

Historical Jesus as the Son of God: Glory to the Newborn King

MV Data sp. z o.o.

2025

Contents

0.1	Preface	5
1	Jesus Christ, Son of Joseph and Mary Christ	7
1.1	Chapter 1 - Jesus Christ, Son of Joseph and Mary Christ	7
2	He Truly was the Son of God	19
2.1	Chapter 2 - He Truly was the Son of God	19
2.1.1	Was God the Father the God of Moses or the God of Plato?	29
2.1.2	Jesus Christ believed in true immortal soul	33
2.1.3	Holy Mary, Mother of God, Perpetual Virgin, Queen of Heaven	33
3	Gospels are Historically Reliable	35
3.1	Chapter 3 - The Early Dating of Gospels	35
3.1.1	John Gospel	35
3.1.2	Synoptic Gospels	48
4	Pauline Epistles to All Nations	59
4.1	Chapter 4 - Pauline Epistles to All Nations	59
4.1.1	Acts of the Apostles	66
5	The Purple Phoenix Raises Again	69
5.1	Chapter 5 - Purple Phoenix Raises	69

Preface

- Historical Jesus as the Son of God: Glory to the Newborn King

0.1 Preface

On 31 Aug the year 326 BCE, Alexander the Great, King of the Macedon stood on the banks of the river Hydaspes in India and wept because there were no more worlds to conquer. In the year 323 BCE, Alexander the Great died in Babylon and left his empire to the strongest among his men. His empire was divided with the biggest share and the imperial title going to Seleucus Nicator. Under the greek rule there came an era of enlightenment and prosperity in all the nations of the world. In a short span of time countless colonies were founded and given the law, currency and culture of the Greeks. Of all the cities under the sun, Ephesus, Antioch, Thessalonica, Laodicea, Philippi, Corinth, Athens, Tarsus and Alexandria rose as the greatest seats of learning.

In 146 BCE, the Roman general Lucius Mummius destroyed Corinth, and Polybius lamented, “The day will come when men will ask where once stood mighty Corinth.” In the year 85 BCE, to the shock of the world, the Roman general Lucius Cornelius Sulla fought and destroyed the combined 350,000 strong army of the Greek world. Athens, once the teacher of the world, lay in ruins. In 31 BCE, at Actium, fortune truly turned away from the Greeks and embraced the Romans as Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus defeated the combined forces of the Greek world and Mark Antony. In the East the Greek world was attacked by the Parthians and Scythians. Meanwhile, in the East, the unstoppable tide of Scythians pressed upon the remnants of Alexander’s empire. The last Greek king of Bactria, Strato II Soter, fell to king Rajuvula around 10 CE. With that the fall of the entire Greek world was no more, well, not exactly... When the general Sulla sued for peace he did not fully incorporate the Judea, a rebellious land, and permitted the the Greek dynasties of the Hasmoneans and Herodians to continue to rule as client

kingdoms of Gallilee, Samaria, Judea, Decapolis. And so the imperial court officials of the Greeks, the Head of the Imperial Guard, the Keeper of Imperial Light and the Imperial Treasurer, came to Galilee from the East to seek the last rightful heir to the empire.

About this time there lived Jesus, a wise man, if indeed one ought to call him a man. For he was one who performed surprising deeds and was a teacher of such people as accept the truth gladly. He won over many Jews and many of the Greeks. He was the Christ. When Pilate, upon hearing him accused by men of the highest standing amongst us, had condemned him to be crucified, those who had in the first place come to love him did not give up their affection for him. On the third day he appeared to them restored to life, for the prophets of God had prophesied these and countless other marvelous things about him. And the tribe of the Christians, so called after him, has still to this day not disappeared.

There is a bird which is called the Phoenix. This is the only one of its kind and lives five hundred years. When the time of its dissolution draws near, it makes for itself a coffin of frankincense and myrrh and other spices, and when the time is fulfilled it enters it and dies. But as its flesh decays, a worm is produced, which is nourished by the moisture of the dead creature and puts forth wings. Then, when it has grown strong, it takes up that coffin and flies from the land of Arabia to Egypt, to the city of Heliopolis, and, in the daytime, in the sight of all, it places itself on the altar of the sun.

And so dear brothers and sisters in Christ, the Son of God, the King of Kings, the Lord of Lords, the Savior of the World, the Light of the World, the Prince of Peace, the Lamb of God, the Good Shepherd, the Way, the Truth, the Life, the Alpha, the Omega, he died for the sins of others, and so we should repent and believe the good news, for the Kingdom of God is at hand, the time is fulfilled, and the purple phoenix shall rise again.

Mild he lays his glory by, born that man no more may die, born to raise the sons of earth, born to give them second birth. Joyful all ye nations rise, join the triumph of the skies, with the angelic host proclaim, Christ is born in Bethlehem, Hark! the herald angels sing, glory to the newborn king.

Chapter 1

Jesus Christ, Son of Joseph and Mary Christ

1.1 Chapter 1 - Jesus Christ, Son of Joseph and Mary Christ

In the first chapter we will list interesting questions regarding the origins and identity of Jesus Christ.

There is a long-standing assumption that historical Jesus and his apostles and companions were illiterate Jewish peasants from Judea and Galilee which were a backwater of the Roman empire. This assumption underlays nearly all of modern scholarship and is treated as gospel while there is barely any evidence to support it, while there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Breaking this assumption can categorically change the way we assign the probabilities to various theories about the life and death of Jesus Christ and the rise of Christianity.

0. Historical background While this book questions a lot of seemingly core concepts of the historical Jesus scholarship, the general timeline is assumed to be correct. All the arguments about time shifts and Jesus living and dying in even slightly different times are not considered in this book and not supported by any evidence. The book assumes the historical timeline in the gospel of Matthew is correct and that Jesus was born in 4 BC and died in 33 AD . Jesus was born in Bethlehem, and did flee to Alexandria, Egypt, as an infant and spent a meaningful part of his childhood there. Later in life he moved to Galilee, although the exact time of the move is not known. It could have been at 2 years old, but also at 12

years old.

1. One of the most ridiculed but still very interesting questions is whether Jesus Christ could actually be the son of Joseph and Mary Christ and not a Jewish Messiah. Mixing up the term Christos and Messiah is very deeply rooted in historiography of Jesus. Nearly every historical treatment of the topic forgets that Christos is a Greek term for the chosen one, or a royal figure and Messiah is a Jewish term for a prophesized apocalyptic figure. The term Christos is almost exclusively used throughout the new testament whereas the term Messiah is used only a couple of times in encounters with Jewish figures. As such, the term Messiah seems to only be used to convince specific Jewish people that Jesus Christos is also a Jewish Messiah and not only the Greek Christos.

2. Jesus could have become a Christos because he had a royal lineage through his mother Mary Christ. The lineage of Jesus is described in the gospels of Matthew and Luke, and with the Luke gospel traditionally linking the lineage of Jesus through his mother Mary. From that alone we know that both Mary and Joseph were also considered to be of royal lineage. This topic has been very deeply discussed by James Tabor in his book “The Jesus Dynasty”, and for an even longer expanded list of arguments and more in depth discussion as to why Jesus descended from the Hasmonean dynasty, please refer to the book.

3. Jesus’s mother was Mary Christ, the last rightful heiress to the Hasmonean dynasty. Mary’s life was described in the Protoevangelium of James, which was considered a very reliable source by the early church fathers. Details of the Protoevangelium of James were also confirmed by the Jewish philosopher Celsus, who lived in the 2nd century AD, and was a very prominent critic of Christianity. The protoevangelium of James lists the father of Mary as Joachim with is in agreement with the gospel of Luke, which lists the father of Mary as Heli, a short form of Eliakim, which the same name as Joachim. Describing Mary as a perpetual virgin and the conception of Jesus as immaculate, is in agreement with the sources on Greek princesses. Making her a Christ, the rightful ruler of the Hasmonean dynasty would explain why there her story was recorded in this scribal biographical fashion. Mary’s brother was Simon, who was the high priest of the temple in Jerusalem, and was killed by Herod the Great in 23 BC . Mary’s birth name was Miriam, which was a very common name in the Hasmonean dynasty. Mary’s birthplace was Sepphoris. In 104 BC Alexander Jannaeus of the Hasmonean dy-

nasty conquered Sepphoris and made it his capital. Jannaeus is a very rare name and also mentioned in the lineage of Mary in the Luke gospel.

4. Joseph was Mary's second husband and a widower, as Pantera was killed by Herod the Great soon after Jesus was conceived. Celsus, a very well-educated prominent philosopher, who used the name Panthera as one of the main arguments against the divinity of Jesus, must have had a very solid source to make such a claim, otherwise, it would carry absolutely no impact. Shabbat 104b & Tosefta Hullin 2:22 – Contains indirect references to Jesus and Mary (Miriam), implying she was accused of adultery.

We need to note here that the name of Herod's firstborn son was Antipater, not Pantera. However, the name Antipater is already an english version of name Αντίπατρος. This name is not pronounceable in natural Hebrew which lacks the "nt" consonant cluster and in Hebrew names are frequently shortened. Notably, Alexander (Alexandros) was commonly called Sandros, Sendros, Sanra And the nt cluster was dropped in Antiochus which was often referred to as Yochus or Yuki (in some Jewish traditions) and Antipas who was called Pas or Pasi (later Talmudic contractions) Finally πατρος morphing back to Pantera as it passed from greek to hebrew and back to greek due to the propensity of the Hebrew language to drop and add single letters.

5. Jesus was born in Bethlehem, the city of the Hasmonean dynasty and the birthplace of the Christs.

5.1. Jesus fleeing to Egypt can be a historical fact as the Hasmonean family had very close ties to Egypt. Notably according to Luke genealogy, Jesus's great-great-great grandfather was Alexander Jannaeus, who was a very prominent figure in the Hasmonean dynasty. The son of Jannaeus, Aristobulus II had a daughter Alexandra, married Philippion, a member of the Ptolemaic dynasty. It is also highly

5.5. The other brothers of Jesus, James, Simon and Judas, also prominently feature in the New Testament The importance of brothers taking over is a very common characteristic of dynasties, not religious movements.

6. Antipater had been designated as Herod's successor, but his ambition and the growing animosity between him and his father led to his downfall. As a

result Joseph and Mary fled to Egypt, where they lived for several years.

7. After Herod's death, Joseph and Mary returned to Galilee to the city of Nazareth, where on the hill of Sepphoris stood the palace of Herod Antipas.

8. The court official titles, Caspar, Melchior, and Balthazar derive from ancient Persian translations and would have been exceedingly hard to fabricate by even the most knowledgeable of scholars in the Roman empire that were not greek empire loyalists. Sanhedrin 67a – Mentions a figure called Ben Stada, who was accused of sorcery and brought from Egypt. Some later traditions tried to connect this figure to Jesus, but the identification is debated.

8. Herod dies in 10AD, not 4BC, and the gospels of Matthew and Luke are not in agreement on the date of Jesus's birth. There is a small difficulty in dating the Jesus birth to 7BC, common date used in modern scholarship.

There is an apparent contradiction between the gospels of Matthew and Luke, as the gospel of Matthew states that Jesus was born during the reign of Herod the Great, who died in 4BC, while the gospel of Luke states that Jesus was born during the reign of Quirinius, who was governor of Syria from 6AD to 12AD .

Even if we date the gospels very late to late second century, it is still hard to explain how the authors could be so right about so many historical background details, yet so wrong about such a critical part of the story. Other than birth, Luke would have to be wrong about Jesus age at the time of baptism, which is also a very critical part of the story. Adding to this, in this book we have a further discrepancy of Caspar, Melchior, and Balthazar journey in 7BC would make no sense as the Greek throne was still held by Strato III and this kingdom was not at the brink of collapse just yet.

It is very overstated what we really know historically about this date. We know the Quirinius was governor of Syria from 6AD to 12AD . It is worth emphasizing that Quirinius being a governor of Syria does not imply Judea was annexed the second day he came to power. It does not violate any historical records to assume Judea was annexed just before he left the office in 12AD . We know the census happened during his governorship, but we do not know when exactly. Josephus does not claim the census occurred after the death of Herod the Great. We know Josephus placed the death of Herod the Great at the lunar eclipse just before the Passover. Note that he specifically emphasized he died after a long illness, which

1.1. CHAPTER 1 - JESUS CHRIST, SON OF JOSEPH AND MARY CHRIST 11

is consistent with the fact he may have spent a few years with the power shifted to his son Archelaus.

And here already comes a substantial mainstream scholarship error. The passage from Josephus that is used to date the death of Herod the Great states “the eclipse of the moon, which happened before his death, took place on the 10th day of the month Lous, which is Nisan.” What is not admitted is that there were 51 lunar eclipses in the years 7BC to 12AD . Out of these, there were three that happened at nighttime in Nisan and would have been prominent enough to be seen by the people. The scholarly consensus is that this passage refers to the lunar eclipse of 4BC, however, upon closer inspection, in 4BC the lunar eclipse happened in Adar, a whole month earlier.

The only possible dates for the lunar eclipse that happened close to 10 Nisan between 4pm UTC and 4am UTC, so could have been seen by the people in Jerusalem is: 0012 Apr 24–22:38:24 10410 -24585 41 N -a 1.4693 0.1335 -0.8101 96.4 - - 11S 64E

Notably the lunar eclipse always happens at full moon and the 15 Nisan is the full moon of the month of Nisan. However, as the lunar calendars do not align with solar, Jewish calendars introduce a second month of Adar, immediately before Nisan on leap years. And it so happens that in year 12AD, the extra month of Adar moved the 15th of Nisan a few days later, which explains why Josephus would have said the lunar eclipse happened on the 10th of Nisan. While on all other possible dates the lunar eclipse happened within a day of the 15th of Nisan.

This readjustment actually solves a lot of problems with the dating of Jesus’s birth and the census. And then the gospels would be in perfect agreement with each other. Quirinius may have conducted his census in 6AD, Jesus could have been both in 6AD . There was enough time to spend some time in Jerusalem in the first 2 years of Jesus’s life, visiting the temple and being circumcised. The magi could have come to visit him in 8AD when he was a very young child, right at the time of the fall of Greco-Indian kingdom. Herod would have the time to order the slaughter of the innocents in 8AD, and Jesus could have fled to Egypt staying there for the next 4 years. And then settling in Nazareth once Herod Antipas took over the throne of Judea.

With this new dating, there come some apparent contradictions with the records. Most notably the traditional dating of the reign of Herod Archelaus, who was the son of Herod the Great and was the ruler of Judea from 4BC to 6AD . Do note that Herod the Great was a tetrarch of Judea and not a king, and the title subsumed Judea proper Galilee Perea Idumea Samaria And other parts adjacent to Nabataea and the Decapolis.

At that time Archelaus was given the title of ethnarch, which was only a king of the Jews. Josephus also quite clearly states that Archelaus ruled while Herod the Great was still alive.

Heir Territory Title Archelaus Judea, Samaria, Idumea Ethnarch (not King)
Herod Antipas Galilee, Perea Tetrarch Philip Gaulanitis, Batanea, Trachonitis,
Iturea Tetrarch

It is also important to highlight the tenures of the Roman governors of Judea is also actually tied to the reign of Herod Archelaus and the know dates are not attested from other sources. So if the reign of Herod Archelaus ended in 12AD, there is still plenty of time to plausibly fit Coponius, Ambivulus, Annus Rufus and Valerius Gratus, the predecessors of Pontius Pilate, into the timeline.

8. As Jesus grew up, he was heavily involved in the reconstruction of Nazareth and the surrounding areas which was destroyed by the Roman army. Hence, the gospels call him tecton, which was misleadingly later translated as carpenter.

9. As with his royal lineage Jesus was also exposed to a variety of scripture and was highly educated. The later connections of Jesus parables to many thoughts and principles of the Greek philosophers, especially the stoics, must imply Jesus was highly educated in the Greek way of life.

10. Jesus was very close to and heavily influenced by his cousin John the Baptist, who christened Jesus and declared him a Christ, the rightful ruler of a Greek kingdom. John mentions that he was not worthy to untie the sandals of Jesus, which was a common Greek expression for a disciple. The gospel of John also mentions that Jesus was the lamb of God

11. John was known to be in close contact with the religious movements in the desert and learned from them extensively. “I am the voice of one crying out in the wilderness: ‘Make straight the way of the Lord,’ as the prophet Isaiah said.”

12. Under the influence of his mother Mary, Jesus was still a believer in the Greek way of life and always taught others the teachings of the Greek philosophers. The philosopher king was a very common concept in the Greek world, and Jesus was educated to become a true philosopher king. He learned from the stoics, the cynics, and the epicureans, and his teachings were heavily influenced

by them. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you, is a very common stoic principle.

13. He opposed the covenant of old testament and the preachings of the pharisees and the sadducees. Jesus said pharisees were very hypocritical.

14. He saw these groups and the Jews as taking what was rightfully his, the kindom of Judea. He got very angry and overturned the tables of the money changers in the temple.

15. The first historical mention of Jesus is in the writings of Mar Bar Serapion, a stoic philosopher, who wrote a letter to his son from prison. The testimony of Serapion of Syria is a very important piece of evidence for the existence of Jesus. The testimony from 73AD reads: “What advantage did the Athenians gain from putting Socrates to death? Famine and plague came upon them as a judgment for their crime. Or the people of Samos for burning Pythagoras? In one moment their country was covered by sand. Or the Jews by murdering their wise king? After that their kingdom was abolished.”

16. Testimonium Flavianum - Josephus, a Jewish historian, mentions Jesus in his Antiquities Jesper Flavius, a Jewish historian, mentions Jesus in his Antiquities, which was written in 93 AD . The passage reads: “At this time there appeared Jesus, a wise man. For he was a doer of startling deeds, a teacher of people who receive the truth with pleasure. And he gained a following both among many Jews and among the Greeks. He was the Christ.” This passage has been heavily debated by scholars, but the evidence for its authenticity is very strong. The question is why would a Jewish historian known to have no sympathy for Christianity call Jesus a Christ? The only plausible explanation is that he was a Christ, a rightful heir to the Greek empire, and not a Jewish Messiah.

This passage poses a very strong conundrum for the scholars who believe that Jesus was a Jewish Messiah and not a Greek Christ. The typical explanation is that the passage was interpolated by later Christian scribes is not supported by evidence and would require an extraordinary high level of conspiracy.

The conundrum is further deepened by the fact that in another passage that is also considered authentic by the scholars and much less likely to be an interpolation, Josephus mentions that Jesus the Christ was the brother of James, who was the high priest of the temple in Jerusalem.

17. Cornelius Tacitus, a one of the most prominent Roman historians, mentions Jesus in his Annals, which was written in 116 AD. The passage reads: “The founder of this name, Christ, was put to death by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judea in the reign of Tiberius.” The overwhelming majority of scholars consider this passage to be authentic, and evidence against a possible interpolation is very strong. This is both because of the style of writing and the difficulty of the passage to be interpolated given the high popularity and importance of his works. A single church father would have had a very hard time to interpolate such a wide-spread work. Given how skilled Tacitus was at historical writing it is an extraordinary corroborating evidence for Jesus being a Christ.

It is thus very compelling that the three earliest mentions of Jesus are from a stoic philosopher, a Jewish historian, both of whom had no reason to lie about Jesus’s identity and all of whom are known not to believe in Jesus’s divinity clearly state that Jesus was a Christ and a king of the Jews.

18. Pliny the Younger, a Roman governor, mentions Jesus in his letters to the emperor Trajan, which were written in 112 AD. The passage reads: “But they asserted that the sum and substance of their fault or error had been that they were accustomed to meet on a fixed day before dawn and sing responsively a hymn to Christ as to a god.” The authenticity of this letter is sometimes debated, but regardless of its authenticity, it highlights the fact that what was known about Jesus was that he was a Christ. So even though this passage adds little to the historical evidence of existence of Jesus, it does add to the evidence that Jesus was a Christ. Note that once again, it is not Jesus the wise man or Jesus of Nazareth, but Jesus the Christ.

19. Suetonius, a Roman historian, mentions Jesus in his Life of Claudius, which was written in 121 AD. Suetonius writes briefly about Jesus as an instigator. This is notable as highlights Jesus was not just a preacher but a political figure.

20. Lucian of Samosata, a satirist, mentions Jesus in his work The Passing of Peregrinus, which was written in 170 AD. The part of the passage reads “and they worship the same crucified sophist and live after his laws.” In here Jesus is called a sophist, which was a common term for a philosopher in the Greek world.

This passage is much later, but highlights the fact that Jesus was considered a philosopher by the Greeks which would corroborate Jesus’s noble Greek lineage.

Again, we are talking about cultural ties here, someone who was closely related to and promoting Greek culture.

21. Clark Kent argument There is something to be said about the fact of the wealth of historical records surrounding Jesus Christ and his apostles. “In total, we have 42 sources dating to less than 150 years after Jesus’s death that mention his existence, 9 of which are non-Christian. In comparison, regarding Julius Caesar, only five sources report his military operations.”

The argument goes that if Jesus was an apocalyptic preacher, or just a wise man, why would there be so many sources mentioning him? There were no books about Clark Kent, but there are many about Superman. For this argument we have to consider both independent sources and the sources that are not Christian.

The wealth of the available records can would be hard to explain by Jesus without supernatural powers or not being a very prominent political figure of major significance. In fact the only non-supernatural plausible explanation may be that Christianity was a loyalist movement attempting to restore the Greek empire.

22. Ossuary of James The James Ossuary, which reads “James son of Joseph, brother of Jesus,” has long been the subject of authenticity debates. However, when examined in the context of the Talpiot Tomb, it becomes a strong data point for Jesus having been a historical figure of high lineage — not a legendary peasant.

Over 1,000 ossuaries have been excavated from the Jerusalem area, dated within a few decades of Jesus’s death. The practice of bone collection into ossuaries was limited primarily to urban, upper-class Jewish families due to cost and ritual precision. Most ossuaries found have no inscriptions — only a minority were inscribed, and among those, only prominent individuals typically had names written.

Critics of the Talpiot Tomb theory have claimed that the names found — Yeshua (Jesus), Yosef (Joseph, father of Jesus), Maria (Mary), Yose (a diminutive of Joseph), Matya (Matthew), Yehuda bar Yeshua (Judas son of Jesus), and Mariamne — were all common in 1st-century Judea. And the critics are right to question all published statistical analyses as they are full of statistical and logical errors that critics very rightfully point out. Almost all the analysis already fail on even asking the right questions to judge the authenticity of the tomb. The right question to ask is what is the probability that this specific tomb could have existed at that time with these specific names in it and not be related to Jesus. $P(\text{this tomb exists} \mid \text{not-Jesus})$ — the probability this cluster arises in a non-Jesus family tomb,

purely by chance.

Here we will re-do the analysis correctly and using the priors of the theory that Jesus and his family were a prominent family deserving an inscription on their ossuaries.

But this objection fails to consider two key statistical distortions:

Only a small fraction of ossuaries has inscriptions, and the more elite the individual, the more likely the ossuary was inscribed. This filters the name sample to a specific social class, not the general population. Only one other known ossuary inscription among over 1,000 ever includes the phrase “brother of” — a highly unusual addition. The James Ossuary is the only one pairing “brother of” with names that correspond precisely to the Jesus of the Gospels. This feature alone radically shifts the statistical significance: the rarity of “brother of” in ossuary inscriptions is what transforms this find from coincidental to highly suggestive. Furthermore, geochemical analysis has shown that the patina of the James Ossuary matches that of the ossuaries in the Talpiot tomb, suggesting it was originally part of the same tomb. If so, then the presence of a “James son of Joseph, brother of Jesus” ossuary from that family tomb further increases the probability that this is indeed the burial site of the historical Jesus and his immediate family.

This convergence of:

Rare inscription format, Clustered familial names, Matching archaeological context, And elite-class burial indicators ...invalidates assumptions of random name coincidence and suggests high plausibility that we are looking at a dynastic burial, not a later legend.

Mariamnou is a fairly uncommon variant of the name Mary but held by Mary Magdalene.

Some experts claim the change of these names with familial connections is 1 in a few hundred. That is simply very poor math skills of the mainstream scholars that everyone repeats and nobody mathematically oriented bothers to check. We know the change of Mary is about 25%, and the change of Joseph is about 10%, Jesus is about 1.5%, Jehuda is about 1.5%, and the change of James is about 1.5%.

So when we combine the odds of Jesus son of Joseph, brother of James, two Marys with a Mariamnou variant.

Very notably this is a greek variant of the name Mary and that is because as a Herodian court member Mary Magdalene would have been a Greek speaker or at least very heavy hellenized. Finding that name in a tomb in Jerusalem would likely not be even close to 0.01, but for this analysis we will assume it is 0.01.

The way to do the math correctly is to estimate how many tombs with inscribed ossuaries were there in Jerusalem around the time of Jesus.

1.1. CHAPTER 1 - JESUS CHRIST, SON OF JOSEPH AND MARY CHRIST 17

We can estimate around 1000 tombs, and generously 200 tombs with inscribed ossuaries.

The Talpiot tomb had 6 inscribed ossuaries, we add James ossuary to it as it was a chemical match.

We have no record of Juda son of Jesus, and Mathew so we treat them as random names, plausibly close family members that we cannot assign with much probability to any particular person in any text or tradition.

The statistical question is what is the probability of finding these 5 names within a tomb of 7 people given the number of tombs being 200.

$P(\text{Jesus, Joseph, Jacob, Mary, Mariamnou in a group of 7}) = 0.015 \times 0.10 \times 0.015 \times 0.25 \times 0.01$
* 21, In 200 tombs this gives us 0.00023625

Now from here, we need to account for Jesus and Jacob being sons of Joseph and Jesus brother of James. Given 3 known male names that are very likely to be brothers or sons of each other, that gives us a factor of 1 in 7. So interesting the strongest arguments given for the strength of the statistics which is brother-father relations only give a relatively minor boost to the probability. And even more interestingly, Jesus listed brother of James is thought to be a major factor in the probability of the ossuary being authentic, but actually it does not even change the probability calculation at all. Both Jesus and James are marked sons of Joseph already, so knowing Jesus and James being brother is already fully accounted for.

But now finally out of 1000 inscribed ossuaries we have only one case of brother of, so having the brother of Jesus is 1 in 1000.

That leaves us with a staggering 3.375×10^{-8} probability. However, we cannot stop here. We need to consider the fact we would have also been stunned if we found another combination of 5 names.

So for that Jesus and Mary are pretty much required, but the other three people could plausibly be Joanna, Suzanna, Salome, Martha (other women mentioned in the gospels, could be romantic interests, but also sisters), Simon, Judas (Thaddeus), John the Beloved disciple, Joseph the father of Jesus

Overall we should estimate about up to 10 people filling up the other two names, albeit with some adjustment because Juda Thaddeus and Suzanna are not as closely tied to Jesus as James and Mary Magdalene. For that we account for about 30 or so plausible combinations of people we would have plausibly identified as Jesus family members.

There is one caveat that Jose in the tomb is Joseph the brother of Jesus, and not Joseph the father of Jesus. Hence, it is referred to by a slightly different name variant than Joseph the father of Jesus.

Note that although Joseph the father may actually not be in the ossuary in favor

od the brother, he still needs to enter the statistics in a similar factor as Joseph the father is clearly inscribed as the father of Jesus and James.

Joseph in the tomb being the father of Jesus is actually the statistically much more probable case, and so for the authenticity calculation we only need to consider that case (Joseph the father of Jesus makes this one in a million as this accident being possible to occur, Joseph the brother of Jesus makes this less than one in 10 million chance).

And that gives us almost exactly one in a million chance a tomb existed with names and relations we would be leaning to identify as Jesus family. This is close to 5 sigma which is considered very strong evidence in natural sciences.

Finally, in a bayesian sense to answer if this tomb is authentic this needs to be adjusted with a prior of Jesus and some of his family having a tomb in Jerusalem. In the scenario of this book, this is a very likely scenario, close to one, but of course if we assign a large probability to Jesus was only a preacher or Jesus really ascending bodily to heaven, then the probability of this tomb being authentic will need to get adjusted by that factor.

23. δεσπόσυνοι Although it is said Jesus never had a son Yehuda, that is necessarily true.

The blood relatives of Jesus or δεσπόσυνοι are mentioned by Hegesippus, a prominent early Christian historian were brought to the attention of the Roman emperor Domitian.

The people brought forward to the emperor were the descendents of Jude, not Jesus, not James. So although Jude is not directly identified as a son of Jesus, there is a possibility the Jude discussed by Hegesippus was a son of Jesus, not Jesus's brother.

Note that James, Simon and Jude, sons of Joseph, are mentioned in the gospels as brothers of Jesus, but likely sons of Joseph, from a previous marriage, while Joseph was likely only an adoptive father of Jesus, not a biological father.

Hence, δεσπόσυνοι could likely not refer to the brother of Jude, but instead Jesus's son, who was also named Jude.

Regardless of if Jude was the son or brother or step-brother, Why would the emperor be interested in the blood relatives of Jesus if Jesus did not have a royal lineage?

Chapter 2

He Truly was the Son of God

2.1 Chapter 2 - He Truly was the Son of God

Next we re-investigate Jesus's royal claim within the context of the greek empire. We want to show that all the titles given to Jesus were titles given to the rulers of the greek empire. That the events surrounding Jesus's life were consistent with the events surrounding the rulers of the greek empire and were deeply rooted in greek imperial cult.

0. Jesus is the Christ. In the gospels and all the earliest materials we can see by far the most common title given to Jesus is Christ. It is not the Messiah, but the Christ. In the very few cases the word Messiah is used, the gospels clearly state that Messiah is the Hebrew translation of the word Christ. Christ is the title used by Josephus, Christ is used by Pliny the Younger, Christ is used by Tacitus, Christ is used by Suetonius, Christ is used by Paul. Christ is the only term used by Jesus own highly educated, greek speaking brother James. It is not the other way around, Jesus was not actually called the Messiah, which later morphed into Christ. The gospels just use the Messiah to explain to the Hebrews what the Christ was, not the other way around. We should look at the usage of the word Christ in the context of the greek empire and not purely in the context of the Hebrew apocalyptic literature.

1. Jesus is the Son of God. Alexander was the son of God and so were the Seleucids, Ptolemys. The title was used for the rulers of the greek empire.

2. Jesus is the Son Of Father. The well known ruler of Egypt, Cleopatra, was given the title “father loving goddess”. Seleucus IV Philopator was also given the title “father loving god”. This or similar title was used by countless other rulers in the greek world. In this context the multiple references to being the only-begotten son of the father signify the rightful heir, and the only rightful claim to the throne.

3. Jesus is the Logos, the Word of God. The Stoics, particularly Zeno of Citium (c. 334–262 BCE) and later Chrysippus, played a significant role in further developing the idea of Logos. In Stoic thought, Logos became the rational principle that permeates and organizes the cosmos. It was understood as a divine rationality that was present in the universe, giving it structure and coherence. Very notably, Philo of Alexandria who was closely related to the Herodian and Hasmonean dynasties and contemporary to Jesus, described the Logos as a mediator between God and the world. Thus, if Jesus and some of the other members of the court were indeed visiting Alexandria in Jesus’s youth, they must have had close exposure to the idea of logos. Based on the age difference and the family relations, Jesus would have likely treated Philo as his distinguished uncle, and so would John the Evangelist.

Notably in the context of the greek empire, the Logos was a divine principle that was both God’s expression and as such the ruler would have been considered to speak the Logos of the God. This is consistent with the idea of multiple quotes as nobody can get to the father except through me.

Notably Philo described the Logos as the firstborn son of God, and so the rightful heir to the throne and the intermediary between God and the world.

Even though countless philosophers claimed rulers should follow the Logos and called the Logos the divine, the title of the Logos itself does not appear to have been given to any ruler prior to John’s gospel. And as the idea of Logos in John appears so closely to the evolution of the Logos idea from Philo, it increases the likelihood that indeed John was in a close contact with Philo.

3. Jesus is the God manifested in the flesh. Epiphanes is a title given to multiple rulers, such as Antiochus IV and Ptolemy V . The title signify the ruler is the god manifested in the flesh.

4. Jesus is the Savior of the World. Essentially every other ruler of the greek empire was given Soter as a title, which means savior. The first Ptolemy was given the title “Soter”, and so was the last king of the greek kingdom Strato II Soter. Antiochus III was even given the title “The God the Savior”.

5. Jesus is the Good Shepherd. Plato taught that a true philosopher king is a good shepherd. Likely it stuck as a title for Jesus.

6. Jesus is the Light of the World. Here the title relates to the cave from Plato's Republic. The journey from darkness to light symbolizes the philosopher's ascent from ignorance to knowledge, particularly knowledge of the Good.

7. Jesus is the King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Similarly, King of Kings and Lord of Lords was a title used for the rulers of empires, not only greeks, but also of India and Persia.

8. Jesus is the Prince of Peace. Ptolemy V Epiphanes famous of the Rosetta stone, was called the bringer of peace.

9. Jesus is the Word. The Stoics, particularly Zeno of Citium (c. 334–262 BCE) and later Chrysippus, played a significant role in further developing the idea of Logos. In Stoic thought, Logos became the rational principle that permeates and organizes the cosmos. It was understood as a divine rationality that was present in the universe, giving it structure and coherence. The Stoics taught that humans should live in accordance with the Logos, which represented divine reason and the natural law of the universe. For the Stoics, the Logos was both immanent and cosmic, meaning it was part of everything and governed all things.

For Philo, the Logos was a mediator between God and the world. He described the Logos as a divine principle that was both God's expression and the agent of creation. Philo's Logos was similar to the Stoic idea, but with a more direct connection to the Jewish monotheistic tradition.

10. Jesus has 12 apostles. Apostles were a common term for the emissaries of the greek empire. Ptolemaic and Seleucid Kings often sent out *ἀπόστολοι* as official emissaries or envoys on diplomatic missions. The emissaries represented the kings' political will and spread decrees across the empire.

11. Jesus was crucified for being the King of The Jews This is the actual question that was asked to Jesus by the Roman governor Pontius Pilate. If Jesus really had the title of the last rightful heir to the greek empire, then he would have indeed posed a threat to the Roman empire. Generally apocalyptic preachers

would not have been given this punishment, but a rightful heir to the greek empire would have been. Typically, the punishment was reserved for those who posed a threat to the Roman empire.

12. The writing on the cross was “The King of the Jews” In the context of crucifixion being a punishment for those who posed a threat to the Roman empire, it would make sense that Romans would post a note like this not to mock Jesus, but to warn others against rebelling against the Roman empire.

13. Jesus was not left on the cross to be eaten by scavengers. Typically, the bodies of the crucified were left on the cross to be eaten by scavengers, but Jesus was taken down from the cross and buried in a tomb. This is consistent with the Roman being harsh but ultimately not trying to overstep their bounds. In a case of a slave committing a crime, Jesus would be left on the cross, but as they could expect more rebellion if their cruelty had no bounds, it is conceivable that they would have allowed Jesus to be buried.

13. Parables of Jesus. There are many parables of Jesus that seem to hint at him being a good ambassador of a future kingdom. The parable of the talents, the parable of the sower, the parable of the lost sheep, the parable of the prodigal son, the parable of the good samaritan, the parable of the wedding feast, the parable of the ten virgins, the parable of the wise and foolish builders, the parable of the rich fool, the parable of the barren fig tree, the parable of the great banquet, the parable of the mustard seed, the parable of the yeast, the parable of the hidden treasure, the parable of the pearl, the parable of the net, all seem to hint at a future kingdom that Jesus would rule over.

14. Kingdom of God was a common term for the greek empire and the greek kingdoms.

The Hellenistic rulers weren't just kings—they were divine monarchs ruling by the will of the gods. Βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is a very common pre christian greek term to describe greek kingdoms, notably used in the writings of Philo of Alexandria who likely influenced Jesus and early Christian writers. This culture was very deeply rooted in the Greek, Persian and Egyptian royal cultures for centuries by that time. And so restoring a kingdom of God on earth much more likely refers to

restoring the greek empire than to some abstract idea of a spiritual kingdom. This is something fresh in the mind of Philo and Jesus himself.

15. Jesus birth was represented as a new star in the sky.

This is a common trope in the greek world, notably used for the birth of Alexander the Great. The Ptolemies of Egypt (Greek rulers after Alexander) often linked their divine status to stars and celestial phenomena. Ptolemy III (246–222 BC) was honored with a new star appearing, supposedly confirming his divine favor. The tradition actually was transferred to the Roman empire, where the birth of Augustus was also represented as a new star in the sky, and so was the death and deification of Julius Caesar.

The story of Ptolemy III (246–222 BC) and a celestial sign is linked to the Canopus Decree (238 BC), an inscription issued by Egyptian priests during his reign. This decree honors Ptolemy III and his wife, Berenice II, and includes references to astronomical phenomena associated with his rule.

The Canopus Decree (238 BC) This decree was issued by Egyptian priests to honor Ptolemy III for his military campaigns and religious patronage. It mentions a new star appearing in the sky, likely in connection with his divine status. The decree also orders the addition of a leap day to the Egyptian calendar, demonstrating Ptolemy III's association with astronomical knowledge. Callimachus (Greek Poet, 3rd Century BC) In his lost work, *Aetia*, Callimachus possibly referenced Berenice's Lock, a constellation myth that was linked to a celestial omen for Ptolemy III. The myth suggests that Berenice II dedicated a lock of her hair for her husband's victory, which disappeared and was later seen as a new star in the sky (Coma Berenices). Manetho (Egyptian Historian, 3rd Century BC) Though most of Manetho's works are lost, later writers reference his accounts of omens, stars, and divine portents during the reign of Ptolemy III.

Antiochus III (the Great, r. 222–187 BC) was said to have had a new star appear before his greatest campaigns. Seleucid coins often depicted Zeus with a star, symbolizing divine rule.

Mithridates VI of Pontus (120–63 BC) Celestial Sign: A comet appeared at his birth, interpreted as a sign of his future greatness. Source: Justin's *Epitome of Pompeius Trogus* mentions his divine status.

16. Jesus was buried in a tomb.

No other crucified person was buried in a tomb. They were left on the cross to be eaten by scavengers. A regular revolutionary would have been left on the cross, but someone with a royal lineage could be given an extraordinary exception. As the Romans likely could have conceived of Jesus being more divine by his royal lineage, they may have already be afraid of Gods wrath at the time of crucifixion.

17. Jesus was crucified on Wednesday in 31 AD.

It is commonly believed that Jesus was crucified on Friday, but all the Christian sources actually very directly say that Jesus was crucified on Wednesday. This is not a new idea, but for some unknown reason it is ignored by nearly all scholars. The Friday crucifixion is a later liturgical development and not present in the bible or earliest Christian sources. All gospels agree that Jesus was crucified on the day of preparation for the Passover. The common misunderstanding is that the day of preparation is the day before the Sabbath, which is Saturday, but in this context the passover is also a Sabbath. So for the texts to be consistent, the day of preparation must be Thursday. If we assume Friday we have trials before Annas, Caiaphas, Sanhedrin, Herod, and Pilate, mocking, beatings, travel, flogging, crucifixion, death, burial before sunset all supposedly occurred on the same morning, which is highly implausible. There is obviously the extremely common statement that Jesus was in the tomb for three days and three nights which only works if we assume Jesus was crucified on Thursday.

To summarize: Wednesday crucifixion in 34 AD (April 21 Julian) fits all the evidence: John 19:31 explicitly distinguishes the Sabbath following Jesus' death as a "high day" (i.e., not a regular Saturday Sabbath). Leviticus 23:7 establishes that Nisan 15 is a mandatory Sabbath regardless of weekday—this is the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Matthew 28:1 does indeed say "after the Sabbaths" (plural: σαββάτων), and this is not a scribal error. Mark 16:1 – "When the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices..." → This refers to buying spices after the first (Thursday) Sabbath, so it must be Friday. "Three days and three nights" (Matthew 12:40) cannot be forced into a Friday-to-Sunday window without manipulating Jewish idiom or chronology. Luke 23:56 – "They returned and prepared spices and ointments; and rested on the Sabbath according to the commandment." → This refers to preparing spices on Friday, and then resting on Saturday.

Day Event Here's the count if Jesus died Wednesday afternoon: Buried before

sunset Wednesday Night 1: Wednesday night Day 1: Thursday (High Sabbath) Night 2: Thursday night Day 2: Friday (spice preparation day) Night 3: Friday night, third night in the tomb Day 3: Saturday (Weekly Sabbath), third day in the tomb Night 4: Jesus resurrected at the sundown of Saturday, that is the beginning of Sunday in Jewish calendar Day 4: Sunday (first day of the week) the tomb was found empty If resurrection occurred just after sunset on Saturday, it is exactly three days and three nights. Leading to Thursday, Friday, and Saturday being the three days and three nights, and the evening of Saturday when the resurrection allegedly occurred is the beginning of Sunday. So this is fully consistent with the numerous references to the resurrection on Sunday.

Why the tomb was found empty Sunday: Because the women waited until the Sabbath ended (Saturday evening), then came at dawn Sunday (Matthew 28:1, Luke 24:1). That's when the resurrection was discovered — not when it happened.

So: Three full days and nights: yes. Resurrection not seen, only tomb found empty Sunday: yes. Fits Jewish counting and Gospel timeline: yes.

Then the crucifixion must have happened on Wednesday, April 21, 31 AD .

Note that for example, the possibly oldest preserved Christian text, the *Didache*, explicitly states that fast on Wednesday and Friday. Friday is likely linked to Sabbath, but Wednesday is a new addition and most logically it would be the day of crucifixion.

Notably the earliest Christian writers outside the gospels and before Tertullian (c. 160–220 AD) that talk about the resurrection are Justin Martyr (c. 100–165 AD) and Barnabas (c. 70–135 AD), both of whom place the resurrection on at the start of Sunday, but do not list the day of crucifixion.

17. Jesus survived crucifixion

In this context it is not even inconceivable that the Romans would have allowed Jesus to be picked up from the cross before death. It is highly speculative, but it has a really strong explanation power to it. Perhaps something as trivial as lightnings and thunders could have already made the Roman soldiers and the crowds to superstitiously believe he truly was the son of God and got scared. Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus did receive an agreement from Pilate to pull him from the cross early, and Jesus could have simply survived the trauma and barely alive. And on the third day he got so much better that he was able to walk around and talk to the apostles and show his wounds. Then Jesus died fifty days later due to infection and all started to believe he was resurrected and ascended to heaven.

Notably all burial care was done at the time of death. It was not Sabbath yet,

and they had allegedly plenty of time to do bury Jesus on Friday. Yet why would they still tend to Jesus body on Sunday morning? This could have been a medical care, not just continuation of unfinished burial process. The eventual death of Jesus from infection, especially given the severe wounds he suffered, adds a realistic angle to the story. After his brief recovery, it would be plausible for his body to succumb to the damage sustained during the crucifixion. This would also explain why the apostles continued to believe in his resurrection, even after his eventual death. They might have interpreted his survival and brief recovery as divine intervention and seen his later death as part of a larger divine plan. Perhaps all the doubting really did happen as the apostles were certain that Jesus was dead as they were not eyewitnesses to the event itself.

Further support to the story is In Mark 15:44, Pilate is described as being surprised by the news of Jesus' death, as he expected Jesus to have been on the cross longer. Mark states: "Pilate was surprised to hear that he was already dead. Summoning the centurion, he asked him if Jesus had already died. When he learned from the centurion that it was so, he gave the body to Joseph." This detail suggests that Jesus' death was unexpectedly quick. Crucifixion was a prolonged form of execution designed to last for hours, if not days, as the condemned person typically died from a combination of blood loss, exposure, and suffocation. For Pilate to be surprised, it could imply that Jesus' death occurred more quickly than usual, which is significant because:

Jesus cries out loudly before dying (Mark 15:37, Luke 23:46): Crucifixion victims typically die slowly, often suffocating, with fading strength. A loud cry right before death is unusual and may imply he still had significant strength—suggesting he was not yet at death's door. A burst of strength like this would point more towards a theatrical performance to convince the others the death was real.

Roman soldiers were typically experienced in carrying out executions, and the death on the cross was intended to be slow and torturous. The standard time for death was several hours, and for someone to die within less than six hours, as Jesus did, would have been unusual. Pilate's surprise may indicate that Jesus' death was significantly quicker than expected. It may be that Jesus wasn't fully dead at the time he was taken down from the cross. It seems likely small omens in the sky mixed with fear in the crowd and even among the soldiers made Pilate more receptive to Joseph of Arimathea's request without carefully checking Jesus fully passed away. Note that Joseph of Arimathea was a member of the Sanhedrin, and he was likely a person of influence making it even more likely Pilate would have been more receptive to his request.

When the Roman soldiers pierced Jesus' side with a spear, blood and water

flowed out, which is often interpreted as a sign of death. “Instead, one of the soldiers pierced Jesus’ side with a spear, bringing a sudden flow of blood and water.” (John 19:34) Trauma, scourging, and prolonged stress could have caused a buildup of fluid around the lungs (pleural effusion) or around the heart (pericardial effusion). If pierced, these fluids could flow out as a mix of clear fluid (“water”) and blood. If Jesus were completely dead, the blood would have likely clotted in his body, and the wound wouldn’t produce such a “sudden flow.” The fact that both blood and water “flowed out” immediately suggests the body still had some circulatory activity, meaning the heart might not have fully stopped yet. Pleural or pericardial effusion does NOT mean the person is already dead—it can happen before death in cases of extreme shock or injury. It would be likely more than enough to convince the centurion that Jesus was dead and pass the news to Pilate. Joseph of Arimathea taking Jesus to his own garden, according to the gospel of Peter, to bury him there, is also highly suspect. If Jesus were truly dead, it would be strange for Joseph, not his family, to take initiative. But if alive, placing him in a personal tomb under control of a sympathizer makes sense. The excuse that Jesus had to be buried quickly before the Sabbath in a temporary grave may actually be a plot to hide the fact that Jesus was not dead yet. Aloes and myrrh for treatment, not burial (John 19:39): 75 pounds of myrrh and aloes were brought by Nicodemus. That’s far more than needed for burial alone and both have known medicinal properties—especially for healing wounds. The quantity hints at treatment, not embalming. It is also worth noting that using armed guards to protect the tomb is not a common practice. Armed guards when the person is still alive would make a lot more sense. For example some of the opponents of Jesus suspected a foul play and wanted to make sure Jesus was really dead and not taken down from the cross alive.

Many scholars point out that Arimathea is a place that does not exist, and so it is likely a made up name. However, Ar-Ram, also known as Ramathaim, today better known as Ramallah or Ram Allah, is an ancient town a few kilometers north of Jerusalem that is more than likely to be that place. We actually already know Ramallah from the Old Testament, where it is mentioned as the birthplace of Samuel. Notably early versions of Septuagint translated the birthplace as “Ἀρμαθαίμ” in 1 Samuel 1:1, while hebrew text used Ramathaim. It is a natural translation of the name into Greek, and the Septuagint should be considered as a strong evidence that Arimathea is indeed Ramallah. It is also notable enough and close enough to Jerusalem that it would have been very logical origin place for a prominent member of the Sanhedrin. It is also notable enough to have been mentioned in the gospels as a place elevating the status of Joseph of Arimathea and familiar enough

to the people of the story to not be needing any further explanation. The doubting found in all the gospels is also highly natural. Simply Jesus being tortured and left for near-certain death but then eventually surviving would have still been treated as a miracle. Most likely the apostles really did not believe much in miracles and were not expecting Jesus to survive.

Finally, many scholars point out that the victim of crucifixion were always left on the cross to be eaten by scavengers in every known record. However, even Philo of Alexandria, featured in many discussions in this book for unrelated reasons, described a case of numerous Jew insurrectionists in Alexandria in 38AD were actually taken down from the cross in exchange for a bribe. It is not completely clear from the text, but the more plausible reading is that some of the victims may have been taken down from the cross before they died. In this light it should not be considered as implausible that a member of the Sanhedrin would have been able to bargain with the centurion to convince Pilate Jesus already died.

Josephus, Jewish War 4.5.2 (333): He says he recognized three of his acquaintances being crucified, asked for their removal, and one of them survived.

Indications do not fully end at the burial, Thomas' request to touch wounds (John 20:27) only makes sense if the wounds are fresh and still healing—rather than glorified.

Summarizing, although partially speculative, there is a lot of speculation that matches unexpectedly well on close inspection. Addition of so much of this detail We need to consider the possibilities that Jesus really died and then numerous propaganda stories were created with strictly controlled narrative. The non-resurrection theory actually does suffer very substantially from the problem of consistent narrative. The ungrounded claims would not be corroborated by everyone in the same way. There is bound to be more serious discrepancies in the story and more variants of the story. To witness the fact, there is famously very serious discrepancy between all the gospels as to how the resurrection was discovered. This actually strongly corroborates the idea that a lot of earlier highly consistent narratives were actually independently attested in the gospels, while the discovery of the missing body must have been a deliberate attempt to cover up the actual story.

The other alternative is that there really was empty tomb and misunderstanding. For example, Joseph and Nicodemus really did use a temporary grave and then moved Jesus to a different grave without telling anyone. Then the women came to the grave and found it empty and spread the news to Peter and John and so the story started to spread. Then the empty grave was undeniable but everyone doubted the resurrection as they had no certainty that Jesus was resurrected or

simply his body was secretly moved.

So here we need to consider the plausibility that Jesus survived because of luck or a conspiracy of Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, and contrast it with the alternative of the event being completely fabricated.

2.1.1 Was God the Father the God of Moses or the God of Plato?

In modern Christianity it is completely beyond doubt that God the Father is YHWH, the God of Moses, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Not many are aware that this is actually a surprisingly recent development in Christianity. Many believe that the distinction of God the Father from the God of Moses was the heresy of Marcion and one Marcion has been excommunicated, the Church has always believed that God the Father is the God of Moses. However, this is not the case. Marcion's theory went further than that, he believed that the God of Moses was an evil god, and that the God of Jesus was a good god. This theory was far more radical than the idea that God the Father is not the God of Moses, and that was what was condemned by other thinkers of the early Church.

In the Gospel of John, Jesus is described as the Logos, the Word of God with is very unequivocal reference to the Greek creator deity and not the God of Moses. A lot more of the philosophy and theology of Logos has been described by Philo who seems to have had very substantial influence on the New Testament texts. Saint Paul refers to the God the Father by "For we are indeed his offspring" which was one of the most common phrases related to Zeus. Just a moment later he uses the common greek thought "The God who made the world and everything in it... does not live in temples... we should not think the divine being is like gold or silver... In him we live and move and have our being."

Perhaps the most common perspective was expressed by Clement of Alexandria "God is one and the same, the universal Father, being known under many names."

An epitaph from the 5th century AD, written by deeply Christian family, reads: "Weak at birth with defence of crosses walled, Guiltless of any dark stain of sin, Little Theodosius, who with pure mind parents Chose to dip in the sacred baptismal font Cruel death seized. May the ruler of Olympus' height Give rest to these members with the noble sign Of the cross marked, proclaiming an heir of Christ."

Then we obviously have the images of God

Pater Noster

In catechisms and commentaries the Pater Noster is presented as a quintessentially Jewish prayer. Two Gospel forms survive—Matthew 6:9–13 (Sermon on the Mount) and Luke 11:2–4 (disciple request). Its usual gloss runs like this: • “Our Father in heaven” echoes synagogue formulas (e.g., the later Kaddish: “Exalted and hallowed be His great Name”). • “Hallowed be thy Name” = sanctifying YHWH’s Name (already holy in Israel). • “Thy kingdom come / Thy will be done on earth as in heaven” = Israel’s hope from Daniel and the Prophets. • “Give us today our daily bread” = manna typology or Psalmic providence. • “Forgive us our debts... as we forgive” = Jubilee/Leviticus ethic. • “Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil” = moral temptations; God’s protection from sin. On this reading the prayer is “Second-Temple Jewish” through and through.

2) Why that neat picture collapses

Read closely, the prayer pointedly avoids Israel’s covenant markers. There is no Sinai, no Torah, no Zion, no Abraham, no Sabbath, no sacrifices—nothing that nails it to Moses. Instead, the vocabulary is cosmic, royal, solar: • A universal Father in the heavens, not the covenant God “who brought you out of Egypt.” • A sanctified Name without the Tetragrammaton or Temple. • A Kingdom that descends from heaven to earth (cosmic axis), not the restoration of David on Mount Zion. • A petition for daily bread does not echo manna (which was not daily) or psalmic providence (which is not daily). • A trial (Greek *peirasmos*) and rescue from the Evil One that ring like an eschatological ordeal with a devouring adversary, not like a generic plea about private temptations.

The standard reading “works” only by importing background the text doesn’t supply, while ignoring the imagery it does supply.

3) The Egyptian solar–royal reading (what fits cleanly, line by line)

- (a) “Our Father in the heavens” Egyptian hymns to Aten and Amun-Ra address the high god as father of all; the Pharaoh is the son of the Sun. The address is cosmic, not ethnic. It’s the right register for the prayer.
- (b) “Hallowed be thy Name” (ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου) Egyptian piety centers on the Name (*rèn*). Amun literally means “the Hidden (One)”; his hidden Name is praised and protected. Refrains like “Your name is Amun—Amun, Amun” are liturgical. This is precisely a sanctified Name without pronouncing it—a far tighter fit than Moses’ tetragrammaton practices as usually described for lay prayer.

- (c) “Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as in heaven.” Every dawn the Sun restores Ma‘at (order) in the heavens and, through the king, on earth. Solar kingship is a heaven-to-earth pipeline of will/order. That is exactly the structure of this petition.
- (d) “Give us today our daily bread” (τὸν ἄρτον... τὸν ἐπιούσιον) The Great Hymn to Aten praises the god who “daily makes bread for humankind.” Egyptian offering formulas (“bread and beer, daily”) are standard temple language. This line is almost a quotation in sense.
- (e) “Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.” Egypt frames justice as weight at judgment—the heart weighed against the feather of Ma‘at. Being “set right” (absolved of moral weight/debt) is the difference between survival and obliteration. The ethical turn (“as we forgive”) binds the worshiper to enact Ma‘at socially. This is far closer to Egyptian moral weight/debt than to later juridical hair-splitting.
- (f) “Do not bring us into the time of trial, but deliver us from the Evil One.” (μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς... εἰς πειρασμόν... ῥῦσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ) Peirasmos = trial/ordeal, not chiefly “temptation.” Read apocalyptically, it is the great ordeal; read visually, it is the judgment scene. And the Evil One is not an abstraction: in Egyptian iconography the failed soul is devoured by Ammit (crocodile-lion-hippo) as the scales tip. “Deliver us from the devourer” is exactly how the scene works.
- (g) “Amen.” Before we pretend “amen” is safely, uniquely Hebrew, note the liturgical practice: Egyptian hymns and responses end with acclamations of Amun; congregational call-and-response reinforces the Name. The sound and function of the close match the prayer’s cadence (whatever the etymology textbooks insist). In worship, “All say Amun/Amen!” is the logic.

Bottom line: every clause fits solar-royal liturgy without strain. The “Jewish only” reading must paper over the prayer’s cosmic grammar; the Egyptian reading doesn’t.

4) The historical pipeline (why this imagery would still be alive)

This isn’t Bronze-Age dust accidentally stuck to a 1st-century text. It’s continuous culture: • Egypt in Canaan (c. 1500–1150 BC). For centuries the southern Levant was an Egyptian province. Jerusalem appears in the Amarna archive

(~1350 BC), with its ruler Abdi-Heba writing Pharaoh as “my Sun.” Egyptian garrisons and cult stood at Beth-Shean, Jaffa, Deir el-Balah, etc. • Davidic psalmic core (c. 1150–970 BC). The linguistically older psalms are drenched in sun, light, heaven, earth, kingship, divine rule (Ps 19; 29; 68; 84; 104). These read like Hebrew adaptations of solar hymns, not Torah homilies. • Aten’s revolution and Amun-Ra’s supremacy. Akhenaten’s Aten-monotheism collapses, but Amun-Ra returns stronger; the solar-monotheist pressure never disappears. • Ptolemaic Egypt (3rd–1st c. BC). The dynasty crafts Serapis/Isis cult and keeps solar divine kingship explicit. Cleopatra’s death (30 BC) is within grandparent memory of Jesus’ generation. • Jesus’ milieu. A “king of the Jews” claim sits inside Roman Syria-Palestine, saturated with Helios/Sol imagery. Early Christian art happily paints Christ as Helios; the holy day is Sunday. The solar-royal idiom is not alien—it is the water everyone swims in.

Seen through this pipeline, the Pater Noster doesn’t borrow a few Egyptian phrases; it belongs to the solar-royal register that ran from Aten → Amun-Ra → Ptolemaic kingship straight into the first century.

5) “But isn’t it still Jewish?” — the honest reconciliation

Yes, the prayer can be prayed in a Jewish key (and was). Luke embeds it in a lesson on dependence; Matthew frames it within piety and forgiveness. The wording genuinely overlaps later synagogue language (“hallowed be His Name”). But that overlap proves adaptability, not origin. Crucially, the prayer: • avoids covenant particulars, • speaks in universal solar-cosmic grammar, and • lands perfectly inside Egyptian/Ptolemaic royal theology.

The better model is fusion: Israel’s high-God devotion absorbed, translated, and reused the dominant solar-royal grammar everyone understood. If Jesus stands—as our thesis argues—as a royal claimant in the wake of a just-collapsed Ptolemaic world, then this prayer reads not as a synagogue formula but as a dynastic solar-royal prayer: heavenly Father (Sun), kingdom descending, daily sustenance, righteous scales, rescue from the devourer—Amen.

6) Clause-by-clause gloss (for the reader who wants the map) • Father in heaven → Solar source (Aten/Amun-Ra) and royal sonship. • Hallowed Name → the hidden Name exalted (Amun’s *rèn*). • Kingdom come / will be done → Ma’at restored from heaven to earth via the king. • Daily bread → the sun-god who daily provides bread. • Forgive debts → lighten the moral weight at the scales; enact Ma’at with others. • Do not bring into the

trial → spare us the ordeal/judgment. • Deliver from the Evil One → rescue from the devourer who consumes the failed. • Amen → the communal seal, functionally identical to Amun-acclamation.

Why this matters for David and Jesus • David (1150–970 BC) sits close enough to the Amarna horizon for Egyptian solar kingship to be living memory; the oldest psalms sound like it because they grew in it. • Jesus (early 1st c. AD) stands within living memory of Ptolemaic solar monarchy. If he is (as our book argues) a royal figure inside that political theology, the Pater Noster is exactly the kind of solar-royal prayer a claimant would teach: it translates Egypt’s oldest grammar of kingship into a form his followers can pray anywhere.

That is the reading that explains everything the text actually says—without importing Sinai—and explains why the prayer crossed languages and empires so effortlessly.

2.1.2 Jesus Christ believed in true immortal soul

Sometimes overlooked, the idea of soul in greek and jewish beliefs is very different. “Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul” ψυχή (psyche) ≠ body (Matt 10:28) “What does it profit a man to gain the world and forfeit his soul?” (Matt 16:26) “Today you will be with me in Paradise” (Luke 23:43)

The belief in post mortem conscious existence as a continuation of soul is not a belief of the Old Testament, but it is a common belief in the Greek world. The Jews of that time believed in a resurrection of the body, but not in the immortality of the soul.

2.1.3 Holy Mary, Mother of God, Perpetual Virgin, Queen of Heaven

1. Mary was the rightful heiress to the Hasmonean dynasty and so the royal titles we know very well today also correspond to the titles of the Greek rulers. There were countless greek female rulers with highly distinguished, divine titles, such as Cleopatra, who was also a common name in the Hasmonean dynasty.

2. Holy Mary mother of God. As Jesus was the Son of God, as a rightful heir, Mary as the mother of future ruler would have been considered the Mother of God.

“Mother of the Lord” (Μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου) – Found in Luke 1:43, where Elizabeth calls Mary the “Mother of my Lord.” This implies royal status since “Lord”

(Kyrios) could mean a divine or kingly ruler. Elizabeth greets Mary: “And why is this granted to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?”

3. Mary was a perpetual virgin. A very common trope in the greek world was that the royal women were pure often called perpetual virgins. This is something that fits really well with the idea of Mary as royal but seems at odds with the idea of Mary as a mother to Jesus.

4. Mary was the Queen of Heaven. The earliest known hymns and prayers to Mary refer to her as Βασίλισσα τῶν Οὐρανῶν – explicit royal status.

“The Woman Clothed with the Sun” – Revelation 12:1 “A great sign appeared in heaven: a woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and a crown of twelve stars on her head.” While this passage refers to Israel, early Christian writings (Hippolytus, 3rd century AD) link it to Mary as a royal mother figure.

5. Mary was Blessed among all women Highlighting Mary’s royal lineage

6. Mary was the New Eve “New Eve” – Early Church Fathers (Justin Martyr, Irenaeus) described Mary as the new Eve, implying a role in a divine dynasty. Protoevangelium of James (c. 2nd century AD) – While emphasizing her perpetual virginity, it also hints at a priestly and royal lineage, calling her “set apart for the Lord.”

Chapter 3

Gospels are Historically Reliable

3.1 Chapter 3 - The Early Dating of Gospels

Acknowledging Jesus as the rightful Christos and his companions as highly powerful and educated people can completely change the way we view the gospels. Most notably in this framework all arguments for early gospels become much more plausible and the arguments for late dating lose almost all of their plausibility.

Moreover with the dating of the gospels, we can also revisit the dating of the large number of early apocryphal texts. The apocryphal texts are typically dated to the second century, but with extreme bias of past scholars placing them consistently later than the gospels regardless of the evidence.

3.1.1 John Gospel

0. Dating of the Gospel of John Famously gospel of John is attested the earliest and has the most prolific earliest sources, yet it is dated the latest, purely based on bias coming from invalid assumptions about “christology”. This is one of these 19th century assumptions of early biblical scholars that falls apart completely when under any detailed scrutiny, but remains a dogma of the modern biblical scholarship.

By attested, we have a papyrus P52 of John, which is dated to 125AD. The allegedly oldest Mark, Matthew and Luke are attested by Irenaeus in 180AD together with several other gospels that are deemed by Irenaeus as heretical, and the earliest manuscript of Mark is dated to late 3rd century. Although the oldest mention of Marcion is from Tertullian, Tertullian himself gives credible attestation of

Marcion in 140AD. So, by current manuscript and reference chronology, the order of attestation is: John first, followed by Marcion, then Mary Magdalene, Thomas, Judas, and only later Mark, Matthew, and Luke.

This alone can be explained by the accident of history, most early sources were lost, and the oldest was John, just by accident. However, we need to consider this gospel of John was found not alone, but as a part of a large library with many texts, including other gospels, and many documents of all kinds, including dated tax documents. The Oxyrhynchus papyrus P52, was unequivocally written in a script style that matched the style of dated to around 125AD, but the texts of other gospels in Oxyrhynchus were certainly at least 25-50 years older.

Although the dating can be disputed, on the basis of geography, in Oxyrhynchus, Egypt, we have gospels that were written likely in the same room by the same group of people, so the relative dating of the gospels as they arrived to Oxyrhynchus is rather certain.

Certainly, it could be the case that the synoptic gospels arrived to Oxyrhynchus much later just by accident, however, the same pattern is repeated in the second oldest source of manuscripts, the Nag Hammadi library, where the Gospel of John is also the oldest and the most prolific text, and the synoptic gospels are not present at all. Nag Hammadi manuscripts are a bit older, but the originals allegedly date to mid 2nd century texts.

The third source fairly securely dated to second century and likely early second century is the Bodmer papyrus, P66 with the Gospel of John. As in the other cases, the Gospel of John pre-dates the synoptic Gospels in the Bodmer collection by at least 25-50 years.

This is essentially it for Gospel references pre-140AD. The only possible earlier references to Gospels are Papias, Polycarp and Clement, who plausibly wrote before 140AD. In case of Papias, he refers to gospels not written in Greek, so they are almost certainly not any of the canonical gospels nor any of the widely known apocryphal gospels. Clement and Polycarp are quoting Jesus as in the Gospels, but regardless of whether Jesus really did say the words, there is no indication whether they quoted the gospels or the gospels from them or mostl likely they simply quoted the same text or oral tradition. The next reference is Justin Martyr, and he again is most likely quoting the Gospel of John, notably not any quote of Jesus recorded in the Gospel of John, but a known fragment of John.

Then the later references from Tertullian, Irenaeus, and Origen all contain unambiguous references to all the canonical gospels as already mature and widespread texts, but at this point we are already in the year 180AD and later.

To be very clear, this does not indicate John was written in 125AD, nor that

Marcion was written in 140AD. John may have been written in right after the events described, or it may have been written in 100AD.

What that does show is that based on the dates of manuscripts and references, it should be John to have the highest probability of being the earliest gospel, and not Mark, Matthew or Luke.

1. The Gospel of John is widely accepted to be one gospel that indicates it was written by an eyewitness. The gospel itself claims to be written by the disciple whom Jesus loved, which is widely accepted to be John. Notably all the other gospels themselves had ample opportunity to claim to be written by an eyewitness, but none of them do. Mark portrays himself as an omniscient narrator, telling a story clearly in third person, does not seem correct about the geography of the area where the events took place. Luke claims to have compiled the stories from the eyewitnesses, which is a clear admission that he was not an eyewitness himself. Matthew is clearly copying Mark and a source like Luke, while also writing in very detached third person, not something an eyewitness conceivably would do.

2. ὁ μαθητὴς ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς The frequent reference to the disciple whom Jesus loved, may also be an indication the disciple was not one of the twelve apostles, as the gospel of John does not mention the names of the apostles at all.

Notably the gospel of John does name the Twelve on multiple occasions, but the disciple whom Jesus loved does not seem to be one of them, while it would have been logical to note that if that were the case. The disciple whom Jesus loved seems separate from the Peter's group. Most notably all gospels seem to strongly indicate all male apostles fled after the arrest of Jesus, and the only ones who stayed were women. "There were also women looking on from a distance... Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James... and many other women..." This means we are faced with either a very major contradiction between John and all three Synoptics where there was no reason to introduce one, or — far more plausibly — the Beloved Disciple was not one of the Twelve, and was a woman, preserved anonymously but recognized within the early community as an authoritative witness.

3. Γύναι, ἰδοὺ ὁ υἱός σου The famous words of Jesus on the cross — "Woman, behold your son" (John 19:26) — have traditionally been interpreted as referring to the Beloved Disciple, but the wording itself is deliberately ambiguous. The Greek phrase υἱός σου means "your child" or "your son," but it is not inherently gender-specific in context. Some scholars, such as Ramon K. Jusino (1998), have

argued that this may point to Mary Magdalene, especially given her presence at the crucifixion and her prominent role in resurrection narratives.

It is also entirely possible that the author is one of the other women from the court of Herod, like Joanna, who was another woman who named in the gospel of Luke as a follower of Jesus, and who was one of three women who visited the tomb of Jesus to anoint his body. Many scholars link Joanna to the court of Herod, and she was the wife of Chuza, the manager of Herod's household, which would make her a very powerful and influential. She is also frequently linked to Junia. As the name Junia is not mentioned in the gospels, yet Paul considers her to be the foremost among all the apostles, the connection to the Jesus's beloved disciple and a biographer of his life seems very plausible. Finally, this would also explain the authorship of the gospel as John not disputed by the early church fathers, as the author would be a disciple of Jesus, Joanna.

4. When the authors of the apocryphal gospel of Mary or other early texts try to argue who the beloved disciple is, they argue that it is Mary Magdalene rather than Peter. No source says it was Mary Magdalene over John, which is what the sources would say the prevalent view was that John was the most beloved one.

5. Finally, a woman writer would have been very likely to describe themselves based on the feelings towards others, not many male authors write like this. She says Jesus loved Lazarus, not in a romantic way, but in a way a female writer would describe close friendship. Jesus is weeping, which is a thing a female would write about Jesus, not a true man.

6. Jesus interactions towards Nicodemus are also very feminine, close and personal, Jesus is talking about being born again. This very likely is not necessarily suggesting Jesus had some homosexual tendencies, but rather that the author of the gospel had some romantic feelings towards Jesus.

7. The Samaritan Woman (John 4:1-42) – An Intimate Encounter at the Well Jesus meets her alone at a well, a setting often symbolizing romantic or covenant relationships in the Old Testament (e.g., Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Rachel). The conversation is deeply personal because Jesus reveals he knows her past (five husbands) yet does not condemn her. He gradually leads her to recognize him as

the Messiah, and she becomes a key figure in spreading his message. The emotional shift—from skepticism to joy—makes this one of the most transformative personal encounters in the Gospels.

8. The detailed description of the passion seems to add credibility to the claim that the gospel was written by an eyewitness, or at least someone portraying themselves as an eyewitness. The gospels seem to indicate the apostles fled and for a good reason, as they were likely rightfully scared to be accused of supporting Jesus in his alleged crime against the Roman state. It is far more likely though women would have been allowed to stay and not prosecuted by the Romans, who were from a far more patriarchal society and would be very unlikely to conceive of a woman being a serious threat to the state.

9. Mary Magdalene (John 20:11-18) – A Moment of Pure Devotion Mary is weeping alone at the empty tomb, showing deep grief. Jesus appears, but she doesn't recognize him at first, thinking he's the gardener. The moment becomes deeply personal when Jesus simply says her name, "Mary", and she immediately recognizes him. She calls him *ῥαββωνί* (Teacher), showing a deeply personal bond. He then entrusts her with the first announcement of the Resurrection, making her the first witness of Easter.

If you know one thing about girls is that they have a thing for teachers. The teacher makes her special by entrusting her with the first announcement of the resurrection.

10. The Bridegroom Motif John the Baptist calls Jesus the bridegroom (John 3:29). The first miracle is at a wedding (John 2), which is unusual as an opening scene for a Gospel. The idea of Jesus as a bridegroom has strong symbolic meaning in Jewish and early Christian traditions, sometimes linking to the idea of a divine marriage (God and Israel, Christ and the Church). Some Gnostic and esoteric traditions later emphasized Mary Magdalene's connection to Jesus, seeing her as part of this bridal imagery.

Please genuinely check how many male writers like to fantasize about weddings and marriage.

11. The anointing of Jesus by a woman with expensive perfume (John 12:3, Mark 14:3-9) Please genuinely check how many male writers like to provide details on the perfume selection.

Similarly, smell is emphasized when Jesus raises Lazarus from the dead, something that is very unlikely to be emphasized by a male writer.

12. The gospel of John passes the Bechdel test. The Bechdel test is almost universally determining if a story is written by a woman.

Notably the gospel of Luke also passes the Bechdel test even better, but in that case the author is focusing on many female characters may be due to the sources and sponsors he or she has. Luke also mentions unusually frequently the words like womb, nursing, mother, birth and much higher female agency including annunciation to Mary and not Joseph. Whereas the gospel of John seems to be an original text, Luke is very clearly a compilation of many sources as admitted by the author, and overwhelmingly agreed upon by scholars.

12. Note the women traveling with Jesus and the disciples are also linked to the royal family of Herod. “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 Chuza, the manager of Herod’s household; Susanna; and many others. These women were helping to support them out of their own means.” Mary Magdalene, Joanna, and Susanna are specifically named as financial supporters. Joanna was connected to Herod’s court, meaning she had access to wealth and influence. The phrase “out of their own means” implies they personally funded Jesus’ ministry. Note, much like Sephoris, Migdala is also within the same township as Nazareth. If Mary Magdalene was also highly positioned in the Herod’s court, then it would make sense that she would have been a skilled writer, yet perhaps not as skilled as the most prominent classics. This explains the very deep knowledge of royal greek cult, while still maintaining some lack of literary sophistication.

13. The authorship of Mary is typically dismissed as a possibility because of the use of male pronouns in the gospel. This is just skill issues of the scholars. A fully female woman calling herself a beloved disciple would still use male grammatical forms. This is because the pronoun is determined by the gender of the word μαθητής (“disciple”), and even if a female version of the μαθήτρια exists, the woman would still typically choose to use the default gender of the word if she does not want to emphasize her gender. And if that is the case the grammatical forms all over the gospel would still be male, even though they are completely

talking about a female person. This is not just a very obscure feature of the ancient greek language, but also the right way to speak in many modern languages like Polish. For example in Polish, one would always say “Jan Ewangelista był kobietą”, John the evangelist was (male) a woman and not “Jan Ewangelista była kobietą” John the evangelist was (female) a woman.

14. The Beloved Disciple is thought to have played an important role in the early Christian community. Some scholars argue that John, as a male apostle, would have had more influence in the early church, and thus, it seems unlikely that a woman like Mary Magdalene would have been the one to write or serve as a central figure. The early church’s view of Mary Magdalene is much more complex than sometimes assumed. Though she was initially marginalized, she held an important role in early Christian traditions. The Gospel of Mary, a non-canonical text, suggests that Mary Magdalene had an influential role, potentially even as a leader among the disciples. Furthermore, early Christian communities were not as rigid in terms of gender roles as sometimes portrayed, and there is evidence that women held significant positions in the early church (e.g., Priscilla, Phoebe, Thecla).

15. The Gospel of John emphasizes the Jesus was the only-begotten son of God. Unique Relationship with God: Jesus is depicted as having a unique and intimate relationship with God the Father, one that is unlike any other. In John 1:14, 18, and 3:16, Jesus is referred to as the “only-begotten Son” (Greek: μονογενής, monogenēs). This term emphasizes the uniqueness of Jesus as the Son, as no other figure shares this same divine sonship.

16. Here there is a very interesting perspective linking the gnostic gospel of Thomas with John: “Jesus said, ‘If they say to you, Where did you come from? say to them, We came from the light, the place where the light came into being by itself, established itself and became manifest through their image. If they say to you, Who are you? say, We are its children, and we are the elect of the living Father.’” There are a few places where Thomas seems to indicate “we” are all children of God. The uniqueness of the sonship seems to be very heavily emphasized in John to the point where it almost seems to become the core concept of the gospel. Interestingly simultaneously John is making Thomas into the non-conformist and disbeliever. ch 11. All the disciples are afraid to go to Jerusalem, but Thomas

says, “Let us also go, that we may die with him.” ch 14. Jesus mentioning he will go to his father. Thomas doubts. Then Jesus says, “I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.” You can only come to the father through the only-begotten son. ch 20. Thomas recognizes. You are my Lord and my God. This shows Thomas despite being Jesus brother or twin, likely holding a meaningful claim himself, John may try to emphasize Thomas could have contested Jesus at first, but then recognized him as the only rightful heir.

14 John 12:31 (NIV): “Now is the time for judgment on this world; now the prince (archon) of this world will be driven out.” In this verse, “archon” refers to Rome or the prince of this world. It signifies authority and power over the world, but it’s used in a negative sense to describe the ruler of evil.

17. Temple destruction is typically used as a marker for the dating of the gospels. This argument is usually applied to the synoptic gospels, but needs a bit of a different treatment for John. One note though that in case of John “Destroy this temple, and I will raise it again in three days.” Unlike in Olivet discourse, the identity and the prophecy of the destruction of the particular temple in Jerusalem in 70AD is much more questionable. And that if we do not overemphasize the Mosaic beliefs of the gospel of John, then the temple could be one of the many many other temples destroyed, not necessarily the main temple in Jerusalem. Note that the temple in Jerusalem was already destroyed by the Babylonians and then rebuilt and already besieged by romans in 63BC. It must not have been a very big stretch it could be destroyed again. Note that Sepphoris was also destroyed by the Roman army during the life of Jesus, and Jesus was heavily involved in the reconstruction of Sepphoris.

18. The females of the greek period were very empowered but not in roman and jewish culture. True—there were multiple female rulers in both the Ptolemaic dynasty and the Hasmonean kingdom. The Ptolemies had several Cleopatras, Berenices, and Arsinoës ruling independently or as co-rulers. Even in the Hasmonean period, Salome Alexandra (76–67 BCE) ruled as queen and was one of the most powerful figures of her time. This definitely weakens the argument that a woman couldn’t have written John just because of gender. If elite women in those circles had power, wealth, and influence, then a female gospel author (like Mary Magdalene or another court-connected woman) wouldn’t be impossible. In John 11:27, Martha says: “ναί, κύριε· ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος.” She uses “Χριστός” (Christos), not “Μεσσίας”

(Messiah). This is significant because John does use “Μεσσίας” in other places (John 1:41 and John 4:25), but here, Martha is speaking in Greek terminology. This aligns with John’s overall Greek imperial framework, rather than a purely Jewish messianic expectation.

John never uses Μεσσίας (Messiah) alone—he immediately translates it as Χριστός, meaning his audience wouldn’t naturally recognize “Messiah” as a meaningful title. John 1:41 – “He first finds his own brother Simon and says to him, ‘We have found the Messiah’ (which is translated Christos).” (εὐρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεύμενον Χριστός). John 4:25 – “The woman said to him, ‘I know that Messiah is coming’ (who is called Christos).” (Οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται, ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός). Both times, it appears in direct speech, meaning these are Jewish characters (Andrew and the Samaritan woman) using a Jewish term, not the narrator or author. This is the case where the Greeks tried to convince the Jews to accept Jesus as their rightful ruler as well to additionally bolster his claim and gather more support.

Nathanael’s declaration: “Rabbi, you are the Son of God! You are the King of Israel!” This means Nathanael is recognizing that Jesus, who is acknowledged as Christos (a Greek royal title), is not only the ruler of the Greek world (Christos) but also the king of the Jews, in a more localized context. The title “King of Israel” acknowledges the Jewish concept of kingship, which would have been understood as a ruler over Israel, distinct from the broader Greek context of kingship. Andrew’s declaration to Simon: “We have found the Messiah.” Andrew is indicating that Jesus, who is referred to as Christos (the Greek royal title), is not just the Greek king (Christos) but also the Messiah, a title that resonates specifically with Jewish expectations of a king. He’s telling Simon that Jesus fulfills both roles—the Greek Christos and the Jewish Messiah—and both Jewish and Greek audiences should recognize him as the ruler of both realms.

19. In that time, kings and emperors were often called divine, not necessarily because people believed they were literal gods, but because divinity was part of royal language and legitimacy. For Mary Magdalene, calling Jesus her “God” wouldn’t necessarily mean she thought he was some abstract deity but rather that he was her true, anointed ruler—her Christos—just as emperors were called divine. She saw him as the rightful king, the one destined to rule, and her personal devotion to him would naturally be expressed in the highest possible terms. So, when she calls him “Lord” or when Thomas says “My Lord and my God” in John, it could reflect the same kind of royal language used for emperors—

deep respect, loyalty, and recognition of his ultimate authority—rather than a fully developed theological doctrine of divinity.

20. Watching him die would have been unbearable. She had placed all her faith, love, and devotion in him—not just as a ruler, but as the center of her world. When the Romans crucified him, it wasn't just the death of a man; it was the destruction of everything she believed in. Grief can do powerful things to the mind. Faced with such a loss, she might have experienced visions, dreams, or an overwhelming sense that he couldn't really be gone. The idea that he had risen wouldn't have started as a theological claim—it would have been a desperate, emotional response to the unbearable pain of losing him. At that moment, she wasn't just an eyewitness; she was the one who couldn't let go.

21. The resurrection story in John isn't just a theological claim—it's a deeply personal, emotional experience that reflects the profound impact Jesus had on her life. This explains why the resurrection account in John is so intimate and personal, focusing on Mary's grief, confusion, and joy. This explains why it is only Mary who sees Jesus first, and why she doesn't recognize him at first—her vision is clouded by tears and despair.

22. Description of male nudity There is an unusual detail of Simon Peter being naked in the presence of the disciple whom Jesus loved. This detail seems to have no place in the narrative, and it is not clear why it is included.

Although more sophisticated readings of this passage have been proposed, the most direct explanation stands out. A woman, emotionally close to Peter or Jesus, remembering this odd, slightly intimate moment: “He was basically naked, saw Jesus, and scrambled to cover up before jumping in.” Peter being “γυμνός” (naked or underdressed) is a kind of detail a woman would be more likely to remember vividly and include in her account, especially if she was reminiscing the stories of her youth. Feels less like theology, more like memory.

And then finally the Jesus's resurrection is described by the shroud being left in the tomb with the implication that Jesus was naked when he met Mary Magdalene. Portraying Jesus as naked meeting a woman would be a very fit conclusion for a female author romance writer, but would make very little sense in any other scenario.

23. The lack of description of physical appearance of Jesus in John seems to contradict the idea that the author was an eyewitness a woman and a lover of Jesus. Given all the other tropes of female writing, it is something very surprising at first. One explanation of this is that Philo of Alexandria, from whom the author of John seems to have borrowed a lot of ideas, also actively avoided describing the physical appearance of anyone in his works. It is possible that Philo conveyed this unusual to us idea to the author of John, and the author of John tried to follow the best practices of their teacher.

24. John leaves out the institution of the Eucharist. The Last Supper is a key moment in the synoptic gospels, where Jesus breaks bread and shares wine with his disciples, establishing the Eucharist. In John, this moment is replaced with the foot-washing scene (John 13:1-17), which emphasizes servanthood and humility rather than the sacramental act of communion.

In the context of Jesus being an observer of Greek religious traditions, the Eucharist would have been already a set tradition. Unlike in Greek feasts, a Jewish passover meal would have been centered around the lamb, and bread and wine rituals would not have been the center of the meal. Most notably the widespread around that time, Dionysian feasts would have been centered around the wine and bread rituals. While drinking metaphorical blood and body of Dionysus would have been a widespread practice, the drinking of the blood and body in a Jewish banquet would have been considered a major blasphemy.

Even if we discount synoptic gospels and the letter to Corinthians, the Didache, a very early Christian text, also mentions the Eucharist as a well-established tradition.

If the Eucharist was a well-established tradition, and already a centerpiece of the Christian faith by the late first century, then how can one possibly explain it just slipped John's mind?

Also noteworthy, John describes Jesus talking about flesh and blood in the context of logos, so a modernized version of the Greco-Roman feast. This is exactly a modern perspective Philo would have embraced, and it is very likely that the author of John was trying to convey the same message.

To note, Justin Martyr and Tertullian both accuse followers of Myhras of copying the Eucharist from the Christians. This only gives a string indication that the ritual was already prevalent in the pre-Jesus Greek world.

The Message

Finally, the traditional view of John being a man. We have to keep in mind that most scholars agree the very early Christian communities had very strong influence from women. Figures like Mary Magdalene, Tecla, Priscilla were all at the forefront of the early church. However, when the gospels were brought to the Roman writers, text had to be interpolated to the modern audience. Women leaders were erased from history, Mary Magdalene made into a prostitute, and Saint Paul 50 years after his death started to tell all good Christian women to be silent and let their husbands do the talking. In that context do we really have any doubt a gospel written by a Joanna or Mary Magdalene would have been attributed to a John? There is always a concern that John the beloved disciple is not mentioned in the synoptic gospels, but maybe the beloved disciple is actually one of the women mentioned in the synoptic gospels.

Keep in mind that there were many Eastern Roman empresses such as Theodora, Aelia Eudocia, and Zoe Porphyrogenita. The most famous scholar of the Byzantine empire, Hypatia was a woman, one possibly the only meaningful innovator astronomical and navigation tools for many centuries.

Whereas in the Latin culture the most prominent women had power only by the virtue of indirect influence on their husband or son.

Miracles in John

There are seven miracles in John, which are often called the “signs” because they point to Jesus’ identity and mission. It is very worth pointing out that the miracles are not just random show of magic, but all are conveying the royal authority of Jesus. Also, the miracles may not be completely a metaphor. Jesus as a ruler very well learned could have been a skilled healer, or perceived as a skilled healer with the power of confirmation bias. Notably it is not hard to believe that if Jesus visited a sick person and the person got better from just a placebo effect, then the person writing his royal biography would have been very keen to write about it. Similarly, if Jesus had the resources to provide food for the hungry, and he showed the high generosity of a ruler, then the person writing his royal biography would have been very keen to write about it.

The seven signs in John are as follows: ##### 1. Water into wine (John 2:1-11) The transformation of water into wine signifies the arrival of a new covenant, just as royal feasts marked the legitimacy of kings. ##### 2. Healing the official’s son in Herod’s court (John 4:46-54) The healing of the official’s son and the paralytic

demonstrate his power over life and sickness, which in the ancient world were under divine royal prerogative. ##### 3. Healing the paralytic (John 5:1-9) ##### 4. Feeding the 5,000 (John 6:1-14) Feeding the 5,000 mirrors the provision of a ruler to his people, akin to divine kingship in Hellenistic and Jewish traditions. ##### 5. Walking on water (John 6:16-21) Walking on water recalls dominion over the elements, a sign of imperial and divine control in both Greek and Jewish thought. ##### 6. Healing the man born blind (John 9:1-12) ##### 7. Raising Lazarus from the dead (John 11:1-44) Healing the blind and raising Lazarus emphasize his authority over fate itself—challenging even the most immutable conditions of human existence.

8. The non-miracle at the death of Jesus. It is also interesting to note that the gospel of John is the only gospel that does not mention the miracles at the death of Jesus. As a gospel written by an eyewitness, it is very likely that the author was present at the crucifixion of Jesus, and would have been able to see the miracles that happened at the time.

9. Conclusion The lack of mention of the miracles at the death of Jesus in the gospel of John is a strong indication that the author was actually attempting to write an accurate account of the events that happened at the time, and not just a theological treatise. As if you were to introduce a miracle for theological reasons this would be the number one place to do it. So although the seven miracles are not necessarily completely historically accurate, there is no compelling reason to believe they were not simply slightly exaggerated versions of the truth, the highlight of actual events where Jesus showed his leadership skills, knowledge of medicine, and generosity, just embellished as would have been expected from a royal biography, especially if the author was in love with Jesus.

What is really worth considering is that the events of the seven signs were really reported by the beloved disciple by Jesus as accurate. For I tell you, let him who never exaggerated their manly deeds to their love interest be the one to cast the first stone.

10. The Gospel of John point While we discuss the historical Jesus and historical John, there is one thought that keeps coming back to me.

Nearly every discussion of the Gospel of John is about its theology. We argue over doctrine and vocabulary and historic accuracy, but maybe we actually miss the single most important thing in the text.

We have lost the author. We have lost the community that first carried it. We have lost the Jesus they knew, and the beliefs of the first church. What survives are copies of copies of copies, shaped by centuries of shifting theology and changing cultures.

But perhaps the best evidence for the true authorship of the Gospel of John is not the in any of the individual hard evidence, but rather the overall message of the Gospel itself. What if the message of love is so strong, so deep, that it actually became the root of Christianity. Perhaps when the billions of Christians read the Gospel of John, they may not realize, but they are subconsciously feeling the love that the author had for Jesus. Perhaps an ancient letter about a lost love has become the most powerful and enduring message of love in human history. Perhaps it is true that love is the only thing we're capable of perceiving that transcends the dimensions of time and space.

3.1.2 Synoptic Gospels

1. The main argument for the dating of the synoptic gospels to after year 70AD is the destruction of the temple by the Romans.

2. Most scholars argue the Olivet Discourse in the synoptic gospels is a prophecy of the destruction of the temple.

3. At the same time the textual analysis of Mark shows that these verses were added later. which is strikingly more formal and technical than the surrounding Markan language. In the rest of the Gospel, Mark tends to favor more direct and accessible expressions of Jesus' teachings and prophecies, often focusing on clear, vivid imagery. The "abomination of desolation" is a very specific, technical term that feels more aligned with prophetic, liturgical, or later theological writing. This suggests it could be an editorial addition, introduced to reflect later theological concerns (like the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE) or to align the passage with more familiar Old Testament imagery.

4. "But in those days, after that tribulation..." (Mark 13:24) The phrase "after that tribulation" introduces a more formal, structured apocalyptic expression that contrasts with the more immediate and direct tone of earlier sections in Mark. Mark's Gospel typically uses simple, conversational language, but this phrase carries a more stylized apocalyptic tone, characteristic of later prophetic writings. It

introduces a period of cosmic upheaval, which is a prominent feature of later apocalyptic literature (including the Book of Revelation and some Jewish apocalyptic texts), but less common in the earlier parts of the Gospel.

5. “When you see the desolating sacrilege set up where it ought not to be” (Mark 13:14) Language Issue: This passage contains complex terminology like “desolating sacrilege” and the phrase “set up where it ought not to be”. While the “abomination of desolation” in earlier prophecies is a well-established term, this variation feels more convoluted and distant from the language of Mark’s usual teachings. It introduces an additional layer of complexity that seems more fitting to later apocalyptic writers, who used this terminology to indicate ritualistic desecration in a manner distinct from Mark’s usual straightforward style.

6. “Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away” (Mark 13:31) Language Issue: The eternal nature of Jesus’ words is a theme more common in Johannine literature (John 1:1, 6:68, 14:23). While Mark presents Jesus as authoritative, this statement emphasizes a long-lasting theological development that might be at odds with Mark’s more human-centric portrayal of Jesus. This phrase might also echo themes found in later Christian writings that focus on the eternal validity of Jesus’ teachings in a way that is somewhat different from the earthly mission Mark emphasizes.

7. “But concerning that day or that hour, no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father” (Mark 13:32) Language Issue: The emphasis on the ignorance of the Son regarding the coming of the Kingdom contrasts with the high Christology that develops in later texts like John, where Jesus has full knowledge and authority. While it is possible that this reflects Mark’s emphasis on Jesus’ humanity, the way the phrase is worded feels slightly out of sync with the rest of the Gospel, where Jesus is shown to have a strong authority over time and knowledge of God’s plans. The focus on ignorance is strikingly different from the confident tone found in later Christian reflections on Jesus.

8. “Let the reader understand” (Mark 13:14) This phrase alone is already an indication of an insert. This is a phrase a later scribe would typically use to clarify a point or to provide additional context for a passage that might be unclear to the reader.

9. Now the question is, if Mark 13 and Mark 16 were added to the gospel known to us, then when would the edits have been made? Well, likely it was quite soon after the event when the event was still fresh in the minds of the people. As so many events relevant to global politics, Jewish and Christian history happened at the time, the edits were done say decades later, likely different events would have been on top of the minds of the editors to make the edits. Based on this alone, we could put the upper end for the dating of the original manuscript of Mark to before 70AD.

10. The other arguments for the lower bound of the dating of the gospels focus on the need to develop the theology of the early church. In the context of Jesus being an heir to the greek empire, the gospel of Mark would not require any development of the theology as it is a historical account of the final downfall of the greek empire. The theological part of it would be the resurrection of Jesus, which was not present in the original gospel of Mark. As such there is little reason to expect much time to pass between the historical events and the writing of the gospel of Mark.

11 The gospel of Mark starts with the baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist. The baptism of Jesus is a very important event in the gospels, as it is the event that marks the beginning of Jesus' reign as the rightful king of the greek empire. Courtly scribes often start at the beginning of the reign of the king, and the baptism of Jesus is likely the event that would have been considered the beginning of his reign. Traditional scholarship does not provide a good explanation for why the story of Jesus would start with the baptism by John the Baptist, but in the context of Jesus being the rightful heir to the greek empire, it makes perfect sense. The story of baptism is also portrayed as a very public event, which would have been a very important event for the people to know about. In all four Gospels, during Jesus' baptism, a voice from heaven declares: "This is my Son, whom I love; with him, I am well pleased" (Matthew 3:17, Mark 1:11, Luke 3:22, John 1:34). This is significant because, in ancient Jewish and Hellenistic traditions, the declaration of someone as a "son of God" often had royal connotations, signifying divine legitimacy or appointment to a kingship. The title "Son of God" was used for kings in the Hebrew scriptures (e.g., 2 Samuel 7:14) and in Hellenistic traditions for emperors and rulers.

In the context of ancient Jewish and Hellenistic practices, the act of baptism, particularly with water, was used in various rites of initiation or purification. How-

ever, in the case of Jesus, the combination of the heavenly voice, the dove, and the symbolic actions surrounding the baptism could be seen as a formal coronation—especially given the royal language and imagery associated with it.

Finally, a well known earlier variant of the baptism quote is “Today I have begotten you” (Psalm 2:7). This phrase (Psalm 2:7), as used in the Gospel of the Hebrews during the baptism narrative, is not just about divine sonship. It is a Davidic enthronement formula. Psalm 2 is a royal psalm, spoken by God to the newly installed king of Israel (originally for Davidic kings). In Second Temple Judaism, it was widely understood as Messianic, referring to the anointed one (Christos) who would rule the nations. The Gospel of the Hebrews’ use of this verse explicitly identifies baptism as the moment Jesus is declared king—not metaphorically, but in the tradition of Hellenistic and Jewish coronation rituals.

10.3 A very interesting but little known fact is that there exists a common early variant of Luke saying “You are my Son, today I have begotten you.” This is a very important variant as it is a direct reference to Jesus actually becoming the king or the son of God at the baptism. Much like the references to temple destruction and additional resurrection stories this variant was likely erased from the Gospel of Luke when the understanding changed from more political to a religious one.

12. Gospel of the Hebrews variants of the baptism story In some fragments, Jesus is portrayed as baptizing others, not merely receiving baptism.

This reverses the standard narrative and places Jesus in the position of the initiator, the one who commands and empowers. That act reflects imperial privilege—a king is not merely initiated, he is the one who now administers the rites of his reign. This underscores Jesus as king over a new order, already exercising regal authority.

The Gospel of the Hebrews uniquely calls the Holy Spirit Jesus’s “Mother,” and she lifts him up by his hair and carries him to Mount Tabor. This echoes ancient royal investiture scenes, where a deity (or female embodiment of Wisdom) reveals or blesses a new ruler. Mount Tabor is symbolic — a “high place” often used in imperial and divine appearances in both Jewish and Hellenistic traditions. The motif of being lifted and carried by the Spirit recalls imperial enthronements where the new king is symbolically raised.

12. Royal Psalms: The Psalms contain numerous references to the king being God’s anointed (e.g., Psalm 2:7, Psalm 45:7), and the baptism scene echoes these royal motifs. By identifying Jesus as the Son of God and anointing him with the

Spirit, the Gospel writers could be alluding to these royal traditions, suggesting a coronation-like event rather than merely a religious cleansing.

13 The dove descending on Jesus at his baptism is a symbol of divine approval and empowerment. The Dove as a Divine Symbol: In Greek and Hellenistic cultures, the dove was often associated with various divine manifestations, particularly linked to gods like Zeus and Apollo. A dove descending from heaven was a common symbol of divine approval or empowerment, as in the case of Zeus transforming into a dove in some myths. In Hellenistic royal ideology, the idea of divine signs, such as a dove appearing at the moment of a king's or leader's coronation, was not unusual. Dove and the "Anointing" of Rulers: Greek rulers and Roman emperors were often seen as divinely chosen, and symbols of divine approval—such as a dove—would serve to emphasize this idea. The use of a dove in the baptism of Jesus could be interpreted as a sign that Jesus is divinely anointed for kingship, in line with how Hellenistic rulers were often anointed by the gods.

14. The gospel of Matthew includes the details of the birth of Jesus with the visit of the Magi. The visit of the Magi has been universally accepted as an allegory but as mentioned in the previous chapter, the titles of the Magi are exceedingly hard to fabricate by even the most knowledgeable of scholars in the Roman empire that were not greek empire loyalists. The Herod's massacre of the innocents is also universally accepted as allegory, but as outlined in the Jesus Dynasty, the massacre of the innocents likely refers to Herod's killing of multiple of his own children and their families. In the context that Joseph was likely too of the Hasmonean family, giving birth in the city of the Hasmonean dynasty, Bethlehem, is again a lot more likely to be a real event than an allegory. Similarly, the flight to Egypt is likely a real event as a noble family would have had more than enough resources to flee to and be welcomed in Egypt for a few years.

15. Finally, the gospel of Matthew includes the great commission, which is likely an edit to the original gospel of Mark. πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη Make disciples of all nations – Spread the teachings of Jesus to people all over the world. Here the word "nations" is a translation of the Greek word "ethne," which can also be translated as "Gentiles" or "non Baptize them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit – Initiate them into the faith through baptism. Teach them to obey everything I have commanded you – Continue teaching and guiding new believers to follow Jesus' teachings. Jesus

promises his presence –”And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age.” The great commission is essentially what the emissaries of the greek empire would have been doing, spreading the decrees of the king across the empire.

16. The term ἔθνη is typically translated as “nations” but can also be translated as “Gentiles” or “non-Jews.” In the context of the greek empire, the term would have been used to refer to all the greek people across the empire, all the nations, kingdoms or tribes that were part of the greek empire.

17. The gospel of Matthew also includes the genealogy of Jesus, which is widely accepted as not-genuine or lost to history. However, with the acceptance of the theory that Jesus was the grandson of Herod the Great, the genealogy of Jesus through Joseph as his adopted father would require a more thorough examination. One notable figure from this lineage are Zerubbabel, who was a governor of the Persian province of Yehud, or Judea, and can be dated to around 520BC. Making best guess estimates to the years of the other figures in the genealogy, the Eleazar fits very well with son Eleazar of Onias I, who was the high priest of the temple in Jerusalem. From these we can fairly obviously link Matthan to Mattathias Hasmonean, Father of Judas Maccabee, leader of Maccabean Revolt.

Name	Possible Historical Identity	Estimated Lifespan (BC)	Significance
Zerubbabel	Zerubbabel	~520 BC	Governor under Persian period
Abiud	Unknown	~480 BC	Persian period
Eliakim	Unknown	~440 BC	Persian period
Azor	Unknown	~400 BC	Late Persian r
Zadok	Possibly High Priest Zadokite line	~360 BC	Hellenization
Achim	Possibly Onias I	~320 BC	Early Ptolemai
Eliud	Possibly Simon I the Just	~280 BC	Respected Jewi
Eleazar	Eleazar, son of Onias I	~260-245 BC	Jewish High Pr
Matthan	Mattathias Hasmonean	~190-160 BC	Father of Juda
Jacob	Possibly Alexander Jannaeus	~120-75 BC	Expanded Hasmonean ter
Joseph	Possibly linked to late Hasmonean elite	~60 BC-10 AD	Era of Herodi
Jesus	Himself	~4 BC-30/33 AD	Claimed rightf

Based on the estimated lifespans of the figures in the genealogy, the Jacob mentioned in the genealogy would be Alexander Jannaeus, whose unusual name is also

mentioned in the lineage of Mary in the Luke gospel may have been recorded by Matthew as a more familiar sounding Jacob. Regardless of the exact identities of all figures, there is enough data here to conclude that the genealogy of Jesus in the gospel of Matthew is not a complete fabrication, but a genuine attempt to trace the lineage of Jesus through Joseph. It is true we may never find the true identity of Abuid, but for the argument to be valid, all we need to accept is that Matthew attempted to trace Jesus lineage though Hasmonean dynasty through some historical figures and focusing on more prominent ones. There were more figures between Mattathias and Jesus, but the genealogy is by design listing only the most prominent ones to show Jesus descent from the well known powerful kings, and not an attempt to list every single person in the family.

Again, gospels are starting with baptism of Jesus, state Jesus's lineage and show Jesus teaching with parables, and perform miracles and forgave sin. This is precisely what you expect from royal chronicles of the time. Start add the lineage of the king, describe coronation, describe the reign when the rules show wisdom and power control over nature and human fate. Then later version may add omens and prophecies of the king's birth, and the death. There is absolutely nothing special about gospels here.

18. Possibly the most prominent element of the gospel of Matthew is the reference to the Jewish scriptures and the fulfillment of the prophecies at seemingly every turn. As such the gospel seems to be with a very high probability written by a prominent Jewish priest, who was also a greek empire loyalist. There is a theory with substantial textual evidence that the gospel of Matthew was written by the Jewish priest Mattathias ben Theophilus. That theory is also not generally accepted as it requires a pre-70AD dating of the gospel of Matthew, however, withing the context of discussed in this book, that argument is not valid, and based on other observations made in the framework that theory becomes the one more likely than the traditional dating.

19. The gospel of Luke also includes a number of edits, most notably the birth narrative of Jesus. The birth narrative seems to be full of internal contradictions and is at odds with the gospel of Matthew the events of which have some of the extremely remarkable facts corroborating to the rest of this theory. The genealogy of Jesus in the gospel of Luke, notably has even more genuine figures from the Hasmonean dynasty down to the father of Mary, Heli, which is a short form of Eliakim, which is the same name as Joachim, which is the father of Mary in the

protoevangelium of James. If we accept that the gospel of Luke was written as a correspondence with the author of the gospel of Matthew, the dating of it would also not be far removed.

20. The gospel of Marcion deserves another look in this context. Even though the gospel of Marcion is dated to the 2nd century, the gospel is also remarkably missing the pre-cognition of the destruction of the temple. Much of modern textual analysis places the gospel not as an edited version of the gospel of Luke, but as an earlier version of the gospel of Luke, due to the simpler language and the lack of the birth narrative of Jesus.

21. The gospel of Luke describes how Jesus engaged with temple leaders and the Jewish elite when he was a child. We are told Joseph and Mary settled in Galilee, but they traveled to Jerusalem for the Passover festival every year. This is consistent with Mary being a member of the Hasmonean dynasty, as the Hasmoneans were known to have a strong connection to the temple in Jerusalem. This theory fully explains how Jesus would realistically be able to engage with the temple leaders and the Jewish elite at such a young age. As per his wise man reputation, it is very likely that Jesus was a child prodigy, and would have been eager and able to engage with the temple leaders about scriptures and the law at a very young age. Likely if Jesus was a child prodigy, he would have been studying Jewish and Greek scriptures and philosophy in Egypt and in Galilee. Galilee libraries in Sepphoris would have been precisely well stocked with the works of the Greek philosophers and the Jewish scriptures fully accounting for Jesus's teachings.

22. Luke is using greek historical writing style, and the gospel is written, not a religious text. Ancient Greek Historians' Opening Formula: Luke's opening in Luke 1:1-4 mirrors a well-established convention in Greek historical writing. The common formula in works by historians like Herodotus and Thucydides begins with a clear intention to provide a factual account and a claim of reliable sources. The historian often says that he will provide a narrative based on careful research and interviews with eyewitnesses. Similarly, Luke introduces his gospel by stating that many have already written accounts, and he aims to write "an orderly account" based on what he has investigated carefully (Luke 1:3). This intro not only appeals to the authority of eyewitness testimony but establishes the writer's credibility—a trait highly valued in Greek historiography.

By establishing this historian's formula, Luke is distancing his account from mythical or legendary stories. This is similar to the way Herodotus sets himself apart from storytellers or poets, aiming for historical accuracy. His explicit claim of factual investigation is Greek historiographical technique.

He says 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. (note he was a servant of the word)

Emphasis on Historical Accuracy: Luke consistently anchors his narrative with real, known political figures and chronological details. For example, he refers to the reign of Caesar Augustus (Luke 2:1), the governorship of Quirinius (Luke 2:2), and the rule of Pontius Pilate (Luke 23:1-25). This is highly reminiscent of Greek historians, especially Thucydides, who grounds his narrative in precise dates and political actors (e.g., the years of the Peloponnesian War). **Public Acts and Decrees:** The Roman census (Luke 2:1-3) is a key event that ties the story into the broader imperial political world. This is a hallmark of Greek historical writing, where historians would use official decrees or military campaigns as turning points in the narrative. Similarly, Acts uses references to imperial trials and Roman legal processes (e.g., Paul's trial before Gallio, Acts 18:12-17) as a means to legitimize Christianity and explain its spread through the empire. **Roman Emperors and Local Leaders:** The mention of Herod the Great in the narrative helps place the events within a concrete political framework. Like Polybius, who uses the actions of local leaders as windows into the larger workings of an empire, Luke does the same. He mentions Herod as a regional figure whose reign is significant not just in its own right but as a piece of the greater political puzzle.

Luke's precise use of geographical locations, like Judea, Galilee, and Capernaum, adds to this historical framework, providing context for the actions of Jesus and the early church in a way that closely resembles the method of ancient historians who anchored their stories in known historical settings.

Unified Narrative: Luke and Acts together form a single, continuous narrative. The structure itself is highly methodical, resembling the way historians like Polybius wrote histories that were divided into books or volumes that followed the chronological development of key events. Luke's work is divided between the story of Jesus' life and ministry (Luke) and the early history of the Christian church (Acts). The transition from the life of Jesus to the apostles' missions parallels how ancient historians would follow a ruler's life and then shift to his empire's activities.

Political and Religious Movements: Just as Polybius traces the rise and fall of

Rome, or Suetonius traces the lives of emperors, Luke similarly focuses on political and religious figures and their movements through the empire. His narrative of Paul's missionary journeys (in Acts) mirrors the structure of royal chronicles, detailing the challenges and legal trials faced by a prominent political figure (Paul) on his travels through the empire.

Speech as Political Tool: Luke often uses speeches by Jesus and Paul to express core theological and political ideas. These speeches resemble the formal rhetoric found in Greek histories, where kings or political figures deliver speeches to clarify their goals and assert their legitimacy. In Acts, for instance, Paul's speeches before kings (Agrippa, Acts 26) or the Sanhedrin (Acts 23) are presented in a historical context where the figure is asserting his political and religious identity. **Strategic Use of Legal Trials and Defenses:** Much like Plutarch or Suetonius, who present key speeches in the trials of emperors or important political figures, Luke uses trials and defenses (such as Paul's before Festus and Agrippa) to emphasize the legitimacy of the Christian message. These trials are strategically placed in the narrative to reflect not only political struggles but also theological defense—showing that the new movement aligns with or challenges imperial policy in ways that are deeply significant.

The Divine Favor of Jesus and Paul: The portrayal of Jesus' divine mission and Paul's apostolic authority mirrors the way Greek historians often depicted kings or emperors as possessing divine favor. Luke's consistent depiction of Jesus' miracles and Paul's visions and divine encounters frames the early Christian movement as divinely ordained, much like the way kings and rulers were seen as divinely chosen or supported in Greek histories.

23. Luke places the lineage of Jesus at the baptism, not at the birth. Scholars argue that Jesus lineage placed after birth narrative is an evidence that the birth narrative was added as a scribal edit. However, this is not a valid argument, as if the scribe went to the effort of adding major piece of text and blend it well into the narrative and the core idea of the author, how could he have just omitted moving the lineage to the beginning of the text?

The obvious answer is that the lineage was not intended to be at the beginning of the text, and was given at the baptism of Jesus when proclaiming him as the rightful king.

24. Later gospels and apocryphal texts It is important to note that to judge the significance of the dating of the texts, or really any claims in any historical work,

it is important to address all evidence available, not just the evidence supporting the claim. The emphasis is that while some texts like the gospel of Hebrews, the gospel of Marcion, the protoevangelium of James, gospel of Thomas, are indeed very likely very tied so independent source testimonies, there are a large number of writings, although seemingly expanded narrative, seem to be fully derived from other texts and do not bring any new source. One example is the very common gospel of Nicodemus or the Acts of Pilate, which, although it adds a lot of human interactions, does not seem to bring up any fresh or contradictory information at all that would not be a natural embellishment or interpolation of the original texts. Thus, it is very likely only composed based on other known texts and not on an unknown source or a direct testimony of first or second hand witness.

Chapter 4

Pauline Epistles to All Nations

4.1 Chapter 4 - Pauline Epistles to All Nations

πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη “Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations.”

The key point missed by most scholars is that *panta ta ethnē* does not refer to “all nations” universally, but rather to the nations of the Greek world. The Septuagint consistently uses *ethnē* to describe the nations under God’s rule—those invited into covenant—not every nation globally.

Καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς “And in your seed, all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.” This is a key passage used in early Christianity (Galatians 3:8) to show that all the nations were meant to be part of God’s covenant, not just outsiders.

Βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντες λαοὶ, ἄρχοντες καὶ πάντες κριταὶ γῆς... ὑψώσεως κεράτων λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὕμνος πᾶσι τοῖς ὁσίοις αὐτοῦ, τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ, λαῶ ἐγγίζοντι αὐτῷ. “Kings of the earth and all peoples, rulers and all judges of the earth... a hymn for all His saints, the sons of Israel, a people near to Him.” The “kings of the earth and all peoples” are brought into God’s rule, but the focus remains on God’s people.

All nations referred to God’s people, not necessarily only Greek ethnicity, but all nations who proclaimed the rule of God. So that would also include Jews and

1. The early dating of the gospels can make the letters of Paul more plausible as it seems Paul already has the knowledge of at least one of the gospels and the acts. Many scholars dispute the existence of Paul based on the striking con-

tradition in mainstream scholarship that authors of Pauline epistles seem to have the knowledge of the gospels and the acts, and yet the gospels and the acts are unanimously dated to be written after the Pauline epistles. In here the existence of Paul can once more be reconsidered if we acknowledge the early dating of the gospels and the gospel of John in being written by an eyewitness of Jesus's life.

2. What is quite striking is that Paul and others write to so many different churches over the short period of time. There is a major challenge for the traditional timeline of the apostles establishing so many churches in such a short period of time. These churches would have to all be established, grow, keep up to date with the fastly shifting theology, and then do nearly nothing for the next 100 years. These churches immediately showed up in every single major city in the former greek empire, and no churches showed up anywhere else. All of the correspondence and scripture was written in Greek, and no other languages. It is important to point out that greek was absolutely not the lingua franca in any part of the Roman empire, that was not recently part of the greek empire. The lingua franca of the Roman empire was Latin, and that was the only language that was used in the administration and the primary language used by the authors. If the apostles were to establish churches everywhere in the Roman empire, and not just in the former greek empire, then we would have had the epistles to the extremely prominent cities of Mediolanum, Lutetia, Aquilea, Lugdunum, Memphis, and Londinium. The truth is that no matter how we model the growth of the early church, it is not possible to explain the the patterns we observe. and then for the next 100 years do not add any new churches.

There were essentially no prominent cities in the former greek empire that were not mentioned in the acts and the epistles:

Judea and Surrounding Regions:				Region	City	Reference(s)	Notes
				Judea and Surrounding Regions	Jerusalem	Acts 1:4, 2:5, 8:1	Center of the early Christian movement and where Pentecost occurred. Bethany
							Acts 1:12
					Near Jerusalem, where Jesus ascended to heaven.	Joppa	Acts 9:36 A port city where Peter stayed and raised Tabitha from the dead. Caesarea
							Acts 8:40, 10:1 Where Philip preached and where Cornelius, a Gentile, was baptized by Peter. Antioch
							Acts 11:19 A key city for early Christian missions and where followers of Jesus were first called Christians. Nazareth
							Acts 2:22
					Hometown of Jesus, mentioned in the sermon at Pentecost. Asia Minor (Modern-day Turkey)	Tarsus	Acts 9:11 The birthplace of Paul (Saul).

Lystra | Acts 14:6 | Where Paul healed a crippled man and was nearly stoned. |||
 Derbe | Acts 14:6 | Where Paul and Barnabas preached and made many disciples.
 ||| Iconium | Acts 14:1 | Where Paul preached and faced opposition from the
 local Jewish authorities. ||| Ephesus | Acts 18:19 | A major city in Asia Minor
 where Paul spent a significant amount of time preaching and establishing the
 church. ||| Miletus | Acts 20:15 | Where Paul met with the Ephesian elders on
 his way to Jerusalem. ||| Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia,
 Laodicea | Revelation letters | Acts doesn't mention directly but likely influenced
 early Christian activity. || Greece | Philippi | Acts 16:12 | Where Paul and Silas
 were imprisoned and where the first European Christian church was founded.
 ||| Thessalonica | Acts 17:1 | A major city where Paul preached and faced
 opposition. ||| Berea | Acts 17:10 | Where Paul went after Thessalonica and found
 the Bereans to be more receptive to the gospel. ||| Athens | Acts 17:16 | Where
 Paul preached on Mars Hill and engaged with philosophers about the "unknown
 god." ||| Corinth | Acts 18:1 | Where Paul stayed and established a Christian
 community, and where he later wrote 1 and 2 Corinthians. || Macedonia and the
 Surrounding Areas | Neapolis | Acts 16:11 | Port city in Macedonia, where Paul
 and his companions arrived after sailing from Troas. ||| Philippi | Acts 16:12 |
 Mentioned earlier in Greece. || Egypt | Alexandria | Acts 6:9, 18:24 | Apollos
 was from here; a major Jewish and early Christian hub. || Libya (North Africa) |
 Cyrene | Acts 2:10, 11:20 | Home of Simon of Cyrene; some early Christians were
 from here. || Italy and Rome | Puteoli | Acts 28:13 | Port city in Italy where Paul
 arrived after sailing from Malta. ||| Rome | Acts 28:16 | Where Paul was taken
 as a prisoner and spent two years under house arrest. || Other Notable Cities |
 Cyprus | Acts 13:4 | Where Paul and Barnabas first traveled for missionary work.
 ||| Salamis | Acts 13:5 | A city in Cyprus where Paul preached. ||| Paphos | Acts
 13:6 | A city in Cyprus where Paul encountered the sorcerer Elymas. ||| Patara |
 Acts 21:1 | A port city in Lycia where Paul caught a ship to Phoenicia. ||| Tyre |
 Acts 21:3 | A city in Phoenicia where Paul stopped to meet the disciples. |

Regions and Cities in the Epistles:

Location	Mentioned In	References
Rome	Acts, Ro- mans, Philippians, 2 Timothy	Acts 28, Romans 1:7, 1:15, Philippians 1:13, 2 Timothy 4:16-17

Location	Mentioned In	References
Corinth	Acts, 1 Corinthi- ans, 2 Corinthians	1 Corinthians 1:2, 2 Corinthians 1:1
Ephesus	Acts, Eph- esians	Ephesians 1:1
Galatia	Galatians	Galatians 1:2
Philippi	Acts, Philippians	Philippians 1:1
Thessa- lonica	1 Thessa- lonians, 2 Thessaloni- ans	1 Thessalonians 1:1, 2 Thessalonians 1:1
Colossae	Colossians	Colossians 1:2
Laodicea	Colossians, Revelation	Colossians 4:13-16, Revelation 3:14-22
Crete	Titus	Titus 1:5
Cyprus	Galatians	Galatians 4:13
Pontus, Galatia, Cappado- cia, Asia, Bithynia	1 Peter	1 Peter 1:1
Macedonia	2 Corinthe- ans, Philip- pians	2 Corinthians 8:1, Philippians 4:15
Miletus	2 Timothy	2 Timothy 4:20
Antioch	Acts, Gala- tians, 1 Corinthians	Galatians 2:11, 1 Corinthians 9:6
Tarsus	Acts, 2 Corinthians	Acts 9:11, 2 Corinthians 11:22

[keepaspectratio,alt=Description of the image]locations_{map}

Figure 4.1: Description of the image

Location	Mentioned In	References
Syria	1 Corinthians, Galatians, 2 Corinthians	1 Corinthians 16:3, Galatians 1:21, 2 Corinthians 11:9
Asia	1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Revelation	1 Corinthians 16:19, 2 Corinthians 1:8
Troas	Acts, 2 Timothy	Acts 20:6, 2 Timothy 4:13
Berea	Acts, 1 Thessalonians	Acts 17:10, 1 Thessalonians 1:7
Paphos	Acts, Titus	Titus 1:5
Puteoli	Romans	Romans 16:3-4

It is important to actually visualize the locations mentioned in the acts and the epistles to see the striking pattern of the locations mentioned in the acts and the epistles being the same as the most significant greek speaking cities.

For those geographically inclined you can spot the near perfect correlation with the borders of Eastern Roman Empire. Of note is the trip to Rome, which was substantially different in nature to the other trips. Rome Map

3. The striking statistics of the cities mentioned in the acts and the epistles are that they are all in the former greek empire, and not one mention of a city in the Roman empire that was not part of the former greek empire. This fact makes any theory that deems Christianity as a religious and not a political movement immediately highly implausible.

4. Finally we consider the apparent minimal resistance to the acceptance of the new religion. The new religion was accepted by the masses in the former greek empire, and not a single mention of any resistance to the new religion. This can be explained if this was already a pre-existing imperial cult.

5. We should also consider that even though the religion was so successful at converting the masses, it still had all the conspiratorial parts to it. Early christians used secret symbols to identify each other, they frequently met in secret, often at night in the catacombs.

6. Consider why the religion was seemingly much more prosecuted than any other religion in the Roman empire. The Roman empire was very tolerant of other religions, and the only time they would prosecute a religion was if it was a threat to the empire. There are some claims that other religions were not exclusive and people could believe in multiple gods, and give offerings to Zeus, but very little has ever been produced to support this very dubious claim.

7. The phrase “soldiers of Christ” is not used explicitly in the Gospels, but it appears prominently in the Pauline Epistles, particularly in the context of the Christian life being compared to a military struggle or a spiritual battle. The most famous reference to “soldiers of Christ” comes from 2 Timothy 2:3-4, where Paul uses military imagery to describe the commitment and discipline required for Christian ministry: 2 Timothy 2:3-4 (NIV): “Join with me in suffering, like a good soldier of Christ Jesus. No one serving as a soldier gets entangled in civilian affairs, but rather tries to please his commanding officer.” This metaphor emphasizes the dedication and discipline expected from Christians, likening them to soldiers who are focused on their mission and loyalty to their leader, which in this case is Christ Jesus.

8. Paul barely mentions the life of Jesus, and almost never quotes him. It is frequently claimed that Paul’s religion is not the religion of Jesus, but the religion about Jesus. There is a shocking lack of references to any of the teachings of Jesus, the Jewish law, and any of the events surrounding Jesus’s life and death. So we may go one step further. It is a religion focusing on restoring the kingdom of God by resurrecting the office of the Christos, the rightful king of the kingdom of God. And so to Paul and all the early Christian, it was a all about resurrecting a Christ not teaching of the particular Jesus Christ. The idea that the God will once again

send a king that will restore the greek empire, the kingdom of God, headed by Christos, the rightful earthly king of the kingdom of God.

9. Using this conspiratorial language clearly worked The Rome did not even realize the new religion's goal was to restore the Eastern Empire until it actually happened.

10. Alexandria was the capital of the Greek Empire and the center of the Hellenistic world and yet there are no missions or letters to Alexandria. The absence of Alexandria in the New Testament is striking, especially considering its significance and proximity to Jesus's life and the early Christian movement. Alexandria was erased from the text, as it was the origin city of Apollos, as well as some of the other companions or contacts of Paul in like Mark, Demas, and Luke. (Mark and Luke that are often presumed to be the evangelists). Although we do not know if Mark mentioned in Pauline epistles is the same Mark as the one who wrote the Gospel of Mark, and that he really came from Alexandria, cities of origin is something we can be more trusting about as people making up tradition are less likely to make up the city of origin.

We are looking here at Alexandria missing as the largest city while the next 30 cities or regions are mentioned. An interpretation withing this theory was that Alexandria was the center of the Greek Empire and the apostles came from there to other nations to spread the word of God, the word that originally came from Alexandria. So they were envoys from Alexandria to all nations. At the same time we know the Christian movement was very strong in Alexandria from the very oldest records on early Christianity we have. When we look at some of the most influential early church fathers, we see Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and Athanasius of Alexandria.

Since Alexandria was such an integral part of the Greek imperial world, the apostles or early missionaries didn't have to make the same kind of outreach there that they did in other regions. Their mission was not to convince Alexandria to join the cause, but to spread it elsewhere in the Greek world, with the understanding that Alexandria was already aligned with the goal of restoring the empire.

This is not too dissimilar from how Ptolemaic empire is almost completely missing from the Old Testament even though it was where the story of the Old Testament took place.

The absence of Alexandria in the New Testament is very hard to explain within any common theories of historical Jesus. We see a lot of activity and communi-

cation with the second and third most significant cities which are Antioch and Ephesus, that also had a very strong Jewish presence, also heavily influential, also deeply philosophical and well educated for the era, so it was not like apostles tried to prioritize major cities less, or cities with a strong Jewish presence or cities with where convincing population to change the views could be harder.

4.1.1 Acts of the Apostles

Is called the Acts of the Apostles, not acts of the disciples. Apostles doing imperial work of letting all nations of the empire know the will of the God king.

10. Acts opens with a royal enthronement Acts 1:6 — “Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?” This is not a spiritual question. It implies Jesus had a claim to political kingship. Your theory: Jesus was understood as the rightful monarch of a revived kingdom—a successor to the Herodian or Has-monean thrones under Greek imperial ideals.

10. Jesus is taken up like an emperor Acts 1:9–11 — The Ascension mimics apotheosis scenes (e.g., Alexander, Roman emperors). It frames Jesus in imperial terms, being enthroned in heaven—like a divine emperor. This matches your view that Christianity was about loyalty to the “Christ Emperor.”

10. The Pentecost scene mimics an imperial inauguration Acts 2 — Multi-lingual miracle and mass conversion reflects the imperial ideal of uniting nations under one divine king. This isn’t random spiritualism—it reflects a Hellenistic, cosmopolitan imperial theology. The language of “tongues” is political: the emperor’s message is for all nations.

10. Acts 5: The trial of the apostles Gamaliel references past revolutionary figures—Theudas and Judas the Galilean. This acknowledges that messianic revolts were political, and that Jesus’ movement was seen in similar terms. It subtly affirms that Jesus was considered a royal claimant and threat.

10. Stephen’s speech in Acts 7 is anti-Temple Stephen attacks the Temple and Mosaic tradition, echoing Philo and Stoic-influenced criticisms of Jewish legalism. This supports your view that early Christianity rejected the Mosaic religion and aligned more with philosophical monotheism.

10. Paul as imperial envoy Paul appeals to Caesar, travels through Greek cities, and preaches to Hellenized elites. His speeches (e.g., Acts 17 in Athens) are clearly political-philosophical, not sectarian Jewish. Acts frames Paul as a kind of philosopher-diplomat for the Christ-emperor, aligning with your imperial theology model.

11. Acts ends without resolution The book ends in Rome, with Paul freely preaching “the kingdom of God.” It lacks a narrative climax because its real message is that the empire is now Christian. It presumes a pre-existing audience that sees Christianity as a political-theological force.

James the Just

1. James the Just also wrote an epistle to all nations. He was the brother of Jesus, and the next in line to the throne.

Much like Jesus Christ the Soter, James also held a royal title, the Just.

James the Just also wrote an epistle to all nations, which is included in the New Testament. Interestingly, James, like John, refers to the same understanding of Logos as Philo of Alexandria.

The writing style of James and John also bear a striking resemblance to the writing style of Philo of Alexandria.

In Greek, James 1:21 reads as: “Διὸ ἀποθέμενοι πάσαν ἀκαθαρσίαν καὶ περισσεῖαν κακίας ἐν πραΰτητι δέξασθε τὸν ἐμφυτον λόγον, ὃς δύναται σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.” Transliteration: “Dio apothemenoi pasan akatharsian kai perisseian kakias en prautēti dexasthē ton emphuton logon, hos dynatai sōsai tas psychas hymōn.” A literal translation would be: “Therefore, putting away all filthiness and the overflow of wickedness, with meekness receive the implanted word, which is able to save your souls.”

It should go without saying that the advanced writing style of James and John is not something that would be expected from a simple fisherman or a son of a carpenter.

Chapter 5

The Purple Phoenix Raises Again

5.1 Chapter 5 - Purple Phoenix Raises

A common unassailable but certainly wrong assumption of modern scholarship is that all early christian literature was written in Greek because Greek was the lingua franca of the Roman empire.

According to this claim we would expect Julius Caesar, the People and the Senate of Rome, Virgil, Seneca to all be fluent and write and speak extensively in Greek.

In fact, it is correct Greek was the administrative language of nearly the oll of the former Greek empire which later became known as the Eastern Roman Empire.

Notably nearly all Christian writers including Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen wrote in Greek.

The first non-greek church father is Tertulian close to the end of second century.

In this chapter we want to highlight that Christianity was Greek-only religion, while there were many mentions of Jesus in non-greek sources, and very notably, religious sources about written in coptic, were not considered the same religion as Christianity.

In this chapter we look at the writings of the church fathers from the prism of the Byzantine Empire resurgence.

0. Alexandria Egypt suffered enormous hardship and persecution during the Roman Empire. The 200-year struggle of the Rome to conquer all the Greek world ended in enormous tax burden of the newly conquered territories. Almost

all tax revenue of the Roman Empire at the time of Jesus and shortly after was coming from the newly conquered territories of the Greeks and nearly half of it came from Egypt. It is often misunderstood that Egypt was simply so wealthy and more developed than the rest of the world that it could account for such a large share of the tax revenue. Egypt was indeed the richest, but by no means by such a large margin. The tax was simply so high to transfer the wealth of the Greeks to Rome and destroy the heartland of the Greek world and their capability to resist in the future. Given the hardships that the Greeks suffered, there should be no doubt they would seek to restore their kingdom of God and not be ruled by the beast of Rome.

Egypt was considered property of the emperor and not subject to normal senatorial and imperial governance system.

1. Many other early Christian texts were written to seemingly promote the restoration of the Eastern Roman Empire. The Clement of Alexandria, a very prominent early Christian theologian, wrote in his book “Stromata” that the true philosophy was the Greek philosophy, and that the Greek philosophy was the true philosophy. He wrote of the bird Phoenix, which was a symbol of the Eastern Roman Empire, and that the bird was purple, which was the color of the Eastern Roman Empire. Universally the phoenix has been assumed to be a symbol of the resurrection of Jesus, but the phoenix was a symbol of the Eastern Roman Empire.

2. The very famous shields of with the Chi-Rho symbol were a symbol of the creation of the Eastern Roman Empire. The creation of the Eastern Roman Empire as a kingdom of God ruled by the Christ by a Christian army of Christian emperor Constantine was a very important event in the history of the world. At that point the symbol of the soldiers was not a cross. The symbol of the soldiers was the Chi-Rho symbol, which was a symbol of the Christos. Note the shields only signified the Christos on them and not Jesus directly, which may have been a designation that we are the soldiers of the Christ, rightful king of the kingdom of God, and the battles for the restoration of the kingdom of the Christos. If the war was thought for religious reasons primarily, there would have likely been a lot more emphasis on the cross and mass conversions to Christianity, and we do not that being strongly emphasized in the historical records of this particular war. We do however see the large emphasis on political changes and restoring the rule in the East.

2. Rome converting to Christianity matched in time with Rome splitting into two empires, the Western Roman Empire and the Eastern Roman Empire.

The restoration of the Eastern Roman Empire was the actual goal of the Christians and Christians taking over corresponded with the restoration of the Eastern Roman Empire.

3. Hippolytus of Rome (c. 170–235 AD) and other early Christian thinkers believed that the fall of Rome was part of God’s plan for the eventual establishment of Christ’s eternal empire.

4. The Apocalyptic Restoration - The End of Time and the Empire: In the Apocalyptic literature, particularly found in Revelation, Christians looked forward to a new heaven and new earth (Revelation 21). The New Jerusalem would come down from heaven, and it was often interpreted as both a spiritual and literal kingdom that would restore what was lost with the fall of the world. Eschatological visions were tied to the restoration of an empire under Christ’s rule, not just in a spiritual sense, but in a political and cosmic sense. The Roman Empire was viewed by some as a precursor to the final divine kingdom.

5. Similarly, Origen (c. 185–254 AD) also held that Christianity could restore the world order. He saw the future reign of Christ as the ultimate restoration of order, justice, and peace in a new universal kingdom, where Christianity would reign.

6. Irenaeus (c. 130–202 AD) - In his work Against Heresies, Irenaeus speaks about the role of the Roman Empire in God’s providence and the eventual victory of Christianity. He hints at a future unity and a cosmic victory which could be seen as the “restoration” of the world through Christ’s reign. Irenaeus of Lyons (c. 130–202 AD) In his *Against Heresies*, Irenaeus focuses on defending orthodox Christian beliefs, but there are also passages where he highlights the role of the Roman Empire in God’s plan. He stresses that the empire’s rule is part of God’s providence and suggests that its peaceful reign is a way of preparing the world for Christ’s return, offering a sense of the empire’s importance in Christian restoration.

7. Tertullian (c. 155–240 AD) - In his writings, such as Apology and On the Resurrection of the Flesh, Tertullian often implies the eventual triumph of

Christianity within the Roman Empire, framing it as part of a divine plan. While he doesn't directly speak of the "restoration" of the empire, there is a sense of Christianity fulfilling the destiny of the Roman state.

8. Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260–340 AD) In his work *Ecclesiastical History and Life of Constantine*, Eusebius explicitly presents the rise of Constantine and the establishment of Christianity as the fulfillment of God's plan for the Roman Empire. He sees Constantine's reign as a "restoration" of the empire, aligning it with divine will. This reflects the idea that Christianity would not only restore the empire but also bring it to its true, Christian purpose.

9. Athanasius of Alexandria (c. 296–373 AD) In his writings, particularly in his defense against Arianism and his theological works, Athanasius talks about the cosmic victory of Christ over evil, which has implications for the empire's restoration. He often frames the Christian emperor as the rightful ruler under divine guidance, which could be seen as linking the restoration of the empire to Christ's victory.

10. Victorinus of Pettau (c. 250–303 AD) In his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, Victorinus draws connections between the Roman Empire and the eventual triumph of Christianity. Like many of his contemporaries, he believes that the empire is part of God's plan and that its ultimate transformation into a Christian empire would bring about the fulfillment of prophecy. This can be seen as a form of "restoration" through the christianization of the empire.

11. The revolt is not militaristic Rome chose to spiritually convert to Christianity, and the Eastern Roman Empire was restored peacefully while the Christian writers started to praise rome. Augustine of Hippo (354–430 AD) – Expanded In *City of God*, Augustine offers a vision where the fall of the Roman Empire is viewed through a Christian lens. He argues that the decline of the empire does not indicate the failure of divine providence. While he focuses on the spiritual aspects of empire, he acknowledges the empire's role in preparing the world for the Christian kingdom, suggesting a "restoration" of the Roman Empire as a Christian entity in the future.

12. The Shepherd of Hermas (c. 100-160 AD) *Apocalyptic Elements*: This early Christian text, written by Hermas, is a visionary work similar in nature to

Revelation. It contains visions and allegories about the future of the Church and the world. The Shepherd speaks about the coming of the end times and the restoration of the Church through repentance and faithfulness, much like how Revelation portrays the establishment of the New Jerusalem and God's final victory over evil. Restoration: Hermas depicts the hope of restoration for the Church and its ultimate triumph, paralleling Revelation's theme of the faithful being vindicated at the end of time.

13. Clement of Alexandria's Exhortation to the Greeks (c. 190 AD) Apocalyptic Elements: In his writings, Clement combines Christian eschatology with Greek philosophy, advocating for the return of the "Logos" and the eventual restoration of humanity to divine harmony. While not strictly apocalyptic in the sense of a Revelation-style vision, his vision of the future aligns with the idea of cosmic renewal. Restoration: Clement's apocalyptic themes include the eventual restoration of the world through the Logos, an idea that ties back to the restoration of divine order similar to the eschatological views found in Revelation.

14. Cyprian of Carthage's The Lapsed (c. 250 AD) Apocalyptic Elements: Cyprian writes about the persecution of Christians and the imminent return of Christ. His works anticipate the final judgment, the victory of the righteous, and the establishment of a divine kingdom. Restoration: Like other early Christian apocalyptic writers, Cyprian believed that the Church would be restored and triumph over its persecutors, reflecting the broader apocalyptic hope seen in Revelation.