

THE PREHISTORIC CHRIST

Apostles Deny Jesus Lived During their Lifetime

The earliest writings about Jesus and we have those writings in the New Testament which is considered to be God's Word by the Church give several clues that Jesus was thought to have lived in prehistoric times. This means the gospels which came after these writings are lying for they put Jesus in the first century CE. This means that the evidence for Jesus having existed is weak or non-existent.

PAUL

Paul writes nothing that hints that Jesus lived recently. Paul was the earliest Christian writer and you would expect him to know something about Jesus but instead he writes as if Jesus were a mythical figure who may have lived in the long gone past. The New Testament in other places indicates that Jesus did not live in the first century AD.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

1 Peter 1 tells the Jews who had been thrown out of Palestine to whom it was addressed, that they had never seen Jesus. Some say the scattered were not real Jews but Christians but there is no need for that interpretation and Peter was an apostle to the Jews. He mentions persecution a lot so they had been persecuted and expelled and scattered for their faith. He said they were saved from idolatry but not all would have been meant and there had been many religiously corrupt Jews in the time of Jesus who did practice forbidden abominations. So the Jews who should have brushed shoulders with Jesus never met him. They knew there was no Jesus in Palestine in their day.

Peter tells us to suffer with patience like Jesus did. Obviously, if you can save yourself you can't talk of being patient during suffering so the letter denies that Jesus had miracle powers. That eliminates the gospels as authentic history for they say Jesus did have such powers. It denies that Jesus Christ was God.

The epistle says that Roman governors must be obeyed for God uses them to punish and reward people (1 Peter 2:13,14).

It is thought that this denies that one of them, Pilate, killed Jesus. It seems to some that Peter would be taking it for granted that we know to obey them only when they are right. But then why does he tell us to uphold the Roman governors decisions about meting out vengeance on people when most of their punishments were unduly harsh and they had little concern for justice? They represented and maintained a system that cared only about money and convenience and expediency not people. Any justice they administered fairly was not administered out of a sense of duty or fairness but to dodge the penalty of the law to which they were bound themselves on pain of death or prison. I agree with G A Wells that this command proves that the early Church did not believe that Pilate unjustly sent Jesus to the cross.

Christians say that Pilate was forced by the Jews or Roman law or both. They say he was therefore innocent. But this is dubious for Pilate had the power to postpone a decision and could have decreed a discreet execution of a man who was not Jesus in Jesus' place to save Jesus.

The John gospel has Pilate killing Jesus because he is afraid of the Jews and then informing Jesus that he could release him if he would only clear himself before him so somebody wasn't able to make up his mind about Pilate. The incoherence suggests that the Pilate episode may never have happened for it should not have been hard to report accurately about it if it had.

1 Peter 3 says that Jesus was put to death in his human body but he was raised in the spirit and he went to preach to the spirits in prison who had sinned when Noah was building the ark and this visit was a success because we are told a few lines later that Jesus has everything subjected to himself. Jesus was not going to go on a wild goose chase anyway. We are not frankly told whether what Jesus preached to them was salvation or judgement. But he made them his subjects which does not necessarily mean that they were willing subjects. No hint is given that he preached salvation to them therefore he did not for Peter would say. This being the case when the passage says they sinned it is most probable that Jesus did not go to convert them but had another reason for the visit. Peter would have told us if Jesus did make them change their ways.

Peter said that Jesus was made alive in the spirit so his resurrection was the resurrection of a ghost not a body. If Jesus had a soul he could not be made alive for he would already be alive so it was not the soul that was meant. There was no need for Jesus to go to them in spirit when he would get a spirit like body as St Paul said he got. He could appear to them without going to them by giving them remote vision. That he had to go personally suggests a struggle with them. And why

just the people who were alive when the ark was being constructed? This suggests that he lived in their time and knew them. When Jesus went to judge the dead of the flood and it was a struggle for him it indicates that he lived about that time for had he lived after there would be other people many of whom were worse to face to judge as well.

Some see in this a hint that the spirits may have sinned but been saved by faith alone which the early Christians said was the only way of salvation so Jesus went to tell them after death that he was the one who had saved them and to explain to them that they had to follow him. There was something that saved them or at least made them want Christ which was why they were the only ones graced with a visit. They could only have been saved if Jesus had told them to trust in a blood sacrifice of the Son of God without necessarily telling them that he was the Son of God. Some Christians agree that as long as you believe in this sacrifice that is enough to save you for you know of Jesus even if you don't know of him by name. You know the essentials and what he does. If the hint is there then why just those spirits? It would still indicate that though Jesus could have gone to them after their and his own death he must have preached the gospel to them in their time on earth for why them only? The answer is that he must have lived among them.

So Jesus lived at the time of Noah according to this chapter. He died before the flood. He might not have been known as Jesus when alive but he is called Jesus now for he saves people at the right hand of the Lord God. Perhaps the Christians decided to call him Jesus when this mystery man started appearing in the latter-days.

Professor Ellegard is right to say that a man pretending to be Peter calling himself a witness to the suffering of Christ in 1 Peter (5:1) does not mean he claimed to have seen the suffering for never did tradition or the gospels say that Peter saw Jesus crucified (page 145, Jesus, One Hundred Years Before Christ). Peter used the word *martus* which means one who would testify to that suffering. All Christians claim they can do that for they sense the Holy Spirit telling them that Jesus suffered for them. He observes that witness means the kind of witness that may not necessarily be an eyewitness. 1 Peter 1:11 says the prophets who lived before the suffering of Christ witnessed it by the power of the Holy Spirit before they happened. He tells his hearers to be able to witness that Jesus saved them by his blood (1 Peter 1:18,19). This letter never speaks of Jesus as a historical person.

Who was the man that Peter may have believed to been his Jesus? Enoch. Enoch was praised in Genesis for habitually walking with God and it is said that he disappeared for God took him which could refer to an ascension or a resurrection. We must remember that in theology the Church says that even those faithful who are alive at the second coming of Christ will be resurrected but WITHOUT DEATH! They are raised from mortal bodies to immortal bodies without dying.

Enoch must have been a sinless figure when his holiness had to get a mention. Enoch was the father of Methuselah who was the father of Lamech who was the father of Noah. Given that men could live to over nine hundred years in those days, Enoch could have preached to the generation that perished in the flood.

It is not the similarities to the Jesus story alone that are evidence for the identification of Jesus and Enoch. Peter never mentioned Enoch by name in our version of his letter. It may be that the words in the original, *en ho kai phulake*, which have led some to believe that Enoch was mentioned in the text but was left out by mistake because of the three first words which sounded like his name are really just a hint that Jesus was Enoch. This would mean that Peter declared that Enoch the Messiah went to preach to the spirits in Prison in Peter's words.

Some crafty Bibles translate the verses to say that Jesus was made alive by the Spirit by whom he went to teach them. See for instance, the New International Version. Even the fundamentalists do not like this Bible for its biased Modernist translating.

The First Epistle of Peter states that Jesus lived long ago and that Peter never met him until he started appearing centuries after his death.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

Second Peter states that the apostles did not give out cleverly devised myths when they revealed to the world the power and the coming of the Lord Jesus but were eyewitnesses to a visionary event, the transfiguration, that revealed the majesty of Jesus (1:16). In other words, a vision verified the power and coming of Jesus. It doesn't hint that it means the second coming of Christ. It just says coming. The vision he recounts said nothing or indicated nothing about a second coming. Second Peter is plainly saying that Jesus' power and coming had to be revealed to the apostles in a vision. He was not heard of before. This supports the idea that there was no Jesus known of until some people claimed to be having visions of this being who claimed to have been crucified and died and rose again. This Jesus could have been crucified centuries before.

BOOK OF REVELATION AND THE PREHISTORIC CHRIST

The Book of Revelation claims that Jesus was crucified in a city it chooses to call Sodom and Egypt (1:8). These names

underline the fact that the city is being said to be one that oppresses God's people (like Egypt did in the book of Exodus) and tries to corrupt them (like Sodom did in the Book of Genesis). Why hide the identity of the city under symbolic names? This city can only be Rome because the book would not have been and was not afraid to insult any other city. To insult Rome was very serious. It was the one city the writer couldn't dare to insult. It would endanger anybody found with a copy of the book. So it was Rome for it had to be condemned in disguise.

Jesus must have died before the first century for the author would not have meant that he died in Rome recently for that would have been shot down straight away. Revelation was not kept secret for it kept its own secrets in its bizarre symbolism. It spoke to the people for it said that it to be published fast for the end was nigh.

Read Revelation 1:7 "Behold, He is coming with the clouds, and every eye will see Him, even those who pierced Him; and all the tribes of the earth shall gaze upon Him and beat their breasts and mourn and lament over Him". The context says that Jesus has made his Church a kingdom and made its members kings and priests to God. It calls Jesus the ruler of the kings of the earth. Since Jesus has the power to rule the kings and the kings defy him he is not a real king because a real king uses his power. He could make them bend the knee or cast them down from their thrones if they do not listen to him. That is what being a king is about. The Book of Revelation says that Jesus is coming back now. There is no doubt that the book thinks that Jesus is on his way and is travelling on the clouds when it calls him king and when it calls the Christians kings. He is coming to be king and this coming is so close that he might as well be described as king now and his followers as kings. This denies the gospel Jesus who claimed to be king. It denies he existed.

Now read the verse again. Why are we told that even those who pierced Jesus will see him coming on the clouds? Even means surprisingly. Now what would be surprising about that?

It could only be surprising if they are going to be raised from the dead especially to see him. That means that Jesus did not live in the first century at all for Revelation would have been written when his killers were alive if he did.

The verse stresses that everybody alive on earth will see Jesus. That is the straightforward interpretation and therefore the correct one. Christians twist it to make people think it means that all the people who ever lived will rise from the dead to see Jesus. But that interpretation is too fancy and therefore the wrong one. Why is it so important to the author that he says that all people will see Jesus? The answer is because Jesus left no evidence for his existence therefore people need to see him.

Revelation 12 has a heavenly woman with a crown of twelve stars and who stands on the moon and is clothed with the sun and who gives birth to a baby boy who has a rod to rule the nations. A dragon is ready to eat her baby and he fires down a third of the stars of Heaven to the earth. The child was born safely and snatched up to God and his throne so the child becomes a ruler which indicates that the child was taken away from possible harm at birth and kept in Heaven and then given the throne when ready – when he had become a man. The woman after the pain she had in labour flees to the desert after the child gets the throne. She has recovered by then so the child could be an adult and it could be a long time after the birth. She was looked after in the desert for 1260 days. This was before Satan was thrown out of Heaven by Michael and his army and before he was on earth to deceive Adam and Eve into sin.

A possible interpretation of this is as follows. Jesus was born in Heaven of an angelic mother who gave birth to him before Satan was thrown out of Heaven prior to the creation of Adam and Eve. She prefigures Israel and its twelve tribes because she has twelve stars. There is no reason to believe that she is Israel. Israel did not flee into the desert after giving birth to the Messiah and it did not have twelve tribes at the time it gave birth to Jesus unless Jesus was born in Egypt before the Exodus and that is what is being said but that would mean over a thousand years before Revelation was written. The view that the woman was Israel and gave birth to Jesus and then fled into the desert as the persecuted Church is not sensible. There is no reason to think that. Nothing hints that the woman becomes a new Israel. Israel rejected the faith so how could the same woman represent Israel and the Church?

Satan the dragon waited in front of the pregnant woman to eat her baby but she got away from him and had her child in safety. Later Satan the dragon was said to have been defeated in Heaven and thrown out by the blood of the Lamb so the sacrifice of the cross took place before Adam and Eve were made. So the baby had grown up and been sacrificed by the time this happened. Satan the dragon then goes after the woman when he is on earth and realises he has been defeated. The dragon is described as wreaking havoc on earth and causing sin so it takes him a long time to realise he is defeated. By the time he realises this, the children of the woman, the spiritual brethren of her son Jesus, are on the earth and he goes after them when the woman escapes. The early Church always believed the woman was Mary and the baby was Jesus. It is undeniable that if this is right the chapter says that Jesus was born in Heaven and was crucified before living memory. It is possible that the woman represents not just the mother of Jesus but all women. All women are poetically symbolised as the Woman – after all the woman was described as a sign. Maybe the dragon wanted to destroy women to destroy life on earth. Maybe that is how the woman could be the mother of those who followed Jesus. The chapter may be about a sign in Heaven but that does not mean the chapter is all symbolism and that we can never understand it. The chapter makes perfect

sense and there is no better interpretation than this one.

About Jesus, Revelation 13:8 reads, “And all the inhabitants of the earth will fall down in adoration and pay him homage, everyone whose name has not been recorded in the Book of Life of the Lamb that was slain [in sacrifice] from the foundation of the world” (Amplified Bible). Some translators pervert the message to make the from the foundation bit mean what is written in the Book. But if the writer had meant that he would have put the from the foundation elsewhere (Fred Pearce, Jesus – God the Son or Son of God? Page 29). We expect this for he knew that for many people considering the claims of Christianity that his book would be the only record of Christian teaching that they would have.

Christians argue that the passage teaches that since God is outside time, it is true to say that Jesus was crucified before the world was made and even that he is being crucified now meaning that it is happening in eternity but not time is concerned. But if the author had this in mind he would have written, “from before the foundation of the world”, meaning eternity as well as time assuming time began when the raw materials of the world did. But he wrote from the beginning. He is thinking about time only. His Jesus died before the world was completely made. But there was enough of it orderly for him to have been crucified, probably by demons, where Rome is now.

But the Book of Revelation calls Jesus the Lion of Judah and the Son of David it seems. But the first occurrence calls him the root or source of David (See Amplified Bible 5:5). The lion reference is inspired by Genesis 49:9 which calls Judah the lion’s cub. Since Jesus was the lion and Judah was the cub it follows that Jesus was older than the cub his son. And Jesus later calls himself the Root and offspring of David (22:16) meaning that he was the adopted offspring of David for he could not have been David’s ancestor and offspring unless he was adopted or reincarnated. There is no evidence that Jesus was believed to be an angel or God that lived as a spirit before he was born on earth in the first century in this book. Reading the Revelation in this light is not on. So he existed as man from before Israel was formed. Jesus could have become the Messiah after David’s time and is to come again to be a proper king.

Revelation should be listened to when it reflects an ancient tradition that Jesus did not live in the first century but centuries before.

Conclusion: It is easy to believe that the gospels lied when they placed Jesus in the first century. He could have been an obscure figure who allegedly lived in the distant past.

- A Concise History of the Catholic Church, Thomas Bokenkotter, Image Books, New York, 1979
Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible, John W Haley, Whitaker House, Pennsylvania, undated
Asking them Questions, Various, Oxford University Press, London, 1936
Belief and Make-Believe, GA Wells, Open Court, La Salle, Illinois, 1991
Concise Guide to Today’s Religions, Josh McDowell and Don Stewart, Scripture Press, Bucks, 1983
Did Jesus Exist? GA Wells, Pemberton, London, 1988
Did Jesus Exist? John Redford, Catholic Truth Society, London, 1986
Documents of the Christian Church, edited by Henry Bettenson, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1979
Early Christian Writings, Maxwell Staniforth Editor, Penguin, London, 1988
Encyclopaedia of Heresies and Heretics, Leonard George, Robson Books, London, 1995
Encyclopaedia of Unbelief, Volume 1, Ed Gordon Stein, (Ed) Prometheus Books, New York, 1985
Evidence that Demands a Verdict, Vol 1, Josh McDowell, Alpha, Scripture Press Foundation, Bucks, 1995
Handbook to the Controversy With Rome, Volume 1, Karl Von Hase, The Religious Tract Society, London, 1906
He Walked Among Us, Josh McDowell and Bill Wilson, Alpha Cumbria, 2000
In Defence of the Faith, Dave Hunt, Harvest House, Eugene, Oregon, 1996
Introduction to the New Testament, Roderick A F MacKenzie, SJ, Liturgical Press, Minnesota, 1965
Jesus, AN Wilson, Flamingo, London, 1993
Jesus and the Goddess, The Secret Teachings of the Original Christians, Timothy Freke and Peter Gandy, Thorsons, London, 2001
Jesus – God the Son or Son of God? Fred Pearce Christadelphian Publishing Office, Birmingham, undated
Jesus – One Hundred Years Before Christ, Professor Alvar Ellegard Century, London, 1999
Jesus and the Four Gospels, John Drane, Lion, Herts, 1984
Jesus Hypotheses, V Messori, St Paul Publications, Slough, 1977
Jesus Lived in India by Holger Kersten, Element, Dorset, 1994
Jesus, Qumran and the Vatican, Otto Betz and Rainer Riesner, SCM Press Ltd, London, 1994
Jesus the Evidence, Ian Wilson, Pan, London, 1985
Jesus the Magician, Morton Smith, Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1978
Jesus under Fire, Edited by Michael F Wilkins and JP Moreland, Zondervan Publishing House, Michigan, 1995
Lectures and Replies, Thomas Carr, Archbishop of Melbourne, Melbourne, 1907
Let’s Weigh the Evidence, Barry Burton, Chick Publications, Chino, CA, 1983
Miracles in Dispute, Ernst and Marie-Luise Keller, SCM Press Ltd, London, 1969

Nag Hammadi Library, Ed James M Robinson HarperCollins New York 1990
 On the True Doctrine, Celsus, Translated by R Joseph Hoffmann, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1987
 Putting Away Childish Things, Uta Ranke-Heinemann, HarperCollins, San Francisco, 1994
 Runaway World, Michael Green, IVP, London, 1974
 St Paul versus St Peter, A Tale of Two Missions, Michael Goulder, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1994
 St Peter and Rome, JBS, Irish Church Missions, Dublin, undated
 Saint Saul, Donald Harman Akenson, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000
 The Bible Fact or Fantasy, John Drane, Lion, Oxford, 1989
 The Bible Unearthed, Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman, Touchstone Books, New York, 2002.
 The Call to Heresy, Robert Van Weyer, Lamp Books, London, 1989
 The Case For Christ, Lee Strobel, HarperCollins and Zondervan, Michigan, 1998
 The Case for Jesus the Messiah, John Ankerberg Harvest House, Eugene, Oregon, 1989
 The Early Church, Henry Chadwick, Pelican, Middlesex, 1967
 The Encyclopedia of Heresies and Heretics, Leonard George, Robson Books, London, 1995
 The First Christian, Karen Armstrong, Pan, London, 1983
 The Gnostic Gospels, Elaine Pagels, Penguin, London, 1990
 The Gnostic Paul, Elaine Pagels, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1975
 The History of Christianity, Lion, Herts 1982
 The History of the Church, Eusebius, Penguin, London, 1989
 The House of the Messiah, Ahmed Osman, Grafton, London, 1993
 The Jesus Event and Our Response, Martin R Tripole SJ, Alba House, New York, 1980
 The Jesus Hoax, Phyllis Graham, Leslie Frewin, London, 1974
 The Jesus Mysteries, Timothy Freke and Peter Gandy, Thorsons, London, 1999
 The MythMaker, St Paul and the Invention of Christianity, Hyam Maccoby, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1986
 The Pagan Christ, Tom Harpur, Thomas Allen Publishers, Toronto, 2004
 The Reconstruction of Belief, Charles Gore DD, John Murray, London, 1930
 The Search for the Twelve Apostles, William Steuart McBirnie, Tyndale House, 1997
 The Secret Gospel Morton Smith Aquarian Press, Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1985
 The Truth of Christianity, WH Turton, Wells Gardner, Darton & Co Ltd, London, 1905
 The Unauthorised Version, Robin Lane Fox, Penguin, Middlesex, 1992
 The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus, Raymond E Brown, Paulist Press, New York, 1973
 Theodore Parker's Discourses, Theodore Parker, Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, London, 1876
 Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Kittel Gerhard and Friedrich Gerhard, Eerdmans Publishing Co, Grand Rapids, MI, 1976
 Those Incredible Christians, Hugh Schonfield, Hutchinson, London, 1968
 Who Was Jesus? A Conspiracy in Jerusalem, by Kamal Salabi, I.B. Taurus and Co Ltd., London, 1992
 Who Was Jesus? NT Wright, SPCK, London, 1993
 Why I Believe Jesus Lived, C G Colly Caldwell, Guardian of Truth, Kentucky