

RETRIEVING JESUS THE MAN



Tosca Lenci

RETRIEVING JESUS THE MAN¹

Tosca Lenci

Introduction

It seems fitting that these words are being written over the a spring Equinox period denoted by “Christians” as “Lent”--days preceding Easter, devoted to abstinence and penitence and commemorating the sacrifice and a divine resurrection of the biblical figure named (Hebrew) “Yehohshua,” known commonly as “Jesus.” The purpose of this writing is toward establishing neutral comprehension of that historical *man*: his material position and acts in the political and popular milieu of his place, culture, and time.

Of the 138,000 *New Testament* original Greek words there literally are thousands of variants of translations and renderings, an average of three in each case, often involving proper usage or non-usage of articles. Granted some differences are accidental and trivial; others, however, are capable significantly of affecting text accuracy and meanings. Origin of the appellation “Christ” began with Greek-translated rendering of Hebrew *mashiah* (“an anointed”) from *mashah* (“anoint,” meaning to smear); then becoming *Messiah* (“God-Anointed One”) in the *New Testament*, from which (via Greek verbal adjective, *khriein*, “anointed,” was derived *khristos*, “an anointed one,” and ultimately Greek *Christos*--“The Anointed One;” moving subsequently through Latin *Christus*, Old-to-Middle English *Crist*, and finally English *Christ*.

While Christians know “Jesus” of the (originally-written in Greek) *New Testament* as their faith’s Messiah, full concept of a god-designated and dispatched savior of the god’s people does not appear directly in the *Old Testament*. There, the specialized title, “Messiah,” never is applied to any uniquely god-directed individual (the only one *potential* reference--*mashiach naghidh* at *Daniel* 9.25--is of uncertain interpretation, in view of uses of “anointed” as to ceremonious oil ‘consecration’ performed by a priestly or royal leader (*e.g.* Saul by Samuel, 1 *Samuel* 10:1; Solomon by David, 1 *Samuel* 16:13; and, possibly when oil is not mentioned, by simple affirmation, *e.g.* Elijah moved to “anoint” as leaders “Hazeal, Jehu, and Elisha,” 1 *Kings* 19:15-16. Cyrus the Great also was referred to as an anointed one at *Isaiah* 45:1). In subsequent Judaic eschatology, the term *Messiah*--not considered to be either *of* or *as* son of

¹ In presenting salient data this article shall avoid over-encumbrance with details most readers already may know or easily can be found. For desired references not fully cited, refer to the extensive Index of *History of the Daughters--“A Compendium of the Epoch of 1935 b.c./b.c.e. to 44 a.d./c.e. as reported by primary ancient ecclesiastical and secular writers,”* available at toscalenci.com. Quotations include supply italizations where pertinent.

god--came to describe a charismatically great future leader of the faith descended from the royal line of King David.²

On the other hand, Christians (who accept Jesus as descendant of David) believe that Jesus by his mission, death, and 'resurrection' fulfills old scripture's 'messianic-type' prophecies toward a god-reasoned world to come. Regardless, each religion is founded upon the same one particular god-- a supremely-embracing, universally-borne entity responsible for creation of the world and its Humankind, and who or which has dictated specific life-governing 'laws' to be accepted and upheld by the god's subjects, ensuring post-death admission of their earthly-identifiable selves/'souls' into the god's eternally-blissful kingdom.

One leaning toward agnosticism or atheisticism ("a decliner") cannot help but perceive the man Jesus as last vestige of the concept of offsprings created by 'gods' via human females (e.g. of only one culture: Zeus on Semele, Leda or Nemesis; Helen of Troy, etc.) It is completely understandable why Humankind over its ages of development has needed to rely on god-belief for reason and solace in its suffered human conditions. But may Time *observe*?--Humankind avoiding repetition of Its' history, toward collectively consciously managing itself and its world. May Time *see*?--the *person*, Yehohshua/Jesus returned to his knowledgeable dedicated *manship*, moved to confront unto martyrdom the-then-existing oligarchical establishment. If so, neutral analysis of reliable scriptural text translation, together with classical historical data, must offer sufficient corroboration.

Jesus' deification was fixed in 325 a.d./c.e. at the First Ecumenical Council of Christian bishops at Nicaea (now Iznik, Bursa Province, Turkey), called by then Roman Emperor Constantine to wreak consensus on an empire-solidifying Christian canon.³ Of particular note at the Nicaea convocation was Bishop Arius from Alexandria, Egypt, who disagreed with the ultimately-adopted doctrine that 'God the Father' and 'Christ the Son' *from the beginning* had been *co-eternally consubstantial* ("of one essence"). Arius maintained 'God the Father' had divinity *over* the Son, that originally only God the Father existed. (For his trouble, all of Arius' books were burned, and he died a quite dramatic death.)

In early first century b.c., when Jesus' region became a "client-state" of Rome (detailed further on), the Temple was allowed to maintain theocratic local self-governance.⁴ The "Sanhedrin," the Temple 'supreme court', presided over by the Chief Priest, retained supervision over its' peoples' day-to-day lives; except, should the court render a death sentence, Rome's prefect/governor had to approve and authorize execution. There is not exact

² For text related to doctrinal establishment of royal lineage from David, cf. 2 Samuel 7:4, 8, 16, 17; 1 Chronicles 17:11ff.; 2 Chronicles 6:10; Psalm 89:3-4; 35.]

³ As an aside, it is curious that despite Jesus' territory's historical successive occupations (e.g. Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Macedonia, Rome), one finds no testamentary references to skin color, excepting one possible allusion--a 'vision' of Ezekiel (40:3): "and there, behold, a man whose appearance [as that] of bronze."

⁴ e.g. as Pilate ultimately would say (John 18:26), "take you him you, and according to the law of you judge you him."

data as to evolution of the Sanhedrin body taken as originated by Moses, who “gathered 70 men of the elders of the people, they [with him], to bear the burden of the people.” (*Numbers* 11:16). *New Testament* word forms rendering “Sanhedrin” derive from the Greek word for “a number of persons assembled in council, a council-board, council—in N.T. *the Sanhedrin*.”⁵

Details with respect to the Sanhedrin that convicted Jesus will be given later, chronologically. Some Sanhedrin mentions are:⁶

About 500 years previous to Jesus’ time, when King Darius I of Persia confirmed predecessor-hegemon Cyrus the Great’s order to return Temple sacred items, among those who “assisted [were] the elders of the Jews⁷ and *the princes of the sanhedrin*” (rarest early use of term).

Circa 37 b.c. Herod the Great would kill 45 sympathizers of his opponent Antigonus II and all members of the *Sanhedrin*.

Even earlier, Herod the Great unilaterally killed one Hezekiah and all his followers in the Galilee without The Law’s requisite *Sanhedrin* trial.

Toward comprehending the *man*, Jesus, his milieu and position in it, there follows the following parts:

- I. Historical tenets as to legitimate royal and chief priestly rulers’ lineage bloodlines under Temple Law; the conceptions of John⁸ and Jesus together with their respective family data.
- II. Last four decades b.c.; popular and dynastic strife under Herod the Great; Mary’s betrothal and dismissal from Temple; births of John and Jesus and Herod the Great efforts to extinguish them; to the death of Herod the Great.
- III. Herod the Great son Archelaus first confirmed by Rome as King; upheavals under new rule; Archelaus reduced to Ethnarch of half the kingdom, and Herod the Great sons Antipas and Philip made Tetrarchs each of one quarter; Archelaus’ banishment, his territory made a Roman province; resistances to Roman hegemony as Galilee Tetrarch Antipas courts Rome.
- IV. Regional events under Roman hegemony; Tetrarch Antipas’ involvements; emerging acts of John and Jesus and growth of their following; John’s arrest and murder by Antipas.
- V. Jesus’ arrival at Bethany; ‘triumphant’ entry into Jerusalem; arrest, trial, sentencing and execution.
- VI. Acts/“miracles” by Jesus; translation/interpretation questions.

⁵ *Greek Dictionary* pages 672-73; see Bibliography.

⁶ For more ancient Sanhedrin mentions, see Appendix, Sanhedrin.

⁷ More properly, ‘Hebrews;’ “Jew” deriving from the old Kingdom of *Judah*; Hebrew *Yehuda*!; Greek *Ioudaia*; Latin *Iūdaea*.

⁸ aka “John the Baptist/Baptizer” (in-depth Greek could translate “John the ‘Dipper’”).

Part One

Historical tenets as to legitimate royal and chief priestly_rulers' lineage bloodlines under Temple Law; the conceptions of John and Jesus, together with their respective family data.

To possess legitimate claim as the people's rulers under The Law, a king had to be descended from David; a chief priest, Aaron (the first appointee under Moses). Strangely not stated in any direct manner, however, is *mother blood* as a fundamental legitimacy determinant.⁹

The *canon* gives but the following data as to lineage of parents and step-parent, respectively, of John and Jesus:

Luke 1:6ff. It is announced to priest *Zechariah of the division of Abijah* that his wife, "*Elizabeth of the daughters of Aaron*" would conceive a child who was to be called John. In the sixth month of Elizabeth's pregnancy, "was sent off the angel [*messenger*] Gabriel from the Theos, into city of the Galilee to which name Nazareth, toward *virgin having been promised in marriage to male person Joseph out of house of David, and the name of the virgin Mary.* And having entered toward her he said, etc."¹⁰

Luke 1:67: Zechariah blessed god, for "he did deliverance to his people and raised up horn of salvation in house of *David.*"

Luke 2:3: For the Quirinius registration, *Joseph went from Nazareth in Galilee "into the Judea into city of David which is being called Bethlehem, his house and father place."*

Matthew 1:18ff.: Before Mary and Joseph "had come together" she was found pregnant; her husband, *Joseph a "son of David,"* was reassured about the condition in a dream.

Commonly it has been taken that Elizabeth and Mary were cousins, while such is not fully conclusory from the canon, in that it involves alternate potential definitions of the Greek word at *Luke 1:36* translated as "Elizabeth the *relative* of you." ("Mary would go "away to her cousin, Elizabeth," *Gospel of the Birth of Mary IX:19*). While they may have been first cousins, or even cousins more removed, all definitely that can be said is that they *were* related.

The two full *New Testament* listings of Jesus' patriarchal lineage after king David--*Matthew 1:2ff.* and *Luke 3:23ff.*—differ. Only two names agree between those paternal lists: Shealtiel and Zerubbabel of the Babylonian exile period.¹¹ Of greatest significance, however,

⁹ Only four women are named in the recorded lineages: Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and the later Bathsheba, the story of each requiring adaptation.

¹⁰ As translated in the interlinear text per Bibliography

¹¹ More related details are available in the Appendix, Lineage – Jesus' and In General.

are the different concluding statements as to Jesus' progenitor:

Per *Matthew*: "Matthan but generated Jacob, Jacob but generated the Joseph the husband of Mary, out of whom [Mary] was generated Jesus."

Per *Luke*: "Jesus, being son, as it was being opined¹² of Joseph of the Heli of the Matthat..."

As to Mary's personal data, non-canonized scripture¹³ offers extra detail:

"...Mary [later form of Hebrew name Miriam/Miriamne] sprung from the royal race and family of David, was born in the city of Nazareth, and educated at Jerusalem, in the temple." Mary's "father's name was Joachim and her mother's, Anna. The family of her father was of Galilee and the city of Nazareth. The family of her mother was of Bethlehem." *Gospel of the Birth of Mary*, I:1-2.

"Anna...brought forth a daughter, and...the parents did call her name Mary." *The Protevanglion* 1:2. "They vowed, if [Tet.]¹⁴ should favour them with any issue, they would devote it to the service of the Lord [anointed one]." *Gospel of the Birth of Mary*, I:6. Anna sang a song of joy, concluding, "[I]t may now be told the sons of Reuben that Anna gives suck."¹⁵ *The Protevanglion*, VI:8; italics supplied.

"[W]hen the child was a year old, Joacim made a great feast, and invited the priests, scribes, elders, and all the people of Israel; and Joachim then made an offering of the girl to the chief priests, and they blessed her." *The Protevanglion*, V:4-5. And when three years were expired, and the time of her weaning complete, they [traveled (IV:5) and] brought her to the temple, [and] having perfected their vow, left her with other virgins in the apartments of the temple, who were to be brought up there." *Gospel of the Birth of Mary*, IV:1, 8.

The difference between *Matthew* and *Luke* has been suggested by some as *Luke* giving Mary lineage and *Matthew*, not. However, if their language is charted as follows—

¹² Also possible Greek translation, *being considered/ believed/recognized as*.

¹³ See Appendix, Apocrypha.

¹⁴ "Tet" being short for *tetragrammeton*, four letters transcribed as Hebrew □□□□, commonly transliterated into Latin letters as YHWH or JHWH, *not* naming but indicating 'The God', to whom or to which, according to The Law, he religiously observant do not give a name.

¹⁵ Reuben's fall from grace is another topic warranting in-deep review, *vis-à-vis* Reuben descendants' later 'northern' affiliations, *i.e.* sons of Reuben being descended from Korah, cousin of Moses and leader of a rebellion of Moses' assumption of authority early in the Exodus.

Per Matthew:

Matthan + ?
/
Jacob + ?
/ Joachim + Anna
/ /
Joseph + Mary
 /
 Jesus

Per Luke:

Matthat + ?
/
Heli¹⁶ + ?
/ Joachim + Anna
/ /
Joseph + Mary
 /
 Jesus

--and, if Joachim¹⁷ is accepted as Mary's father, the only question involves Joseph's parentage. Possibilities are (1) That 'Jacob' was 'Heli's' proper name, and 'Jacob Heli' was Joseph's biological father; or (2) one or the other--'Heli' or 'Jacob'--was Joseph's biological father and the other, his maternal grandfather—it recognizable in wholly-patriarchal biblical genealogical tables, where legitimate blood passed to a grandson through his grandfather's daughter, the name of the grandfather could appear instead of the husband/biological father.¹⁸

The record does not state precisely *why* Mary and other females were housed and reared at the Temple, although "[T]he priest the highest of his brothers...a wife in her virginity shall take--a virgin of his people he shall take a wife; and not shall he pollute his seed among his people." *Leviticus 21:7ff.*¹⁹

Two last significant historical elements are: (a) whether in fact Mary was not daughter of a poor village family but of a regionally recognized, relatively affluent family of community status also as related to that of John, there seemingly sufficient data to substantiate such.; and (b) the announcing language as translated of the conceptions of John and Jesus, upon which the word translated *angel* can be seen to pivot, as follows.

The first definition of both Hebrew *mal'akh'* and the Greek *ag'gelos* is "I. messenger, envoy; the Greek dictionary second definition used in Scripture, II. "messenger from God, an angel;" the latter apparently rendered (subjectively) if a 'spirit' messenger *is taken to be indicated* while, when referring to a human being, 'messenger' is rendered.²⁰

¹⁶ "Heli" is Latin form of "Eli." *Luke's* "Heli" (*/eta/lambda/epsilon/iota*) is the only *New Testament* use, there also being only one in the *Old Testament* (in high priest lineage given by *Esdras*). "Heli" lettered derivatives are *Matthew 16:14's* */eta/lambda/epsilon/iota/alpha/ny* rendered "Elijah;" and *Luke 1:17* */eta/lambda/epsilon/iota/alpha*, also rendered "Elijah."

¹⁷ Varying forms of Hebrew "Joachim:" Jehoiachin, *2 Kings 24:6*; Jehoiakim, *2 Kings 23:36*; Joiakim, *Nehemiah 12:10*). It remains that Joacim could have been Heli's given name.

¹⁸ See Appendix, Lineage – Jesus' and In General.

¹⁹ The practice bears reminiscent tinge of the Code of Hammurabi; see Appendix, Naditum.

²⁰ Other examples: "the lips of the priest should guard knowledge...for the messenger [*malakh*] of [Tet.] is he," *Malachi 2:7*; "To the angel [*aggelo*] in the congregation in Ephesus, write,"

Given the prevailing beliefs under The Law it is reasonable to assume that, in times of sore oppression of its people, there would be both underground resurgencing factions and impetus to preserve legitimately lineaged seed. Circumstances of John's and Jesus' time (explored in the next part) call to mind Assyria's warring domination in the time of Isaiah (700's b.c.) Regardless Isaiah's unrealized hopes for a saving progeny, he reported:

"And I took to record for me witnesses faithful, Uriah the priest and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah, the son of Zechariah. And I drew near to the prophetess, and she conceived and bore a son." *Isaiah* 8.2.

Another example is found in *Tobit* during that family's Assyrian captivity from Naphtali, Galilee, when visited and assisted by the "angel"/*messenger* Raphael, who revealed himself as one Azariah, "son of Hananiah the great." Along with a medical intervention for father Tobiah I (detailed in Part Six, "Restoring Sight), Raphael/Azariah was instrumental in arranging marriage of son Tobiah II and his cousin Sara, whose father, Raguel, over-joyously gave thanks that mercy had been granted "two that were the only children begotten of their fathers (and, it must be assumed, *mothers*). As Azariah added, "I suppose that she shall bear children."

"Whence it is a custom of our country, that no one should take the high [/chief] priesthood of God but he who is of the blood of [Levi + ? -] Aaron, while every one that is of another stock, though he were a king, can never [legitimately] obtain that high priesthood." *Josephus AJ*, XX.X.1.

While there can be no concrete proof of politically-manipulated conceptions in dire times to preserve or perpetuate legitimate representatives under The Law, Elizabeth's and Mary's respective conceptions of John and Jesus remain notable.

Conception of John by Elizabeth with Zachariah:

"It happened to be but in Zachariah serving as priest in the order of the upon-day of him according to the custom of the priestly office he obtained by lot, was seen to him *aggelos* [/messenger/'Gabriel']" who told him, "the woman of you Elizabeth will generate son to you, and you will call the name of him *Ionin* [actual translation of Greek text, *iota/omega/alpha/ny/eta/ny* but rendered John]." *Luke* 1:5-13; 19. And when "were fulfilled the days of public service of him, he went off into the house of him. After these days conceived Elizabeth the woman of him." *Luke* 1:19-24.

"[I]n the days of Herod [the Great] priest to name Zechariah, upon day-service of [the priestly division²¹] Abijah, and woman to him out of the daughters of Aaron, and the

Revelation 1:20.

²¹ *cf.* "by lot" in first quotation. It is not certain whether up to Jesus' time Temple priestly service continued as established by King David. In addition to a full Chief Priest, each

name of her Elizabeth....” *Luke* 1:5. In the messenger’s visit to Mary he would say, “Elizabeth the relative of you also very she has conceived, and this month sixth is to her the being called barren.” *Luke* 1:36.

Conception of Jesus by Mary

Mary was visited by the same *aggelos* [messenger/”Gabriel”] and told that she had been “highly favored and to not be fearing. You will conceive in belly and you will give birth.” Mary asked, “How will be this, since male *person* [also possible translation, *husband*] I not am knowing?” He replied, “power of Most High will overshadow you; through which also the being generated holy will be called.” *Luke* 1:26, 31, 34-35. “[T]he power of the Most High shall *overshadow* you, *without any of the heats of lust.*” *Gospel of Birth of Mary*, VII:19; *The Protevanglion*, IX:13; italics supplied. [The Greek word *epsilon/pi/iota/sigma/kappa/iota/alpha/sigma/epsilon/iota*, rendered *overshadowed*, has other forms including *to cover, to veil.*]

Populace bound by their commonality with their “ears to the ground,” in a time of drastic political upheaval and economic and cultural hardships, well would have been aware of the significance of births of John and Jesus, specifically their legitimacy under The Law. As will be shown, King Herod himself definitely had more than a clue as to the importance of their existence. John may have been in the Aaronic line, but Jesus was in both Aaronic *and* Davidic—a double threat. Continuing explorations in Part Two will include the questionable circumstances of Mary’s discharge from the Temple.

priesthood division “house” had its own ‘high’ priest who served at Temple at regular cyclic intervals . Of David’s original 24 houses initially composed of sons of both (Aaron-) Eleazar and Ithamar--Abijah being eighth in order in that list--no more than eight of those divisions appear following the exile, while new ones seemingly are named. (In the texts the terms “chief” and “high” often are used interchangeably unclear.)

Part Two

Last four decades b.c.; popular and dynastic strife under Herod the Great; Mary's betrothal and dismissal from Temple; births of John and Jesus and Herod the Great efforts to extinguish them; to the death of Herod the Great.²²

Setting the scene for the within time period, certain descendants from the prior independence-driven "Maccabean" era had been absorbed by the Herodian dynasty. Their lineage follows, with names bolded of those in Herod the Great's power:

Asamonean/Hasmonean/Maccabees: Mattathias (+ ?) - Simon/Thassi/Matthes (+ ?) - John Hyrcanus I (+ ?) – Aristobulus I + (? + ? -) Alexandra I (widowed) + (John Hyrcanus I + ? –) Alexander I Janneus – Aristobulus II (+ ?) – Alexander II and **Hyrcanus II** (+ ?) – **Alexandra II** + (Aristobulus II + ? -) Alexander II – **Aristobulus III** and **Miriamne/Miriam I** (+ Herod The Great) - **Alexander III** and **Aristobulus IV**.

Circa 37 b.c. and forward:

Herod the Great, fearing legitimately royal Hyrcanus II and uncovering attempts to give him sanctuary, had him put to death. Hyrcanus II's daughter, Alexandra II—using all efforts toward re-securing power for her family--was in solid alliance with Egypt's Cleopatra VII. Alexandra pressed Mark Antony to dispose of the Great, even sending him pictures of her children Aristobulus III and Miriam. Antony finally wrote to the Great asking Aristobulus III be sent; but Herod politely replied that his land "would be in a state of war" if Aristobulus left the country, because the people "were in hopes of a change in the government."

Herod assembled his "friends" and informed them Alexandra II was conspiring against him. But "in order to deceive" and placate Alexandra II, the Great temporarily replaced one Ananelus as High Priest with the handsome 18-year-old Aristobulus III, who received a great popular hailing at public appearance. Alexandra II, nonetheless knowing herself no more than a prisoner, and upon Cleopatra's advice, prepared for herself and Aristobulus III to be smuggled out by night in a coffin. When the escape plan was foiled by unspecified informants, Aristobulus III was caused to be drowned "by such of Herod's acquaintance appointed to do it" while the young man was bathing in a pool at Jericho during a banquet organized by his mother.

²² This section provides pertinent highlights. As to Herod the Great's full tenure, *History of the Daughters* offers complete details of Herod's warrings, alliances, inquisitorial tortures and arbitrary killings. *History* also reports the earlier Asmonean/Hasmonean/Maccabean era and evolving then-world powers, personalities, relationships, and events.

A spy having given report of a plot to kill the Great, torture of “certain women” yielded 10 male citizens whom he executed, along with destruction of “their entire families. “ Meanwhile, hostile stories were carried to him by various competing palace members (*e.g.* sister, Salome)—“all in all” against Miriam’s sons, Alexander III and Aristobulus IV. Included were “cunning strategems” of Antipater III against his half-brothers. Antipater III’s “general aim being to lay a plot to make it believed that Alexander III lay in wait to kill his father.”

Circa 31 b.c.:

The contest reached the battle point between Rome’s Octavian versus Cleopatra VII and Mark Antony (the latter two having joined formally in marriage). Herod the Great [*ca.* “his seventh year”] was influenced by Cleopatra and Antony to go against Arabia. Although Cleopatra VII sent a general ostensibly to support Herod, the general instead aided the Arabians initially to rout Herod. Herod, however, ultimately decimated the foe (significantly east of the Jordan near Philadelphia), refused any terms, and “punished Arabia, so severely extinguishing the spirits of its men that he was chosen as their ruler.”²³

Circa 30 b.c.:

Battle of Axium/Azio: As commonly known, Rome’s Octavian conquered Mark Antony and Cleopatra.

Circa 29-27 b.c.:

Now disastrous plotting reached Miriam (who fiercely had spurned the Great after murder of her father); she being charged through accusations obtained through tortures of searching for poison to kill Herod. He placed her on trial before a court reportedly of “those that were most faithful to him.” A death sentence was rendered and carried out. Alexander III’s and Aristobulus IV’s enmity of the Great was sealed by their mother’s fate at his hands, and they let it publically be known that they had no desire for his company.

The Great had a meeting at Rhodes with Rome’s Octavian, who had received the title, Caesar Augustus. Herod satisfied his fealty to Caesar, and his political position was more magnificent than ever. However, before the trip, he had “separated the women’s camps” in his household and left instructions that, should he not return, Alexandra II and Miriam I be killed (of which order they learned).

Herod, who subsequently fell ill, had not taken any action yet against Alexandra II. Then, while he took health treatment at Sebaste, Alexandra II at Jerusalem proposed to those that kept strongholds (“the one belonging to the city itself, the other belonging to the temple”) “be given over to her and her sons.” Herod, informed by “old friends,” sent an order that Alexandra II be, and she also was slain.

²³ Far from private wishes of Cleopatra VII who, bearing little love for Herod the Great (as evidenced by her secret attempts to aid his ‘family prisoners’), would have preferred his demise.

By about 23 b.c.:

Caesar Augustus had cleared Herod the Great of charges against him by “Arabians” in his dominions and made him “one of the procurators of ‘Syria’.”²⁴ Within the next year or so He commenced raising and rebuilding Jerusalem’s temple and surrounding construction. While he had made some concessions for the people (particularly during a time of drought and plague; and once forgiving subjects a third of their taxes), yet “people everywhere talked against him” as he used all efforts to keep them in control: he restricted fraternalization, setting “spies everywhere; enjoined the people to be always at work; did not permit the citizens to meet together or to walk or eat together, but watched everything they did.” “Many there were who were brought to the citadel Hyrcania, both openly and secretly, and were there put to death.”

Depending on formulae used, birth of Mary, mother of Jesus, occurred in this timeframe.

Circa 15/14 b.c.

Caesar Augustus had left it in Herod the Great’s power to name his testamentary successor(s) and distribution of his kingdom territories. While the Great held suspicions as to his potentially succeeding sons, he indicated to Caesar that family concord existed; and, at home, that successors would be, first, Antipater III (mother, Doris) and then Miriam’s sons, Aristobulus IV and Alexander III.

The Great informed Caesar, however, about allegedly purported slanderings and threats against him by Aristobulus IV and Alexander III. Caesar left all relative authority on the matter to Herod. Subsequently, through torturous methods Herod sought confirmation that Miriam’s sons had been planning to murder him. Tortured individuals were produced for public accusations “before a multitude at Jericho” (“which accusers many of the people stoned to death”). The sons, ignorant of the deep inroads that had been made against them, were placed in custody, while all that truly stood against them was Alexander III’s admission that he and his brother had planned to escape to sympathetic Cappadocian king Archelaus, who “had promised to send them away to Rome.”

Herod then called an inquisition--“150 assessors” of “principal men,²⁵ the king’s kinsmen and friends.” The brothers were not allowed to be present, for Herod “knew well enough that they would certainly have been pitied.” The ‘court’ “perceived there was no room for equity and reconciliation, so they confirmed Herod’s authority.” “Now all Syria and Judea was in great expectation, and waited for the last act of this tragedy; yet did nobody suppose that Herod

²⁴ See Appendix, Syria.

²⁵ “...excepting [Cappadocian king] Archelaus, for Herod had suspicion of him.”

would be so barbarous as to murder his own children.” Yet “by their father’s command” Aristobulus IV and Alexander III “were brought to Sebaste and strangled.”

Circa 13 to 11 b.c.

Saw the Great’s construction at Caesarea Sebaste of a sailing ship/port haven between Dora and Joppa for ships between Phoenicia and Egypt, and surmounted by a temple for Caesar Augustus. Meanwhile the Great continued seeing to his personal security, “encompassing the whole nation with guards,” while producing “a great festival—the fifth-year games.” Internally, in the palace, however, “the tumult was like a civil war.”

Mary’s betrothal to Joseph, dismissal from Temple and pregnancy; births of John and Jesus; death of Herod the Great. [Date range, 6 – 2 b.c.²⁶]

All that is given in the canon as to Mary is: “Having been promised in marriage Mary to the Joseph, before or to come together them she was found in belly having. Joseph not he was knowing her until when she gave birth to son.” *Matthew* 18:24.

Mark commences 1:9 with adult Jesus’ baptism by John.

Luke commences at 2 with Mary and Joseph trip to Bethlehem and the birth.

John commences 1:28 with John and Jesus encounter in Bethany where John was baptizing “on other side of Jordan.”

Only (“apocryphal”) *The Protevangelion* and *The Gospel of the Birth of Mary* give in-depth personal detail of Mary and the apparent quandary presented by her initial refusal to leave the Temple. Both sources time-wise name the Temple’s then-serving high priest as “Zechariah” (John’s father), which accords with his later reported murder.

When Mary “arrived to her fourteenth [also given as twelfth] year,” high-priest Zechariah [aka Zecarias] first made a public order that all virgins with public settlements in the temple and were come to this age, should return home. Mary alone answered, that she could not comply. “The high priest was hereby brought into a difficulty, seeing he durst neither on one hand dissolve the vow nor on the other introduce a custom to which the people were strangers.”

Zechariah commanded that at the approaching feast “all principal persons both of Jerusalem and neighboring places should meet, that he might have their advice how he had best proceed in so difficult a case; and they unanimously agreed he seek counsel. According to the usual way he went to consult [Tet²⁷],” from whence he reported “that it must be inquired or sought out by a prophecy of Isaiah²⁸ as to whom the virgin should be given and be betrothed; for Isaiah saith, there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse,” according to which

²⁶ Mixed variables are employed in ascertaining dates, e.g. Caesar Augustus’ taxation decree; Rome’s Quirinius registration; and a moon eclipse.

²⁷ See Part One, footnote 14, regarding this term.

²⁸ Refer to Part One, Section I, Isaiah’s witnessed purposed conception with “the prophetess.”

prophecy he appointed all men of house and family of David not married [“widowers”] bring their several rods to the altar. But Joseph, a person very far advanced in years, drew back his rod while everyone besides presented his.

“When nothing appeared agreeable the high-priest judged it proper to consult [Tet] again” and reported that “he to whom the virgin was to be betrothed was the only person of those who had not brought his rod.” Joseph (initially balking) ultimately agreed; took Mary to, and left her in “his house,” saying, “I must go to mind my trade of building.”

When later “Joseph went from Judaea to Galilee, near three months since Mary was betrothed to him, it plainly appeared she was with child and it could not be hid.” [Alternately: when then Mary’s “sixth month was come, Joseph returned from his building houses abroad, which was his trade” and found her “grown big.”] When “the ninth month from her conception drew near, Joseph took his wife [“to have her taxed as my wife”] and what other things were necessary to Bethlehem, the city from whence he came,” where the birth of Jesus occurred.

The Protevangelion, VIII:8-16, IX:1-6, 8- 9; X:1-12, XI:1-7, 8, 14; XVI:16-28.

Gospel of the Birth of Mary, V:3-16; VI:1-7; VII:1-3.

(Consolidated; italics supplied; differences between books noted.)

Plagued by physical debility and pain, Herod the Great had become in “all things like a madman; and knowing that “to the Jews his death would be very desirable,” slaughtered many.²⁹ Following births of John and Jesus, with upheaval constant in his kingdom, he pursued locating both John and Jesus, recognizable legitimate contenders under The Law, about whom the people could rally. He questioned “all the chief priests and scribes” as to where Jesus was, and was told, ‘In Bethlehem of the Judea.’” Then--when visited by eastern “magi” (taken to be priestly followers of Zoroastrianism) who asked, “Where is he born King of the Jews?”—Herod sent them into Bethlehem” instructing they “report back” when they found the child. Instead, not returning to Herod, “through another way they withdrew into the country of them.”³⁰

After the magi had withdrawn, Joseph was convinced to take “along the young child and the mother of it, and of night withdrew into Egypt,” in that Herod was seeking “to destroy the child.” When the magi failed to return, Herod, “enraged, took up’ [*Greek*: translation given of ἀνεἶλεν/aneilen: “put to death”] all the boys in Bethlehem and in all the districts of it from two years and down more.”

Elizabeth, expecting her son also about to be searched for, had taken him up into the mountains. And Herod did make search for John (“Is not this son of his like to be king in

²⁹ Refer to Appendix, Major Protests Against Herod the Great.

³⁰ Questions arise, as to how ‘easterners’ would have had any knowledge relative to Jesus, combined with nothing known of/whether/where he might have traveled, before rabbinical appearance on the scene, and what available ‘medical’ knowledge he in the interim may have acquired.

Israel?”), sending his men to serving high priest Zechariah, John’s father. Herod’s men asked Zechariah at Temple: “Where hast thou hid thy son?” Zechariah replied, in that he was serving at the altar, how should he know? Herod, incensed, again sent his servants to Zechariah, with the message, “Tell the truth, where is thy son, for you know that your life is in our hand.” Zechariah replied, “if the king shed my blood, [Tet] will receive my soul.” Indeed, Zechariah was murdered—“in the entrance of the temple and altar, and about the partition.” *The Protevanglion*, XVI:3-14.

As to the murder of Zechariah, is it not *most* reasonable?—that the grown Jesus (knowing well his people’s history) was referencing his own relative’s/uncle’s murder?—when he said, that those “versed in the law” knew the “wisdom of the *theos* also said, ‘I will send forth prophets and apostles,’ who will be killed and persecuted, “in order that *might be sought out the blood of all the prophets* having been poured out from founding the world to generation *this—from blood of Abel until blood of Zechariah having been slain between the altar and the house*” (Luke 11:47-51); “all blood righteous being poured out upon the earth from the blood of Abel the righteous till the blood of *Zechariah* son of Barachiah [Berechiah].” (Matthew 23:35).

Scholarship has focused Jesus’ reference to Zechariahs of older times; a raft of slain Zechariahs appear historically, a name much found in the *Old Testament*³¹ and often associated with Jesus’ north region home territory (Acts 1:2ff-leading to assumption that of the apostles all but one or two were Galileans).

Death of Herod the Great

Continuing political power plays and personal subterfuges by Antipater III previously had caused the Great to “send for his testament, alter it, and therein designated Antipas (mother, Malthace, “of the Samaritan nation”) as successor king” instead of Antipater III (and five days before his own death, the Great would have Antipater III put to death). “Almost seventy,” as his distemper became more and more severe and he despaired of recovery, he now made a final testamentary alteration: the kingdom was to go to Archelaus (Antipas’ full brother).³²

The Great’s death was made public, before soldiery “and the rest of the multitude,” at an assembly at the Jericho amphitheater, addressed by one (undesigned) Ptolemy, who had been “entrusted by the king with his signet ring” and read the Last Will. It was Ptolemy’s duty to take the ring to Caesar for confirmation of the testamentary settlements. Data of the different competing family camps that sailed to attend and make their cases before Caesar, and subsequent unfolding events before and after Roman settlement of Herod the Great’s

³¹See Appendix, Zechariah/Baruch, Berekياهو, Berechiah. (Further, John’s father well might have been a descendant of Barachiah).

³² Other gifts included: to Antipas--Galilee and Perea regions; Philip--Gaulonitis, Trachonitis and Paneas; sister Salome—Jamnia, Ashdod and Phasaelis.

dominions and assets, continue in Part Three.

Part Three

Archelaus first confirmed by Rome as King; upheavals under new rule; Archelaus reduced to Ethnarch of half of Herod the Great's territories and his sons Antipas and Philip made Tetrarchs each of one quarter; Archelaus' eventual banishment, his territory made a Roman province; resistances to Roman hegemony, as Galilee Tetrarch Antipas courts Rome and regional power.

Before Archelaus set sail to obtain Caesar Augustus' confirmation as king, he solicited the people's good will, and listened but made no response to clamors for release of prisoners and tax reforms. Subsequently crowds gathered, lamenting murders of Judas, Matthais, etc.³³ and stoned Archelaus' intermediaries. That year's Passover at hand, an "innumerable multitude" came to Jerusalem and at temple begged support for sedition, as they "bewailed the murdered Rabbins." A cohort Archelaus sent, ordered to use force if needed, was assaulted, its tribune and some soldiers wounded. Archelaus then "sent his whole army upon them"—"on the sudden" as they were offering their sacrifices--to prevent those tenting for Passover from assisting. Archelaus' forces slew 3,000; the remainder dispersed."

Archelaus, leaving half-brother (Herod the Great + 'Cleopatra of Jerusalem' -) Philip in charge, departed for Rome. At Rome, Caesar Augustus received Herod's signet, last testament, a monetary accounting, and Archelaus' claim to the crown of Herod dominions. Various Archelaus' kin ("Salome and those with her who hated Archelaus") stated that they "rather desired to live under a Roman governor;" but, if they had to accept a continuing monarchy, *their* choice was Antipas. Salome's son Antipater IV spoke for the Antipas faction, and a Nicolaus for Archelaus. *At issue were* (a) "the slaughter at the temple," about which Caesar had received notice (Nicolaus de-emphasizing it as unavoidable; that the slain were enemies of Rome); and (b) whether Herod's final testament should be taken as valid. Caesar ruled that it was, and Archelaus initially was confirmed as king.

In the interim--it being "manifest" to Rome's Syrian President Varus that "the nation would not be at rest"--Varus went to Jerusalem and restrained a first sedition, "a great one," and left an army legion to keep order. Caesar's Syria-region steward Sabinus (despite ordered "to not seize upon any of the castles") used a force of a "multitude of his own armed servants, seizing citadels and pressing search after Herod's money," "so oppressing the populace that at length they rebelled:" "An immense number out of Galilee, Idumea, Jericho and Perea beyond Jordan, together with a greater number of Judea itself"—"entirely besieged the Romans, enclosing them on all sides."

A great battle ensued, ultimately won by Sabinus' force—a "terrible slaughter" that also saw burned vast works of the cloisters around the temple outer court. Some resisters fell from

³³ See Part Two, fn. 29.

where they had rained arrows, dying in the fall; some in final desperate suicide. Sabinus' soldiers gained entrance and "seized on that treasure where the sacred money was deposited," of which "great part was stolen." The destruction, human losses, and thievery caused "a much greater number of a more warlike sort" to persist against the Romans, then gradually "the greatest part" of the resisters began changing alliances to various Roman-led forces while others "went on with the siege"-- digging mines under the palace walls, and beseeching the deserters not to hinder their chances for victory.

At the same time there were other "great disturbances in the country in many places"-- "10,000 other disorders in Judea," while 2,000 veteran Herod soldiers grouped in Idumea to fight against "the dead king's party under Achiabus, the Great's first cousin." Also prominent were three other factions of leaders "strong and bold."³⁴ "Thus did great and wild fury spread itself over the nation, because they had no king; and because those foreigners who came to reduce the seditions on the contrary set them more in a flame, because of the injuries and their avaricious management."

Varus, as soon as he heard, assembled a large expedition—"the remaining two of Syria's three legions and four troops of horsemen"--at Ptolemais, by order met by "several auxiliary forces which kings or certain of the tetrarchs afforded."³⁵ One force he sent into the Galilee where it "made an attack and put the enemy to flight" and "took Sepphoris, made its inhabitants slaves, and burnt the city." "All places were full of fire and slaughter," as Varus marched for Jerusalem through Samaria.³⁶

At Jerusalem Varus was met by Joseph (cousin german of Herod and "first cousin of Archelaus"), Captain Gratus of the "king's party" with one Rufus "over horse," with their soldiers plus those remaining of the dead king's army and those of the Roman legion that had been besieged. The general citizens received Varus, who only reproached the men there in opposition and made them disperse (they pleading that they were on Rome's side and that the warring was made by the influx of strangers).

³⁴ (a) Ezekiel -) Judas with a "multitude about Sepphoris in Galilee; attacked the palace, seized all weapons, carried away what money was left there." (b) In Perea, a Simon, former Herod slave, "burnt down the Jericho royal palace, plundered what was left in it, arsoned many other king's houses;" stopped by Roman soldiers with Gratus, who cut off Simon's head, although Simon supporters went on to burn "the royal palace at Amanthus, by the river Jordan." (c) A third faction led by unknown shepherd Anthronges/Athrongeus, commanding four "numerous bands" "slew a great many both of Romans and the king's forces."

³⁵ Also including "no small assistance from "Arabia" [/Nabataean] king Aretas of Petra, who--out of both his hatred of Herod and to purchase Roman favour---brought "a great army of horse and foot." Varus also received 1500 auxiliaries from Berytus as he passed through.

³⁶ Varus avoided Samaria City "because it had not at all joined with the seditious," but found "villages Arus and Sampho plundered and burnt by the Arabians."

Varus sent parties throughout the country to search out the “authors of the revolts; “caught great numbers of them; punished some; some he dismissed. Such as were most guilty he crucified; that number were about 2,000.” He then proceeded to clean matters up: “disbanded his [allegedly disorderly, mischievous] army and sent away “the Arabians because they did not act like auxiliaries, managing the war according to their own passions;” “while those that had revolted delivered themselves up to him before it came to a battle.” Although Varus “forgave the crime of revolting to the multitude,” “he sent their several commanders to Caesar to be examined.” Caesar dismissed many but “gave orders that certain of the king’s [unnamed] relations [/kinsmen] should be put to death, in that they had engaged in a war against a king of their own family.”

Not long after, Ethnarch Archelaus “had new trouble come upon him.” Varus earlier had permitted “the nation’ to send an [unidentified] embassy that they might petition for the liberty of living by their own laws.” The ambassadors numbered 50, but there were more than “8,000 Jews at Rome who supported them.” Archelaus was summoned to a council of Caesar’s “friends and the chief men among the Romans.” “The ambassadors came, and a multitude of the Jews already there, as did also Archelaus’ friends.” “The multitude of the Jews stood with the ambassadors, and on the other side stood Archelaus with his friends; but as for the kindred of Archelaus, they stood on neither side.”

“[T]he ambassadors, hoping to obtain dissolution of kingly government,” spoke to tyranny endured under the Great; detailed his torture of citizens and harm to his own country’s cities, while expensively embellishing foreign ones; slaying nobility and confiscating estates; and how he had reduced a flourishing nation to poverty. Although Initially it had appeared Archelaus would be “more mild to them” and they had stood “ready to oblige him if they met any degree of moderation,” Archelaus, they charged, however, “seemed lest he not be deemed Herod’s own son; without delay he immediately let the nation understand his meaning, giving a specimen of the type of governing his own citizens could expect, when--before his dominion was established by Caesar--he made slaughter of 3,000 of his own countrymen at the temple.” And, he “used not the ‘Jews’ only but Samaritans, also, barbarously out of his resentment of their old quarrels with him.”

The “main thing the ambassadors desired was this: That they might be delivered from kingly and the like forms of government, and might be added to Syria, and be put under the authority of such presidents as should be sent by Rome; that, given moderate governors, the people would prove they would live in an orderly manner.” They prayed “that the Romans would join their country to Syria, and administer the government by their own commanders.”

Nicolaus of Damascus, representing Archelaus, “reproached all those kinsmen of Archelaus who had gone over to his accusers,” claiming it lame now, that unpunished acts of the dead father be used in current proceedings. He “accused the nation as hard to be ruled, and as naturally disobedient to kings”—it being willfully lawless behavior of those who had persisted in sedition before Archelaus’ confirmation. Meanwhile letters had arrived to Caesar from Varus about how, after Archelaus had sailed for Rome, “the revolt put the whole

nation in a tumult.” Varus gave full account and of having finally “restrained for the most part this sedition, a great one,” and of leaving a legion at Jerusalem.

When Antipas arrived at Rome “inclinations of Archelaus’s kindred who had hated him removed to Antipas,” should they be forced to re-accept a monarchy, “although in the first place every one rather desired to live under their own laws.” Caesar noted the complexities of settling the kingdom and “understood that Antipas had sent letters to lay claim to the kingdom.”

After much testimony and deliberations Caesar ruled that, instead of kingship, Archelaus would be “ethnarch of the one-half of kingdom which had been subject to Herod,” and receive tribute from “Idumea and Judea, and the country of Samaria--promising to give him full royal dignity thereafter if he governed his part virtuously.” Subject to Archelaus were the cities of Strato’s Tower, Sebaste, Joppa, and Jerusalem; but eliminated were certain Grecian cities [“Gaza, and Gadara, and Hippos”] that Caesar “cut off and added to the Roman province of Syria.” At the same time Caesar further ordered one-fourth of Samaria’s tribute be taken off, in that “they did not join in this revolt with the rest of the multitude.”

The other half of the Great’s kingdom Caesar divided into two tetrarchies between Herod sons Philip--“tribute paid by Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and parts around Jamnia;” and Antipas (“who had disputed with Archelaus for the whole kingdom”)--“tribute paid annually by Perea and Galilee.”³⁷

Note: All of foregoing and much that follows taken from Josephus AJ and Wars, primarily from sections below, as appear in History of the Daughters:

AJ XVII.X.1-3; Wars II.III.1-4.

AJ XVII.X.4-7; Wars II.VI.1-3.

AJ XVII.X.8-10; Wars II.V.3.

AJ XVII.XI.1-2; Wars II.VI.1-2.

AJ XVII.XI.3-5; Wars II.VI.2-3.

AJ XVII.XII.1-2; Wars II.VII.1-2.

AJ XVIII.I.1.

AJ XVII.XIII.3-5.

Wars II.VII.3-4; II.VIII.1.

Wars II.IX.1-2.

Although after Herod the Great’s death Joseph first had taken “the young child and the mother and re-entered into the land of Israel,” upon finding Archelaus reigning in Judea he

³⁷ Caesar also confirmed or added other titles and royalties to family members; caused marriages of various Herodian descendants; and later set to rest a conspiracy that had put forth a young man claimed to be the secretly-saved Alexander III, which had garnered support of many who hoped for perpetuation of [Ashemonean-] Miriamne’s line.

“became afraid “and instead “withdrew into the parts of the Galilee [where] he settled into city Nazareth.” *Matthew 2:2 ff.*

Between 9 and 11-12 a.d.

Jesus and John roughly would have been (per widest/narrowest ranges) between ages 11 and 14.

Mary and Joseph--who went “according to year into Jerusalem to the festival of the Passover”--“when Jesus came to be of years twelve” they also went, “according to the custom.” *Luke 2:41-42.* On this occasion Jesus was found precociously holding forth in the temple.

In this timeframe, “a certain Galilean, Judas, a teacher of a peculiar sect,” together with one “Sadduc, a Pharisee, prevailed with his countrymen to revolt.” They “excited a fourth philosophic sect and had a great many followers, which filled civil government with tumults— which spread thence among the younger sort, who were zealous for it.” Judas’ “bold attempt proceeded to a great height;” “one violent war came after another,” together with “very great robberies and murders of principal men. A famine also added to the last degree of despair, as did also the taking and demolishing of cities.”³⁸

One Coponius had been sent by Rome as Procurator of Judea “with power of death put into his hands by Caesar; and Cyrenius/Quirinius, a Roman senator, was sent to take account of substance.” Under Coponius’ administration the people took the “report of a taxation heinously,” but initially were persuaded by then Chief Priest Joazar to “leave off any further opposition; so they gave an account of their estates.” When Cyrenius concluded the taxations, Joazar was deposed,³⁹ and (Seth-) Ananus/*Annas* [of the Gospels] was appointed Chief Priest.

“In tenth [or ninth] year“of Archelaus’s government, he was accused before Caesar” of immoderate rule by “both his brethren and the principal men of Judea and Samara.” He was summoned to Rome by Caesar, who “upon hearing, banished him to Vienna, took his money away from him,” “and laid Archelaus’s country to [Rome’s] province of Syria.” Rome replaced Coponius with Marcus Ambivius as Procurator. Then:

12 a.d. Ambivius was replaced as Procurator by Annus Rufus.

14-15 a.d. Caesar Octavian/Augustus died and was succeeded by one Tiberius.

³⁸ Judas the Galilean’s “fourth sect” “agreed in all things with the Pharisaic notions but had an inviolable attachment to liberty and said that [Tet] is to be their only Ruler and Lord.” Judas called his countrymen “cowards if they would endure to pay a tax to the Romans and submit to mortal men as their lords.”

³⁹ Despite his efforts to control opposition, Joazar, whose chief priesthood reportedly was “conferred by the multitude,” when replaced was accused of aiding sedition.

When Rome's empire was translated to Tiberius, both Antipas and Philip continued in their tetrarchies. Tiberius "sent Valerius Gratus to be Procurator to succeed Rufus," who had served some three years. Gratus "deprived Ananus of the chief priesthood and appointed Ishmael, the son of Phabi." *Ananus*, hereinafter referred to per *New Testament* as *Annas*, became *Emeritus* at temple.

"After a little time" Gratus removed Ishmael also, and "ordained Eleazar, son of Annas, as chief priest." Gratus would serve another 10 years.

16 -17 a.d. Eleazar held the chief priest office only "for a year." Gratus replaced him with "Simon, son of Camithus," who also "possessed that dignity no longer than a year."

17-18 a.d.⁴⁰ Joseph Caiaphas (who at some point married a daughter of former Chief Priest Annas) was made Chief Priest. (Caiaphas' parentage not given.)

25-26 c.d. Gratus returned to Rome; Caesar Tiberius replaced him with Pontius Pilate as Procurator.

Jesus and John, now young men; and given their later revealed fundamental interests and callings (plus an inevitable 'grape line'), reasonably would be aware of political events as they had been developing and would continue to unfold, as in Part Four.

⁴⁰During the within period, Rome's Germanicus defeated the kingdoms of Cappadocia and Commagena, which became Roman provinces.

PART FOUR⁴¹

Regional events under Roman hegemony; Tetrarch Antipas' involvements; emerging acts of John and Jesus and growth of their following; arrest and murder of John by Antipas.

As stated, when the Roman empire was translated to Tiberius, both Antipas and Philip continued in their tetrarchies, each subsequently constructing or advancing villages in their respective regions.

Among Pilate's first acts, in removing the army from Caesarea to winter quarters at Jerusalem, a furor was raised when conveyed into Jerusalem by night were "those ornamental images called 'ensigns', which former procurators refrained from displaying," in that The Law "forbade the very making of images." Pilate's act "excited a very great tumult"--"multitudes of people came running out of the country and persevered him many days" to remove the ensigns. On his initial denial "on the sixth day" Pilate called the multitude to his "judgment seat["tribunal"] in the open ["market"] place, surrounded by soldiers threatening "immediate death, unless they would leave off."

"Five days and nights the people prostrated, their necks laid bare," willing be slain rather than acquiesce to transgression of their laws. Pilate, "deeply affected with their firm resolution to keep their laws inviolable" and "greatly surprised at their prodigious superstition," "finally commanded the images be carried back from Jerusalem to Cesarea."

Meanwhile another Pilate-related furor erupted over his "expending that sacred treasure which is called *corban* upon aqueducts, whereby he brought water from the distance of four hundred (or "two hundred") furlongs." As he sat in tribunal at Jerusalem, "many ten thousands of the people got together, clamoring he should leave off that design." Informed in the premises, he concealed soldiers in the crowd but instructed at his signal only to beat clamorers with staves; nonetheless, they carrying hidden daggers, "laid upon them much greater blows;" "many perished;" "many trodden to death by themselves. The multitude, astonished at the calamity of those that were slain, ultimately held their peace. And thus an end was put to this sedition."

An interim incident resulted in Tiberius' expelling and "banishing all 'Jews' out of Rome," due to one who professed laws of Moses filching treasure from a dignitary's wife, ostensibly for the Jerusalem temple. The result was Tiberius ordering "4,000 men to the Island of Sardinia and punished a greater number unwilling to become soldiers in keeping with laws of their

⁴¹ Due to absence of a fixed chronology among the Gospels, events are placed where they appear most reasonable. (Again, *Josephus* and *New Testament* quotations in this part are referenced in *History of the Daughters* narratives (in some instances here, condensed).

forefathers.”

Circa fall of 29 into 30 a.d.

“In year five and tenth of Tiberius” (some “three years into Pontius Pilate’s term”), John, son of Zechariah, came in spring into all country around and across the Jordan, preaching.” Although there is no recorded data that John’s ministry was connected to the Temple, he (as well as Jesus) was at the age of entering priestly service. Nonetheless, his stature is evident as congregating followers submitted to “baptism,”⁴² ‘baptizing’ also Jesus and indicating him the more worthy in the premises (in which passages Jesus first is recognized as a Rabbi). It also was “about this time that Jesus, a wise doer of wonderful works, a teacher, began to draw over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles.”

Tetrarch Antipas’ fear initially focused on John, who publically had castigated Antipas’ transaction with Herodias, mother of Salome, including the warring caused by his divorcing the daughter of Nabataean king Aretas in order to marry Herodias.⁴³ Antipas “feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion;” for the people were going “in crowds about him, greatly moved by his words;” and Antipas “was being willing to kill John but feared the crowd, because they were having him as a prophet.” Then, Antipas, “having sent off [men], took hold of John and bound him in prison.”

Under Pilate’s procuratorship, neither did “Samaritans escape without tumults.” Armed men under an unnamed leader assembled near Mount Gerizzim” where “troops of Pilate had fallen on them; “some of them they slew; others of them they put to flight, and took a great many of alive, the principal of which, and also the most potent, Pilate ordered to be slain.”

Circa 30 a.d. forward:

Meanwhile, Jesus had begun “preaching onto the synagogues of Judea,” where he incurred criticism for effecting a ‘cure’ [doing labor] on a Sabbath day.⁴⁴ Also, at a time of Passover, Jesus, “having entered into the temple grounds, he started to be throwing over the tables of the money changers and the seats of those selling the doves, etc.”⁴⁵

“Having heard that Antipas had taken John,” Jesus withdrew; aware that the Pharisees knew he was gathering even more followers than John, and a growing crowd threatening “to be

⁴²As an apparent act of renewal in the faith as held by him?; refer to Appendix, Baptism, Etymology.

⁴³Refer to Appendix, Tetrarch Philip, for details.

⁴⁴“Curing” by and “miraculous” acts/signs made by Jesus are discussed in Part Five.

⁴⁵For detail as to Jesus taking down the merchants, refer to Appendix, “Temple Tithings.” (Either another similar disruption was caused by Jesus later, or the report is mis-sequenced between *New Testament* books.)

coming to snatch him, that they might make him king.” But it was necessary to traverse Samaria. “[M]any of the Samaritans believed into him,” Jesus resting two days at a city called Sychar “near the field that Jacob gave to Joseph his son.” Afterward, “he went out from there into the Galilee, whence received him well the Galileans, all having seen as he did in Jerusalem in the festival.”

Jesus had received a message from captive John. Besides responding, Jesus continued smuggling reports to John. Meanwhile a band had begun to gather around Jesus—his first ‘disciples’, later, “apostles”—brothers Andrew and Simon/Peter/Cephas “of Bethsaida;” Philip “from Bethsaida” who brought Nathanael; James and John. Jesus instructed his main men *not to say to anyone* that he was the “Christos” [*anointed one* of Theos]; that “the son of Man” was destined for sacrifice.

“Many tax collectors came reclining with Jesus,” after he had crossed back west from a sojourn to “the country of the Gadarenes,” and “went into his own city [Nazareth].” “Levi [son of] Alphaeus followed him;” and in his house “made reception feast great to Jesus and a crowd much of tax collectors and others who were with him.” (It perhaps is here that Matthew joined the band.)

31 - 32 a.d.⁴⁶

Reportedly, along with Antipas, Herodias and her daughter were at “Machaerus,”⁴⁷ when “Antipas, out of his suspicious temper, sent off a body guardsman with the order to behead John.” [Alternately, Antipas on his birthday made a “supper to the greatest men of him and to the chiliarchs and to the first of the Galilee,” where (per the *New Testament*) a (there) *unnamed* daughter of Herodias (commonly taken to have been young Salome) was prompted by her mother to ask John’s beheading as the favor Antipas promised her for dancing for him. That commonly-held version does not appear in *Josephus*, which does report that Salome had been betrothed to the Philip that became Tetrarch

Upon Jesus returning with his band from a preaching tour, shortly before the 32 a.d. Passover, word spread quickly that he was to be present (taken as at Capernaum); and a crowd was on the road before sunrise. After a sermon at the local the temple, he and some of the men took a back path and put out across Galilees sea; but the people, not deceived, followed—one full boat after another; men, women and children aboard. Jesus held an assembly of an estimated 5,000 persons.⁴⁸ At assembly’s end, Jesus knowing again that they were about to be “snatch him, in order that they might make him king,” withdrew.

⁴⁶ These events necessarily are not placed in exact order of occurrence due to uncertainty in the sequencings between gospels.

⁴⁷ Fortified hilltop palace 16 miles SE of the mouth of the Jordan river east of the Dead Sea; *per Josephus*, the location of imprisonment and execution of John the Baptist.

⁴⁸ The ‘miracle’ of food provided for the multitude is discussed in Part Six.

“In these days”—Jesus now with additional stalwart compatriots including Bartholomew, Thomas, [James-] Judas, and Judas Iscariot; having come down from “the mountains”—he was met by “a multitude from all Judea, Jerusalem, and the maritime country of Tyre and Sidon, then the Decapolis, who came to hear him” (this event referred to as the “Sermon on the Mount”). At some point Jesus with his dedicated men made another speaking tour of the Galilee.

Midway through the 32 a.d. fall Festival of the Tabernacles, Jesus taught and discoursed at Temple. At this, like at other times, he rebuked principal men for their hypocrisies, as he expounded interpretive beliefs of the ‘national’ faith. Difficult as it may be for modern thinkers to imagine ancients’ religious certainties, obviously Jesus believed in the fundamental Mosaically-developed God-concept and precepts enshrined in Temple law, while embodying *reason* applied to them; *e.g.* pointing out, when accused of gleaning grain on a Sabbath, how David and his men ate of the forbidden priestly showbread to keep going (*Luke 6*); and, to the Sadducee-posed levirate query (whose wife in resurrection would a multiply-married sister-in-law be?), responded, “Sons of the age this are marrying and they are given in marriage; but those counted worthy to attain resurrection neither are marrying nor given in marriage; equal to angels they are.” (*Luke 20:27ff.*)

“Were saying some, ‘Not this one they are seeking to kill?’,” in that had been “sent forth the chief priests and the Pharisees subordinates in order that they might get hold of him.” It appears in this timeframe that Jesus received a night visit from one Nicodemus, a prominent Pharisaic member of the Sanhedrin, seeking elucidation of Jesus’ precepts.

At festival’s end, when the officers returned without having taken Jesus into custody, they responded to their superiors’ query, “‘Never spoke thus man;” while “Pharisees” replied to the effect that the “crowd” was ignorant and that not anyone of the “rulers believed into him.” Nicodemus, having met previously with Jesus, cautioned the principal men the effect that “our law does not judge a man before first hearing from him and it is known what he is doing.”

Jesus also appeared at Temple for 32 a.d. winter Festival of Dedication,⁴⁹ at which “They were seeking him again to get hold of but he went forth out of the hand of them, again [to] other side of the Jordan.” He “went off into the country near the desolate, into Ephraim city, and there he remained.” it not possible chronologically to confirm other reported journeys (including travel through Jericho, beyond Jordan, Perea and Samaria as well as Judea)—“through cities and villages teaching, going with him crowds many.” “And it occurred, as he was traversing, came some Pharisees saying to him, ‘Get out and be gone from here, because Herod [Antipas] is willing you to kill.’”

When [33 a.d.] Passover “was drawing near,” people arriving in Jerusalem looked for

⁴⁹ Where Jesus gave the talk later titled “Fine Shepherd.”

Jesus, “saying with one another in the temple, ‘What is it seeming to you? That not not he might come into the festival?’ Had given the chief priests and Pharisees commands, in order that if ever anyone should know where he is he should disclose, that they might get hold of him.”

PART FIVE

Jesus arrival at Bethany; ‘triumphant’ entry into Jerusalem; arrest, trial, sentencing, and execution.

33 a.d.

Six days before Passover Jesus arrived at Bethany.⁵⁰ He is reported partaking of a meal at the home there of “Simon, the *leper*,”⁵¹ at which three gospels recount the feet anointing by the [unnamed] woman and wiping away tears with her hair.⁵² Jesus is reported as stating that, “after two days, the Passover is occurring.” In this timeframe, “some Greeks coming up to worship in the festival approached Philip—he from Bethsaida—and, questioning him, said ‘Lord, we are willing the Jesus to see.’”⁵³

As the Passover drew nearer and Jesus was “in the temple walking about, came toward him the chief priests and the scribes and the older men, saying ‘In what sort of authority, these things you are doing?’” Jesus replied he would ask one question of them, then tell them by what authority. He asked, “The baptism of John—was it out of ‘empyrean’⁵⁴ or out of men?” In that the people held “John as a prophet,” Jesus’ questioners “feared the crowd” reaction, should they answer, “out of men;” and, contrarily, if they answered, “out of ‘heaven’” for then they expected Jesus would ask, *why, then, did they not believe John?* They answered, “Not we have known” which John had been; to which Jesus replied, “*Neither I am saying to you in what sort of authority the things I am doing.*”

“Sent off ones pretending themselves righteous to be, in order that they might catch of him of word to allow giving him over to the government and to authority of the governor.” “And they sent off toward him some of the Pharisees and of the Herodians,”⁵⁵ and when they asked whether he did or did not believe Caesar’s head tax to be lawful, Jesus responded with a brief dialectic which avoided answering in the negative, while playing on Caesar’s self-titled

⁵⁰ Exposition as to some sequencing of events of these days is not affective here, excepting that the upheaval of money changers textwise appears also in this timeframe; description is at Part Four, footnote 4.

⁵¹ Alternate definition: “a person who is avoided by others; a pariah.” Was this “Simon” a Pharisee out-of-step with the hierarchy?—see next footnote re unnamed Pharisee. Further, might the “Simon” be father of purported betrayer Judas of Iscariot?

⁵² *Luke* reports the anointing episode when, “requested *someone [unnamed]* of the Pharisees that he might eat with Jesus, and Jesus entered the house of the Pharisee and reclined.”

⁵³ It is not stated whether the requested meeting took place; but addressing Philip as “Lord” is notable *vis-à-vis* the possibility he *was* the Tetrarch Philip?

⁵⁴ The strict translation of the Greek word here is *sky*; ‘empyrean’ is suggested neutrally, based on etymology of the later-developed word, *heaven*.

⁵⁵ This is a ‘clue’ suggesting influence of Antipas.

godship (*Render unto...etc.*). Also during this time, Jesus when confronted both gave scathing diatribes and pointed parables, to make his points.⁵⁶

Now the chief priests and the scribes were seeking him also to destroy *the first of the people*⁵⁷ and how they might take Jesus up. Not they were finding what they might do, for the people all was hanging out of him.” And “was made to quake all the city saying, ‘Who is this?’—the crowds saying, ‘This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of the Galilee.’” (In one chronology the upheaval of money changers at the temple is recounted at this point—the most dramatically reported of Jesus’ public ‘displays.’⁵⁸)

“Together the chief priests and Sanhedrin members” among themselves questioned, “What are we doing because of this man? If ever we should let him go off thus, all will believe unto him, and will come the Romans and they will lift up us [*translation definition*, ‘acquire our nation’].”

Jesus entered Jerusalem for the last time in what appears historically an especially significant manner, more than suggesting that, albeit refusing his position lead the people into war, he well knew what he represented to them. For his entry into Jerusalem, Jesus sent disciples to find and bring to him a particular animal. Interpreting the record would conclude that the animal desired and obtained was a *mule*, upon which disciples threw their outer garments for Jesus to sit upon. That the animal was a mule combines well with (a) related history and (b) *Book of John’s* entry description: (a) anciently--opposed to the common ass--a hybrid mule was hard to come by, used as mounts by kings and prominent persons; David’s own she-mule was assigned to Solomon on occasion of his anointing, Solomon also subsequently receiving gifts of mules; (b) “Jesus sat down upon it, according as it has been written, ‘Not be fearing...look! *The king of you is coming, sitting upon colt of ass*’.”⁵⁹

Meanwhile, “the chief priests and the older men led together into the courtyard of the chief priest Caiaphas, and took counsel together in order that Jesus by crafty device they might seize and they may kill[*acquire*] him, saying ‘but not in the festival,’ in order that not uproar might occur in the people.” Caiaphas said, ‘It is bearing together to you in order that one man should die over the people and not whole nation should be destroyed.’ From that therefore the day, they took counsel in order that they might kill him.”

The night that would become day of Jesus’ condemnation, he went “together with his disciples to spend it according to custom, to the other side of the winter torrent of the Cedars,

⁵⁶ *E.g.*, parables of wicked cultivators, the widow’s mite; etc., besides silencing the issue of Davidic descendency.

⁵⁷ A notable reference reflecting the populace’s estimation of Jesus’ legitimacy under The Law.

⁵⁸ Misfortune, that Jesus did not have his Plato to record all he must have said, politically and beyond parables....

⁵⁹ See Appendix, Colt.

into the Mount of Olives to a spot, Gethsemane, where was a garden.”

In the interim, purportedly “‘Satan’ entered into Judas being called Iscariot; and having gone off he talked with the chief priests and captains how to them he might give beside Jesus.”⁶⁰ Reportedly, upon offer of money, Judas “consented” to find a time “without crowd.” Thus Judas came to Gethsemane “with crowd much with swords and woods beside the chief priests, captains of the temple, Pharisee subordinates, and older men of the people.” Jesus’ identity apparently confirmed by Judas (or, was it to where Jesus was, that required leading?), Jesus was arrested: “The band and the chiliarch and the subordinates took Jesus, bound him and [and, depending upon which report] they [either] led him first toward Annas], father-in-law of then chief priest Caiaphas;” or, “Having been seized, Jesus was led off [directly] toward Caiaphas.”

Potential charges under The Law were (a) False Prophesying, *Deuteronomy 13:1-5*, which called for the death penalty only if the transgressor performed signs enticing the people to other gods; (b) Desecration of the Sabbath, *Exodus 20:8*, *Leviticus 19:3*, *Numbers 15:32*--case of man stoned to death for gathering sticks on a Sabbath; and (c) Blasphemy, *Leviticus 24:16*; but *Numbers 15:30* said only that such person “shall be cut off.”

In uncertain sequencing, Caiaphas proposed that Jesus was guilty of blasphemy and asked the ‘arresters’, “‘What, to you, seems it?’”--to which the others responded, “‘Held in of death he is.’” It may have been at this point that “Caiaphas counseled, ‘it is bearing together one man to die, etc.’” Then, “as it became day, together the body of elders of the people, chief priests both and scribes, they led Jesus into the Sanhedrin.”

Full political makeup of the Sanhedrin at the time is unknowable from Scripture; although *per Josephus* members were of either Sadducee or Pharisee party and after Roman conquest appointed by Rome. The text suggests only two potential Jesus sympathizers: Joseph of Arimathea(/Ramathaim-zophim/Ramah), a “reputable counselor” (he the gentleman who reportedly would ask of Pilate and be granted permission to remove Jesus’ body to cave burial); and the aforementioned Nicodemus.

Conduct of the ensuing Sanhedrin ‘trial’ is known to have met only one, (a),⁶¹ of the four trial requisites under The Law: (a) that trial be in daytime; (b) that a tribe, false prophet or high priest was not to be judged save by a court of seventy-one; (c) that a verdict was not to issue until

⁶⁰ Whether Jesus in fact might have ‘commissioned’ Judas as instrument for his arrest, has been subjected to some debate; it would require that language debasing Judas was a later subjective interpolation. Significant is translation of Jesus’ statement at the ‘last supper’: “I am saying *that one of you deliver me*” (not, “one of you ‘is going to’/will deliver me,” suggestible Jesus may have been laying his own plan. *In re* the word “Satan” as Christianity’s supreme evil spirit, see Appendix, Satan Etymology.

⁶¹ Although exact timing of the night-to- (“early”) morning progression is unclear.

the following day; and (d) that a capital trial was proscribed on the eve of a Sabbath (and the current Passover was a double, a 'Great' Sabbath).

At trial the main question put to Jesus was, "If you are the *anointed one*, say." Jesus replied, "You say that I am." A search for witnesses resulted in only two brought forward. One said that Jesus had said, "I am able to loose down the divine habitation of the God and through three days to built up." Caiaphas then decided to put Jesus under oath of "Theos," as to whether he was the anointed one of Theos. Jesus replied, "You say it; except I say to you, henceforth you will see the son of man [anthropos] seated from forceful right."

"Of morning," Jesus was taken by "all the chief priests and the older men of the people, bound and led off to Pilate the governor;" and, "early in the morning, consultation having made, Pilate inquired, if the man Galilean is; and, having ascertained that out of the authority of Herod Antipas he was, sent him toward Herod Antipas, being also him in Jerusalem in these days."

Antipas "rejoiced," having wanted for some time to see Jesus, and spoke at him at length; but Jesus "answered nothing to him" as the priests and scribes stood by "vehemently accusing." Antipas and his "troops" ridiculed Jesus and "sent back him to Pilate." Jesus was brought a second time to Pilate, with demands that Jesus be impaled. Jesus refused to answer Pilate's question, whether he was "king of the Jews;" but initially Pilate could determine no cause. The accusers responded, "We law are having, and according to the law [blasphemy] he is owing to die." As the emperial representative, Pilate exercised full control; his ratification had to be obtained by the local court for a death sentence to be valid.

Pilate then questioned Jesus inside the governor's palace and still could find no cause. He returned outside the governor's palace and asked, according to the custom of Roman release of a prisoner at Passover time: "Are you willing I should loose off [release] to you *the king of the Jews?*" (--said pointedly, in that Pilate "was knowing that through envy had given over Jesus the chief priests"). His offer was declined in favor of one Barabbas. Pilate then had Jesus scourged and presented him out, saying "not one cause I am finding in him." Ultimately, Pilate appears to have been moved by political self-protection, the chargers' claiming that, "If ever this [one] you should release, not you are friend of the Caesar; everyone, the king himself making, is saying against the Caesar."

Pilate then "sat down upon step into place being said Stone pavement. Was but preparation of the Passover, hour was as sixth." Pilate asked, "The king of you shall I impale?" Answered the chief priests, 'Not we are having king if not Caesar.' Then therefore he gave beside Jesus to them in order that he might be impaled." Pilate then washed his hands in the Roman custom following a judgment; "Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men condemned him to the cross."

PART SIX⁶²

“Acts/Miracles” of Jesus; translation/interpretation questions

Having explored Jesus, *the human man's* existence, in its' time and place against its' region's then politics, history, and beliefs, one arrives at the expurgative “crux:” *how to explain the “miracles” attributed him?* There, humanists are stymied before the possibilities: (a) that the being, Jesus, *did* possess supranatural power over matter irrespective its' source; (b) that miracle accounts are all fabrications; or (c) ‘miracle’ event descriptions both lack practicably explanatory data and were embroidered subjectively over time in concert with developing Christian beliefs. As to those possibilities:

(a) is unpursuable given current human knowledge (absolute belief in divine powers inviolably requisite to faith being its' support).

(b) While some of the reported ‘miracles’ might be considered fully invented, it seems unreasonable that not all accounts were fabrications uninstigated by some actual circumstances.

(c) Although most ‘miracle’ reports as given are too definitely stated to allow linguistical speculation, when Greek text is subjected to finer word definitions and syntax others do lend themselves to practical explanations.

Examples of possibility (c) follow. Worth noting as to definitions is, Jesus made *points* (rather than “signs”—*e.g.* Nicodemus' remark in his secret meeting with Jesus: “Rabbi, we know that from Theos you have come teacher, for no one is able these *points you are making.*”

Feedings Of The Multitude⁶³

That an expected appearance by Jesus could draw thousands of people alone is telling. The numbers of people that flocked to see and hear Jesus speak obviously saw him as their recognized legitimate king who might take principled rebellion to the brink.

Picture it:: A charismatic figure has come along who with great erudition is addressing matters which in your reality, under hegemony, are robbing you and your family of a decent godly life. If he is to be in your vicinity, you will muster all for the opportunity of seeing him and hearing him speak. So much does it matter to you, that you will use whatever means available to go to where he will be—in a small boat, perhaps, with your wife and children. Now,

⁶² *New Testament* scholarship well has established inability to fix a definite chronology between the four gospels, which largely appear to have been individual assemblies from disparate ‘tellings’ and/or writings.

⁶³ See Appendix, Feedings of the Multitude, for detailed similarities/differences among the gospel accounts, as well as participation of apostle (Tetrarch?) Philip.

determined to make the journey, whether by boat or foot and not knowing the duration, *would you not take food? Would you not, if you had more than you and family needed, perhaps contribute something from your supply?*

Reviewing the data about the containing “baskets,” *John* remarks that apostle Andrew brings a small boy who has five loaves and two fishes; *Luke* says that Jesus asked the apostles, “See what you have;” and per *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke* they reply, five loaves and two fishes (while other accounts mention that the apostles when on the move brought “provisions”).

“Baskets” is not mentioned until the end of accounts. When Jesus asks the apostles to gather the leftovers, only in *Mark* and *John* is it stated, “12 full baskets.” From where, it can be asked, did the additional ones come if not from the people themselves? Ending statements also draw consideration: per *Matthew*, *Mark* and *Luke* the statement, “*And, they ate all and were satisfied,*” could be translated “*All was applied and was replenished.*”

It as well could be deduced that Jesus was not expecting to cause a ‘god’-wrought miracle but was relying on the *goodness* of the people, knowing that by starting one basket they would respond. Witnessing the circumstances, would not individuals and families with more than truly needed to survive not add some of their provisions to the one basket circulated?⁶⁴

.Jesus’ ‘congregation’ well might have constituted an army. He however, at meal’s end-- again “knowing that they would come and grab him to make him king,” once more withdrew alone into the mountain. (Jesus’ comprehension of what his followers easily could have been moved to do would show later in his pre-death dialogue with procurator Pilate [*John* 18:36]: “If my kingdom was out of this world, my subordinates well would be struggling in order that I not be given over.”)

‘Changing’ Water into Wine – *John* 2:1ff.

Jesus and his mother are attending a wedding feast at Cana. The wine “having lagged behind,” Jesus’ mother points it out to him. When he replies, ‘What is it to the people or to us?’ she tells the servants, “Whatever he may tell you to do, do.”

Six stone jars had space in them for two or three more “measures,” and Jesus tells the servants to add water, which they do to the top. Next he tells them to draw some out and bring it to the head of the dining room. The head/“governor” of the feast knew not from where his drink came, but the servants did (having been so busy they knew the wine had

⁶⁴ Of interest here, See *Pneuma and Ruahh*, Appendix. (Perhaps here can be that belief in individual *spirit* under The Law; that it did shine that day.)

become depleted).

Upon tasting the drink, the governor “sounded out” to the bridegroom, exclaiming: “To every man goes first the fine wine until, when they might be drunken, comes the inferior. You have kept the fine wine until now for all!” “Thus the principal of the points Jesus manifested in Cana of the Galilee,” this account concludes.

Had there been some wine left in the jars, so that the drink served to the governor was near all-watered down, which he guessed but to which graciously reacted?

Summoning Change of Psychophysical Strength – John 5:1ff.

Jesus in Jerusalem was at the sheep (gate) pool, Bethzatha, where it was believed that an angel in a certain season troubled the water and the diseased person first in after the troubling stopped was made whole.

Among sickened ones surrounding the pool Jesus encountered a man on a cot having “for 38 years sickness of him.” Jesus said to him, ‘Do you want to become healthy?’ The man replied that he had no one to thrust him into the pool at the right time before another gained the advantage. Jesus said, “Get up, lift up your cot and walk about;” and the man, soundly immediately did.

It happened to be a Sabbath, and observing persons chastised the man for the proscribed (labor of) lifting his cot. He replied that a man had told him to do so, but questioned as to who, he answered he did not know; Jesus having left the area. Subsequently, however, Jesus came across the man in the temple and said, “See how sound you’ve become? Avoid ‘sinning’ so that nothing worse happens to you” [the Greek word translated here as “sinning” correctly defined as *missing the mark*; generally, *go wrong, fail of one’s purpose*].

While it can be assumed that dialogue was omitted from this account--*e.g.* knowledge as to the man’s precise condition—relatively, as to the actual condition, the primary definition of the Greek word translated as “sickness” is *want of strength, weakness*; then, “sickliness” (*i.e.* the man need have been but a “languisher,” not a certained paralytic).

Predicting Survival of Sick Boy -- John 4:46 ff.

Jesus while in Cana was met by and requested by a royal person to accompany him to his home in Capernaum to heal his sick son, who the man was sure was dying. Instead Jesus told him to go home; that his little boy was living. As the man was returning home next day, he was met by slaves who told him the boy’s fever had broken. He inquired of the slaves as to when the boy’s condition had improved and learned that the hour the fever had broken, the day before, was that in which Jesus said that the boy would live.

Again, practical dialogue could be missing here. Reader is left to imagine that Jesus used either divine action-at-a-distance to heal and/or telepathy to discern the boy's condition and predict his recovery. Jesus might have questioned the father to learn symptoms, etc., especially in view of potential studies and learning by him over the unrecorded years of his life between ages 12-30. He may have recognized an illness that ran a specific course, from which the son most likely would recuperate. While full Christian scholarship generally has not embraced theories of Jesus travels (to India, for example), certainly nothing disallows his acquiring useful physiological (as well as psychological) knowledge of his day).⁶⁵

Reforming the Spirit -- Matthew 8:14-17, Mark 1:21-34, Luke 4:33ff.

A man in the synagogue was suffering a *daemonic*⁶⁶ [better translation: *impure*] spirit and shouted loudly, "What is to us and family, Nazarene Jesus? Come you, to destroy us?" Jesus rebukingly responded, "You are angry! Come out!" [?"Muzzle yourself and come out!"] Then occurs a difficult sentence translation which only *might be*, "And tempted, that [which was] in the midst of him [the man] that hurt him was come out of him." All in the vicinity were astonished and conversed toward one another, "What the *logos* (reason) that commands power and force to affect impersonal spirituality?"⁶⁷ And talk about Jesus went around everywhere....

Restoring sight – John 9

Jesus' disciples call to his attention a man "born"[*congenitally*] "blind" [*sightless*]. Jesus spat on the ground, made clay out of the spittle, affixed the clay over the man's eyes, and told him to go and wash it off in the Siloam pool, after which the man "came back seeing." It appears that this described 'miracle' offers nothing toward a linguistically practical rendering; but definitely calls to mind the apocryphal *Old Testament* account in "Tobit," as follows.

Tobiah I, his wife, Anna, and their son, Tobiah II--exiled when northern tribes revolted during Assyrian domination--were reunited after some time with cousin relatives. Tobiah I at age 58 had developed an eye affliction--"a whiteness" came into his eyes, impairing his vision for eight years.

Preparing for sending son Tobiah II on a journey to collect funds previously left in trust, Tobiah I engaged a gentleman to accompany the son. The man, initially calling himself "Raphael," divulged to Tobiah I that his name in fact was "Azariah;" that he was "a son of

⁶⁵ cf. Appendix, Curing; also, "Restoring Sight," below.

⁶⁶"Daemon:" from Ancient Greek *δαίμων*; in Greek mythology, a supernatural being intermediate between gods and humans; *an evil or undesirable emotion, trait or state*. A myriad of human sufferings frequently were summed by the word, "daemon"--possession of spirit, muteness, blindness, epilepsy, convulsions in general, and lunacy.

⁶⁷ Admittedly, a prime example of how a [this] renderer's subjectivity can affect translations!

Hananiah the great;” and they he had lodged in other places with Tobiah brethren. Tobiah I, knew “Hananiah and Jonathan, sons of that great Shemaiah, in that they had worshipped together at Jerusalem,” and determined Azariah was who he claimed to be.

Along the journey, one evening camped along the Tigris River, Azariah had Tobiah II preserve gall of a fish. Later, nearing home, Azariah told Tobiah II a way to improve his father’s affliction; and, at home, Tobiah II followed Azariah’s instruction. As Tobiah I stumbled to the door to greet him, Tobiah II straked the preserved fish gall across his father’s eyes, which caused them to smart. As Tobiah I rubbed at his eyes the whiteness pulled away, and eyesight restored.

Absent conclusion that Tobiah I indeed suffered from cataracts, this account nonetheless is another summons to consider the extent of ancient observations, experimental efforts and trials in developing medical knowledge.

“Raising” of Lazarus/Eleazar – John 11:1-44

Could the man, Jesus, actually bring the dead back to life? If not, inordinate divining embroidery certainly was employed in the Lazarus episode, that possibility added strength by certain relatable factors. As to them, a little history repeat is needed, as follows.

“Lazarus” is a later Romanized form of “Eleazar,” a biblically substantive a name seen over time as having northern ties.”⁶⁸ Following deposal of Ethnarch Archelus and formation in 6 a.d. of the Roman province “Judea”/Samaria/Idumea), the province knew persistent unrest (summarized as the “Jewish-Roman Wars”). During Quirinius’ administration, *New Testament* Annas had served as temple Chief Priest.

In 15 a.d. Valerius Gratus became Prefect of the Judea province. Gratus removed Annas to emeritus position after which Annas’ son Eleazar served as Chief Priest for about one year (16-17 a.d.). Eleazar’s brief tenure was followed by appointment of *New Testament’s* Joseph Caiaphas, who married a daughter of Annas.

There is no way to know whether service by high priests at temple in the contemporary period still followed that established under King David.⁶⁹ Such seemingly is corroborated, however, by the acknowledgedly-serving Zechariah of the Division of Abijah-- John’s father—at the time of his murder under Herod the Great. Thus it can be conjectured that *Lazarus* of Bethany may have been a division priest, especially considering *John* 12:1ff.: At Bethany before Jesus’ last Passover it is said (as interlineally given in the *New Testament* of the bibliography herein): “Took counsel the chief priests in order that also the *Lazarus* they might kill, because many through him were going under and believing into the Jesus.”

⁶⁸ See especially, Appendix, Lazarus, etc. for a list of historical participants named “Eleazar.”

⁶⁹ Refer to footnote 21.

Might Lazarus have been the Gratis-removed high priest “Eleazar?” Proceeding on premise that Lazarus in fact did die, the texts say nothing of the cause. Might he have languished, demolishedly ill from prevailing circumstances?⁷⁰ It could be speculated that he had been victim either materially or psychologically to the aims of those in power. *In* that event, instead of supranatural restoration from actual death to material existence, Jesus’ ‘resurrection’ of Lazarus’ identity could be in keeping with his “resurrection” of historical Zechariahs in consequence of the murder of John the Baptist, as detailed in Part Two.

Jesus’ ecumenical absorbance by time and culture into an ethereal ‘son of God’ has all but obliterated his stellar human reputation, a revered proponent of fairness and truth within the history and tenets of a theocratic society chafing under an oligarchy—a ‘missionary’ scope of a pacifistic son of *man*,⁷¹ his human identity drowned in the Constantinian cementing three centuries later of a canon unchanged to this day.

⁷⁰ Certain translatable language almost sounds as if he has been ‘bound’.

⁷¹Refer to Appendix, “‘Son of God’ vs. ‘Son of Man.’”

APPENDIX

Annas/Hananiah

Annas [*Ananus/Ananias/Hebrew Hananiah*] was appointed by Roman legate Quirinius as the first Chief Priest, of 6 a.d. newly formed Roman province after Ethnarch Archelaus was deposed, the province then directly under Roman rule. Officially removed from office by procurator Gratus, Annas remained as Chief Priest Emeritus. Five of his sons reportedly served as chief priest at varying times; the youngest, also named Ananus, would be assassinated 66 A.D. for advocating peace with Rome. Pertinent terms of office:

- Annas son of Seth (6–15)
- Eleazar the son of Annas (16–17)

Unnamed daughter of Annas of *New Testament* became wife to Joseph Caiaphas.

Apocrypha

The apocrypha include *The Protevangelion*, a book ascribed to James (“publicly read as canonical in the eastern churches”) and *The Gospel of the Birth of Mary*, translated from fourth century works of Jerome (which contemporaries Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, and Austin also mentioned). Additionally, as suggested by *Luke*, there are indications of other accounts not surviving canon establishment at Constantine’s ecumenical conference: “Since even many took in hand to compile statement about [our completeness] of facts...” (*Luke* 1.1)

Baptism, Etymology

English *baptism* derived indirectly through Latin from the neuter Greek concept noun *baptisma* (Greek "washing-ism"), “baptism” *per se* being a *New Testament* newly-coined expression from masculine Greek noun *baptismos*, ritual washing. In Greek texts of Hellenistic Judaism during the Second Temple period, both nouns derived from the verb *baptizō*, “I wash,” used in Jewish texts for ritual washing, and in *New Testament* for both ritual washing and simple before-meal washing, besides the new ‘rite’ *baptisma*, carrying with it divine connotations.

The Greek verb *baptō*, “dip,” from which verb *baptizo* derived, in turn hypothetically is traced to a reconstructed Indo-European root **g^wabh-*, “dip.” Gospel passages also indicate the verb *baptizein* exclusively did not always mean *dip*, *plunge* or *submerge*, being used with literal and figurative meanings such as *sink*, *disable*, *overwhelm*, *go under*, *overborne*, *draw from a bowl*.

Colt

Per *Matthew*, Jesus instructed his disciples to find a “colt” tied to an “ass;” *John* refers to “colt of an ass;” the other two mention only “colt;” “colt” = “foal,” “young of an animal of the horse family.” A *mule colt* would be a hybrid offspring either of a he-ass and a mare or of a male horse and a she-ass. Its’ body resembles that of a horse but short; has a thick head, long

ears, short mane, small feet, and tail terminated by a tuft of long hairs; it combines some finer qualities of both parents---endurance, strength and vigor--as opposed to male or female ass (*syn.* donkey), domestically slow, spiritless, and obstinate.

Curing

Also pursuable in the ‘medical’ vein: mentions of laying on of hands (*massaging? cricking bones?*). When persons variously afflicted were brought to Jesus, he “to each of them putting upon the hands was curing them,” *Luke* 4:40; Simon’s mother-in-law *was feverish* (not “burning with fever”), *Mark* 1:30.

Feeding Of Multitude -- Chart of Details with Similarities/Differences

Notable:

While there is no text proof that apostle Philip and Tetrarch Philip were one and the same, the fact that Jesus asked Philip where locally food could be found, *Tetrarch* Philip—having advanced the town of Bethsaida in his region—logically would have been the person to ask. (*Philip was from Bethsaida, out of the city of Andrew and Peter (John 1:44); Philip from Bethsaida of the Galilee [John 12:21]; see Tetrarch Philip, below.*)

	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>John</u>
Apostles return from touring; ⁷²			x	
a Passover is near				x
It is after Jesus is told of John’s murder	x	x		
After long sermon passages by Jesus, he crosses to other side of Galilee				x
Jesus suggests rest to disciples		x		
Withdraws in boat to lonely place	x	x		
Withdraws to a “private” (“ <i>same</i> ”— <i>as before?</i>) place in Bethsaida city			x	
A very large crowd is following	x	x	x	x
Jesus takes pity on crowd	x			
Jesus feels tender affection for crowd		x		
Jesus kindly receives and addresses crowd			x	
Disciples say, dismiss people so they might find food--	x			
when it becomes night:		x		
when day declines:			x	
Jesus says, “Ye give them to eat”	x	x	x	
They reply, if we buy would cost 200 dinarii		x		
Jesus asks Philip where loaves could be bought; he replies 200 would not be enough				x

⁷² Per English text, returned from “declaring good news;” however, accurate translation would be, returned from *evangelizing* (?).

	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>John</u>
Jesus says, "See what you have"		x		
They have five loaves and two fishes	x	x	x	
Andrew says a small boy has five barley loaves and two small fishes				x
Jesus has people recline, (divides food, <i>Mark</i>), blesses food, bids distribution	x	x	x	x
Number of persons fed:				
<u>"male persons 5,000, apart [trans. without] women and little boys"</u>	x			
"And were those having eaten 5,000 <u>male</u> persons"		x		
"As if 5,000 male persons"			x	
<u>"male persons as 5,000"</u>				x

NOTE: A second multitude feeding of "4,000" is reported by *Matthew* (15:21ff.) and *Mark*(7:24-8:9); a crowd "already three days waiting." That account records seven (not five) loaves and a few fishes. While several details are identical to the above feeding, there is at least one discrepancy (number of retrieved baskets). It is not possible either to prove that there was only one such event or actually two; regardless, one is sufficient to prove Jesus' popular attraction.

Lazarus (Romanized version); Hebrew "Eleazar" and "Elesah"

Scripture reveals significant historical intra-clan differences⁷³ in which the name appears. Examples include the after-Solomon split into two kingdoms—south under Rehoboam; north, Jeroboam; and the Asmonean/Hasmonean/Maccabean rebellion that won a period of independence.

Foremost is that *Eleazar/Lazarus* was third-named son of Aaron's wife, *Elisheba* (daughter of Amminadab, who follows "Ram" in lineage to David). Political controversy during the Exodus culminated in extinction of *Elisheba's* sons, Nadab and Abihu (father[s] not specified), when Moses established *Aaron* as first *Chief* priest. This *Eleazar/Lazarus* (of the *Levi-Kohath* branch (which ultimately lost out to the *Aaron*) initially after *Aaron's* death shared the *Chief* priesthood with his brother, *Ithamar*. He, along with *Aaron* and *Aaron's* other three sons, constituted the original priesthood under *Moses*. He also was the first named high priest to officiate after *Aaron's* death, later working with *Joshua* in land apportionments.

Later Eleazars/Lazaruses:

Son of *Abinadab* who guarded the ark in its 20-year maintenance at *Kirjath-jearim* after its return from *Philistines*.

Son of *Dodo* the *Ahohite*, one of *David's* mighty military leaders.

⁷³ Similar to *Sunni*" and "Shiite" opposing beliefs as to proper legitimate post-Mohammed rule.

Son of tribe of Levi-Merari-Mahli-, who had only daughters taken as wives by cousins, sons of Kish.

Son of a certain Phinehas; Levite priest at Ezra/Nehemiah temple re-inauguration, who on fourth day of Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem assisted priest Meremoth in weighing gold and silver temple treasures.

Levite priest in the procession arranged by Nehemiah at the inauguration of the rebuilt Jerusalem wall.

Ancestor of Jesus' step-father Joseph.

(Parosh-) Eleazar/Lazarus, who post-exilically had a foreign family (many of such not being counted legitimate in the reformation).

Josephus mentions an Eleazar/Lazarus who took the high priesthood, possibly as regent, for the young son of (Chief Priest Onias-) Simon.

It was Chief Priest Eleazar/Lazarus with whom Ptolemy II Philadelphus of Egypt in the third century b.c. graciously commissioned "the 70" to provide to Ptolemy a Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, which became the only full text that survived and from which *Old Testament* Hebrew renderings later were made.

Eleazar/Lazarus, one of the five sons of the independence-winning family of illustrious Maccabean Mattathais.

Lineage – Jesus' and In General

Over the approximately 1,000 years between king David and Jesus, *Matthew's* list would yield 26 generations of an average 38-1/2 years each; *Luke's*, 41 generations of an average 24-1/2 years each.

Matthew includes all known intervening Judah kings but two after Solomon to Jeconiah[/Jehoiachin (Babylonian exile); nine generations between (Jeconiah/Jehoiachin-) Zerubbabel to Joseph. The format is, male name "a generated b, b generated c," etc., *excepting* as to Solomon--"David but generated the Solomon out of the [wife, *Bathsheba*] of Uriah;" then 12 names to (Shealtiel-) Zerubbabel and through seven more names to the "...Matthan but generated Jacob, *Jacob but generated the Joseph the husband of Mary, out of whom was generated Jesus.*"

Luke's list runs back from Jesus in format "b [son] of a, c [son] of b"), and shows between (David-) Nathan⁷⁴ and (Shealtiel-) Zerubbabel, 20 names; then 17 to the "Jesus, "being son, as it was being opined [also possible in Greek translation, being considered/ believed/recognized as] of Joseph of the Heli, of the Matthat...."

As to the issue in patriarchal lineage listings where a bloodline-legitimizing daughter's *father's* name could be substituted, for that of her husband/her issue's biological father, potential examples are:

⁷⁴ Remarkable here is (the seemingly never-discussed?) possibility, that David and Bathsheba son Nathan and "prophet" Nathan were one and the same.

Differing lineage identifications of Zerubbabel's grandfather: "Zerubbabel of the Shealtiel of the Neri" *Luke* 3:27. "After the deportation of Babylon, Jeconiah[/Jehoiachin] generated the Shealtiel; Shealtiel but generated the Zerubbabel." *Matthew* 1:12; while the lineage given at *1 Chronicles* shows: "Jeconiah[/Jehoiachin-] the captive Pedaiah-Zerubbabel" 3:17-19.

Mother(s) of the three primary Exodus-related Hezron sons-- Jerahmeel, Ram/Arni and Chelubai/Caleb--is/are not named, touching the "'Chelubai'/'Caleb' puzzle: at Shiloh, when Joshua oversaw distribution of territories, he confirmed Moses' instruction that the Hebron region was to belong to the [Egyptian-descended?] Caleb clan unto perpetuity, for its support of Exodus territorial progression.⁷⁵

At the same time, Ephrathah is the only one of three [Egyptian-descended] Hezron wives to whom *no* Hezron children are acknowledged. A reference to "Ram, firstborn of Jerahmeel," has been taken to denote a second Ram as a Hezron grandson; however, a reference to (Jerahmeel-) Ram as a "son" of Hezron would fall within the referential parameters of the patriarchal system, *if* mother of (Jerahmeel-) Ram was a Hezron daughter.

A related circumstance (*cf. Numbers* 26-33, 27:4-7) is loss of dead, son-less Zelophehad's likewise-dead wife's recognizable bloodline via her five daughters into the male descendancies of their cousins, to whom the females were directed given *after* Moses reversed, on application of the girls' uncles, his original ruling that daughters were to have rights of inheritance..

As to royal lineage before king David, per *Matthew* 1:2ff.: "origin of Jesus Christ, son of David son of Abraham," shows: Abraham-Isaac-Jacob-Judah-Perez (and Zerah "out of Tamar")-Hezron-Ram-Amminadab-Nahshon-Salmon-Boaz *by* Rahab-Obed *by* Ruth-Jesse—David.

Major Protests Against Herod the Great

Included were major protests against his assuming appointments/changes of Chief Priests and revengeful atrocities after the "Judas and Matthais" uprising at the Temple ("on which night there was an eclipse of the moon"). Herod, by then unable to stand, from his couch he had many "together with their Rabbins" burnt alive and the rest put to death by his officers, and made another change in the high priesthood. *Refer to History of the Daughters* for full narrative of the Great's disposition of opponent revolts against him; *e.g.* at very end, "in a wild rage," he summoned "the most illustrious principal men of the entire Jewish nation" "out of every village," had them shut up in the hippodrome, and extracted promise from sister Salome I and her husband Alexas that before releasing news of his death they immediately were to have all the prisoners killed, ordering further also "that one of every family should be

⁷⁵Ethnic mother potentials there.

slain.” (Upon his death, however, Salome did not follow the order.)

Naditum

1728-1686 b.c. Code of Hammurabi (sixth king of Old Babylonian/Amorite Dynasty) referenced “*naditum*” priestesses, derived from affluent elite families including royal daughters and quartered in monastic buildings. Language in the prologue to Anna’s conception of Mary does provoke a “*naditum*” ring, *i.e.* Joachim’s presence is taken away for a long spell; Judith, Anna’s “maid,” gave Anna a “hood...for it is not fit,” said Judith, “that I, who am a servant, should wear it.” When Joachim reappeared, Anna, “having on her wedding garment ran, and hanging about his neck, said, ‘behold, I who was a *widow* am no longer a widow, and I who was barren shall conceive.’” (May Judith have been a concubine?)

Also under Hammurabi law, casting a shoe across property was a ritual act of asserting possession, which touches upon Sarai casting shoes in Hagar’s face in *Book of Ruth*.

Pneuma and Ruah

Pneuma = Greek: *breath, wind, spirit.*

Ruahh = Hebrew: *vital breath, wind, air.*

Interchangeably, also = rational soul or mind possessing counsel, purpose, and will; but not to be confused with the vital principle of life placed in breath.

Perhaps enough can be drawn as to Jesus’ fundamental concept of godly *spirit*, scriptural texts replete with uses of *pneuma* and *ruahh*, from the root noun meaning ‘to breathe’ extended to mean the invisible vital force in living creatures—*individual spirit*. Scrape off the face, make mute the voice, mangle the limbs; *still there*: Self—that anonymous, thinking causer of action; which, should one believe that godliness not only should be striven for but possessed, mutually would be recognizable by like-spiriteds.

If one psyche encounters another the thinking of which equals one’s own, sensing mutual identification, might one then describe the meeting as of another of a particular spiritual constitution, irrespective body? Might that have been Mary of Magdala’s true experience in her encounter at Jesus’ tomb?—recognized reflection of a specific manifestation of ‘spirit’/consciousness?

“Satan” Etymology

In biblical sources the Hebrew term *satan* describes an adversarial role, not name of a particular character. Old English *Satan* from Late Latin *Satan*; appears only in (late 4th century “Vulgate”/Latin translation of *Old Testament*; from Greek *Satanas* from Hebrew *satan*: “adversary, one who plots against another;” from root *s-t-n*, “to show enmity to, oppose, obstruct, plot against.” (In Greek Septuagint, usual translation is *diabolos* “slanderer”—literally “one who throws something across” the path of another, although *epiboulos* “plotter” is used once.)

“Son of God” vs. “Son of Man”

If Jesus indeed believed that he had been conceived by his God upon his human mother, Mary, then it need be concluded that, by the Greek term, *anthropos*--translated as ‘man’--he

also would mean *female* human. At the same time, there is no way to make a case concluding that he in fact not only had had, but *knew* that he had a biological father; leaving only the circumstances of *Isaiah* (see Part One after footnote 20) upon which to base conjecture.

There exists considerable exposition regarding scriptural usage, forms, and renderings of the term, *son of Man/Son of Man/Son of man/son of man*, translating mainly as (a) Hebrew *ben 'a dham'*, generically, 'mankind'--a human or earthling son; or Greek *anthropoi* in its various declensions and from which has evolved *anthropology*, the science of man. In the following *Old Testament* sites the term in any of its forms specifically denotes a fully human being, with the same Hebrew characters used for the word, *man*: *Daniel* 8:17; *Jeremiah* 49:18, 50:40; *Ezekiel* 11:2, 5; *Psalms* 80:17, 146:3; *Genesis* 1:26, 4:1, 5:1, 25.

New Testament: The Greek root word is employed both for *man*-undesignated and for the term, *son of man*, e.g. : "is being given over," *Matthew* 26:24; "is going under," *Mark* 14:21; "who will say word into the," *Luke* 12:10; "in front of the Son of," *Luke* 21:36. The same Hebrew characters for "man," are employed in: "Let us make *man*" (*Genesis* 1:26) "son of *man*" (*Daniel* 8:17) "son of *man*" (*Jeremiah* 49:18) "Son of *man*;" "son of *man*" (*Ezekiel* 11:2, 5) "the son of the *man*" (*Psalms* 80:17) "a son of *man*" (*Psalms* 146:3); as also in "And the *man* knew Eve his wife; ...And knew *Adam* again his wife" (*Genesis* 4:1, 25); "This the book of the generations of *Adam*" (*Genesis* 5:1).

Syria

"Syria" (usually shortened from "Assyria") in *New Testament* period was over time an annexed Roman province of indeterminate boundaries but embraced the whole of Palestine. Its capitol, Antioch on the Orontes River, was third largest city in Rome's empire.

Temple Tithings

Regarding money exchangers profiteering, reportedly the annual Temple tax/tithe was in the form of two drachmas (a *didrachma*). Similar to present international travel, a fee was charged for conversion of monies of Temple adherents from other regions. Apparently, drachmas also were charged to purchase sacrificial animals sold there for temple offerings made by the faithful—Jesus making reference to a "house of merchandise" and "cave of robbers." [Note: Either another identical disruption would be caused later by Jesus, or the same report is mis-sequenced between *New Testament* books.)

Tetrarch Philip

Tetrarch Philip--son of an unknown "Cleopatra of Jerusalem" and Herod the Great--offers yet another *New Testament* puzzle, it not exclusive is that he and *apostle* Philip were one and the same. Elements involved are (a) Tetrarch Philip's territory proximate to, and including some (e.g. Pella) of the 10 Greek cities of the "Dekapolis;" Philip having been emissary during the 33 a.d. Passover for Greeks requesting a meeting with Jesus; (b) Philip being betrothed originally to young Salome, the last Asmonean/Maccabean flower, subsumed by Herod Antipas when he acquired Herodias, Salome's mother, who divorced her husband/Salome's father to marry Antipas; (c) Tetrarch Philip's men supporting the war of Nabataean/Arabian king Aretas'

against Antipas, when Antipas divorced Aretas' daughter upon taking Herodias; and, previously, (d) Philip had been a sympathizer in the murder by the Great of of Miriam's sons.

Circumstances surrounding John's imprisonment significantly included the presence of Herodias. It was previously (while Antipas was spending time at Rome with a half-brother⁷⁶ and the half-brother's wife, Herodias) that Antipas--then being "married to and having lived a great while with the [unnamed] daughter of Aretas, King of Arabia"--apparently decided to break alliance with Aretas in favor of assimilating the Asmonaeon/Hasmonaeon Herodias. He "ventured to talk to Herodias about a marriage between them," "one article of the marriage being that he should divorce Aretas's daughter." Herodias responded favorably and "agreed to change her habitation" as soon Antipas returned from a planned journey to Rome."

Aretas and Antipas as well "had some quarrel also about their limits at the country of Gamalitis;" also, at some point Antipas also agreed to support Herodias' brother Agrippa and made him "magistrate" of Tiberia.

Unknown to Antipas, Aretas' daughter had advance knowledge of Antipas' plans, went to Macherus (the fortress "situated in the borders of the dominions of Aretas and Herod"), and revealed matters to her father. The result was war: Aretas and Antipas each "raised armies and sent their generals to fight." "Some of the tetrarchy of Philip joined with Aretas' army," and Antipas' army was destroyed. "Now some of the 'Jews' thought the destruction came justly as a punishment of which he did against John called the *Baptist*[/baptizer]."

It is reported that Philip departed life—*how* is not said; only that he died "in the twentieth year of the reign of Tiberius." His "principality Tiberius took and added it to the province of Syria," "for Philip died childless."

Zechariah/Baruch, Barekyahu, Berechiah

Among more early historical Zechariahs were:

- Son of king Jehoshaphat-S during sibling kingship conflict (2 *Chronicles* 21:1-4);
- Son of high priest Jehoiada "stoned...in the court of the house" (2 *Chron.* 24:20);
- King *Zechariah*-N killed "before the people" during power struggle (2 *Kings* 15:10);
- A chief Levite Ezra sent to obtain temple ministers during the restoration; head of division of Iddo in "the days of Joakim";
- A Zechariah among sons of Shecaniah-Parosh with 150 males and of Bebai with 28 males, genealogically enrolled under Ezra;
- Zechariah descendants among priests post-exilically residing at Jerusalem;
- One at Ezra's left hand as he read The Law;
- One a trumpeting priest; another priest son at dedication of rebuilt wall.

Other *Zechariah* associations:

⁷⁶ Called Herod; son of the Great by former high priest Simon's daughter, Miriamne II.

[Jeberchiah-] *Zechariah* called by Isaiah to witness Isaiah's conception with prophetess (mentioned in Part One; *Isaiah* 8.2);

Writer of *Book of Zechariah* refers to himself as "son of *Berechiah of Iddo* the Prophet);

Mention by Josephus (*Wars* IV.V.4) of one [*Baruch-*] *Zacharias*, "slain in the middle of the temple," but which occurred some 34 years future (during John of Gischala's revolt precipitous to Jerusalem seventh-decade c.e. fall) having similarity with *Zechariah* of the *Book of*.

Baruch, itself an abbreviation of Yarekyahu, *both usually rendered "Berechiah."*

Bibliography

This Bibliography of *History of the Daughters* embraces references within, drawn from that compendium--Sonoma, CA: L P Publishing, 4th Edition, December 2012; Tosca Lenci compiler; free for download at toscalenci.com.

CORE DOCUMENTS

Apocrypha, The, London, U.K.: Syndics, Cambridge University Press; undated. *Herodotus, The History of*, Chicago/London/Toronto: William Benton, Publisher, 1952. *Jasher, Book of* [non-canonical]; Kingsport, Tenn.: Kingsport Press, Inc., June 1981 Edition. *Josephus, Life and Works of Flavius*, Standard Edition; Whiston, A.M., William, Translator; Philadelphia, PA: The John C. Winston Co. [Cited *AJ* or *BJ* and followed by number of book, chapter and paragraph.] *Lost Books of the Bible*, New York, N.Y.: Crown Publishers, Inc./Bell Publishing Company Division, 1979 - reprint of 1926 Edition published by World Publishing Co., Cleveland, Ohio, of William Hone's *The Apocryphal New Testament* first published in 1820. [Cited *Lost Books*.] *New Testament/Greek Scriptures - Kingdom Greek-English Interlinear*, New World Bible Translation Committee; New York, NY and Brooklyn, NY.: International Bible Students Assn.; 1969. [Cited by *Name* of biblical book, followed by chapter and verse.] *Old Testament/Hebrew Scriptures -Hebrew-English Interlinear*, Green, Jay, Gen. Ed. and Trans., Wilmington, Del: Assoc. Publishers & Authors, 1976; volumes I, II and III. [Cited by *Name* of biblical book, followed by chapter and verse.] *1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees, Books of; New American Bible*, Wichita, KS: Catholic Bible Publishers, 1975-75 Edition. *1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees, Books of, of The Complete Bible*, Goodspeed, Edgar J. Translator; Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press, 1948. *Xenophon Cyropaedia*, Greek with English Translation by Walter Miller; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, and London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1983.

OTHER HISTORICAL WORKS

Botsford, Ph.D., George Willis, *A History of Rome*, New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1902. [Cited *Botsford* followed by page number.]
Bury, J. B., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., *A History of Greece*, London, England: MacMillan & Co. Ltd. and New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, Third Edition, 1963. [Cited *Bury* followed by page number.]
Cambridge Ancient History, The, J. B. Bury, M.A., F.B.A., S. A. Cook, Litt.D., F. E. Adcock, M.A., Editors; Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1965, volumes III, IV, V and VI. [Cited *Cambridge* followed by volume and page number.]
Encyclopedia of World History, Langer, William L., Compiler and Editor; Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., The Riverside Press Cambridge; 1948 Revised Edition. [Cited *Ency.* followed by page number.]
Mazar, Benjamin, *The Early Biblical Period*, copyright 1986; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society.
Plutarch, Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans (The Dryden Translation), 14; Chicago, IL: Wm. Benton, 1952.
Plutarch's Lives, Vol. 12 (Dryden translation per Clough, Arthur Hugh), Eliot, LL.D., Charles W., Ed.; New York, NY: P. F. Collier & Son Corp., 1969.
Plutarch Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans, "The Life of Demetrius," Trans. out of the

Greek into French by James Amyot and out of the French into English by Thomas North; New York, NY: The Heritage Press, 1941, vol. 2, page 1583.

REFERENCES, COMPREHENSIVE

Aid to Bible Understanding, New York, N.Y.: Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. and Brooklyn, N.Y.: International Bible Students Assn.; Copyright 1971. [Cited as *Aid* followed by page number.]

Atlas of Classical History, Talbert, Richard J. A., Editor; Kent, England and Sydney, Australia: Croom Helm Ltd., 1985.

Atlas of the Classical World, Vander Heyden, A. A. M., and Scullard, H. H., Editors; U.K., London, etc.: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd. 1959.

Bible Timeline, Michael Friedman Publishing Group, Inc., Olson, Karla, Editor; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc. 1992.

Dictionary, Classic Greek-English/English-Greek, Chicago, Ill.: Follett Publishing Company, 1951 (12th printing; copyright 1927).

Klassen, Frank R., *The Chronology of the Bible*, Nashville, TN.: Regal Publishers, Inc. 1975.

Lempriere, J., *A Classical Dictionary*, F. D. Lempriere, A.M., Editor; London, U.K.: T. Cadell, 1826. [Cited either *L* or *Lempriere* followed by a page number.]

Lempriere, J., *A Classical Dictionary*, London: George Routledge and Sons, Undated. [Cited *L Undated Ed.*]

McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr., *Ancient Inscriptions*, Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1996.

New Century Cyclopedia of Names, New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954, Volume 3. [Cited *New Cent. Cyclopedia.*]

New Oxford American Dictionary, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2001.

New Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language, Chicago, Ill.: Consolidated Book Publishers, 1971.

Oxford Classical Dictionary, The (Third Edition); Hornblower, Simon and Spawforth, Antony, Editors; Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1999. [Cited *O* followed by page number.]

MISCELLANEOUS

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vulgate_Bible – re “Satan”