

JESUS' TEACHING MADE UP

Jesus' life story is regarded by most scholars as being embellished and its increasingly popular to see the whole saga as fiction.

Strong evidence that Jesus was made up comes from the fact that his teaching was stolen from other teachers and authorities.

Why was Jesus' teaching referred to as new in Mark when Mark says so little about Jesus teaching anyway? The expression came about when Jesus' ministry had hardly started! What was new about it? What teaching was it?

As Karen Armstrong noted in *The First Christian* (page 30), "The more we read of the rabbis, the more we see that Jesus' teaching is for the most part well within the rabbinic traditions and not strikingly original. Like the Pharisees, he is insistent that 'Charity and deeds of loving kindness are equal to all the mitzvot in the Torah' (Tosefta Peah 4:19).

The similarities between Jesus' teaching and the wording he used and that of James in the epistle of James would make one suspect that the teachings were copied and stolen from James. James never quotes Jesus but just uses his own authority. This supports this hypothesis.

A critic of GA Wells, James Patrick Holding stated that Jesus must have existed though GA Wells thinks he didn't because there couldn't be a Church that gets its ethical teaching from a non-existent teacher (Wells Without Water). But this is a distortion of logic because it is possible to hallucinate that a man risen from the dead has appeared to you and made you a prophet. The Mormon Church was full of prophets in the early days and look at it now. Joseph Smith was only one of many prophets in that faith. When Joseph Smith could get ethical teachings from a fictitious God who used to be a man and who is totally different from the Christian God why couldn't this happen in the more credulous first century?

The parable of the Prodigal Son appeared in the Deuteronomy Rabbah 2:24, a commentary on the Law.

Hillel taught that we must treat others as we like them to treat us which fulfills the Law and the Prophets (Shabbath 31a) which is almost identical to what Jesus allegedly said years later.

As Karen Armstrong noted in her book, *The First Christian*, "The more we read of the rabbis, the more we see that Jesus' teaching is for the most part well within the rabbinic traditions and not strikingly original. Like the Pharisees, he is insistent that 'Charity and deeds of loving kindness are equal to all the mitzvot in the Torah' (Tosefta Peah 4:19)" (page 30).

It is hard to see how the crowds could have been as spellbound by Jesus as the gospel says when he only served up what was on the menu for the previous hundred years.

It was child's play to put teachings into Jesus' mouth that he never gave.

It was no bother to the Gospellers to invent the sermons that Jesus allegedly preached and the teachings he uttered. They did not give dates for when Jesus said this or that. Memories are short and minds wander during lectures. Not everybody would catch all that was said. Do you remember exactly what the priest preached at Mass two weeks ago? But Jesus' teachings were recorded long after they were allegedly given which does not vouch for accuracy. And the Gospellers did not care when they did not say anybody was taking notes at the sermons and that they used those notes. Luke says he consulted records but gave no proof that the records were authenticated. The fact that the teaching was not verified though Jesus said his teaching was one of the proofs that he was the Son of God proves that Jesus was a fake. Jesus implied that even if his doctrine was not hitting the bull's-eye then his miracles had to be fake. He proclaimed that miracles proved nothing if they came from a man whose doctrine was mistaken. To believe in Jesus is to trust Matthew, Mark, Luke and John and not Jesus at all. They are the gods of Christendom. They have the audacity to claim to be servants of the Son of God.

Jesus talks too much. He is too obscure and repetitive at times. This garrulousness is a device to avoid saying too much about what he is supposed to have got up to. The less said about a man's actions the better if he does not exist or was no saint. His discourses could not have been constructed from memory so they must have been made up. If they were, then there is no reason why the stories of Jesus' deeds could not also have been made up. It is evidence that they probably were. Don't say the information came from notebooks for there is no evidence that Jesus had anything recorded. There is evidence that he did not expect the people to depend on memory (Matthew 10:27). He did not have his apostles taking notes or memorising for he said the Holy Spirit would come and remind them of what he had been saying (John 14:26).

Never is any hint given that notes were kept though Christian books lie that the apostles did keep notebooks. We are told that the word was to be shouted from the rooftops (Matthew 10:27) when he should have said be read from the rooftops but didn't. We are told that he would send the Holy Spirit to remind the apostles what he said indicating that no books would be kept or needed to be. When the points in Jesus' parables could all have been expressed in one paragraph and many of the parables are repetitive it is a sign of inauthenticity and artificial gospel-mongering.

Jesus told the apostles that he spoke in parables to prevent understanding among the outsiders. If that is true then the stories about crowds coming to hear him are fiction for you don't come to listen to a man who can't speak plainly to you.

The inventors of the Jesus story just stole the teachings from other sources and mainly from Jewish rabbis.