

*The Uninspired New Testament...*

In Yahuwdah and then throughout the Greco-Roman world, there would be an abrupt change from Yahowah, the God who gave us life and the means to become immortal, to a god now called “Jesus Christ,” who was not only mortal, but was killed by men. There would be a complete reversal, from promoting and affirming Yahowah’s Towrah, His Miqra’ey and Beryth, to denouncing and annulling something now called the “Law” and the “Jewish Feasts” such that the “Old Covenant” would be seen as so ineffectual it had to be replaced with a “New Covenant” and requisite “New Testament.”

As we turn the page from Yahowah’s Divinely inspired and consistently accurate prophets, away from men like Yasha’yah, Yirma’yah, and Zakaryah, at the end of His book and open the new one beginning with “the Gospel of Matthew,” accuracy becomes a thing of the past and Yahowah’s love for His Chosen People, Yisra’el and Yahuwdah, even His dire warnings about the ways of the Gentiles, are completely upended, with God hating His People and choosing all others over them.

After being regaled with countless long, credible, and enlightening narratives which are verifiable in the annals of history and archeology about the likes of Noach, ‘Abraham, Moseh, and Dowd, the things we learned, the things Yahowah accomplished through these men, were turned to mush, with nothing but occasional and

unattested musings about them which upend their lives in an irrational attempt to negate what they represented and validate a different narrative. From one page to the next, from Malaky to Matthew, most everything changes, and is, at least after the Sermon on the Mount, reversed.

In the Hebrew text a relationship was prized above all else and religion was despised. Then suddenly, that relationship was discarded and replaced with a religion. Why?

What is the purpose of the Beginning of the Book when the Addendum works so hard to usurp its credibility and then negate it? This is to say, “All of that old stuff was unreliable and ineffective, and no longer applies, no matter what God said about it, but nonetheless you should trust us because that same God authorized us to denounce Him and come up with an entirely different plan.” Say what?

We turned to *Sha’uwl* | Paul’s oral diatribe in his “New Testament” to see if Yahowah was right when He denounced the Son of Evil for renouncing Him and then transferring every promise He had made to His beloved son, Dowd, to a character who bears no resemblance to Him, now called “Jesus Christ.” And while we affirmed His assertion, we also came to see why God loathes the Despised and Despicable Soul who changed his name from Sha’uwl to Paul, along with his allegiance from Yisra’el to Greece and Rome.

While we have demonstrated with very little effort that Sha’uwl, now Paul, deliberately misquoted and misrepresented the Towrah and Prophets to promote his faith, we also discovered that he lied about what occurred in what would soon be called, Hadrianopolis. He presented “Jews” as his enemy and the enemy of his god, even as the people who murdered his god. The Gentiles were suddenly in the role of Jews and Jews were acting

like Gentiles. As a result, we are told that Paul's god changed allegiances such that this role reversal became the foundation of the resulting religion.

This leads us to wonder what came first, the hideous anti-Semitic episode at the conclusion of the "Gospel of Matthew" where "Jews" are engaged in elaborate conspiracies to kill "Jesus" or Paul's crusade against them. Are we to believe that Paul was justified in his accusation that God had come to hate His people for killing His Son to such a degree that He suddenly changed loyalties? Are we to believe that God is now embracing the Roman Beast – which is shown cleansing its hands of the whole bloody affair as it is depicted in Matthew 27?

In the current order of things, the Gospel of Matthew precedes the Acts of the Apostles in addition to Paul's fourteen letters. It has the appearance that Paul's animosity flowed naturally from what was alleged to have been said during the "trial" before Pilate. While he was a liar of the first order, could Paul have been justified in concluding that God had turned on His People as the "Gospel of Matthew" suggests?

As is the case with most things worth knowing, if we want to know the truth, we will have to invest considerable time and due diligence to assess the credibility of the "Gospel" attributed to "Matthew." If my suspicions are correct, and they are based entirely upon what we have come to know about Yahowah, in addition to what He promised Dowd, I think we will find that while portions of it were correctly rendered very early on in Hebrew, after the Sermon on the Mount very little of what follows in the "Gospel of Matthew" was actually written by the Disciple, a tax collector whose name was *Lowy* | Levi according to Mark and Luke. Only in what's now called the "Gospel of Matthew" does this fellow bear the name *Mattanyah* | Matthew.

This is a serious problem relative to identity of the book's namesake. Matthew 9:9 says: "And as Jesus passed on from there, He saw a man, called Matthew, sitting in the tax office; and He said to him, 'Follow Me!' And he rose and followed Him." Whereas Mark, from which the "Gospel of Matthew" was plagiarized, reads: "And as He passed by, He saw Levi [Lowy in Hebrew] the son of Alphaeus sitting in the tax office, and He said to him, 'Follow Me!' And he rose and followed Him." (Mark 2:14) The "Gospel of Luke," from which substantial portions of "Matthew" were derived, conveys a similar account in 5:27: "And after that He went out, and noticed a tax-gatherer named Levi, sitting in the tax office, and He said to him, 'Follow Me.'" As such, prudence dictates that there never was a Disciple named *Mattanyah* | Matthew and that the book bearing this name was written by an imposter.

Christians will protest, of course, and say almost anything to avoid a realization this caustic to their beliefs. The first Christian resource I checked on this matter wrote: "*The answer is very simple. Both are true because Matthew and Levi are the same person. Matthew is the Greek name and Levi was the Hebrew name. As a tax collector, Matthew worked for Greek-speaking Romans. He gathered taxes from Hebrew-speaking Jews. We see, as an example, Peter also being called Simon.*" (<https://carm.org/bible-difficulties/matthew-mark/was-taxman-named-matthew-or-levi>)

Sorry, but Matthew is based upon *Mattanyah*, meaning "Gift of Yah," and is a Hebrew name, not Greek. And Levi is the Masoretic corruption of the name of the priestly tribe, Lowy, meaning "to unite," of which Moseh was a descendant. Simon is an English transliteration of Shimown, from *shama'*, which means, "He Listens." Peter is an English transliteration of the Greek translation of the Hebrew word, *keph*, which describes "hollow

indentations in a rock.” As such, it wasn’t something to brag about. This known, *keph* is closely related to *kaphar*, which is the basis of “reconciliation.” And that indeed is the very purpose of the Miqra’ey of which Yahowsha’ was speaking when the title was afforded to the Disciple. The truth is so vastly superior to the lies, it’s a wonder Christians prefer one to the other.

As is the case with all but some unknown portion of two books within the entirety of the Christian New Testament (*Yahowchanan* | John and his Revelation), the closer we look the worse it gets. We are about to discover that Paul’s diatribes were scribed and distributed long before the Greek version of Matthew was penned and that it was Paul’s attitude toward Jews that would cause the “Gospel” to read as it does today. Since this assessment is consistent with the historical evidence, Christianity is a house of cards, all Kings, Queens, and Jokers, which is about to tumble to the ground. This may be the most explosive exposé we have yet undertaken.

Let’s be clear. While there is no independent historical affirmation, it would still be reasonable to conclude that Yahowsha’ was condemned to be crucified by the Roman governor, Pilate, in the Province of Judaea on Passover in 33 CE. It is also possible, but not assured by any means, that some of Yahuwdah’s religious leaders, including the High Priest, were opposed to Yahowsha’ because he didn’t respect them. The preponderance of the Jewish people, however, didn’t know or care one way or the other, in contrast to what is written. It is likely that the few who met the reclusive Yahowsha’ along the way would have been impressed with what He had to say.

Further, as for those who may not have respected Him, the Jewish leaders were neither “teachers of the law” as they are errantly portrayed, nor any more depraved in character nor anti-God than any other clerics

or politicians, most notably Christians. If God had shown up at the Vatican, He would have been treated far worse. Catholics would have used the grotesque implements of torture they invented for their Inquisition to illicit a confession.

Some of what we read today in the “Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke,” and especially *Yahowchanan* | John pertaining to the events of Passover in 33 CE appears to be accurate. However, there are as many differences between their stories as there are similarities – which is an affront to their credibility. Matthew, Mark, and Luke are not the reports of eyewitnesses nor of prophets – and thus they were not inspired by God, nor were they inerrant in the manner of the Hebrew text of the *Towrah wa Naby’*.

Much of what was reported is inconsistent with the history of that time and with common sense. There was only one eyewitness, Yahowchanan, who claims personal knowledge of these events and discussions, but even he was not a witness to the musings of Jewish religious leaders or what was said before Pilate or Herod. And his assessment has been subject to more religious tampering than any other such that it is now impossible to distinguish what he may have said from what a religious scribe in Egypt or cleric in Caesarea attributed to him.

Evidence and reason dictate that there are limited portions of what is contained in the “Gospel of Matthew” that were written by an eyewitness not bearing that name. However, the overwhelming preponderance of the events regaled in the Greek text, especially in Matthew, were written by an imposter, something that will become evident momentarily. And Paul’s accomplice, Luke (Paul refers to him as his “fellow-worker” in Philemon who offers “lots of love”), was no better. They were both anti-Towrah and overtly anti-Semitic, which is likely why the “Gospel of Matthew” reads as it does today.

I'll admit, I'm biased. I am with Yahowah. I trust Him. I have come to love God's people and despise those who abuse them, appreciate those who tell the truth and abhor those who deliberately deceive. So before we press on, I have a confession to make on a directly related topic: I was wrong about "Mattanyah." The evidence is clear: nary a word of it was written by a Disciple named Matthew. The former tax collector turned Disciple, *Lowy* | Levi, did, however, unintentionally contribute to it with his book: *According to Hebrew*.

Unfortunately, as little as ten percent of what is presently contained in the Greek text came from *According to Hebrew*. The rest was largely hearsay and plagiarized, then embellished under the influence of the Despised and Despicable One. This conclusion is readily derived from the text itself because the "Gospel of Matthew" is exceedingly anti-Semitic. While I have come to this conclusion reluctantly, it was driven by trying to understand the origins of the anti-Jewish nature of the episode before Pontius Pilate and the zombiesque conclusion of Matthew 27 – especially as it relates to Paul's rant against Jews in Acts 13. It is the case of the wolf and his litter.

Let's acknowledge and become grounded in what is factual. The "Gospel of Matthew" does not specify an author. That would not have been the case if it had been written by one of Yahowsha's Disciples, because the realization that he was both chosen by Yahowsha' and an eyewitness would have given his account enormous credibility – as is the case with *Yahowchanan* | John. Moreover, had it been scribed by a Disciple, it would have been called, "*Lowy* | Levi." It is only called "Matthew" because the tax collector's name was changed and then misappropriated.

The resulting "Gospel of Matthew" was based upon Mark, with 600 of Mark's 661 verses incorporated into

the text. Taking far less than 90% of any text and passing it off as one's own is dismissed and discredited as "plagiarism" today. There are an additional 220 statements taken from Luke, Paul's coworker. In truth, 56% of the Greek text of Matthew came from Mark and 24% was taken from Paul's associate, Luke, such that only 20% of it is original – half of that jaundiced by Sha'awl, himself. Each time the Towrah and Prophets are cited, the wording matches that found in the Septuagint, including that of the supposed virgin birth. Every time Yisra'el and Yahuwdaym are mentioned, the Greek text reflects the attitude we find reflected in Paul's oral and written diatribes against them.

Now that we know where the content was taken from, let's consider the timing of events. Since it contained his defiant and emotionally-charged rebuttal to the excoriating trial before Yahowsha's Disciples in Yaruwshalaim, and since it is the only letter to restate (actually contradict) his frightening encounter with the flashing light he claimed was "Jesus," Paul's first letter was the one he dashed off to rebuke the Galatians. It was penned in 52 CE. Over the next decade, his other 13 epistles would be written and widely distributed. They are preserved in their entirety in P<sup>46</sup>, a scribal copy comprising the most comprehensive early papyrus.

Luke, Paul's "beloved physician" (read the conclusion of Colossians), was an active player in Paul's entourage, and he produced the book that bears his name in addition to Acts of the Apostles, composing both towards the end of Paul's life at around 66 years of age in 66 CE. Considering that Paul admits that the "thorn in his side" was "a messenger from Satan," Dr. Luke may have been a frustrated exorcist.

The overwhelming majority of scholars have concluded that the earliest Greek edition of the "Gospel of Matthew" was written between 80 and 90 CE, after the



fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple by Rome in 70 CE. That is at least two decades after Luke wrote his “Gospel” and its sequel, “Acts,” and the circulation of Galatians followed by the dissemination of Paul’s other epistles.

Matthew’s gestation, therefore, coincided with the end of the Towrah-centric movement among *Yahuwdym* | Jews who followed Yahowsha’ and the subsequent transition to the overwhelmingly Gentile phenomenon that evolved into the Christian religion. The author of the text may have been Jewish, but if so, he had become decidedly Christian. He wrote in a highly polished version of Greek. His story reads like a journey from one to the other, going from the Towrah-affirming Sermon on the Mount to the Romanesque nature of the meeting before Pilate and subsequent Roman crucifixion before a mob of angry Jews.

Interesting in this regard, prior to the melee leading to the crucifixion, *Yahuwdym* are called *Yisra’elites* by the compiler, only becoming “*Ioudaioi* - Jews” thereafter as a sign of their rejection of the Christian Christ. This is shown precluding them from the Kingdom of Heaven and as evidence that the promises made to them had been taken away and given instead to the church. In fact, the only support for this kind of Replacement Theology among the “Gospels,” and apart from Paul’s letters and the Book of Acts, is found in the “Gospel of Matthew.”

In my defense, I had a good reason for considering key aspects of what I had wrongly attributed to Mattanyah favorably, and I was not alone. There is sound justification to conclude that Yahowsha’ told the Disciple *Lowy* | Levi about his encounter with Yahowchanan in the Jordan and with Satan in the wilderness such that these stories were incorporated into the “Gospel’s” 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> chapters. And there is every reason to conclude that, as a witness to the Sermon on the Mount, the Disciple *Lowy* |

Levi transcribed what he had heard, composing what is found in the 5<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> chapters.

The reason this rings true is because there is credible extant evidence showing that the earliest followers of Yahowsha' were Towrah-observant Yahuwdym who read what *Lowy* | Levi wrote in a book called "*According to Hebrew*" and nothing else apart from the Towrah and Prophets. Affirming this, in 140 CE Papias wrote that the book his fellow Christians referred to as "'Matthew' has compiled the sayings of Jesus in Hebrew." In addition, Irenaeus wrote: "They use 'Matthew' only, and they repudiate the Apostle Paul, maintaining that he was an apostate from the Towrah." (Irenaeus *Haer* 1.26.2) If Irenaeus is right, we already have our answer.

The Talmud even admits to burning early Hebrew accounts pertaining to Yahowsha's testimony. The lone candidate would have been *Lowy's* | Levi's *According to Hebrew*, now mislabeled the "Gospel of Matthew."

Even Jerome, the author of the Vulgate, admits to receiving a truncated copy of this book written in Hebrew, one which he says was prepared for him by a Jewish acquaintance near Antioch. Fragmentary evidence of it is preserved in his notes. Known then simply as *According to Hebrew*, or just *Hebrew*, it was attributed to the Disciple and contained the prophetic testimony leading to Yahowsha's birth while excluding the genealogy now found in the "Gospel of Matthew." The Hebrew text chronicled Yahowsha's experience in the Jordan River and his temptation before Satan in the wilderness. It included a limited collection of Yahowsha's most important sayings, specifically His Sermon on the Mount – which is found nowhere else in the "New Testament." *Hebrew* addressed His transfiguration along with His celebration of Pesach with his Disciples before actually fulfilling Passover. It even

covered Yahowsha's first appearance thereafter, which was to his brother, Ya'aqob.

*Hebrew* states that, while the Set-Apart Spirit was responsible for his birth, Yahowsha' was a man, not God. Although later in life, that is if we can trust Jerome's citation of *Hebrews* in his *Commentary on Isaiah Four, Lowy* | Levi, who was not yet an eyewitness, is said to have written: "And it came to pass when [Yahowsha'] came up out of the water, the whole fount of the [Set-Apart] Spirit descended upon him and rested on him and said to him, 'My son, in all of the prophets was I waiting for you so that you might come and I rest upon you.'" While Jerome didn't mention it in deference to Mary, according to the citations of others, the Set-Apart Spirit was called "Mother," and She was noted for Her wise counsel throughout the book of *Hebrew*.

Based upon what was quoted from *According to Hebrew*, it's worth reiterating that this eyewitness account concludes with Yahowsha's first post-*Bikuwrym* appearance, which, as I've mentioned, was with his brother and Disciple, Ya'aqob – affirming that he made this sacrifice for his people. And speaking of Ya'aqob, in Jerome's *Commentary on Ezekiel Six*, in reference to *Hebrew*, he would lament on behalf of the Roman Catholic insistence that Mary remained a virgin: "there is counted among it the most grievous offenses, 'He that has grieved the spirit of his brother.'" As we might expect, *Hebrew* presents Ya'aqob, Yahuwdym, and Yisra'el, as brothers, and the Towrah favorably.

Affirming the existence of the Hebrew eyewitness text, Clement, Origen, Hegesippus, and Didymus all cite from it, as did the aforementioned, Jerome. They admit that *According to Hebrew* was used as a proof-text to supplement what is now called the "Gospel of Matthew." Eusebius, the most villainous man in this entire episode, included a reference to it in his list of disputed writings in

*Antilegomena*, noting that “it was only used by the Hebrews.”

Sadly, shamefully, a result of Eusebius and Roman Catholicism, indeed because of their utter disdain for all things Jewish, the codices of *Hebrew* were obliterated when the Church Canon was codified in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. *According to Hebrew* was deemed heretical and destroyed – that is with the exception of its memory.

Even the Roman Catholic Church admits: “Christian antiquity is unanimous in maintaining that St. Matthew wrote a gospel in Hebrew. The testimony of St. Papias, St. Irenæus, St. Pantæus, Origen, Eusebius, St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome, and of many other Fathers and ecclesiastical writers bears out this statement.” (eCatholic2000, Catholics Online for the Third Reich (oops, my mistake) Millennium) Please bear with me on the intended pun; we have a lot of ground to cover and it is going to get nasty. This isn’t the last time I’ll cop an attitude. Frankly, I’m disgusted that so few have fooled so many for so long.

There is a ray of light. The people who were responsible for drawing our attention to *Hebrew* referred to themselves as “Ebyownym.” Their name was based upon the Hebrew word, ‘*ebyownym*, which was spoken by Yahowsha’ to describe “those who have been oppressed and abused in need of deliverance who will inherit the earth” at the commencement of the Sermon on the Mount. The lives of those mistakenly called “Ebionites,” was scandalously recorded by Irenaeus in *Adversus Haereses*, Origen in *Contra Celsum*, Eusebius in *Ecclesial History*, Hippolytus in *Fefutatio Haeresium*, and even by Jerome in his *Commentary on Matthew*. The Roman Catholic Church universally despised them – to the same extent and reason Paul loathed Towrah-observant Yahuwdym who recognized and followed Yahowsha’.

The justification for all this decidedly negative attention is that the ‘Ebyownym universally rejected Paul. They celebrated the Miqra’ey, Beryth, and Shabat. To these Church Fathers, they were “Judaizers” and thus “Heretics.” But far from Rabbinical, Rabbi Akiba and the followers of Bar Kochba also persecuted the ‘Ebyownym for refusing to recognize their messianic claims. Hated by both religions, following the Diaspora that ensued after the final Roman assault on Judea in 133 CE, few, if any ‘Ebyownym survived. But they left a gift, an affirmation that the Disciple *Lowy* | Levi had indeed transcribed Yahowsha’s words in Hebrew and that the first to follow Yahowsha’ treasured *According to Hebrew* along with the *Towrah*.

Additionally, the Sermon on the Mount, from which the ‘Ebyownym derived their name, is so universally disconcerting for Christians and destructive to their religion, it’s unlikely to the point of being ludicrous to assume that Yahowsha’s speech was composed by one of the Christian faithful. The ‘Ebyownym have given us a gift – one I suspect Yahowah wanted us to appreciate, because the “Sermon on the Mount” contains everything we need to know about Yahowsha’ to prove that He and Paul were enemies.

Collectively, the combination of the authentic material compiled in Matthew 3-7 and perhaps 23 (the Olivet Discourse), when compared to the weight of the Greek text’s irrational, anti-Semitic, and otherwise unattested conclusion, represents the lion’s share of what is unique to the final product.

Successful fabricators seldom invent anything from whole cloth, but instead weave in threads of truth by usurping the credibility of others. Such is the basis of the *Book of Enoch* and the *Gospel of Thomas* – as well as the *Qur’an* and *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. The Christian who compiled Matthew would have been aware that the

early followers of Yahowsha' had treasured the Disciple's eyewitness testimony in *According to Hebrew*. It's also readily apparent that he had copies of Mark, Luke and Acts, in addition to many of Paul's letters. He simply blended them together to create his "Gospel," leaving its hideous conclusion to be embellished by a far more nefarious fellow, Eusebius. He followed suit, pilfering from the *Acts of Pilate*, a spurious work which reads eerily like the conclusion of the resulting compilation.

What we know for certain is that the Disciple Lowy | Levi, as an eyewitness, strove to accurately record Yahowsha's testimony in the language he spoke. According to the Disciple, the joy He expressed in initially reuniting with his brother, Ya'aqob, proved that He came for the lost children of Yisra'el. But this would all be disregarded, as it was too "Jewish" for what the Roman Catholic Church had become. We also know that those who gained custody of these documents, those who compiled the Church's Canon which became the "New Testament" of the "Holy Bible," were the scum of the earth. They were everything they falsely projected on God's people, an arrogant and deadly, scheming brood of religious racists and consummate liars. If you think this an unfair generalization or oversimplification, buckle your seatbelt.

The oldest surviving manuscript of the "Gospel of Matthew" is P<sup>104</sup> from Alexandria, Egypt. That's telling because it attests to the fact that Christians would return to the place from which Yisra'el had been freed. The Greek text was scribed sometime before 200 CE. It covers Matthew 21:34-37:

"When the harvest time approached, he sent his servants to the tenants to collect his fruit. The tenants seized his servants; they beat one, killed another, and stoned a third. Then he sent other servants to them, more than the first time, and the tenants treated them the same

way. Last of all, he sent his son to them. ‘They will respect my son,’ he said.”

We know that Yahowah asked Dowd to tend His garden, and that he is God’s son, who the world has failed to respect. But the Christians, duped by Paul, have remained clueless in this regard. As a result, they would make this a battle between “Jesus” and “his killers” – *the always cheating and conspiring, power-hungry, Jews*. It takes one to know one, I suppose.

Verses 38 through 42 were not part of this papyrus, the lone pre-Constantine witness to the 21<sup>st</sup> chapter. Wherein we now read how this story was twisted to implicate the Jews:

“But when the tenants saw the son, they said to each other, ‘This is the heir. Come, let’s kill him and take his inheritance.’ So they took him and threw him out of the vineyard and killed him. Therefore, when the owner of the vineyard comes, what will he do to those tenants?

‘He will bring those wretches to a wretched end,’ they replied. ‘And he will rent the vineyard to other tenants, who will give him his share of the crop at the harvest time.’

Jesus said to them, ‘Have you never read in the Scriptures: “The stone the builders rejected has become the cornerstone; the Lord has done this, and it is marvelous in our eyes?”’”

Not a word of this is found in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century P<sup>104</sup>. It is so awkward, so readily transparent, with “Jesus” asking his audience, comprised of either Romans or Jews, to complete his parable, only to offer an incongruent citation, it’s obviously a Christian interpolation. Think about it: why would Yahowsha’ ask those who were not to be trusted to convey something which is endorsed as

trustworthy? Can you name another parable in which Yahowsha' asks His audience to participate in the story?

Furthermore, the citation attributed to "Jesus" regarding the "cornerstone" is from *Mizmowr* | Psalm 118:22, and it pertains to Dowd | David. It represents yet another pathetic attempt to justify Christianity through Replacement Theology.

With P<sup>104</sup> in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century jumping from Matthew 21:37 to what is now classified as Matthew 21:43-44, we find:

"Therefore, I tell you that the Kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a people who will produce its fruit. Anyone who falls on this stone will be broken to pieces; anyone on whom it falls will be crushed."

That would be all that can be confirmed that the unknown compiler wrote in the waning days of the 1<sup>st</sup> century. And since God hasn't taken anything away from His people, and cannot do so without becoming a liar, we should be asking ourselves why this parable was attributed to Jews in a much later, 4<sup>th</sup> century, Roman addition:

"When the chief priests and the Pharisees heard Jesus' parables, they knew he was talking about them. They looked for a way to arrest him, but they were afraid of the crowd because the people held that he was a prophet." (Matthew 21:45-46)

Therein lies one of the three "Gospel" claims attributed to "Jesus" that the Kingdom of God had been taken from Jews and given unequivocally to Gentiles. But without the added text from the 4<sup>th</sup> century or later, it is torn asunder. Although to be fair, the entire proposition is preposterous. It's Dowd's Kingdom which will be established forever according to Yahowah, and Dowd is



the most Yahuwd of Yira'elites. In a moment, we'll consider the fate of the other two.

Based upon all we have come to know, Heaven is actually out of reach to those who are common, and thus forbidden to the political and religious. Those who claim to be serving God, and who make a living doing so, will be excluded, many imprisoned in She'owl, for having misled multitudes.

And yet the only proof apart from the heavily redacted Roman Codexis of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus of the 27<sup>th</sup> chapter even existing before the conclusion of the 8<sup>th</sup> century is P<sup>105</sup>, which was written sometime before 500 CE. It contains Chapter 27:62-64, a fanciful episode of “Chief Priests and Pharisees” walking to “Pilate” on the Shabat of Matsah and asking him to allow them to work on that day “by guarding and securing the tomb.” It also includes Chapter 28:2-5, describing a “violent earthquake caused by an angel of the Lord who came down from heaven and, going to the tomb, rolled back the stone and sat on it. His appearance was like lightning, and his clothes were white as snow. The guards were so afraid of him that they shook and became like dead men. The angel said to the women, ‘Do not be afraid, for I know that you are looking for Jesus, who was crucified.’” The earthquake the previous day is well-attested, but the resounding thump and dazzling light show of the heavyweight angel, not so much – nor the trembling dead.

Without Chapter 6 appearing anywhere prior to time of Constantine and the Nicene Council, Roman Catholics were free to add their own variation of “the Lord’s Prayer” (6:9-15). Without a witness to Chapter 16, Eusebius likely added 16:13-20, which includes “upon this rock I will build my church,” creating the presumptuous basis for the Roman Catholic Church, and its un-Godly institution of a Divinely appointed papacy which includes the “Seat of Saint Peter.” This addition

would also serve to artificially validate the idea that “Jesus” acknowledged that he was “the Christ.”

Without any evidence except for the heavily edited Codex of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (in Sinaiticus alone, which is the least mutilated of the two, throughout the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> centuries ten different scribes made over 20,000 alterations and revisions to the text), prior to the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century there isn’t any support for anything in Matthew Chapter 6. Therefore, based upon what we know of him, Eusebius becomes the most likely source of:

“From that time on Jesus began to explain to his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem and suffer many things at the hands of the elders, the chief priests, and the teachers of the law, and that he must be killed and on the third day be raised to life.” (Matthew 16:21)

This was also seen as a repudiation of Jews and their Towrah. However, there were few if any “teachers of the law” in the sense of the “Towrah” at that time. The rabbinical types favored their Talmud, just as they do today. The few who were actually Towrah observant, were neither religious nor leaders within the community – and all who were would have recognized Yahowsha’ and clung to his every word. Further, Yahowsha’ “suffered many things at the hands of the” ROMANS, not “elders, the chief priests, or the teachers of the law.” It was absolutely, and unquestionably, inarguably, Rome that “killed” the Passover Lamb. The notion that some Jews may have encouraged them is incidental to the fact.

Yahowsha’s entire purpose was to serve as the *Pesach* ‘Ayl | Passover Lamb. His life would have been meaningless if he had not done so in harmony with the Towrah. This is one of many things that Christians cannot seem to fathom. While it is interesting that the Roman Catholic Church blames Jews for what they did in order

to justify their standing with God, what actually matters is that Yahowah fulfilled His promise to provide the Passover Lamb – not who killed him.

Unlike Mark, however, upon which the Gospel of Matthew was based, you'll find no mention of "Passover" in association with the crucifixion. It was deemed too Jewish for Roman Catholic tastes and was seen as clutter around Easter. And thereby, the Church doomed the billions of souls it claimed to have saved.

While Chapter 4 is extant in P<sup>102</sup>, only verses 11-12 and 22-23 are shown, thereby eliminating any credible backing for the third of the three supposed allegations that the promises to Jews were somehow transferred to Gentiles. Christians use the belatedly added 4:17, which reads: "from that time on Jesus began to preach, 'Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven has come near,'" to suggest that things had changed such that it was out with the old and in with the new. And yet even here, the Christian interpolator got it wrong. The "Kingdom of Heaven" would not begin for another 3,000 years, and even then, it would follow the reestablishment of the "Kingdom of Dowd."

Returning to Chapter 16 for a moment, now that we know that there is no early evidence of it, we can credibly dismiss another false prophecy attributed to "Jesus" at the conclusion of the chapter. The beginning of this conversation rings true, while what follows is likely from Christian musings in the 4<sup>th</sup> century.

Trying to stop Yahowsha' from serving as the Passover Lamb, the Disciple: "Peter took him aside and began to rebuke him. 'Never, Lord!' he said. 'This shall never happen to you!' Jesus turned and said to Peter, 'Get behind me, Satan! You are a stumbling block to me; you do not have in mind the concerns of God, but merely human concerns.'

Then Jesus said to his disciples, ‘Whoever wants to be my disciple must deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me. For whoever wants to save their life will lose it, but whoever loses their life for me will find it. What good will it be for someone to gain the whole world, yet forfeit their soul? Or what can anyone give in exchange for their soul? For the Son of Man is going to come in his Father’s glory with his angels, and then he will reward each person according to what they have done. Truly I tell you, some who are standing here will not taste death before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.’” (Matthew 16:22-28)

It bears repeating at every opportunity. There is a message at the beginning of this story that Roman Catholics and their stepchildren have missed. Yahowsha’ came to be the Passover Lamb. Allowing the body of His diminished manifestation to die was, therefore, the primary concern of God. Wanting to keep his physical body alive, wanting to prevent him from fulfilling his purpose, aligns one’s motives with the religious and their sponsor, Satan. Therefore, when Roman Catholics seek to blame Jews for killing “Jesus,” rather than expressing their gratitude for His sacrifice as the Lamb of God, they are associating themselves with the Adversary and precluding the benefits of Pesach.

If Jews were to blame for doing as the Towrah prescribes, and presenting the Passover Lamb for sacrifice, then they are to be commended. And that is likely the reason a small number of Yahuwdaym were shown encouraging his death on this day. While they did not kill him, it was their responsibility to select and present the lamb. The Christian text’s failure to mention God’s intent on this day, and Yahowsha’s role in it, is an impenetrable blight on the religion’s credibility. Preoccupied with irrelevant details, and getting most of

them wrong, the Church missed the big picture – the only story which actually mattered.

Speaking of incredulous, at this point in the timeline, it would have been jarring to mention the idea of a cross – of the device Romans invented to ensure submission to their subjugation through the most hideous form of torture ever perpetrated on humankind. The words ascribed to Him are counter to the Towrah and sadistic, wholly counter to Yahowah’s nature – the very thing He rails against. Human sacrifice is an anathema to God. He isn’t asking us to torture ourselves, much less try to become our own Passover Lamb. He honored His promise to do this for us so that it wouldn’t happen to us.

Further, the only things we are asked to “deny” are the very things those who wrote these words prescribe: submission to religion and government (theirs, of course). The purpose of Passover, Unyeasted Bread, and Firstborn Children is only denial in the sense that we are denied the consequence we would have otherwise deserved by having been religious. Instead, and as a result of these three days, we receive the lavish blessings of eternal life, perfection before God, and adoption into His Covenant Family.

According to Yahowah, He is returning with His beloved son, Dowd, His Chosen One and Messiah, not with the “Son of Man” – unless we read that as *Dowd* | David. God has made it abundantly clear that Dowd is returning with his Father’s glory.

While I do not know, and frankly don’t care, if Dowd is going to reward those who have done something meritorious, and only know that he is going to do away with the likes of Roman Catholics, “truly I tell you, EVERYONE who was standing there tasted death twenty centuries before ANYONE would see the son of God come in his kingdom.”” Placing words on Yahowsha’s

lips he would never have said is unforgivable, as is making him out to be a false prophet. And yet I'm thankful in a way for their blunder because it proves that these words were not inspired and that they were not spoken by God.

To assume otherwise, to believe that the "Gospel of Matthew" represents the inerrant word of God, is to be irrational. I suppose that is why it requires faith.

There is a sticking point here for thoughtful Jews that I'd like to address before we move on. Since Yahowah is resolutely against human sacrifice, why was the Passover Lamb human on this day? Why not an actual lamb – maybe just a really big and shiny one? The answer is that Yahowah told 'Abraham not to harm Yitschaq because He was going to provide the sacrifice, becoming the *Pesach* 'Ayl. In that He created us in His image, we humans, by design, were conceived to be the animal most like God.

When Yahowah set apart a diminished aspect of Himself to honor His promise to provide the Passover Lamb, the body took the form of a man, not a cute, furry, four-legged animal which would otherwise be consumed during the celebration. The *Pesach* 'Ayl representing Yahowah on this day acted like Him and spoke like Him such that the observant would recognize Him and appreciate what He was doing to fulfill Passover.

Beyond this, the body was simply flesh – something with a very limited lifespan by any standard. His soul, which was and remains the essence of His nature, did not die. His *nepesh* | soul would go on to fulfill *Matsah* the following day such that when it was released from *She'owl*, Yah's *nepesh* and *ruwach* were reunited – representing the unification of man and God. Therefore, the actual life of Yahowsha' was not sacrificed, just his body, which, as a collection of molecules, was

meaningless apart from the symbolism. The real sacrifice was what Yahowah's *nepesh* endured in She'owl on Unyeasted Bread, and it is this *Miqra'* which perfects us so that we can be adopted into His Covenant Family.

Therein is yet another part of this story Christians miss: Passover without UnYeasted Bread is counterproductive. Eternal life without perfection equates to an eternity separated from God in She'owl. That is why the Roman Catholic insistence on "Good Friday" leading to "Easter Sunday" has become a Plague of Death. And this is not a recent contrivance, but instead, replacing Passover with the resolutely pagan celebration of Easter Sunday began in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century such that it was ubiquitous among Christians by the time Roman Catholics seized upon it.

The Christian fixation on the tortured and dead body of their god is sadistic and bizarre. Even their belief in bodily resurrection is counterproductive. It is our frail, physical nature that keeps us stuck in time, making bodily resurrection leading to eternal life an oxymoron. To be eternal, we can no longer be material.

With the Jews swept off center stage and into hell in Christian lore, "*God's primary work in the world is now accomplished through the building of Christ's church, after which Jesus will come again to the earth and establish His kingdom – ruling the world from Israel.*" (Chuck Swindoll, *God's Masterwork*) Speaking of "hell," you've earned it, Chuck, for having swindled Jews of God's Masterwork.

Returning to the Christian *piece de résistance*, the glaring omission from all ancient manuscripts of the entire episode before Pilate becomes more curious still when we recognize that there are two parchments attesting to what came before it, covering Matthew 26:7-8, 10, 14-15, 22-23, 31-33, and 29-40 dating prior to 300

CE, with another, P<sup>37</sup>, written prior to 400 CE covering 26:19-52. This means that there is nothing apart from the aforementioned Roman contrivances dating prior to 800 CE to suggest that the Christian author of what has been entitled “the Gospel of Matthew,” whomever he may have been, wrote a word about what occurred before “Caiaphas, the High Priest” (Matthew 26:57-68), of them stating that “Jesus” was “worthy of death,” of them “spitting in his face,” or of them “taunting him.” There is also no validation for “Peter” denying “Jesus of Nazareth” in Matthew 26:69-75, which is convenient since there was no Nazareth at the time. In fact, to call him “Jesus of Nazareth” (as is now stated in Matthew 26:71) emphatically dates the completion of the “Gospel of Matthew” to the time of Constantine and his mother in the 4<sup>th</sup> century when this myth was conceived and then promoted by Eusebius – Constantine’s publicist. With this obvious error, we now have proof that portions of the “Gospel of Matthew” were developed under the dishonest and racist auspices of Eusebius and his Roman Catholic Church. There is no other rational way to explain this mistake.

In addition, there is no indication, whatsoever, apart from the mutilated texts prepared initially by Eusebius on behalf of Constantine known today as Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, both Roman creations in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, both replete with tens of thousands of modifications over many hundreds of years, that “early in the morning, all the Chief Priests and the elders of the people made their plans how to have Jesus executed. So they bound him, led him away and handed him over to Pilate, the governor.” (Matthew 27:1-2)

In Mark, upon which the Greek Matthew is based, this alleged meeting took place “two days before Passover,” not the morning of it. And it must be acknowledged that every reference to the motives of



Jewish religious leaders is “alleged.” If such a meeting took place, there is no way that those who contributed to the creation of Matthew, Mark, or Luke, and not even Yahowchanan, would have known what was thought or said. They were not there. In fact, other than Yahowchanan, they were not even in Yaruwshalaim, and perhaps not even alive, when the events they regale occurred. But they left their fingerprints, proving with the long list of obvious misrepresentations and false prophecies, that none of this was inspired by God.

There is no validation for “Judas’ remorse for having betrayed innocent blood” for having “thrown the money into the temple,” or for “hanging himself.” (Matthew 27:3-5) It may have occurred to a man of a different name, but the reference to “innocent blood” was a Roman contrivance used to condemn Jews.

The unattested conversation between the “Chief Priests” “talking about picking up the coins since it was blood money” is a myth, nullifying the misquotation and misappropriation of the prophecy in Zakaryah, “they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price set on him by the people of Israel, and they used it to buy the potter’s field, as the Lord commanded me.” (Matthew 27:6-10 (corrupted to fit the occasions from Zechariah 11:12-13)) The notion is preposterous. Clerics of their status don’t go around picking up scattered coins. Moreover, if they perceived it as “blood money,” they wouldn’t have gone on to commit the crime.

It’s likely that this content is the residue of Roman Catholic anti-Semitism, and of their chief apologist and propagandist, Eusebius (d. 340 CE), as well as his unsavory cronies. He was the bishop of Caesarea, a place where there was no distinction between Imperial Rome and Roman Catholicism. He was also a raging anti-Semite and consummate liar, who blamed the Jews for the “death of ‘Christ.’” It is as if religion constipates the

brains of such men, and for them becomes a license to lie (by Eusebius' own admission as we will soon see).

Yahowsha' was tortuously executed on a Roman order, by Romans, and in the Roman method. He was not stoned by the Jews who were powerless at the time – something clearly acknowledged in Mark. And as we have noted: the Passover Lamb always dies. It does not matter who does the deed, only that we understand and celebrate his sacrifice. In lamenting about “Jews killing Jesus,” Roman Catholics have become the embodiment of what they claim “Jesus” said in response to “Peter” when he took that same approach: *“Get behind me, Satan! You are a stumbling block to me; you do not have in mind the concerns of God, but merely human concerns.”*

We'll make our case against the emergence of the Roman Catholic Church and Eusebius in a moment, but first I'd like to present some of the other material which can be removed from the “Gospel of Matthew” now that we know that the 27<sup>th</sup> Chapter is spurious. It is obvious from the historical record that the following was written in the 4<sup>th</sup> century to exonerate Rome and condemn Jews. Not a single word of this is chronicled in any independent source – at least apart from the Acts of Pilate, which isn't even remotely credible. It, like the alleged letter from Pilate to Tiberius and the “Messianic” addendum to Josephus' *Antiquities* in the 4<sup>th</sup> century regarding the events of this day, has been shown to be a careless forgery. This did not happen this way...

*“Meanwhile Jesus stood before the governor, and the governor asked him, ‘Are you the king of the Jews?’ ‘You have said so,’ Jesus replied. When he was accused by the chief priests and the elders, he gave no answer. Then Pilate asked him, ‘Don't you hear the testimony they are bringing against you?’ But Jesus made no reply, not even to a single charge—to the great amazement of the governor.*

Now it was the governor's custom at the festival to release a prisoner chosen by the crowd. At that time they had a well-known prisoner whose name was Jesus Barabbas. So when the crowd had gathered, Pilate asked them, 'Which one do you want me to release to you: Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus who is called the Messiah?' For he knew it was out of self-interest that they had handed Jesus over to him.

While Pilate was sitting on the judge's seat, his wife sent him this message: 'Don't have anything to do with that innocent man, for I have suffered a great deal today in a dream because of him.' But the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowd to ask for Barabbas and to have Jesus executed.

'Which of the two do you want me to release to you?' asked the governor. 'Barabbas,' they answered. 'What shall I do, then, with Jesus who is called the Messiah?' Pilate asked. They all answered, 'Crucify him!' 'Why? What crime has he committed?' asked Pilate.

But they shouted all the louder, 'Crucify him!' When Pilate saw that he was getting nowhere, but that instead an uproar was starting, he took water and washed his hands in front of the crowd. 'I am innocent of this man's blood,' he said. 'It is your responsibility!' All the people answered, 'His blood is on us and on our children!' Then he released Barabbas to them. But he had Jesus flogged, and handed him over to be crucified." (Matthew 27:11-26)

All of the characters are out of character. This was so poorly written, it is transparent. If you cannot see through the lies, then you have indeed been blinded by them.

It is incumbent upon us to use the test Yahowah prescribed in His Towrah to know what is true and what is not. All we need is to use His criteria, plug in the evidence, and use reason. For example, I started to

question this diatribe for many reasons. First, washing of the hands to absolve one of guilt is a Jewish practice, one prescribed in the Towrah. It was never Roman. Pilate would not have done so.

Second, Romans don't play to the crowd and they aren't swayed by non-Romans. We actually have a credible, extant record of how Pilate dealt with messianic figures. His response is dutifully recorded by Josephus in *Antiquity, Volume XVIII*, Chapter 4, Page 1. The incident occurred in 36 CE and chronicles the inhuman way Pilate quelled a messianic uprising. The chapter is entitled: "How the Samaritans made a tumult, and Pilate destroyed many of them. How Pilate was accused; and what things were done by Vitellius relating to the Jews."

It reads: "[Year 36.] But the nation of the Samaritans did not escape without tumults. The man who excited them to it was one who thought lying a thing of little consequence: and who contrived everything so, that the multitude might be pleased. So he bid them to get together upon mount Gerizzim: which is by them looked upon as the most holy of all mountains: and assured them, that when they were come there, he would show them those sacred vessels which were laid under that place; because Moses put them there. So they came there armed; and thought the discourse of the man probable. And as they lived at a certain village, which was called Tirathaba, they got the rest together to them, and desired to go up the mountain in a great multitude together. But Pilate prevented their going up, by seizing upon the roads, with a great band of horsemen, and footmen: who fell upon those that were gotten together in the village: and when it came to an action, some of them they slew; and others of them they put to flight; and took a great many alive. The principal of which, and also the most potent of those that fled away, Pilate ordered to be slain.

But when this tumult was appeased, the Samaritan senate sent an embassy to Vitellius; a man that had been consul, and who was now president of Syria; and accused Pilate of the murder of those that were killed. For that they did not go to Tirathaba in order to revolt from the Romans; but to escape the violence of Pilate. So Vitellius sent Marcellus, a friend of his, to take care of the affairs of Judea; and ordered Pilate to go to Rome, to answer before the Emperor to the accusations of the Jews. So Pilate, when he had tarried ten years in Judea, made haste to Rome: and this in obedience to the orders of Vitellius; which he durst not contradict. But before he could get to Rome, Tiberius was dead. [A.D. 37, Mar. 16.]”

In light of this historical record, what are the chances that, when ordering the death of the most famous individual in world history, the leading messianic figure of all time, this same man turned to his wife and chatted about her dreams, or that he washed his hands of the whole affair? What are the chances that, if this actually occurred, not a word was written about it in any historical account, especially considering the Roman propensity to record and respond to every hint of revolt in their Empire with an iron hand?

What are the chances that Jews, who hated Romans for their subjugation, and who would be crucified by the hundreds of thousands by them, asked a Roman procurator to torture one of their own? Why would the Roman listen to, much less agree with, the Jews he was there to suppress? Why is there no record of “Jesus Barabbas” if he was such a notorious fellow? Why is there no history of Roman clemency in association with Passover if it was the governor’s custom? And speaking of Passover, if we are to believe that this was written by the Disciple, why didn’t he mention it since he would have known that it was Yahowsha’s sole purpose? He would have, after all, have celebrated Pesach the previous

evening with Yahowsha' and have listened to Him explain His role during this *Miqra* | Invitation to be Called Out and Meet with God. If this had been inspired by God, don't you think He might had have wanted us to know this as well?

Since the issues between Pilate and the Jewish religious leaders prior to this event are legend, with Pilate tormenting them by displaying all manner of Roman religious paraphernalia, why is the Roman capitulating to those who have sought his dismissal? Why would anyone, much less everyone, say: "Let his blood be on us and on our children?" Not only was contact with blood, especially from a dead person, of considerable concern to Jews, their children had done nothing.

This account is told quite differently in the other "Gospels," especially in Mark and by Yahowchanan. And why is there no corroborating historical text for an event of this magnitude – one that would be used to change the course of history? And I am neither the first nor the last to bring this great aberration of God's message to our attention. German theologian, Ulrich Luz, describes it as: "redactional fiction." Graham Stanton, a British New Testament scholar, wrote: "Matthew's anti-Jewish polemic should be seen as part of the self-definition of the Christian minority which is acutely aware of the rejection and hostility of its 'mother' Judaism." Howard Kee recognized, "The bitter words he attributes to the Jews have caused endless harm in arousing anti-Jewish emotions." N.T. Wright, the Anglican New Testament scholar and theologian, stated: "The tragic and horrible later use of Matthew 27:25, 'His blood be on us, and on our children,' has served an excuse for Christian anti-Semitism as a gross distortion of its original meaning, which was surely a reference to the fall of Jerusalem."

Donald A. Hagner, a Presbyterian New Testament scholar and theologian, warned: "It cannot be denied that

this statement, unfortunately, has been used to promote anti-Semitism. The statement is formulaic, and the reference to ‘our children’ does not make them guilty of the death of Jesus, let alone children or Jews of later generations.” Too bad he was unaware that the entire presentation was a Roman Catholic deception.

Anglican theologian, Rowan Williams, then Archbishop of Wales, and soon-to-be Archbishop of Canterbury, stated that Matthew’s Gospel has been made into “the tool of the most corrupt and murderous misreading of the passion stories that has disfigured the Church’s record.” “The evangelist’s bitterness at the schism within God’s people that continues in his own day, his impatience with the refusal of the Jewish majority to accept the preaching of Jesus, overflows into this symbolic self-denunciation by ‘the people.’ It is all too likely that his first readers heard it as a corporate acknowledgement of guilt by the Jewish nation, and that they connected it, as do other New Testament writers, with the devastation of the nation and its sacred place in the terrible disasters of AD 70, when the Romans destroyed the Temple and along with it the last vestiges of independent power for the people. Read at this level, it can only make the contemporary Christian think of all the centuries in which Jewish guilt formed so significant a part of Christian self-understanding, and of the nightmare which was made possible by this in the twentieth century.”

While that is the heart and soul of the Christian problem, the cancer that has eroded the church and led to its genocidal rage against Jews, that’s not the end of the lunacy. The following reads like a page out of the twisted and plagiarized *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*:

“While the women were on their way, some of the guards went into the city and reported to the chief priests everything that had happened. When the chief priests had

met with the elders and devised a plan, they gave the soldiers a large sum of money, telling them, ‘You are to say, “His disciples came during the night and stole him away while we were asleep.” If this report gets to the governor, we will satisfy him and keep you out of trouble.’ So the soldiers took the money and did as they were instructed. And this story has been widely circulated among the Jews to this very day.” (Matthew 28:11-15)

This is so preposterous it requires a wholesale suppression of reason to believe a word of it. The book Yahowah inspired on behalf of Yisra’el had now been given an addendum to destroy these same people. The world was being engulfed in the longest lasting and most reprehensible conspiracy of all time: Blame the Jews.

When we recognize what Roman Catholics were able to add in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, we are even freed from the Day of the Zombies...

“The tombs broke open and bodies of many holy people who had died were raised to life. They came out of the tombs after Jesus’ resurrection and went into the holy city and appeared to many people. When the centurion and those with him who were guarding Jesus saw the earthquake and all that had happened, they were terrified, and exclaimed, ‘Surely he was the Son of God!’” (Matthew 27:52-54) While rational people know that this did not occur, it does explain the Christian fascination with Zombies and the Living Dead. And please, if Yahowsha’ was the “Son of God,” don’t you think He would have said so and not referred to Himself as “the Son of Man?” Said another way, should we rely on anonymous men, indeed Romans, to declare that “he” was other than He claimed?

Since all of the anti-Semitic warts found in the Gospel of Matthew are unattested in the colosseum of 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and early 4<sup>th</sup> century manuscripts which have



been unearthed, and with the exception of Eusebius' heavily redacted Codex of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, not one of these troubling accounts is contained in a later 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, or 8<sup>th</sup> century manuscript, the obvious conclusion is that Rome added them to justify their desire to annihilate the Jews and exonerate themselves immediately after having solidified their power.

Their embellishments remain incompatible with Yahowah's enduring love for His People, they are inconsistent with the Towrah, are unattested in history, and are irrational in dialogue, setting, and execution. Only those whose religion has predisposed to believe lies would put any faith in something this completely incongruent, perverted and preposterous. Quite frankly, Satan's Qur'an isn't as overtly anti-Semitic as the closing chapters of Matthew. They had in every conceivable way become far worse than the vile assessments they were projecting on Jews, such that they created a Straw Man who, by comparison, didn't make their intolerance seem as bad.

Since we've drawn the association, let's consider how differently this story plays out in the book that was plagiarized to create it. Why, after copying 600 of Mark's 661 verses to compile Matthew, are they so divergent when incriminating Jews?

In Mark 15, there was a question and answer session before Pilate, but no trial. Yahowsha' is delivered to Pilate, but not accompanied. He asks him only two questions, "[Are you the king of the Jews?](#)" Yahowsha's answer to the first is not only different than recorded in Matthew, his, "[It is as you say,](#)" would have led directly to his crucifixion without anyone playing the blame game. Rome had appointed Herod King of Judea and that response would have been seen as admitting to leading an uprising against Roman authority, and thus as treason. So,

let's agree that Mark, who was not there at the time, gave the wrong answer.

In Matthew, a flashback was deployed at this point as a rhetorical tool even though it was out of sync with the flow of events: “When he was accused by the chief priests and the elders, he gave no answer.” It was inserted because Pilate wasn't invited to that session and would have known nothing of it, providing no basis for his subsequent line of questioning. But in Mark, the religious are present and within earshot, interrupting the Roman governor: “And the chief priests accused him of many things, but he answered nothing,” which again was the wrong answer. They just didn't like his replies, but nonetheless, he provided answers.

Not only would it have been un-Roman and a security risk for Pilate to have shared the stage with the Chief Priests who detested him, had they been there taunting “Jesus” they could not have been among the crowd, inciting them. Nonetheless, Mark's account then reads: “Then Pilate asked him again, saying, ‘Do you answer nothing? See how many things they testify against you. But Jesus still answered nothing, so that Pilate marveled.’” Matthew reads, “to the great amazement” of Pilate.

In an attempt to separate fact from fiction, that was the first time, not the second, Pilate asked this question. And secondly, Yahowsha' answered the only answerable question Pilate posed, making the rest of this read like it was written by an idiot. For example, what's the motivation for Pilate being “greatly amazed” or “marveling?” Frustrated perhaps, bored, maybe, but rulers are seldom impressed with subjects who implicate themselves as Yahowsha' had done if we are to believe Mark.

While Mark, the older of the two sources, has thus far presented much less information than is found subsequently in Matthew, and nothing conspiratorial, other than word order, Matthew regurgitates Mark's assessment: "Now it was the governor's custom at the festival to release a prisoner chosen by the crowd." Versus: "Now at the feast he was accustomed to releasing one prisoner to them, whomever they requested."

But then it's Mark which adds additional details not found in Matthew, with: "There was one named Barabbas, who was chained with his fellow rebels, they had committed murder in the rebellion." Excuse me for trying to make sense of this, but there was no rebellion at this time and Rome never released murderous revolutionaries. Of him, Matthew says: "At that time they had a well-known prisoner whose name was Jesus Barabbas." If he was so well-known, why is nothing known of him?

Then rather than Pilate recommending the release of Barabbas, as we read in Matthew, "So when the crowd had gathered, Pilate asked them, 'Which one do you want me to release to you: Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus who is called the Messiah?' For he knew it was out of self-interest that they had handed Jesus over to him," is not at all what we find in Mark: "Then the multitude cried aloud and began to ask [*him to do*] just as he had always done for them. But Pilate answered them, saying, 'Do you want me to release to you the King of the Jews?' For he knew that the chief priests had handed Him over because of envy."

Keeping it real, there is no record of Rome releasing prisoners to appease those they had conquered, and especially on occasions which were in opposition to their religion, as is the case with Passover. Moreover, the one thing we know about Pilate is that he is best known for antagonizing Jewish religious sensibilities – not

accommodating them. And speaking of them, not only wasn't there room for a "multitude" before Pilate's residence, Roman soldiers would have seen such crowds as a threat and removed them.

Addressing the differences in the Gospel of Matthew, once again we have Pilate initiating the possibility of a prisoner release rather than the crowd requesting it – which is significant with regard to motivation. Worse, at least for the credibility of the text, in Matthew, Pilate says "[Jesus who is called the Messiah](#)" rather than "[Do you want me to release to you the King of the Jews?](#)"

If Pilate had surmised that Yahowsha' was indeed claiming to be "King of the Jews," he was as good as dead. The same is true as we have learned by searching *Antiquities* of those who made Messianic claims. But they are not the same – not even remotely.

The reason for this delegitimizing difference is likely found in a pathetic and desperate text entitled "*The Acts of Pilate*." It purports to have been prepared by Pilate's agents and sent to Rome because Pilate allegedly converted to Christianity and wanted Tiberius to know that they had appeased Jews by killing the Messiah. Most everything we read in Matthew that differs from Mark is found word for word in that thoroughly discredited 4<sup>th</sup> century text, likely forged by Eusebius, the same fellow that forged a letter from Pilate to Tiberius on this subject and altered Josephus' testimony so that rather than never mentioning Yahowsha', he waxes poetic about him, calling him "the Messiah."

Pilate's concluding assessment in both Mark and Matthew is inconsistent with the other "Gospels," and it is out of character for Rome. Trying to explain the unexplainable, Mark wrote: "[For he knew that the chief priest had handed him over because of envy.](#)" Again,

there isn't a snowball's chance in hell that the Roman governor would have assessed such motives, nor cared if he had. He would not have concerned himself with their "self-interests" either. His loyalty was to Rome.

When a subsequent document adds more to the story, it typically has more to do with the mindset of the writer than what actually happened. All that Mark, the text that was used to create Matthew, has to say next is: "But the chief priests stirred up the crowd, so that he should rather release Barabbas to them. Pilate answered and said to them again, 'What then do you want me to do with Him whom you call the King of the Jews?' So they cried out again, 'Crucify Him!'"

Since the determination of whether this is true or false is life or death, I'm not being petty picking it apart. The chief priests could not have stirred up the crowd if they were sitting beside Pilate accusing Yahowsha'. And this reads: "so that he [Pilate] should rather" instead of "so that the crowd of Jews would rather" release Barabbas. If the priest were inciting the crowd it would have been the other way around. And Pilate is said to be answering them [the crowd] when they've said nothing. Moreover, it reads, "he said to them again," when this is the first time he has done so. Further, since there was no rebellion at this time, Barabbas would not have become a cult hero for rebelling against Rome. Romans suppressed such notions by killing a hundred subjects for every Roman murdered by a rebellious community.

As previously noted, claiming to be king at this time in opposition to Rome was tantamount to treason. Had the Roman governor actually made this statement he would have become complicit in the crime, recalled and likely killed: "What then do you want me to do with Him whom you call the King of the Jews?" The Jews were not calling him their "king." Every word of this is utter nonsense.

There is yet another irresolvable problem for the Christian depiction – one that I’ve suspected for a long time. There wasn’t enough room for a small crowd to gather, much less one sufficient to bring shame on an entire population. In the “Gospel” which has come to bear Mark’s name, Pilate met Yahowsha’ in an *aule*, which means “hall,” wherein Pilate was seated during the brief interview. This would suggest a room in the Praetorium – which was located in the northernmost wing of Herod’s Palace. From *praetor*, it speaks of the residence of the highest-ranking civil servant of Rome. The attendees ushered into an audience before the Roman prefect, and within a hall serving as an adjunct to the larger palace, would have been by invitation only, thereby eliminating any possibility of a crowd.

Challenging Mark’s assessment, and moving the proceedings outside, Yahowchanan wrote in 19:13 that “Pontius Pilate brought [Yahowsha’] forth, and sat down in the judgment seat, in the place that is called Lithostrotos, and in Hebrew, Gabbatha.” That’s a problem too because this not only differs from Mark’s *aule*, Gabbatha is an Aramaic term, not Hebrew, and means either “black” or “elevated.” Lithostrotos is Greek, and means “tessellated” or “mosaic,” and speaks of “ornamental pavement.” However, the only “tessellated mosaic floor” was neither “elevated” nor “black.”

The lone mosaic of the kind dating to this period is on the eastern side of the palace. And even here we have two issues. Archaeological studies have confirmed that the Roman pavement at this site was laid by Hadrian in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century – a hundred years after these events played out. This mosaic serves as the floor of the eastern forum of Aelia Capitolina, which Hadrian named after himself after destroying the rest of the city in 133 to 135 CE. Prior to Hadrian’s artistry, the area he covered had been the site of the Struthion Pool, and thus was filled with water. The

pool survives with vaulting added by Hadrian so that the Roman Forum could be built over it. Therefore, Yahowchanan's depiction is all wet and dates this portion of his "Gospel" to sometime around 150 CE.

Suffice it to say, there is no possibility that a large crowd of unruly Jews had gathered before Pilate on this day to shout: "Crucify him" or "May his blood be upon our heads and that of our children." And since that didn't occur, there is no justification for Paul's arguments against Jews, no basis for Christianity, Replacement Theology, nor Christian anti-Semitism.

Also inconsistent with the customs of this time, the Romans had a well-established system of jurisprudence. What's depicted within the "Gospels" was not a trial and Pilate was not sitting in the judge's seat. Further, judges don't interrupt criminal proceedings of this magnitude to consider notes from their spouse, nor use them to issue a verdict. Dreams are inadmissible. So this is equally ridiculous...

"While Pilate was sitting on the judge's seat, his wife sent him this message: 'Don't have anything to do with that innocent man, for I have suffered a great deal today in a dream because of him.' But the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowd to ask for Barabbas and to have Jesus executed.

'Which of the two do you want me to release to you?' asked the governor. 'Barabbas,' they answered. 'What shall I do, then, with Jesus who is called the Messiah?' Pilate asked. They all answered, 'Crucify him!' 'Why? What crime has he committed?' asked Pilate. But they shouted all the louder, 'Crucify him!'"

While this choice was not afforded in Mark, the rest of the story is somewhat similar, except Matthew corrects the problem of "Crucify him" only being requested once, not twice. Mark then finds closure, while Matthew has an

agenda. Mark reads: “Then Pilate said to them, ‘Why, what evil has He done?’ But they cried out all the more, ‘Crucify Him!’ So Pilate, wanting to gratify the crowd, released Barabbas to them; and he delivered Jesus, after he had scourged Him, to be crucified.” End of story.

Again, trying to keep it real, a Roman prefect would never have subjected himself nor solicited an unruly crowd in this manner – even if there had been room for one to swim in the fountain before him. If they were indeed, chanting death wishes while splashing around in the fountain, there would have been no speaking over them or reasoning with them. Moreover, under the dictatorial control of Rome, popular sentiments were irrelevant, especially when judging a person suspected of treason.

These issues, while devastating to the credibility of Mark’s hearsay account, are nothing compared to what we now find in the Gospel of Matthew...

“‘Why? What crime has he committed?’ asked Pilate. But they shouted all the louder, ‘Crucify him!’ When Pilate saw that he was getting nowhere, but that instead an uproar was starting, he took water and washed his hands in front of the crowd. ‘I am innocent of this man’s blood,’ he said. ‘It is your responsibility!’ All the people answered, ‘His blood is on us and on our children!’ Then he released Barabbas to them. But he had Jesus flogged, and handed him over to be crucified.”

Frankly, the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* is more credible. No Roman washed his hands of any such affair, shirking his duty to Rome. And even Romans didn’t torture and kill innocent men for their amusement – at least not until the advent of Roman Catholicism. And yet all the while we are to believe that thoughtless zombies went from chanting “Crucify him” to a unified chorus of,



“His blood is on us and on our children!” There is a better chance of snow in hell.

This comparison was solely between Matthew and Mark, since one was predicated upon the other, and the latter couldn’t keep his story straight in the end. The conflicts with Luke’s account are far greater, and yet they pale in comparison to what we find in Yahowchanan. If these four accounts were presented today, the defendant wouldn’t need Johnnie Cochran to rhythmically proclaim on behalf of a murderer: “If it doesn’t fit, you must acquit.”

Out of the “Gospels” and back to reality, after squelching the sanity of Arian (who recognized that Yahowsha’ could not have been the totality of God, but instead a diminished manifestation) at the Council of Nicaea, the Roman Catholic Church used the caricature of “Jesus” they had modeled after the vastly more popular Dionysus, to project Greco-Roman hatred on those they had oppressed, delegitimizing and dehumanizing Jews. They did so based upon the inspiration of Paul and the Roman Church. Their war of words serves as the basis of the conspiracy theories which led to the Holocaust and which are running rampant today.

Christians have perpetrated these lies for a reason: they, like their patron saint, Paul, want to claim for themselves what God has given to Yisra’el and Yahuwdah. And they want a scapegoat to blame for never having grown beyond their dead god on a stick. Clueless as to who Yahowsha’ was and what he was doing there, this miserable institution is attempting to mask its ignorance and shame.

We will never know how far Paul’s devotee went in the waning days of the first century to blame Yahuwdym for what Rome had done to Yisra’el. All we know is that he conspired to create an amalgamation of Paul’s letters,

the Disciple *Lowy's* | Levi's Hebrew transcriptions of Yahowsha's most important declarations, with Mark's and Luke's hearsay accounts.

The historical evidence affirms that the Disciple provided eyewitness testimony on the Sermon on the Mount and Olivet Discourse concurrent with the events which was beloved by the 'Ebyownym – those who were the first to recognize that Yahowsha' walked out of the pages of the Towrah and that Sha'owl sought to demean and sever the only connection that made Yahowsha's life meaningful. To counter them, this unknown victim of Paul's poison pen took it upon himself to use Mark and Luke to flesh out the story such that it read like his beloved Paul's epistles. Then, immediately after the Roman Church emerged under Constantine and began formalizing its creed at Nicaea, the Roman Catholic Church wrote the rest to demonize Jews and canonize themselves.

In this light it would be unfair to blame one man. But Eusebius played a role for sure, stirring the pot of anti-Semitism and Roman supremacy. He had means and motive with regard to the gestation of Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. They express his sentiments and read like his other works. So it was Rome that changed the course of history by writing: "As Pilate washed his hands of the affair, the Jews all shouted, 'Let His blood be on our heads and that of our children!'"

Unfortunately for Roman Catholics, their forefathers not only committed this crime, they blamed the victims. You and your Church remain the Whore of Babylon. You will be convicted for this audacious lie, along with promoting the pagan practices of Sunday Worship, drinking the blood of "Christ" during the Eucharist, Lent, Christmas, and Halloween, the Madonna and Child, Mother of God, and Queen of Heaven, of the Lord Jesus, for a New Covenant and New Testament, for the Trinity,

for the myth of the birth, death, and resurrection of God, of crosses and Jewish culpability, of Replacement Theology, of popes, Holy Fathers, and saints holding the keys to heaven, while replacing the Passover meal with the “Last Supper,” and its fulfillment with “Easter.”

Romulus and Remus, mythically born of Greco-Roman nobility to this same Vestal Virgin and Mars, the God of War, were abandoned along the banks of the Tiber to be suckled by a wolf and adopted by a shepherd. One would kill the other, with the survivor becoming the antithesis of what Moses would achieve, creating the most vicious empire man would ever know, Rome. It’s all chronicled in Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ *Roman Antiquities* should you care to read the Roman Old Testament. And just as Romulus would kill his brother and partner in pursuit of supremacy, it is legend that Rome killed the Benjamite Wolf, Paul.

⌘ ⌘ ⌘