At the onset of chapter 20 of Acts, Paul was in Ephesus. Acts 20:1-3 describe Paul going through Macedonia and arriving in Greece (Corinth was in Greece), and staying in Greece for three months. Acts 20:6 describes Paul sailing from Philippi after "the Feast of Unleavened Bread". The three months that Paul stayed in Greece appear to have occurred relatively shortly before "the Feast of Unleavened Bread", which would have occurred around the beginning of spring. So Paul stayed in Greece for three months leading up to spring, which would place those three months mostly if not entirely in winter. So chapter 20 begins in Ephesus, then Paul traveled through Macedonia, and then he stayed in Greece (where Corinth was) for three months that were mostly if not entirely in winter. That mirrors the travel plan described in 1 Corinthians 16:5-9 in terms of leaving Ephesus, traveling through Macedonia, and staying in Corinth for the winter.

There have been two main conclusions reached so far about 1 Corinthians. One is that 1 Corinthians appears to have been written during a time-period in which Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla were all together in Ephesus, which is a time-period represented in chapter 18 of Acts. The second is that 1 Corinthians describes a travel plan that appears to mirror the travels described at the beginning of chapter 20 of Acts.

One objection could be related to Acts 19:10 claiming that Paul was in Ephesus for two years.

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.

This verse in chapter 19 of Acts claims that two years passed after the time-period covered in chapter 18 and before the time-period covered in chapter 20, so chapter 19 basically portrays a two-year time-period.

If the writing of 1 Corinthians took place in the time-period covered in chapter 18 and the travels described in chapter 20 represent the travel plan described in 1 Corinthians, then the time-period spanning from a certain point in chapter 18 to the beginning of chapter 20 would have been less than a year or up to a year (from a certain point in spring through winter). That conclusion contradicts Acts 19:10, so one could make the objection that Acts 19:10 allows for the possibility that 1 Corinthians was written during the time-period covered in chapter 19.

First, Aquila and Priscilla are never mentioned again through the rest of Acts after chapter 18. That doesn't necessarily mean that they couldn't have been with Paul at some point in the time-period covered in chapter 19. However, Acts identifies a lot people who traveled or met with Paul, so the absence of Aquila and Priscilla in chapter 19 shows strong evidence that they were not with Paul during that time-period. Furthermore, a lot of attention is specifically placed on Aquila and Priscilla in chapter 18, so it would be strange to not name them at all after that if they were with Paul in the time-period covered in chapter 19. So while it's not impossible that they could have been with Paul at some point in the time-period covered in chapter 19, it appears most likely that chapter 18 is the last chapter that represents their presence with Paul given that it is the last chapter that names them and Acts frequently names the people who were with Paul, including putting a lot of attention on Aquila and Priscilla in chapter 18.

Second, there's a pattern in Acts of describing a time-period of two years.

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.

Acts 28:30
For two whole years Paul stayed there in his own rented house and welcomed all who came to see him.

We'll go into more specific details about Acts 28:30 and how it was fraudulently used to conceal information about Paul's time in Rome. What we can see right away is that it's unrealistic that Paul would have been kept in prison for four years as described in these verses. Both Acts 24:27 and 28:30 describe Paul being imprisoned for two years. Both verses are a part of the same judicial case. Paul was arrested in Jerusalem, supposedly held for two years, transferred to Rome, and supposedly held for two more years there. Paul was a Roman citizen and the Roman government is not described as charging Paul with a crime against a Roman law. A Roman citizen wouldn't have been held for four years without a conviction when that Roman citizen didn't break any Roman law. The verses below show support for that conclusion.

Acts 16:38-39
The officers reported this to the magistrates, and when they heard that Paul and Silas were Roman citizens, they were alarmed. They came to appease them and escorted them from the prison, requesting them to leave the city.

The point being made here is that a Roman citizen wouldn't have been imprisoned for four years without breaking any Roman law. So both Acts 24:27 and 28:30 obviously appear to be fraudulent. Therefore, just from those two examples, there's a pattern of fraudulently describing a time-period of two years, which shows further evidence that Acts 19:10 is fraudulent. More specifically, there appears to have been large

amounts of information about Paul taken out of Acts. We saw in Part 5 that there was a lot of fraudulent information produced about Paul and that there was information concealed about him. We will go into more details about Acts 28:30 and Paul's time in Rome. For now, we can already see that the descriptions of two-year time-periods appear to be fraudulent attempts to cover up large amounts of time.

In conclusion, Acts 19:10 appears to be fraudulent and evidence shows that the time-period from a certain point in chapter 18 of Acts to the beginning of chapter 20 appears to be less than a year or up to a year.

There are other parts of chapter 19 of Acts that appear to be fraudulent as well.

Acts 19:21-22
After all this had happened, Paul decided to go to Jerusalem passing through Macedonia and Achaia. "After I have been there", he said, "I must visit Rome also." He sent two of his helpers, Timothy and Erastus, to Macedonia, while he stayed in the province of Asia a little longer.

First, Acts 19:21-22 suddenly present travel plans for Paul, which seem out of place as if someone inserted that information for a specific purpose other than just telling a story. Acts 19:21-22 are out of context given the storyline in chapter 19. Chapter 19 as a whole represents Paul's time in Ephesus and never describes Paul going elsewhere. Verses 2-20 of chapter 19 cover Paul in Ephesus, and then verses 19:21-22 make an abrupt pivot to a travel plan and unnecessarily state that Paul stayed in "the province of Asia" (where Ephesus was) when chapter 19 as a whole already represents Paul's time in Ephesus and never describes him going elsewhere, and then verse 19:23 picks back up with Paul's time in Ephesus and that's what the rest of chapter 19 is about. So there appears to be an abrupt pivot to a travel plan before resuming the previously established theme of Paul's time in Ephesus. Second, Acts 19:21-22 show the only instance in Acts that describes Paul making plans to go somewhere without him immediately leaving to go there. The purpose of Acts is to describe what was happening, not what anybody's plans were. For example, Acts 16:9-10 describe the idea to go to Macedonia and then the very next verse describes them leaving and the verse after that describes them being in Macedonia, which shows that Acts was not really designed to discuss future plans but rather what was happening at that time. So abruptly describing a travel plan in Acts 19:21-22 is out of place for Acts and it only happens in Acts 19:21-22. Third, Acts 19:21-22 show the only instance in Acts that describes Paul sending someone somewhere. Paul's letters describe that plenty, but Acts only does it once. So the description of sending Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia is also out of place for Acts. Fourth, the text expresses that Paul planned to pass through Macedonia and Achaia to get to Jerusalem. However, Paul is described as being in Ephesus, so it wouldn't make sense to discuss passing through Macedonia and Achaia to get to Jerusalem. Instead, Paul wouldn't just pass through Macedonia and Achaia to get to Jerusalem but rather would stay there for an extended visit like how chapter 20 of Acts describes Paul staying in Greece for three months. Furthermore, 1 Corinthians expresses that Paul didn't want to make a passing visit and wanted to stay in Corinth for an extended duration. In addition to that, Paul would travel to more places than just Macedonia and Achaia if he was starting from Ephesus, traveling west through Macedonia, traveling to Achaia, and then traveling back east all of the way to Jerusalem. For example, beginning in chapter 20 of Acts after the description of going to Macedonia and Greece and going to chapter 21, which is the chapter that describes Paul going to Jerusalem, Paul is described as traveling to 14 places: Philippi, Troas, Assos, Mitylene, Kios, Samos, Miletus, Cos, Rhodes, Patara, Phoenicia, Cyprus, Syria, Tyre, Ptolemais, and Caesarea, all of which were not in Macedonia or Greece. So specifically calling out Macedonia and

Achaia but no other place and claiming to just pass through on the way to Jerusalem is out of place and appears fraudulent. In conclusion, these four points show that Acts 19-21:22 appear to be fraudulent.

What appears to be happening is that information in Acts 19:21-22 was taken from 1 Corinthians. 1 Corinthians describes a travel plan of passing through Macedonia to get to Corinth. So it appears that Acts 19:21-22 are supposed to represent a time-period in which 1 Corinthians was written. However, we've already seen that 1 Corinthians appears to have been written during the time-period covered in chapter 18. So Acts 19:21-22 appear to serve the purpose of fraudulently portraying 1 Corinthians as having been written during the two years described in Acts 19:10. The combination of Acts 19:10 and 19:21-22 presents 1 Corinthians as supposedly having been written after Apollos supposedly went to Corinth. It was shown earlier that 1 Corinthians 16:12 shows that Apollos wouldn't go to Corinth. Someone trying to conceal someone's identity in chapter 18 of Acts and replacing their name with Apollos' name would have faced a problem with 1 Corinthians 16:12. In addition to that, as we will get into more detail on shortly, there was also motivation to fraudulently portray the writing of 2 Corinthians as having happened after chapter 18 of Acts as well, and doing that with 1 Corinthians effectively does that for 2 Corinthians as well since 2 Corinthians appears to have been written after 1 Corinthians. So in response to all of that, it appears that someone used Acts 19:10 and 19:21-22 to fraudulently portray 1 Corinthians as having been written after Apollos' supposed visit to Corinth.

The following verses further that conclusion.

1 Corinthians 4:17
For this reason I am sending to you Timothy, my son whom I love, who is faithful in the Lord. He will remind you of my way of life in Christ Jesus, which agrees with what I teach everywhere in every church.

1 Corinthians 16:10
If Timothy comes, see to it that he has nothing to fear while he is with you, for he is carrying on the work of the Lord, just as I am.

1 Corinthians 4:17 describes that Paul was sending Timothy to Corinth but verse 16:10 indicates that Timothy was not the deliverer of the letter by stating "if Timothy comes", which indicates that the letter was expected to reach Corinth before Timothy was. Someone else was delivering the letter and Timothy was being sent on a journey that wasn't directly to Corinth but was expected to eventually end up in Corinth before traveling back to Paul. Acts 19:21-22 describe Timothy being sent to Macedonia, which represents Timothy heading west towards Corinth and following the same path Paul planned to take to Corinth but also represents Timothy first going elsewhere. So Acts 19:21-22 can be matched to 1 Corinthians 4:17 and 16:10. That shows further evidence that Acts 19:21-22 are supposed to fraudulently represent a time-period that was around the writing of 1 Corinthians.

More evidence can be seen when we examine the overall fraudulent nature of chapter 19 of Acts. More fraudulent verses in chapter 19 of Acts can be seen right after the description of Apollos in Corinth as shown by the following verses.

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 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.

First off, it was shown in Part 3 that John the Baptist doesn't appear to have prepared the way for the Messiah in the way that the Bible describes. Second, it was also shown in Part 3 that the baptisms performed by John the Baptist don't appear to have been for repentance for the forgiveness of sins. Third, John the Baptist probably wasn't in Ephesus. Fourth, the phrase "John's baptism" is language used in chapter 1 of Acts rather than language Paul would likely have used. That appears to have been language used by Peter's group. Fifth, the description of people prophesying and speaking in different tongues are ideas from chapter 1 of Acts and are more likely to have come from Peter's group. Sixth, the description of twelve men being present is also similar to the ideology of Peter's group. Seventh, Paul never mentioned John the Baptist in any of his letters in the New Testament, so John the Baptist doesn't appear to have been someone who Paul really connected to Christianity. Again, that appears to have come from Peter's group. Eighth, the verses below clearly show that Paul did not usually practice baptism rituals.

1 Corinthians 1:13-17
Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Were you baptized into the name of Paul? I am thankful that I did not baptize any of you except Crispus and Gaius, so no one can say that you were baptized into my name. Yes, I also baptized the household of Stephanas; beyond that, I don't remember if I baptized anyone else. For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel – not with words of human wisdom, lest the cross of Christ be emptied of its power.

These verses clearly show that Paul did not regularly practice baptism rituals, express that he's relieved that he didn't baptize more people than he did, and state that he was not sent to baptize. This shows even further that the verses in chapter 19 of Acts about Paul in Ephesus talking about baptisms are fraudulent.

So far, evidence has been shown that verses 1-7, 10, and 21-22 of chapter 19 of Acts are fraudulent. Therefore, the probable scenario is that the first 22 verses of chapter 19 are all fraudulent. The rest of chapter 19 may be fraudulent as well, or maybe some of it is true. Regardless of exactly how much of chapter 19 is fraudulent, the simple observation that there is a large portion of fraud in chapter 19 at least shows further evidence that the first verse of chapter 19 is fraudulent, and that's the conclusion that really matters. It matters specifically that Acts 19:1 is fraudulent because that verse describes Apollos in Corinth.

Plenty of evidence has been presented that shows that large portions of chapter 19 of Acts are fraudulent. It has also been shown that there appears to be fraud revolving around the use of Apollos' name, which shows that chapter 18 of Acts appears to have been fraudulently altered. It was explained earlier that it's very strange that Paul was described as leaving Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus, and that it's also strange that Paul is described as going to so many places in between two different supposed trips to Ephesus without much description of what was happening. Given all of the other fraud that has been discovered in chapters 18 and 19 of Acts, we can see that the oddities revolving around Paul leaving Aquila and

Priscilla in Ephesus appear to be indications of fraudulent alterations. It has already been shown that information related to 1 Corinthians appears to have been fraudulently presented in Acts to separate 1 Corinthians from the descriptions of Apollos going to Corinth. Along with that, it appears that chapter 18 was fraudulently altered to separate Paul from Aquila and Priscilla being in Ephesus while inserting Apollos' name to conceal someone's identity. This also appears to separate 1 Corinthians from chapter 18 of Acts because 1 Corinthians describes Aquila and Priscilla as having been with Paul when he wrote 1 Corinthians.

In conclusion, a lot of chapters 18 and 19 of Acts is fraudulent, but that fraud appears to center around information related to someone interacting with Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla in Ephesus. So there is important truth to pull away from all of the fraudulent alterations. Someone's identity is being concealed and 1 Corinthians is being separated from chapter 18 of Acts to support that effort.

Further evidence that Apollos' name is being used to conceal someone's identity can be seen by the fact that 1 Corinthians mentions Apollos, Aquila, and Priscilla thereby showing that Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla all knew Apollos by the time that 1 Corinthians was written; and since 1 Corinthians appears to have been written during the time-period covered in chapter 18 of Acts and during a time-period when Paul was with Aquila and Priscilla, it doesn't make sense that chapter 18 of Acts describes Aquila and Priscilla as having met Apollos without Paul. During the time-period covered in chapter 18 of Acts, it appears that Paul was with Aquila and Priscilla and they all already knew Apollos.

As we turn to 2 Corinthians, we can see that the letter appears to have been written before the time-period covered in chapter 20 of Acts according to the following verses.

2 Corinthians 2:12-13
Now when I went to Troas to preach the gospel of Christ and found that the Lord had opened a door for me, I still had no peace of mind, because I did not find my brother Titus there. So I said good-bye to them and went to Macedonia.

Chapter 20 of Acts describes Paul traveling west to Macedonia, going to Greece, then traveling east back through Macedonia, then arriving at Troas, then going to other places that were east of Macedonia, and then going to Jerusalem. After that, Paul was arrested and eventually taken to Rome and then Acts ends. That sequence in chapter 20 shows Paul traveling east from Macedonia to Troas, which is the last time Acts describes Paul in Troas. In contrast, 2 Corinthians 2:12-13 describe Paul traveling west from Troas to Macedonia, so that appears to have been a different trip to Troas and Macedonia and therefore appears to have occurred before the time-period described in chapter 20 of Acts. It appears that trip occurred in the time-period covered in chapter 16 of Acts. Acts 16:10 describes a plan to go to Macedonia and Acts 16:11 describes that they were in Troas, so those two verses combine to show that they were going from Troas to Macedonia. Therefore, 2 Corinthians 2:12-13 appear to refer to a trip described in chapter 16 of Acts, which supports the conclusions that 1 Corinthians was written in the time-period covered in chapter 18 of Acts and that 2 Corinthians was written before the time-period covered in chapter 20 of Acts. Since most if not all of chapter 19 of Acts appears to be fraudulent, that would mean that 2 Corinthians appears to have been written during the time-period covered in chapter 18 of Acts. Therefore, both 1 Corinthians as well as 2 Corinthians appear to have been written during the time-period covered in chapter 18 of Acts.

There's some confusing verses in 2 Corinthians that need to be sorted out in terms of Paul's travels and visits to Corinth.

2 Corinthians 1:15-16
Because I was confident of this, I planned to visit you first so that you might benefit twice. I planned to visit you on my way to Macedonia and to come back to you from Macedonia, and then to have you send me on my way to Judea.

2 Corinthians 1:23-24
I call God as my witness that it was in order to spare you that I did not return to Corinth. Not that we lord it over your faith, but we work with you for your joy, because it is by faith you stand firm.

2 Corinthians 2:1
So I made up my mind that I would not make another painful visit to you.

First off, these verses propose that Paul had planned to visit Corinth on his way to Macedonia. Corinth was the main place Paul visited on that side of Macedonia so Paul would have likely already visited Corinth if he was already on that side of Macedonia. Therefore, it wouldn't have been likely that he would have visited Corinth on his way to Macedonia. Instead, the opposite is the likely scenario and the kind of travels that are described in Acts. He would have likely visited Corinth after passing through Macedonia. So this idea about visiting Corinth on the way to Macedonia is the opposite of how Paul traveled to Corinth. For example, chapter 20 of Acts describes Paul passing through Macedonia to get to Greece (Corinth was in Greece) and then traveling back through Macedonia on the way to Jerusalem, which shows how Macedonia was the passthrough to Corinth rather than Corinth being the passthrough to Macedonia. Secondly, this travel plan claims that Paul would visit Corinth twice in this time-period, once on his way to Macedonia and again on his way back. So for 2 Corinthians to be correct about all of this, Paul couldn't have been in Corinth, Macedonia, or anywhere on the east side of Macedonia and he was planning to then visit Corinth, then Macedonia, and then back to Corinth. While that's certainly possible, it's quite unlikely. Acts only describes one trip to Greece after chapter 18, describes Paul coming from Macedonia beforehand, describes Paul going back through Macedonia afterward, and then describes Paul traveling to many places on the east side of Macedonia before going to Jerusalem. That is representative of a realistic traveling schedule for Paul. He would realistically have come from Macedonia on his way to Corinth and then return to Macedonia as he travels elsewhere rather than traveling from Corinth on his way to Macedonia and then returning to Corinth afterward. Corinth would be more of an end point that he would return from rather than a beginning point that he would return to. So Macedonia would realistically get visited twice while Corinth would likely get visited only once on a trip to Corinth rather than Corinth being visited twice while Macedonia only gets visited once. That shows further that 2 Corinthians describes the opposite of what would have realistically happened: two trips to Corinth and one trip to Macedonia rather than two trips to Macedonia and one trip to Corinth.

Additionally, the description of planning to go to Judea after Corinth shows further evidence that these verses are fraudulent. It says at the end of 2 Corinthians 1:15-16 "then to have you send me on my way to Judea". There is only one description in Acts of Paul going to Jerusalem after the initial visit to Corinth described in chapter 18, which occurs in chapter 21. Chapter 21 describes Paul going to Jerusalem and then Acts goes on to describe Paul being arrested, being a prisoner, and being transported to Rome. So any plan that Paul had to go to Jerusalem after visiting Corinth appears to have been associated with his

travels described in chapters 20-21 of Acts. In contrast, 2 Corinthians 1:15-16 claim that Paul missed a trip to Corinth that he planned to take on the way to Judea, and the letter later states multiple times that Paul had plans to visit Corinth again. So the supposed missed trip isn't a reference to the trip described in chapter 20 of Acts. Since 2 Corinthians clearly states that Paul planned to go to Corinth again, that plan appears to refer to the trip described in chapter 20 of Acts. Therefore, the information in 2 Corinthians 1:15-16 represents a time-period that occurred before the one represented in chapter 20 of Acts. So 2 Corinthians 1:15-16 claim that Paul had plans to take two trips to Corinth that were both supposed to occur in a time-period that was after the time-period covered in chapter 18 of Acts and before the time-period covered in chapter 20 of Acts, and that the first of those two trips happened and the second one didn't. For 2 Corinthians 1:15-16 to be accurate, there would had to have been another trip to Corinth and another trip to Jerusalem that occurred after the time-period covered in chapter 18 of Acts and before the time-period covered in chapter 20 of Acts. Paul appears to have been in Ephesus during that time-period and doesn't appear to have gone to Corinth or Jerusalem during that time-period. The next time Paul went to Corinth appears to be described in chapter 20 of Acts and the next time Paul went to Jerusalem appears to be described in chapter 21 of Acts. So the first conclusion is that these verses from 2 Corinthians about this supposed plan about two trips to Corinth before going to Judea appear to be fraudulent. The second conclusion is that Acts 19:21 appears to be the reason why those verses describe that supposed plan.

Acts 19:21
After all this had happened, Paul decided to go to Jerusalem passing through Macedonia and Achaia. "After I have been there", he said, "I must visit Rome also."

Acts 19:21 is portrayed as representing travel plans that were decided upon during a time-period when Paul was in Ephesus. Acts 19:21 doesn't represent an actual trip, it only represents plans. Those plans then materialize beginning in chapter 20. However, if one were to mistakenly interpret Acts 19:21 as representing an actual trip, then they could easily believe that there was another trip to Corinth and another trip to Jerusalem. If that was the case, then it would appear that there were at least two different authors involved in the fraudulent alterations that span Acts, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians because then the author who wrote the verses previously shown from 2 Corinthians would be different than the author of Acts 19:21. Although, regardless of whether Acts 19:21 played a part in the descriptions of these supposed extra trips, the point is that the information in 2 Corinthians about another trip to Corinth and a missed trip to Corinth appear to be fraudulent.

The verses below show the plan to visit Corinth that appears to be associated with chapter 20 of Acts. Both of these verses appear to fraudulently describe that trip as the third trip to Corinth, which goes along with what appears to be a misunderstanding that there was an extra trip to Corinth other than the two described in chapters 18 and 20 of Acts.

2 Corinthians 12:14
Now I am ready to visit you for the third time, and I will not be a burden to you, because what I want is not your possessions but you. After all, children should not have to save up for their parents, but parents for their children.

2 Corinthians 13:1
This will be my third visit to you. "Every matter must be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses."

Along with that, some people believe that 1 Corinthians refers to two different travel plans to go to Corinth.

1 Corinthians 4:18-19
Some of you have become arrogant, as if I were not coming to you. But I will come to you very soon, if the Lord is willing, and then I will find out not only how these arrogant people are talking, but what power they have.

The idea of Paul traveling to Corinth is presented in 1 Corinthians 4:18-19 while there's a travel plan described at the end of the letter. However, these two instances don't appear to be separate from each other. Verses 4:18-19 are simply generally referring to how Paul plans to visit them and then he went into specific details at the end of the letter. Additionally, since Paul appears to have spent that winter with them and he was previously in Ephesus, it doesn't appear that he made another trip to Corinth before the trip that led to him staying there that winter.

Additionally, aside from this supposed extra trip described in 2 Corinthians, the other important piece of information from the verses just previously shown from chapters 1 and 2 from 2 Corinthians is that the claim is made that Paul missed a trip to Corinth. 2 Corinthians 1:15-16 claim that Paul was going to visit Corinth twice, once before he went to Macedonia and once afterward. 2 Corinthians 1:23-24 and 2:1 clearly describe that Paul supposedly did not return to Corinth for the second supposed planned trip. So all of those verses combined claim that Paul planned two trips to Corinth, that he made the first trip, and that he missed the second trip. It was explained earlier that in reality there appears to have been only one planned trip described in 1 Corinthians and that it's the trip described in chapter 20 of Acts. The claim that there was another trip before that appears to have been erroneously concluded, but it doesn't matter so much what's going on with that. What's important here is what was done with the actual travel plan. It appears that Paul carried out the travel plan described in 1 Corinthians, and it also appears that chapter 20 of Acts mirrors that travel plan. In 2 Corinthians, however, it appears that the claim is being made that Paul missed that trip, which would then portray the trip described in chapter 20 of Acts as a later trip, at least one year after the actual trip. Paul appears to have actually gone to Corinth later in the year in which he wrote 1 Corinthians and stayed the winter there. To claim that Paul missed that trip combined with chapter 20 of Acts describing a visit that presumably occurred during the winter would be to portray that visit as happening at least one year after the actual winter in which Paul stayed in Corinth. The motivation for portraying that trip to Corinth as having happened at least one year later appears to be related to the two years described in Acts 19:10. It was shown earlier that Acts 19:10 appears to fraudulently describe two years as having passed in Ephesus to separate Apollos' supposed trip to Corinth and the writing of 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians, which then portrays 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians as having been written in the time-period covered in chapter 19 of Acts (or the beginning of chapter 20 in the case of 2 Corinthians) rather than the time-period covered in chapter 18. 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians are being portrayed as having been written in the time-period covered in chapters 19-20 and chapter 19 is portrayed as having covered two years. So to account for the two years in chapter 19, the travels described in chapter 20 are portrayed as having happened a year later than they really did.

Paul appears to have gone to Corinth, met Aquila and Priscilla there, traveled with both of them to Ephesus, and then wrote both 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians while in Ephesus, and Aquila and Priscila appear to have still been in Ephesus with Paul. All of that appears to have occurred in the time-period

covered in chapter 18 of Acts. Most if not all of chapter 19 of Acts appears to be fraudulent. Then Paul appears to have left Ephesus, traveled through Macedonia, and then went to Corinth and stayed the winter there. That sequence appears to have occurred during the time-period covered in the beginning of chapter 20 of Acts and that sequence is in accordance with the travel plan described at the end of 1 Corinthians. Meanwhile, it appears that less than a year or up to a year passed from the writing of 1 Corinthians to Paul's visit to Corinth described in chapter 20 of Acts.

Fraudulent alterations appear to have been made to Acts and 2 Corinthians to present Paul as having left Aquila and Priscila in Ephesus, to conceal someone's identity in chapter 18 of Acts and present Apollos as having met Aquila and Priscilla without Paul and then going to Corinth, to present 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians as having been written after Apollos supposedly went to Corinth, to present an extra trip to Corinth in 2 Corinthians because someone misinterpreted information in Acts and/or 1 Corinthians, and to present the travels described in chapter 20 of Acts as having happened at least one year after they really did to account for the two-year time-period fraudulently portrayed in chapter 19 of Acts.

Why was all of this done? Whose identity is being concealed?

It's already been established that Apollos' name was used in Acts to conceal someone's identity in relation to meeting Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla in Ephesus and that person traveling to Corinth afterwards. The verses below give specific insight into who this person is.

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"; "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 jealously 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.

First, Apollos appears to have been a part of Paul's group. More specifically, Paul writes on Apollos' behalf related to his unwillingness to go to Corinth. Paul expressed that he tried to convince Apollos to go to Corinth, that Apollos was unwilling to go, and that Apollos would go when he's ready. That clearly shows that Paul and Apollos were in the same group and that a Christian community would not follow Apollos instead of Paul or vice versa. The mere fact that Paul wrote on behalf of Apollos shows that Apollos wouldn't have a separate group of followers from Paul. So the references to Apollos in these verses in 1 Corinthians show clear evidence that Apollos' name was used to conceal someone else's identity and that the person who was originally named by Paul was someone who was separate from Peter and Paul. Furthermore, the identity of a man would not likely have gone concealed here as clearly evidenced by the naming of Peter and Paul as well as the general risk being that information was typically concealed about women rather than men, so the person whose identity was concealed appears to have been a woman.

Second, the description of supposed division between Paul and Apollos combined with Paul writing on behalf of Apollos shows evidence of multiples authors. The information about division related to Apollos simply doesn't match up with Paul writing on behalf of Apollos. The contradiction presented between these two sets of information shows evidence that two different authors wrote each, and therefore that Apollos' name was used to conceal someone's identity related to division with Peter and Paul.

Third, these verses outline that not only was there division between Paul and someone identified as "Apollos", but also verses 1:11-12 specifically outline three main categories of division, which include both Peter and Paul as well as someone who appears to have been a woman. So the three main classifications of division appear to have been Peter, Paul, and a woman whose identity has been concealed. Obviously, we can already conclude that the woman is Mariam, but a specific analysis of the division that existed back then will show even more specific evidence. Mariam was the top disciple of Christ, Peter specifically placed himself in opposition to Mariam, there was division within "the eleven", and there was Paul. From Paul's perspective, "the eleven" would have been seen as connected to Peter. So there was Mariam, Peter's group, and Paul. That would have been the three main classifications of division from Paul's perspective. Therefore, in a list that classifies three main categories of division that include Peter and Paul and the other person's identity is concealed, even if men are considered possibilities, the person whose identity is concealed would by far most likely be Mariam.

The conclusion that Paul originally named Mariam in 1 Corinthians shows specific evidence that Apollos' name was used to conceal Mariam's identity. That conclusion combined with the conclusions previously reached that Apollos' name was used to conceal someone's identity in Acts and that Acts, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians were all fraudulently altered as a part of the same coordinated effort shows clear evidence that Apollos' name was used to conceal Mariam's identity in Acts in relation to meeting Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla in Ephesus and traveling to Corinth afterwards.

As discussed in Part 2, there are references to unnamed people in 2 Corinthians. Paul refers to a "brother" who received praise in the gospel through all of the churches and who was planning to go to Corinth. Mariam is the only person who would have likely received praise in the gospel through all of the churches who would have gone unnamed, especially since this person appears to have been a woman because a man would have likely not gone unnamed. Generally speaking, a man would not likely have gone unnamed. More specifically, Titus is named just before the unnamed person is mentioned, and Paul, Timothy, and Silas are named elsewhere in the letter. So there's no shortage of men being named in this letter, and Titus was named right before the unnamed person is mentioned. So the unnamed person is obviously probably a woman, and more specifically probably Mariam since the claim was made that this person received praise in the gospel through all of the churches.

There wouldn't likely be a woman who is praised in the gospel through all of the churches who wasn't named at all in the Gospels. It would be quite unrealistic for all women named in the Gospels to take a backseat while a woman who isn't named at all in any Gospel ends being someone who was praised in the Gospel through all of the churches. Of all the women mentioned in the Gospels, only two women are mentioned in all four Gospels, and all other women with maybe the exception of Salome are mentioned in only one Gospel. If Salome is Mother Mariam's sister, then Salome is mentioned in two Gospels. So there might be one woman besides Mariam and Mother Mariam who is mentioned in two Gospels, but otherwise all other women are only mentioned in one Gospel. Even if Salome is Mother Mariam's sister,

Salome still wouldn't likely be the one woman who was praised in the gospel through all of the churches because Mariam and Mother Mariam would likely receive praise before Salome. If Salome isn't Mother Mariam's sister, then she appears to only be mentioned in the Gospel of Mark. It's unlikely that someone who is only in one Gospel would be considered someone who is praised in the gospel through all of the churches because they're not even mentioned at all in 75% of the Gospels. A woman who is praised in the gospel through all of the churches would likely be named in all four Gospels. So that leaves us with Mariam and Mother Mariam. Between the two of them, Mariam is more likely to be recognized for her discipleship simply because she appears to have been of a younger generation and Mother Mariam appears to have been of an older generation. Someone from a younger generation is more likely to spread a religion. So just from that, we can conclude that Mariam is being referred to in 2 Corinthians 8:18. Additionally, Mariam was the top disciple of Christ, so she would be given that title before any other woman and nobody else is a realistic candidate.

The following verse shows that Mariam appears 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 in Acts 18:27 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. The reason why Apollos' name isn't used in 2 Corinthians is probably because the unnamed person is described as being praised in the gospel through all the churches and because describing Apollos as going to Corinth would connect that to the description of Apollos going to Corinth in Acts and that would contradict the fraudulent timeline created that places 1 Corinthians after that time-period. It was shown earlier that 1 Corinthians is portrayed as having been written during the time-period covered in chapter 19 of Acts, even though it appears to have been written in the time-period covered in chapter 18 of Acts. That would be contradicted by 2 Corinthians being connected to chapter 18 of Acts. So while Apollos' name is used multiple times to conceal Mariam's identity elsewhere, an unnamed "brother" is used in 2 Corinthians.

As we will go into more detail on later, Paul appears to have shifted his stance over time and he appears 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. This evolution in Paul's thinking is further supported by the contrast shown between the following verses.

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.

Romans 16:3
Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my fellow workers in Christ Jesus.

1 Corinthians 16:19, which was probably written before Paul met Mariam, names Aquila before Priscilla. In contrast to that, Romans 16:3, which was apparently written after Paul met Mariam, names Priscilla

before Aquila. That might seem like a minor difference. However, as we saw with James son of Mother Mariam being named before Peter in Paul's letter to the Galatians and John being named before his brother in Luke and Acts, the ordering of names is significant and realistically intentional. In the case of John being named before his brother in Luke and Acts, the default position would have been to name James son of Zebedee before John based on how the order of their names appears in Mark and Matthew. So for John to be named before his brother is a departure from the default position. Likewise, naming a husband before their wife was typically the default position in the first century. A man in the first century would have obviously typically named a husband before their wife as is the case in 1 Corinthians 16:19. So for there to have been a switch, there must have been some reason for that switch. It appears that in between the writing of 1 Corinthians and Romans, Paul met Mariam and described her in 2 Corinthians as someone who was praised in the gospel through all of the churches. So it appears that Paul named Aquila before Priscilla when writing 1 Corinthians, then met Mariam, then described Mariam as someone who was praised in the gospel through all of the churches when writing 2 Corinthians, and then named Priscilla before Aquila when writing Romans. His default position was to name the husband before the wife. But after meeting Mariam, he departed from his default position and was open to naming the wife before the husband. It is likely that such a change is reflective of Priscilla's work as a Christian disciple, which she may have exceeded her husband in considering true Christianity appears to have been widely spread among women by Mariam. But even if Priscilla didn't exceed Aquila, Paul meeting Mariam and gaining a better understanding of equality between men and women would provide a reasonable explanation as to why Paul would depart from his default position and name Priscilla before Aquila.

We can see that Acts makes the same kind of change, although we will also see that it's for a different reason.

Acts 18:1-2
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.

Acts 18:11
So Paul stayed for a year and a half, teaching them the word of God.

Acts 18:18
Paul stayed on in Corinth for some time. Then he left the brothers and sailed for Syria, accompanied by Priscilla and Aquila. Before he sailed, he had his hair cut off at Cenchrea because of a vow he had taken.

It was said before that a person's departure from their default position would have been caused by some reason. We see the same kind of departure in Acts in that Aquila is first named before Priscilla in Acts 18:2 but then Priscilla is named before Aquila in Acts 18:18. While Paul appears to have shifted his position after meeting Mariam, the shift in Acts appears to be for a different reason. Evidence has already been shown that chapters 18 and 19 of Acts appear to have been fraudulently altered. Additionally, Acts 18:11 says "Paul stayed for a year and a half" in Corinth and Acts 18:18 says "Paul stayed on in Corinth for some time". It seems unnecessary to reference an amount of time that Paul stayed in Corinth after it had already been done and it seems like a step backwards to make a general reference like "some time" after the previous specific description of "a year and a half". That point shows further evidence that there was another author who fraudulently altered the text, which strongly supports the conclusion that

Apollos' name, which first shows up shortly afterward in verse 24, was used to conceal information about Mariam.

The likely reason why someone would place Priscilla before Aquila in Acts is the placement of Priscilla before Aquila in Romans. Romans has been a very popular letter since the first century. It's the very first letter shown by Paul in the Bible and it comes right after Acts. With the default position in society back then having been to name a husband before a wife and the only apparent reason for departing from that in Acts is that the same kind of departure occurs in Romans, it appears that Romans influenced the author who named Priscilla before Aquila in Acts. That strongly suggests that the author was in or around Rome, much like the author of the First Epistle of Clement and the author of Hebrews appear to have been as we will get into more detail on. The First Epistle of Clement claims that the author was in Rome and the book of Hebrews claims that the author was in Italy. Likewise, the placement of Priscilla before Aquila in Acts appears to have come from someone in or around Rome who new Paul's letter to the Romans. Furthermore, given that Priscilla was named before Aquila in Paul's letter to the Romans, she may have been a strong Christian leader in Rome and may have even been known by the person who fraudulently altered Acts and placed her name before Aquila's.

As mentioned before, Paul appears to have shifted his stance over time and he appears 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. This meeting in Ephesus may have been the beginning of that or at least a part of Paul's evolution. 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.

Now that it has been established that Apollos' name appears to represent information related to Mariam in the ways that have been examined, 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 the 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 was apparently called "the Magdalene" or a similar name that represented where she was from. Since someone was apparently 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 just 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 city of Egypt during the first century. For someone to have gone 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 appears that Mariam was 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 Egypt, the story that we have today describes Apollos as having been from Egypt. That's similar to the changes that appear to have been made with descriptions of "Apollos" having both superior and inferior knowledge. The original story probably described Mariam being from Egypt and having superior knowledge, and the story we have today describes Apollos being from Egypt and having both superior and inferior knowledge. In conclusion, since Apollos' name appears to have been used to conceal information about Mariam, the description of Apollos being 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 appears very improbable that Mariam was from Galilee. Instead, there is enough evidence to be very confident that Mariam was from Egypt rather than Galilee. Additionally, Mariam likely spread Christianity in Alexandria and likely lived there at some point after the Resurrection.

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 10 of them are women: Phoebe, Priscilla, Mary, Junias, 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 is apparently 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 described 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 apparently 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 apparently 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 named before "Mary". After "Mary", Andronicus and Junias are named and are described as relatives of Paul's who had been in prison with him. They obviously appear to have had a very close relationship with Paul and they are mentioned 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 said about Priscilla, Aquila, Epenetus, Andronicus, and Junias contrasted with the simplicity of what Paul said 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 appear to be 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. For the only person who Paul called out as having worked hard for Christians in Rome, for that person to have been a woman, and for that person to have shared the same name as the top disciple of Christ, it appears probable that Mariam is being referred to in Romans 16:6. Of course, "Mariam" was a popular name back then within the Jewish population. However, the name "Mariam" appears to have been a lot less common in Rome than it was in Judea and Galilee. The widespread popularity of the names "Mariam", "Maria", and "Mary" came from the rise in popularity of Christianity. So back in the first century, the name "Mariam" was mostly popular just within the Jewish population. There was a Jewish population in Rome, and Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla all appear to have had a Jewish background. Mariam likely had a Jewish background before following Christ given that her name was popular within the Jewish population. For her to have the name "Mariam" probably indicates that she came from a Jewish background before following Christ. However, based on the names in Paul's list of greetings as well as his practice to teach to gentiles, there appears to have been several gentiles among the list of people who Paul was writing to. There are a lot of names in Paul's list of greetings that were more common among gentiles rather than Jews, so just based on that the people of this community

appear to have been mostly gentiles, so the name “Mariam” would have been much less common than in a place like Judea or Galilee, 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.

Furthermore, 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. More specifically, for Paul to have only called out one person as having worked very hard for Christians in Rome and for that person to have been a woman, it appears that a woman was the leader of the Christian community in Rome. For that to have happened in the capital city of the Roman Empire in a male-dominated world, the only person likely to have accomplished that would have been the top disciple of Christ, who just happens to have the name that is referred to in Romans 16:6.

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 like the label “the Magdalene” as is the case in the Gospels, there appears 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 a lot more problematic for the “orthodox church” than the simple 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 appears to have known Mariam and was likely with her when he wrote 2 Corinthians. Priscilla and Aquila both appear 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 all appear to have known Mariam, and Paul indicates in his letter to Romans that there was someone named Mariam who was with Priscilla and Aquila in Rome. Priscilla and Aquila appear to have been with Paul in Ephesus, appear to have been with Paul when he wrote 1 Corinthians, appear to have met Mariam in

Ephesus, and appear 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 referred to in Romans 16:6. That in turn shows evidence that Mariam was the leader of the Christian community in Rome since Romans 16:6 appears 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 someone to carry on his legacy. As we will go into more detail on later, those legends appear to be fraudulent. Regardless, even if Peter did make it to Rome and named a bishop to succeed him, 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 someone to succeed him. As will be shown later, Peter probably never even 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 relatively large, at least proportionate to the overall population in that city compared to everywhere else. 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.

Romans 15:20-22 show evidence that someone other than Paul developed the Christian community in Rome.

Another piece of evidence is that nobody mentioned in the Gospels besides apparently Mariam is mentioned in Paul's letter to the Romans. Romans 15:20-22 show 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 none of them appear to have been in Rome when Paul wrote that letter, which shows evidence that they 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.

Aside from Paul's letter to Romans, it's been established that Acts, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians were fraudulently altered to conceal information about Mariam meeting with Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla in Ephesus and going to Corinth afterward. More specifically, the instances in 1 Corinthians that show Apollos' name instead of Mariam's show that Mariam appears to have spread teachings in Corinth by the time that 1 Corinthians was written. 1 Corinthians states that there was division between followers of Paul and followers of "Apollos". So it appears that there were people in Corinth who followed teachings of Mariam by the time that 1 Corinthians was written. It appears that Mariam had been to Corinth and people in Corinth were already following her teachings by the time 1 Corinthians was written, that she had traveled to Ephesus while Paul was there, and that she had gone to Corinth again afterward. Therefore, it appears probable that Mariam was living somewhere on the north side of the Mediterranean Sea during a certain time-period. It was previously established that Mariam was probably from Egypt and appears to have been there after the Resurrection. It now also appears to be the case that she eventually moved to somewhere on the north side of the Mediterranean Sea.

While Mariam appears to have been to Corinth multiple times as well as to Ephesus, it's unlikely that the place she made her new home was any of the places Paul traveled to prior to being arrested. As previously shown, Paul wrote in his letter to Romans that he didn't want to build on someone else's foundation. While Mariam spread teachings in Corinth, if she made her home there, it's unlikely that Paul would have gone there according to what he wrote about not wanting to build on someone else's foundation. Paul traveled to a lot of places from Jerusalem all the way to Corinth, so Mariam probably didn't make a home in Greece or east of Greece on the north side of the Mediterranean Sea. Additionally, since Mariam appears to have been coming from Egypt, Mariam most likely would have gone somewhere relatively close to the Mediterranean Sea rather than going far into northern Europe. That mostly just leaves what is today Italy, France, and Spain. Italy is the closest of those in relation to Egypt and the capital city of the Roman Empire was there. Therefore, Rome is by far the most likely possibility.

In Paul's letter to Romans, someone named "Mariam" is credited with working very hard for Christians in Rome. That description and the placement of her name in the order of names in that list strongly suggest that someone named "Mariam" was the leader of the Christian community in Rome. Furthermore, Paul's letter to Romans indicates that the spread of Christianity to Rome doesn't appear to have been accomplished by Paul, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, John, or any of the other "eleven". So just from Paul's letter to Romans, it appears that Mariam led the development of the Christian community in Rome. In addition to that, an independent analysis of Acts, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians shows evidence that Mariam appears to have lived in Rome.

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 supposed time in prison 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 supposed time in prison, 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 also believe that he was imprisoned again later on and executed during that later prison sentence. Where did the information at the end of Acts come from? Why are we told about one conversation that supposedly took place there and 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 are described as arriving in Rome before getting to the conclusion?

The author of Acts apparently 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 with Paul while he was a prisoner. This person appears 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's 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. That assertion is supported even more given that there is mysteriously no explanation given by any legitimate public record as to how Christianity spread to Rome. It's incredibly ridiculous that there is no legitimate public explanation as to how Christianity spread to Rome, the capital city of the Roman Empire. Such a significant absence is evidence that very 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 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 evidence that there appears to have been an attempt to fill a void caused by the removal of other information.

The author's apparent 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 appears 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 appears to have led 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 Paul traveled to, 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 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 appears to have been an effort to conceal information about Mariam as well as the Christian community in Rome. Along with that, it also appears that the "orthodox church" did not want to report information about the persecutions after the Great Fire of Rome in 64. There isn't a single publicly known document written by a Christian author before the fifth century that explicitly refers to the persecutions after 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. We're talking about the emperor himself ordering the persecution of Christians at a relatively very early time, which would have been the climax after the Resurrection. The Resurrection is of course the main climax of Christian history, but afterward, the Roman emperor himself targeting Christians as early as 64 would have been the climax after the Resurrection. Said another way, it would have been the climax of the first generation of disciples after the Resurrection. That basically would have been the biggest news story among the Christian population since the Resurrection and there really hasn't been a bigger story since. So 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 appears 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 appears to be based on some truth, but they attempted to disconnect those persecutions from the Great Fire and they 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 has been a lot said and 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 specifically 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 earliest copies that exist today are not from the second century, but they are supposedly copies 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.

The earliest copy of the writing about Nero in Annals is from the 11th century. There is evidence on that manuscript 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 appears 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 appears to have been an alteration to the ink on that copy. So it appears 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 originally written by different authors.

Christians in the first few centuries were often incorrectly called "Chrestians" based on the name "Chrestus". It even appears 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 appears to have been 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 appears that there were at least two authors involved in the text shown from Annals and that there was an adjustment to the ink at some point afterward.

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 appears to

have had that is 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 appears 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 Chrestians by the populace”. Whoever wrote that was apparently drawing on information from what the general population called Christians. If the author was confident that such a group of people were called Christians or Chrestians, then they wouldn’t have to specifically refer to them as being called that by the populace. Instead, the author could have just called them Christians or Chrestians and not refer to the populace. The reference to the populace calling them Christians or Chrestians shows a certain degree of unfamiliarity. The second paragraph, on the other hand, appears 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 appears to have not needed to draw on what the populace said about 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, would not likely have known who Pontius Pilate was unless they found out through information about Christianity. Pontius Pilate only governed the small area of Judea during the twenties and thirties in the first century. It is estimated that Tacitus was born multiple decades after the reign of Pontius Pilate and died about a century after his reign. 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 is not present in the first paragraph. So the different degrees of familiarity with Christianity among the first and second paragraphs show further evidence that they were written by different authors.

The third paragraph can also be shown to have probably been 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 refers 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 portrayed Christians as the guilty party. Such a contrast clearly shows a difference of opinion, and therefore the first and third paragraphs appear to have been written by different authors.

So there appears to have been at least two authors who contributed to this writing. Paragraph 1 appears to have been 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 it appears that multiple authors were involved in this writing. The exact number of authors is not as important as the conclusion that there were simply multiple authors rather than a single author.

While there appears 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 are 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 apparently 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 wasn't 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. Additionally, at least some of that sympathy apparently derived from the author's negative view of Nero. Although Christians are discriminated against in that paragraph, Nero is presented as the real villain. It's from that perspective that some sympathy is given to Christians even though the author was apparently a non-Christian who discriminated against Christians. So even though the third paragraph shows some degree of sympathy for Christians, the author was still apparently a non-Christian. Also, the third paragraph calls Christians "criminals", so it appears obvious that the author was not a Christian. In conclusion, all three paragraphs appear to have been written by a non-Christian, and it appears that at least two non-Christians contributed to the writing.

It's important that all of the authors were apparently not Christian 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 apparently disliked Christians, they obviously apparently didn't write about Christians just to give Christians attention. Additionally, they don't appear 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 appears 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 appears to serve the purpose of giving 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 apparently wasn't to discredit Christians. In conclusion, the authors of these paragraphs were apparently not Christians and so they apparently didn't write about Christians just to give Christians attention, and the authors were apparently writing with a main purpose that was beyond simply discrediting Christians. What that conclusion shows is that these authors appear to have 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 apparently revolved around trying to give what they thought was an appropriate account of history.

Since these authors appear to have been trying to give what they thought was an appropriate account of history, there appears to have been information circulating that these authors used to give their accounts. So it appears that they probably didn't make up all of this information on their own, even if they made up some of it, 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 appear 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 appears 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 appears 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. The attention that Peter gets in the Gospels apparently 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 Peter. 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 concept 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 those persecutions from the "orthodox church" for four centuries is in line with the absence of information in Acts about what happened in Rome after Paul 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 16th 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 appears to have referred to Suetonius’ work by stating “we read 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 appear 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 appears 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 and before the Great Fire 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 apparent 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 appears 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 appears to be 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 while avoiding any mention of the Great Fire and 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 as a part of a broader effort to conceal information about Mariam and the Christian community in Rome that she developed.

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 was true because there doesn't appear 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" appears to have avoided writing about the Great Fire. It's incredibly strange that the "orthodox church" avoided writing 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 is obviously Mariam. Since they appear to have purposely avoided that subject, it appears 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" appears 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, and it was shown earlier that Paul's letter to the Romans shows evidence that Nero probably didn't persecute Christians before the Great Fire. Additionally, if there were continuous persecutions ordered by the Roman Emperor, then there would likely be more historical information about that. A major reason why there isn't much historical information about these persecutions after the Great Fire is because these persecutions apparently were an isolated occurrence rather than continuous and were specifically related to the Great Fire rather than a broad persecution of Christians. So 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 appear to have written about those persecutions and there doesn't appear 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. Given the evidence that Christians really were persecuted in the aftermath of the Great Fire, the "orthodox church" 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 in the aftermath of the Great Fire as a part of a broader effort to conceal information about Mariam and the Christian community in Rome that she developed.

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 Dircæ, 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 Dirce”. Since this author is writing about this group of women having been persecuted, we can reasonably derive the belief that they were Christians. As mentioned earlier, the author obviously probably wouldn’t have written about their persecution if they weren’t Christians, especially since their persecution is mentioned shortly after the mentioning of the deaths of Peter and Paul. So the description of “the Danaids and Dirce” appears 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 describing 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. That is said immediately after the sentence that refers to the torment and murder of this group of women. So obviously the mentioning of women being separated from men was written in reference to this group of women, which shows evidence that this group of women consisted of independent women.

The author's discriminatory attitude towards this group of women can be further seen in the description "the Danaids and Dirce". As previously explained, 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.

As also previously explained, 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 being tied to a bull. There was a marble statue that was excavated in Rome that has been dated to different times from the second century BCE to the third century CE (there is debate about exactly when it was constructed) that depicts the fictional death of "Dirce". This statue, having been influenced by Greek mythology that was circulating among the public long before the first century CE and having been seen by the public in Rome very possibly in the first century CE but probably at least by the third century CE, shows that the name "Dirce" was known in the Roman Empire before, during, and after the first century CE as a reference to a fictional woman who wanted another woman murdered and who was murdered by being tied to 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 presumably didn't call themselves "the Danaids" or "Dirce". Those names obviously appear to be inappropriate and insulting 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 it appears that this group of women were independent Christian women who were looked at as outcasts by the "orthodox church" and were tormented and murdered.

The letter refers to sacrifices being made at the temple in Jerusalem, which indicates that this letter appears to have been written before the destruction of the temple in 70. The author refers to the temple and the high priest multiple times. More specifically, 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. Realistically, the use of present tense to describe sacrifices at the temple would probably indicate that sacrifices were still being made at the temple. However, as some argue, it is possible that a person could use present tense to describe something that occurred in the past. In any given instance, that would be unlikely. Usually, when present tense is used, it's referring to something that still goes on. But even so, since the author was referring to administration of the church, some argue that the author was

only referencing the temple because it was an example of administration, and therefore it's possible that the temple had already been destroyed. While it's possible that someone could use present tense to refer to the past, the first point in objection to that is that present tense most likely refers to the present. The second point is that the conclusion that the author derived about adherence to certain laws pertaining to the temple would have been defeated if the temple had already been destroyed. The author was making the case that God made certain laws and wants a certain order to be followed, and no human being should contest what has been instructed by God. That is why the author was referring to the administration of the temple to provide an example of adherence to certain laws. The author was attempting to provide an example of law and order and was saying that people should treat appointed bishops in the same way that high priests of the temple were treated and should treat the demands of appointed bishops in the same way as Jewish law was treated. However, the destruction of the temple eliminated all participation in any laws or practices regarding the temple. It wouldn't have made sense for the author to reference something that had been destroyed to assert that something should continue. The author was asserting that appointed leadership should stay in place simply because they were appointed. However, if the temple had already been destroyed, then the author would have been referencing something that got destroyed to assert that something should continue, and so the reference to the temple would then defeat their point. If appointed leadership is to be compared to a destroyed temple, then it's reasonable to believe that such appointed leadership can be destroyed too. If the author was using the temple as an example to show authority after it had been destroyed, then their point would have been automatically defeated. Their point could only hold any standing if the temple had not yet been destroyed. The third objection to the argument that present tense was being used to discuss the past rather than the present is that chapters 42-44 of the letter show other examples provided by the author to show authority over people, and both chapters use past tense. The author talks about the so-called "apostles" in chapters 42 and 44 and talks about Moses in chapter 43. Chapters 42-44 serve the same purpose as chapters 40-41 (the chapters that refer to sacrifices being made at the temple in present tense), which is to claim that a certain order needs to be followed. The switch from present tense in chapters 40-41 to past tense in chapters 42-44 while applying the same purpose in all those chapters shows that the author was differentiating the past from the present, and therefore that the present tense appears to refer to ongoing activity rather than something that was completely in the past. These three points show that the author appears to have been referring to ongoing activity at the temple, and therefore that the temple had not yet been destroyed.

A fourth point is that the letter refers to the deaths of Peter and Paul, which makes it likely that their deaths had occurred relatively recently rather than multiple decades before the writing of this letter, and both of them likely died before the destruction of the temple, which shows further evidence that the letter was written before the destruction of the temple.

Additionally, since Paul's death is referred to, it appears that this letter was probably not written before the sixties in the first century. Since the letter appears to have not been written before the sixties and appears to have been written before the destruction of the temple in 70, the letter appears to have been written in the sixties, or at the very latest shortly before the destruction of the temple in 70. Since the letter was probably 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, especially given that the author was referring to a group of independent women who they discriminated against.

As for location, the author was apparently in Rome as described in the beginning of the letter, 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 have known much about them unless they lived around 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 appears that the murders of these women took place in Rome during the sixties. Since these women appear to have been murdered in Rome during the sixties, it appears 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 and murders appear to have been known to people who weren't among the people who were tormented and murdered. Additionally, the reference to "unspeakable torments" appears 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, the description of "unspeakable torments" appears to refer to punishment that was worse than being crucified, burned alive, fed to animals, or stoned to death. Therefore, the description of "unspeakable torments" appears to refer to the Roman government inflicting torments that were beyond typical capital punishment like being crucified, burned alive, fed to animals, or 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 description of "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 description of "unspeakable torments" refers to the persecutions in the aftermath of the Great Fire. The first is the setting in which the letter appears to have been written: Rome during the sixties. The second is that "unspeakable torments" likely refers to torments inflicted by the Roman government that were beyond typical capital punishment like being crucified, burned alive, fed to animals, or stoned to death, which would most likely refer to 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 appears to stand apart among a group of women. If there is to be one human being singled out apart from the rest of the human race, let alone a group of Christian women in Rome in the first century, that person would be the most faithful disciple of Christ and the true human leader of Christianity, Mariam. Additionally, it has already been shown that Mariam appears to have led the development of the Christian community in Rome, so it is that much more unlikely that any other woman would be singled out among a group of Christian women in Rome in the first century. Therefore, the woman who appears to be singled out among a group of Christian women in Rome in the first century in this letter appears to be Mariam. That conclusion not only shows further

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 appear to have been continuous persecutions of Christians over a multi-year period. Instead, the evidence supports the conclusion 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 or at least extensive enough of criminalization that there would be more historical evidence of such persecution. An empire-wide or otherwise extensive sanction to hunt down and murder a certain group of people for multiple years is much more likely to be recorded by the empire while a single local persecution is much less likely to be. So the evidence clearly shows that the persecution of Christians by Nero appears 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 appears to have not extended through the rest of the reign of Nero. The other point is that there apparently were still 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 provide evidence of that. The First Epistle of Clement appears to have been written in the sixties after the Great Fire and the author appears to have claimed to have been a Christian living in Rome. The book of Hebrews claims that the author was writing from Italy. Additionally, as we will go into detail on in Part 7, the book of Hebrews, like the First Epistle of Clement, appears to have been written in the sixties. There are references to the temple like in the First Epistle of Clement that show evidence that it was written before the destruction of the temple in 70. Many believe that the book of Hebrews appears to represent feelings about the Jewish-Roman War, which began in 66, about 2 years after the Great Fire. It's debatable whether the book of Hebrews was actually referring to the Jewish-Roman War. If it was, then that shows that it was written after the Great Fire; but even if that's not the case, it does appear that the book of Hebrews was probably written sometime in the sixties and probably after the early sixties, which doesn't prove that it was written after the Great Fire but shows that it was likely written afterward. So both the First Epistle of Clement as well as the book of Hebrews provide evidence that Christians were in and around Rome in the sixties after the Great Fire.

Since it appears that there continued to be Christians in and around Rome after the emperor blamed certain Christians for the Great Fire and after the emperor ordered the murder of certain Christians, then those Christians who were persecuted appear to have been a particular group of Christians who were separate from a lot of the Christian population that was in Rome afterward. Otherwise, persecutions would have likely continued for as long as Christians were found to be in Rome and there wouldn't likely

be letters being freely written about Christianity coming out of Rome and the rest of Italy as we see in the First Epistle of Clement and the book of Hebrews. Therefore, Nero doesn't appear 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 appears to have been a group of independent women who were Christians who were tortured and murdered in Rome during the sixties and that those tortures and murders appear to have been the persecutions in the aftermath of the Great Fire. So we can easily identify that unique characteristic that Nero appears to have 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 much of the first century, if not longer. 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 was likely a fairly large percentage who were independent women; and those who were independent women 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 apparently 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 apparently 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 specifically in the aftermath of 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 writing 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 appears 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 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 appear 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 appears 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 shows that Peter probably had never been to Rome before 60; and depending on how one dates the end of Acts, that evidence could show that Peter probably hadn't been to Rome through the early sixties. Since the Great Fire appears to have occurred in 64, it appears 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 appears to have come straight from John 1:44, which has already been shown to appear to be fraudulent, especially since Peter was apparently from Capernaum.

There are eight 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 he may have died by then or if not he was likely an old man, and 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 and was very wild and untamed compared to the conservative Jewish society of Jerusalem. Paul's letter to the Galatians shows Peter's apparent reluctance to be comfortable in a gentile environment and so Rome would not likely have been a place that Peter would have become a leader in. While there was a Jewish population in Rome and it's still possible that Peter could have gone there, it was still such a different world for someone like Peter. Paul was different than Peter. Paul was more diverse and open and more of a traveler. Peter was more stuck in his old ways. Paul was more open and Peter was more controlling. Peter made strong efforts to try to control people and was uncomfortable when he wasn't in control. From that perspective, Rome is not a place he would have likely gone to. The third is that there is evidence that Peter was based in Jerusalem for multiple decades and it appears strange that Peter would have all of a sudden left Jerusalem for a place like Rome. Peter apparently grew up in Galilee 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 such a faraway place like Rome seems very uncharacteristic of what we appear to know about Peter. The fourth is that the Gospels are filled with plenty of information about how supposedly important it was to be in Judea and focus on Israel and Jerusalem. The Gospel of Luke even says "stay in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high" and "they stayed continually at the temple". That second excerpt from Luke is in the very last sentence of the Gospel. Acts even says "Do not leave Jerusalem, but wait for the gift my Father promised". So it's highly unlikely that Peter would have left Jerusalem for a place like Rome. The fifth is the importance that Peter placed on the temple in Jerusalem. It's one thing for Peter to travel to Antioch and be gone for a week or two, it's another to leave the city of the temple for a place so far away like Rome that would have required Peter to have been gone for a long time. He not only would have had to have spent a lot of time traveling to get there, but would have also had to have spent a lot of time developing and sustaining the Christian community in Rome. Paul and Barnabas were developing a community in Antioch, so Antioch was not a place that Peter had to stay at for a long time. Peter was more involving himself in someone else's work when he went to Antioch. To say that Peter went to Rome and built the Christian foundation there, one would realistically have to believe that Peter stayed in Rome for multiple years and likely the rest of his time on Earth until he died. So Peter probably never went to Rome. But even if Peter was going to do that, given the importance he placed on the temple, he likely

wouldn't have until after the destruction of the temple in 70, and he probably died before then, but even if he didn't he probably would have been too old to travel that far and preach successfully and Nero was gone by then anyway. Additionally, the First Epistle of Clement appears to indicate that Peter died before the destruction of the temple. So Peter probably died while Jerusalem was still his home. The sixth is that Peter appears to have spread information about the expectation that Christ would return in physical form in Jerusalem, so that is further evidence that Peter would have been very unlikely to have left Jerusalem for Rome, especially before the destruction of the temple in 70, and Peter appears to have died by then and Nero was gone by then anyway. The seventh is that the First Epistle of Clement mentions Peter's death but does not connect it to the Great Fire or even to Nero or Rome at all. Clement was supposedly a bishop of Rome, and therefore considered a pope by later historians. 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 considered a pope who may have personally known Peter and who specifically wrote about Peter's death relatively soon afterwards didn't mention anything about Peter being in Rome, then it would appear 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 that Peter had been in Rome at all, let alone died in Rome. Even if the First Epistle of Clement was written by someone else, it was still apparently 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 Peter 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 deaths, but only includes information about Paul's travels. The author was apparently in Rome and even specifically mentions Peter's death, 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 eighth 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 you 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 appears 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, so that would place Peter in Rome. However, a reference to Rome as Babylon would realistically have been written after the destruction of the temple in 70, and Peter appears to have died by then and the legend about Peter having been in Rome describes Peter as having been executed by Nero who apparently died in 68. Additionally, as previously mentioned, the First Epistle of Clement provides evidence that Peter died before the destruction of the temple in 70. So Peter had presumably died before the destruction of the temple and before it was common to refer to Rome as "Babylon", which shows that Peter apparently didn't write 1 Peter 5:13. Therefore, 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" appears 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 be necessary. So 1 Peter 5:13 not only shows strong evidence that there was a desire of the "orthodox church" to fraudulently push a legend about Peter having been in Rome, but it is also shows 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 appear 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 appears that information about those persecutions existed despite the "orthodox church" apparently not 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 appears 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 appears 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 appear 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 appears 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 if Tacitus didn't, it appears that multiple non-Christian Roman historians did.

Since multiple non-Christian Roman historians appear to have really written about the persecution of Christians in the aftermath of the Great Fire and the "orthodox church" appears to have not wanted to write about that information, those persecutions appear to have really happened and the "orthodox church" appears 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 13 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 description and the placement of her name in the order of names in that list strongly suggest that someone named "Mariam" was the leader of the Christian community in Rome.
2. Paul appears to have known Mariam, so Paul writing about someone named Mariam who appears to be portrayed as a Christian leader is evidence that Paul was writing about Mariam.
3. Aquila and Priscilla appear to have known Mariam, so writing about someone named Mariam being with Aquila and Priscilla is evidence that Paul was writing about Mariam.

4. Paul indicates in his letter to the Romans that he wasn't the one who developed the Christian community in Rome.
5. "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, which shows the Christian community Rome was not developed by Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, or any of the others of "the eleven".
6. An analysis of Acts, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians shows evidence that Mariam appears to have lived in Rome.
7. The most faithful disciple of Christ in the first century would have been the most likely person to have been the leader of the Christian community in the capital city of the Roman Empire.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Acts doesn't say much about the Christian community in Rome and abruptly 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 apparent 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.
11. The "orthodox church" appears 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 apparent 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.
12. The "orthodox church" appears 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.
13. 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 appears to stand apart among a group of women. If there is to be one human being singled out apart from the rest of the human race, let alone a group of Christian women in Rome in the first century, that person would be the most faithful disciple of Christ and the true human leader of Christianity, Mariam. Therefore, the woman who appears to be singled out among a group of Christian women in Rome

in the first century in this letter appears to be Mariam. The letter appears to have been written in Rome during the sixties so this group of women appears to have resided in and/or around Rome. That shows that Mariam appears to have been referred to in a way that portrays her as the leader among a group of Christian women in and/or around Rome in the first century. 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 spread teachings in Corinth
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 appears 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 appears 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 Christian 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 Chrestus” 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. Especially since Suetonius appears to have written this several decades afterward and ancient historians often got certain particular details wrong, it’s very likely that Suetonius didn’t have all of the correct details. 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 appears 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 appear 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 who caused “disturbances” would have been Jews in general or specifically Jews who identified as Christians. If those people were Jews who identified as Christians, then “disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus” would appear to refer to “disturbances” made by Jews who identified as Christians. If those people were Jews and not Christians, then “disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus” would appear 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", Jews who identified as Christians were thought to be making disturbances, or non-Christian Jews were making disturbances by acting out against Christians.

Additionally, if Jews were expelled from Rome during this time-period, that likely wouldn't have included all Jews. There would have been a good possibility that it excluded wealthy Jews. Hypothetically, if Jews were making disturbances against the spread of Christianity, that probably would have been done by Jews who were among the common people or the lower class, in which case only Jews among the common people or lower class would have likely been expelled.

If the reference to "Chrestus" refers to a real human being who was a Jew, then it would appear 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 appears 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" appears 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 "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 about 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 appears 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 presumably represented a very 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 have been a broad exile of all Christians and/or Jews. That conclusion shows evidence that the reference to Jews making disturbances is likely a reference to non-Christian Jews acting out against Christians rather than simply Christians spreading Christianity.

Furthermore, Suetonius writes as though readers were expected to know who "Chrestus" is, so it appears that Suetonius identified a difference between Jews who were not associated with "Chrestus" and people who were associated with "Chrestus". So Suetonius would appear to not have thought of the entire Jewish population as associated with "Chrestus"; and since he probably wouldn't have been knowledgeable about factions within Judaism, it's unlikely that he would have thought of Christianity as a faction within Judaism. So he probably identified Christians separately from the Jewish population. That conclusion shows further evidence that the reference to Jews making disturbances is likely a reference to non-Christian Jews, which would show that Jews appear 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 would make sense if Suetonius was referring to a situation that involved Jews making disturbances because of the presence of Christians in Rome. Even if he didn't exactly know that's what he was referring to, it appears that Jews were 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 18:1-4, 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 appears 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 shows evidence that Paul (or at least the author of Acts) viewed the expulsion of Jews from Rome to have applied to non-Christian Jews. That in turn shows further evidence that Jews were making disturbances because of the presence of Christians in Rome.

When we combine Suetonius' writing with Acts 18:1-4, we can see that both refer to the expulsion of Jews, that Suetonius' writing refers to Jews making disturbances related to "Chrestus", and that Paul refers to Jews who weren't Christians being expelled. Just based on the information in Acts 18:1-4, it appears that non-Christian Jews were expelled. That by itself shows that what Suetonius refers to does not appear to relate specifically to Jews who identified as Christians. So what Suetonius refers to appears to be about non-Christian Jews. As mentioned earlier, if there was a Jew named "Chrestus" who was leading some sort of rebellion, then they would have likely been imprisoned or executed rather than exiled. So what Suetonius refers to does not appear to be about a Jew named "Chrestus" and the expulsion appears to have been related to non-Christian Jews. So the comparison of Suetonius' writing and Acts 18:1-4 shows further evidence that non-Christian Jews were expelled for making disturbances related to "Chrestus" and that "Chrestus" does not relate to a Jew named "Chrestus" and so probably refers to Christianity, and therefore the expulsion of Jews appears to be related to Jews making disturbances because of the presence of Christians in Rome.

Claudius appears to have been the emperor of the Roman Empire 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 by some historians is 49.

Assuming 49 as a reasonable estimate, the writing from Suetonius as well as Acts 18:1-4 show that there appears to have been a Christian community in Rome by the late forties, which shows that Mariam appears to have been in Rome by the late forties. By then, it appears that the Christian community in Rome had such a presence that Jews were causing such disturbances that they were exiled from Rome. Since the Christian community in Rome appears to have had that strong of a presence by the late forties, Mariam was probably in 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 that 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 appears 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, that provides further reason to believe that Mariam arrived in Rome by the early forties. Then, by the late forties, it appears 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 appears very likely that the forties were a decade in which Mariam arrived in Rome or had arrived there relatively recently, Christianity first spread to Rome or first spread there relatively recently, 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 during the night of July 18th or 19th (we will assume the 18th for this analysis but it could have been the 19th). 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 on 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 would have to 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 were 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 18th and continued on until coming to a halt during the night of July 24th, and then broke out again later on July 24th or on July 25th and continued on until finally ending on July 27th. 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. Any of these authors could have been wrong. 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 closest to the Palatine and Caelian Hills. Tacitus describes combustible merchandise as having contributed to the fire's immediate strength and describes 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 appears 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 or someone else ordered the fire to have been started, it is unlikely that they planned on burning so much of Rome. It is more likely that 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 on the estate of Tigellinus after having been halted. If the fire really did start back up again on 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 or someone else 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 him. That shows that there was plenty of motivation to slander Nero. In conclusion, it appears unlikely that Nero wanted the fire started, and the accounts suggesting that he ordered the fire to have been started appear 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 appears to have still been the leader of the Christian community in Rome and the Christian community in Rome appears to have been strong enough to be recognizable enough for someone in the

Roman government to have noticed them and communicated information about them to the Roman emperor in the aftermath of the Great Fire.

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 appear to have been 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 appears 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 appear to be 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 appear 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 appears to have come from the perspective of a non-Christian and likely a pagan, so such a perspective is obviously 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 appears 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 exactly what 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 the Roman emperor Claudius expelled Jews from Rome; and then in 64, on orders of the Roman emperor Nero, Mariam and other independent Christian women were 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 appears 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 appears 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, like James son of Zebedee, but "Magdalene" apparently 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 presumption that the name "Magdalene" refers to a town shows that Mariam was apparently 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 appear likely. A realistic and likely 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 appears that Mariam was from Egypt, and John 1:38-39 may give us a good indication of what may have happened when Mariam began following Christ. Sometime later (approximately two years later according to the Gospel of John), Mariam appears 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 28th, or early on Monday, March 29th, in the year 28, Christ was arrested and Mariam appears to have followed. On Monday, March 29th, 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 may have been placed in a tomb. It appears that Mariam anointed the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ 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 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 after the burial. If Mariam expected the Resurrection, and it appears that she did, and the Resurrection occurred on the day after the Crucifixion, and it appears that the Resurrection did, then there is a good possibility that Mariam stayed there. Regardless of whether Mariam stayed there, it appears that on Tuesday, March 30th, 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 appears that Mother Mariam went with her, likely to Egypt. It appears that Mariam spread the Christian Revolution in Egypt, probably mostly in Alexandria, before traveling to Rome.

Mariam appears to have traveled to Rome likely by the early forties. Mariam appears to have been the leader of the Christian community in Rome, which appears to have grown into a large community by the end of the forties and appears to have eventually become the largest Christian community in the world.

Mariam appears 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 appears that Mariam and other independent Christian women were falsely convicted of arson by the Roman government and were tortured and murdered.

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 apparently 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 apparently 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 appears to have referred to female Christian leaders and appears to have referred to 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 appears 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.

In the sixth century, Pope Gregory fraudulently claimed that Mariam was a sinful woman by conflating her with the sinful woman described in Luke 7:36-50, which contributed to the misconception that she was a prostitute and over 1,300 years of portraying Mary Magdalene as a sinful prostitute. Such an 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.

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

Succession

Here in Part 7, we will develop a timeline that spans nearly 3,500 years from the 15th century BCE all the way to now in the third millennium CE.

Egyptian artifacts show the presence of the Shasu of YHW in the 14th or 15th century BCE.

There may have been a community called Israel as soon as the 13th century BCE. The name Israel has pagan origins, includes the name of the chief Canaanite "god" El, and most likely means "chief El". So likely by the 13th century BCE there was a pagan community called Israel

A likely scenario is that Yahwehists either migrated to the highlands of Israel and/or they shared their beliefs with people who already lived in the highlands of Israel. It's not clear when this may have happened. It could have happened before the Israel community was established or it could have happened afterward. Either way, it does appear that Israel remained mostly a pagan area with Yahwehists being a minority portion of the population and mostly if not entirely in Jerusalem.

For centuries, the highlands of Israel harbored different religions. Eventually, likely in the 9th century BCE, the kingdom of Israel was established as the northern kingdom and was mostly a pagan kingdom. There is archaeological evidence of a "House of David" having existed in the 9th and 10th centuries BCE. So the character of David in the Bible may actually be based on a real person. The south does appear to have been separate from the north. So the south may have had their own local government. However, such a local government appears to have been relatively very small, not likely much of a kingdom. Also, the evidence of the House of David on the Tel Dan Stele also appears to show an inscription that refers to the kingdom of Israel. So the House of David appears 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 shows that the House of David may have been a vassal for the kingdom of Israel. Furthermore, the 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 later on people in the kingdom of Judah, which supposedly carried on the legacy of the House of David, 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 appears to have grown into the kingdom of Judah, and the kingdom of Judah appears to have thrived after the kingdom of Israel was destroyed by the Assyrian Empire in the 8th 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 appears 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, or even if neither of those possibilities occurred, 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 the Babylonian Empire.

There appears to have been fraudulent religious documents produced during the reign of the kingdom of Judah, and possibly even before then. Those fraudulent religious documents appear to have then been taken to the lands of the Babylonian Empire where Israelites appear to have compiled a lot of what became the Hebrew Bible and later on the Old Testament.

Towards the end of the 6th century BCE, after the Persian Empire defeated the Babylonian Empire, the Persian emperor Cyrus freed Israelites who were in captivity. 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 took over much of the area surrounding the Mediterranean Sea with Judea on the east side of that empire.

It appears that fraudulent supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah were first produced before the Exile, apparently during the reign of King Hezekiah, and possibly also during the reign of any other king. During and/or after the Exile, it appears that more fraudulent supposed prophecies were produced that shifted expectations about the coming Messiah. The combination of all of the fraudulent supposed prophecies about the coming Messiah appear 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 appear to have been widespread among the Jewish population heading into the first century CE.

As shown in Part 6, Mariam was probably from Egypt. The top disciple of Christ was probably from Egypt and "the Twelve" all appear to have been from Galilee or surrounding areas. Mariam and "the Twelve" appear to have met through following Christ. Mariam appears to have begun following Christ before any of "the Twelve". Given that the Gospel of John appears to portray a two-year timeline and the Synoptic appear 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, according to the Gospel of John, Christ's Ministry may have begun in 26. Evidence has been shown in support of the following information about Christ's Ministry, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection.

Likely in 26, Mariam chose to follow Christ and then became the first disciple of Christ.

Likely around two years later, sometime in March of 28, Christ raised Lazarus to life after Lazarus had died.

On Wednesday, March 24th, 28, Mariam anointed Christ in Bethany.

Late on Sunday, March 28th, or early on Monday, March 29th, Jewish priests moved forward with the decision to have Christ arrested. 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 supposed prophecies that they knew had been fraudulently made up hundreds of years before then. After Christ was arrested, Mariam followed. Christ was first taken to Annas and then to Caiaphas.

On Monday, March 29th, 28, a group of 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 the physical body of the physical appearance of Christ.

On Tuesday, March 30th, 28, Christ appeared to Mariam.

After the Resurrection, it appears that Mariam proclaimed the Resurrection to "the eleven", and that likely took place in Jerusalem before 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 worshipped him and 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 about."

Acts 1:12
Then they returned to Jerusalem from the hill called the Mount of Olives, a Sabbath day's walk from the city.

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 appear to have been originally produced by the same person. Also, since Luke and Acts were apparently produced after Mark and Matthew, there appears to have been even 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 and others 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 in those verses probably would have been on Judea. The Crucifixion and the Resurrection occurred in Jerusalem and Peter and others moved to Jerusalem, so if Peter and others didn't go to Galilee in between, then there probably wouldn't have been a focus on Galilee instead of Judea in these verses from Mark and Matthew. Furthermore, since at least some of "the eleven" appear 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.

While Mark 16:7 and Matthew 28:16 appear to be fraudulent, the focus in those verses on "the eleven" being in Galilee likely derives from some degree of truth. So at least some of "the eleven" appear 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 after the Resurrection, which was probably in Egypt. Meanwhile, Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John appear to have moved to Jerusalem after not having much success in Galilee. Levi, Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas likely went to Egypt.

Paul appears to have begun his ministry in the time-period of 28-36. After that, Paul appears to have traveled to Jerusalem in the time-period of 30-38 and spent 15 days with Peter; and James son of Mother Mariam was apparently 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 apparently spreading much greater in Egypt where Mariam appears to have been.

Probably by the early forties, Mariam appears to have traveled to Rome and began spreading Christianity there. By the late forties, it appears 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 appears to have given way to the original version of the Gospel of John in the time-period of 28-44. Philip, Thomas, and/or Andrew appear to have fraudulently altered the Gospel of John in the time-period of 28-44. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John appear to have given way to the Gospel of Mark in the time-period of 39-44. The Gospel of Mark appears to have been revised into the Gospel of Matthew by Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and maybe also John in the time-period of 41-51. 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 apparently in the time-period of 43-51. By the fifties, it appears that all four Gospels were circulating in Egypt.

The probable scenario by the early fifties and maybe earlier is 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, Matthew, and Luke were circulating in Egypt; Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, and 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 appears to have been involved with. There then began to spread an altered version of the Gospel of John, which Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas appear to have been involved with. There are also the Synoptic Gospels, which Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and John appear to have been involved with. Another was Paul's ministry.

As for some of “the eleven”, if not all of them, they appear 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 appears 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 true Christian Revolution in both places. Meanwhile, Peter, Paul, 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 Judea, Egypt, Samaria, Galilee, surrounding areas, and many places along the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea. 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 of. Regardless of the exact timing of such an evolution, it appears that at least by the early fifties and probably much sooner, 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 appears to have spread the Christian Revolution in Egypt, and then led the development of what appears 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 apparently were based in Jerusalem and traveled to nearby communities while Levi, Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas were likely in Egypt and Paul was traveling along the east and north sides of the Mediterranean Sea. Nearly 2,000 years later, we are left with the Synoptic Gospels, which appear to be fraudulent and unreliable, and the Gospel of John, which is largely fraudulent but appears to possess fragments of the Testimony of Mariam.

Through the forties and the fifties, Paul apparently traveled to Galatia, Ephesus, Corinth and other places as well. Paul appears to have arrived in Corinth and met Priscilla and Aquila by 51, and probably earlier than that. About a year and a half later, the three of them appear to have traveled to Ephesus. They appear to have met Mariam in Ephesus. Paul probably wrote both of his letters to the Corinthians in Ephesus. Mariam appears to have been in Corinth before Paul wrote 1 Corinthians and appears to have gone back there after he wrote 2 Corinthians. By the time that Paul wrote his letter to the Romans, it appears that Mariam, Priscilla, and Aquila were all in Rome together. Around 57-58, Paul apparently 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 chapter 21, the chapter that describes arriving in Jerusalem and Paul being arrested there, and chapters 27 and 28, the last two chapters of Acts. Based on those first-person references, it appears 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, 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 almost certainly have 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 died 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 Jerusalem. If Peter died before Paul arrived in Jerusalem, then Peter probably died around 10-15 years before the time that the popular legend asserts. Many believe that Peter died in Rome around 67-68. However, Acts 21:18 might indicate that Peter had likely died 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 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 1:13-15
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 prophecy his own death or have any prior knowledge of his own death as these verses suggest. These verses show evidence that this letter is fraudulent and was 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 further evidence that this letter is fraudulent. Such unity between Peter's side and Paul's side likely began when there was new leadership sometime after Peter's death. 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 appears to have taken pretty full shape by the time that letter was written. 2 Peter, on the other hand, appears to represent an earlier time-period when that union was still in the process of being worked out. So 2 Peter was probably written before the First Epistle of Clement and therefore also probably written before the destruction of the temple in 70. Acts 21:18 shows that James son of Mother Mariam appears 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 been 60 or around 60. We don't know if that information from Jerome is accurate; but the sixties, particularly the early sixties, represent 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 around 62 according to information that is in Josephus' writing. We also don't know if that information is accurate either, but it does appear very realistic. 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 appears that 2 Peter is fraudulent and was 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 appears 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 appears 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, especially given the details related to the hierarchy of bishops.

1 Timothy is a great example of how the hierarchy of bishops began to take shape. Since this letter appears 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 appears 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 appears to have been a shift in strategy at some point, maybe around 60-62. After that, it appears that new leadership tried to take over communities that Paul developed, which appears 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 died, 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 appear to have distinctly opposed Paul. In the continued efforts by this new leadership, it appears that there were also efforts to unify Peter's side with Paul's side. Furthermore, apparently as a part of the efforts by this new leadership, 1 Timothy and 2 Peter were fraudulently produced. It appears 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 died. It was probably this new leadership, not the old 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 appear 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 appear to have been in Rome; Paul appears to have been traveling around before being arrested in Jerusalem; Peter appears to have likely

died by then; and James son of Mother Mariam appears to have still been a leader in Jerusalem. Paul appears 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 overseeing a network of bishops and 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 appears to have advanced through communities that were developed by Paul. They appear 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, which is more likely. Regardless, such an effort appears to be in line with the 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 all died by then, that the author discriminated against Mariam and independent women in general even while describing their torture and murders, 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 already begun to be implemented, and that the author was trying to influence and control that community in Corinth and was even willing to claim that danger had been brought upon them.

The book of Hebrews contains 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 describe 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", which would relate to 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. Furthermore, the author writes about the sacrificial tradition at the temple, which shows further that the temple had not been destroyed yet. So the book of Hebrews was clearly apparently written before the destruction of the temple in 70. Additionally, 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, which was previously shown to have been written in the time-period of 64-70.

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, and none of them would have likely taken that position in a letter. 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 died. The phrase "confirmed to us by those who heard him" shows a certain degree of separation from "those who heard him" as if they weren't around anymore, which suggests that "those who heard him" had already died, which leads to a dating that goes past the fifties and into the sixties. If Peter and Paul had not both died yet, then it's unlikely that such an elaborate letter would make such a vague and impersonal reference as "those who heard him".

Hebrews 13:23 states that Timothy had been in prison, which also suggests a dating that goes past the fifties and into the sixties. Although Timothy could have been imprisoned before the sixties, this particular mention of Timothy being imprisoned appears to have been written in the sixties because the book of Hebrews appears to have been written in Italy according to Hebrews 13:24 as shown below, Timothy was a traveling companion of Paul's and Paul presumably didn't go to Rome before the sixties, and Timothy was not mentioned in Paul's robust list of greetings in his letter to Romans, which was likely written in the late fifties. So while Timothy could have left Paul and traveled to Rome, it doesn't appear that he did before the sixties because he isn't mentioned in Paul's robust list of greetings to Romans that appears to have been written in the late fifties. Therefore, a mention of Timothy in prison in a letter that was apparently written in Italy shows evidence that the letter was written in the sixties.

Hebrews 2:3 and 13:23 don't provide definitive evidence but do provide quite strong indications that the book of Hebrews appears to have been 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 apparently written in the sixties.

Not only was the book of Hebrews probably written in the same decade as the First Epistle of Clement, it also appears to have been written around the same area as shown by the following verse.

Hebrews 13:24
Greet all your 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 among them 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 because there isn't really a need to say that when sending greetings without any other purpose so the relevance of such a statement realistically derives from it being a reference to the community that the author was with. 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 appears 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 appears 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 designated by God to be high priest in the order of Melchizedek.

Hebrews 13:17
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 as being saved from death, as 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 described in the book of Genesis. Additionally, Hebrews 13:17 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, 2 Peter, and 1 Timothy all provide clear examples of the characteristics of the so-called "orthodox church" during 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 to human authority, specific instructions on how to behave, and control being asserted over communities and even with the willingness to claim that danger had been brought upon them.

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 probably have been described in Acts. Additionally, Paul was a Roman citizen, it doesn't appear that there were legitimate charges against him, and he was away from the Jews who wanted him arrested in the first place. 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 and as having been executed. So Paul may have ended up in Spain before being executed.

As shown in Part 6, it appears that Mariam and other women in and/or around Rome were blamed for the Great Fire of Rome in 64 and were then tortured and murdered.

Mariam was the true human leader of Christianity for over 35 years leading up to the Great Fire. She spread the true Christian Revolution in Egypt and then in the capital city of the Roman Empire. From the twenties to the sixties, Mariam spread the true Christian Revolution.

As time went on, the hierarchy of bishops of the "orthodox church" continued to spread and take more control. Clement of Rome is thought to have died 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. In the third century, the bishops included Tertullian of Carthage, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen of Alexandria.

As shown earlier, Celsus wrote about what appears to have been the Gospel of John and referenced "Salome", "Mariamme", and "Martha", which shows evidence that there were groups of Christians in the second century who followed teachings that were passed on by women. So this power struggle for the "orthodox church" against female Christian leaders that appears to have been happening in the first century also appears to have been occurring in the second century. The hierarchy of bishops appears to have been fighting a relatively large population of Christians who held onto teachings passed on by women. Meanwhile, the Gospel of John appears to have been the most popular Gospel. By the end of the second century, a biblical canon appears 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 the Roman Empire. 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 likely over 1,500 bishops and deacons.

What appears to have been a large issue debated during 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears 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 appears that Christianity was more of an issue for Constantine than the threat of a foreign attack. Constantine appears to have promoted Christianity and had architecture built resembling Christianity, so it's not necessarily that he was trying to escape Christianity. It's more likely that he wanted to consolidate power away from the control of the bishop of Rome and other bishops. It's important to remember how obedient people in ancient times were to religion as well as how much money and power flowed through Rome. With wealthy and powerful people as well as a massive lower class population looking to the bishop of Rome as a religious leader, the power structure of Rome had changed drastically and Constantinople provided an opportunity to build a new glorifying capital city. A lot was changing and it appears that Constantine was ready for some change for himself. So it appears that the spread of Christianity may have influenced the emperor of the Roman Empire to move the capital city away from Rome, which was reportedly the capital city for over a millennium. If that was actually the case, that would be an incredible testament to how prevalent Christianity had become in the Roman Empire, particularly in the capital city of Rome.

Later in the fourth century, Roman emperor Theodosius I adopted Christianity as the state religion of the Roman Empire. He was also 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 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 as it had done before. The Visigoths invaded Rome in 410 and the Western Roman Empire eventually dissolved, many believing that it dissolved in 476. The Eastern Roman Empire remained and had its capital in Constantinople. Western Europe then evolved through the rest of 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. That gave way to a period that has been called “the dark ages”.

In the sixth century, Pope Gregory fraudulently claimed that Mariam was a sinful woman by conflating her with the sinful woman described in Luke 7:36-50, which contributed to the misconception that she was a prostitute and over 1,300 years of portraying Mary Magdalene as a sinful prostitute. Such an 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.

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 up to Spain, at times being in Spain but mostly staying out of Spain. By this time, there were different kingdoms, including the Franks, in Western Europe while the Eastern Roman Empire continued on.

On December 25th, 800, the pope named Charlemagne, who was the king of the Franks, as the “Holy Roman Emperor”, which began a union between the pope and the kingdom of the Franks and began the 1,000-year reign of the so-called “Holy Roman Empire”. The “Holy Roman Empire” was mostly a Germanic empire that was in union with the pope.

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 were really just wars revolving around power like any war, and these operations turned into a powerful economic pipeline that pumped wealth back to Europe along with valuable information related to science, technology, and philosophy. The Crusades appear to have been instrumental in revolutionizing Europe after “the dark ages” and helping to give rise to a period that has been called “the Renaissance”.

In 1453, the Ottoman Empire, which was an Islamic empire, conquered 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 so-called “witches”. Convictions of so-called “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. It appears 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 conclusion 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 Reformation” and the formation of Protestantism gave rise to many different denominations.

In the 1500s, settlers from Spain arrived in the Americas and began spreading Roman Catholicism there. In the late 1500s and in the 1600s, 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 14th and 15th 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 up from “the Reformation” and the formation of Protestantism 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, the original religion of the so-called “latter-day saints”. 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 son of Zebedee, 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. The large amount of land they had, the control they asserted over such a relatively large population, the power of their military, and the polygamy all show the obvious motivations of power, control, and desire of Joseph Smith and other Mormon leaders. 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. Islam did so in opposition to Christianity as can be seen by how the Quran responds to the presence of Christianity while Mormonism is a fraudulent religion that claims to represent Christianity.

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 Hezekiah and maybe any other king ordered the production of fraudulent supposed 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 24th, 28
Mariam anointed Christ in Bethany

Late on Sunday, March 28th, or early on Monday, March 29th, 28
Christ's was arrested

Monday, March 29th, 28
The Crucifixion

Tuesday, March 30th, 28
The Resurrection

28-51
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 appears to have 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 appears to have been involved with; an altered version of the Gospel of John, which Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas appear to have been involved with; the Synoptic Gospels, which Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and/or John appear to have been involved with; and Paul had gone in his own direction. Mariam had given her Testimony. Levi appears to have been involved with the original version of the Gospel of John, which appears to have been later altered by Philip, Andrew, and/or Thomas. Peter, James son of Mother Mariam, James son of Zebedee, and/or John 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 appear to have been circulating before the Gospel of Luke was produced, and they appear to have been circulating in Egypt. The Gospel of Luke was then produced and appears to have been circulating in Egypt shortly afterwards.

28-36
Paul's conversion

30-38
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

41-51
The Gospel of Matthew was produced

43-51
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

43-60
Peter died

60-62
James son of Mother Mariam died

60-70
Paul died

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

313
Constantine legalized Christianity

325
The First Council of Nicaea

330
Constantine moved the capital city of the Roman Empire from Rome to Constantinople

380
Roman emperor Theodosius I adopted Christianity as the state religion of the Roman Empire

386
Augustine converted to Christianity

591
Pope Gregory fraudulently claimed that Mariam was a sinful woman

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 conquered 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 so-called “witches”.

1495-1498

Leonardo da Vinci painted “The Last Supper”, which appears 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 so-called “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 the Bible that is 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 to the present day and as we move forward.

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 the Crucifixion and the Resurrection appear to have occurred in 28. On the day of the Resurrection, Tuesday, March 30th, 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 centers on the true Christian Revolution.

It appears that Mariam told Peter and the others of "the eleven" about the Resurrection, but they mostly didn't believe her. Afterward, Mariam went to Egypt and spread the Christian Revolution there, likely mostly in Alexandria. At some point, 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 found out about these women. This community is unlike any other before or after their time here. What Mariam started in Rome became known even to the emperor of the Roman Empire.

After the Great Fire, the emperor wanted 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 appears 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 that disappeared long ago 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 civilization 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 a new society as she did. What she accomplished was unprecedented during that time and 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 and our mission 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 that 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 committed and determined and to persevere in our discipleship? What excuse do we have to not accomplish what everyone else tells us we can't after Mariam spread the true Christian Revolution in the capital city of the Roman Empire as a woman in the first century?

Christ was crucified and the top disciple of Christ was tortured and murdered. What excuse do we have to do nothing to spread the true Christian Revolution?

After all of the tragedy surrounding early Christianity and all of the tragedy that has ever occurred, 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 appear 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 Dircæ, 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 claiming that danger had been brought upon these people and then they demanded 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 tried to instill fear into 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 tried to instill fear into those who did not submit.

From then on, the battle between the “orthodox church” and so-called “heretics” continued to increase in size and aggression. 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 third or fourth century. Then, in the late sixth century, Pope Gregory fraudulently claimed that Mariam was a sinful woman, presumably to fight against her popularity among the people. The Revolution spread information about Mariam being the top disciple of Christ for over half a millennium. But then what?

There are legends about people praising Mariam through the centuries in Europe. A lot of those legends are false, but the mere existence of those legends still likely indicates some sort of truth. Those 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 the idea of Christianity with it, and the development of so many different denominations in Europe, what later became the United States of America, Africa, Asia, and elsewhere.

Through all that has happened since the first century, people have been oppressed, controlled, and forced to take in false information while hidden truth remains in the shadows waiting to be discovered. We have what we need to find the truth and to give that truth to others. We need to immerse ourselves in the Revolution and bring the Revolution to others.

Think back to the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Revolution that Mariam spread, and the persecution after the Great Fire. Return to the Revolution. We need to 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. That 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 top disciple. Many people believe in traditions and perform rituals that are not a part of true Christianity 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. Based on the laws and other writing in the Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament, some of the narratives in the New Testament, and other historical documents, we can see that Jews, other Israelites, and Christians oppressed their own people. In addition to all of that, it was Jewish leadership who desired to have Christ crucified. Governments as well as religious leaders oppressed and controlled people. 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 is that really true? Look at all of the tragedy that goes on in the world today and how much of the world suffers. And how much of the world really knows true Christianity? Regardless, 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 who were tortured and murdered after 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. Happiness is not the main priority, and nobody is good enough without discipleship. 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 our struggles, we should serve God and spread the true Christian Revolution.

As much as we suffer in our own lives, we still need to recognize the suffering of other people. We each will focus on our individual self because we each live within ourself, 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, imprisoned, 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 people'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 leading up to 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 and life will go on forever.

Discipleship embraces 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. We are children of God, we are finite, and we will always be learning, so we will always be children. We get older and we learn more, but we will always be children. Since we are finite, we will always be children and always be learning. No matter how much you know or how much you've accomplished, you will always be a child of God and you will always be finite. You will always be a child of God, growing more and more. We will always be children of God.

God communicates will 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 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 choice 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. Your experiences, this world, and society can influence you to feel pain, even 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 or otherwise feels pain. 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 at times, it's literally impossible for you to be alone. Feel your own life, feel your consciousness, and you will feel God's presence. 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 those challenges and struggles to spread the true Christian Revolution in Egypt and in

the capital city of the Roman Empire, and she did all of that 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 it also appears that she suffered 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 for decades, and suffered a torturing death. You can look to the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, and you can also look to what Mariam accomplished and how she suffered. So that when you feel sad, depressed, angry, frustrated, anxious, nervous, afraid, or hopeless, recognize God's presence within you, let yourself turn back to the Revolution, 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 move forward 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 the true Christian Revolution 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?