



the Gospel

*seen
from below*

Marcello Rogneri

**The Gospel
seen
from below**

Introduction

The Gospel tells the earthly life of Christ.

Everything which is described in it took place in our daily life and is subject to certain rules.

The facts, phrases, words that we may read in it have a profound analogy with the divine's spiritual truths, but this is not to suggest, in any case, that they are *only* analogies and that the events described in them are *only* symbolic, because this thought would take the Gospel into the *realm of fantasy*, and it's a dangerous thought.

A simple example: we read in the Gospel of Luke that the angel appeared to the shepherds keeping watch over their flock in the "*night*".

The analogy is that this was the "*night of the world*", which is true, but at the same time was also the night of a real day, with all that goes with it and that we can imagine.

Without getting into the explanations of the above mentioned divine's truths, having the right and the duty of interpretation of such truths only to the Catholic Authority, it is intended to examine the spoken facts from a specific earthly point of view. This is the reason of the title of this text.

What it means to "*examine the Gospel from a specific earthly point of view*"?

It means considering the facts narrated as if they had taken place in our daily lives, imagining the people described in it not as a crib's figurines that appear at the time and then vanish into thin air, but as living beings under every aspect, with their strengths

and their flaws, living beings with their past and future history. It also means to penetrate their thoughts.

Knowing a given fact actually occurred then can be deduced by logic both the previous events that have created the foundation of it, and the consequences that the very fact produced.

Obviously in this kind of exercise a certain margin of error is always there.

There are around many texts that are written to refute the facts described in the Gospel, texts that draw on certain critical destructive theories that mold of the Enlightenment (Illuminismo), and attempting to dismantle and demolish the Gospel with what it would bring. Many of these theories are evidently unfounded, far from scientific and held only for the purpose for which they were designed, and while not giving the reader any solid foundation are able to instill considerable confusion of thoughts, and therefore happily reaching their goal. This text also answers to some of those.

This is why it is important to know that if the Gospel speaks of the *night*, is meant to be the night of a given normal day.

This is why it is important to know that if the Gospel speaks of Jesus *walking on the water*, without prejudice to the spiritual analogy certainly more important than the physical fact in itself, is meant to be that the feet of Jesus, those same feet that will be pierced by nails, walked on the water of the Lake Tiberias, the same lake that we can visit nowadays.

This is why it is important to know that if the Gospel speaks of a *Lazarus who rises from the dead and walks out of his grave* the important analogy is that Christ saves the man from his sins, but it

is also true that on a given day a dead and buried man named Lazarus was resurrected by Christ.

This is the meaning of "*examine the Gospel from a specific earthly point of view*".

In *the Gospel seen from below* you will also find some singular and/or unusual explanations which are not intended in any way to contradict the sanctity of the Gospel in particular, and of the Holy Scripture as a whole, but rather to support it with force.

The text begins with the study of the Gospel of John, follows that of Mark, Matthew and then Luke.

Bible quotations, unless otherwise stated, comes from the text in English published on the official Vatican's site of the Holy See (http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0839/_INDEX.HTM).

The quotes in Greek are from the Nuovo Testamento Interlineare Greco-Latino-Italiano (*New Interlinear Testament Greek-Latin-Italian*), edited by San Paolo, Italy, basing on the Greek text Nestlè-Aland (see it in english here: nestle-aland.com).

Being the original text written in Italian such quotations are directly translated in English by the author.

Hebrew quotations have been taken from two sources: the Mechon Mamre website (mechon-mamre.org), and the digital text I.S.A. (scripture4all.org).

“Are even you likewise without understanding?”

Index Gospel of John

[prologue of the Gospel](#)

[John 1:1-3](#)

Theological explanation of the essence of Christ, creation of the universe through Christ.

[John 1:19-51](#)

Testimony of John the Baptist on himself and on Christ to the Pharisees. First disciples.

[John 2:1-11](#)

Miracle at Cana

[John 2: 13-25](#)

Easter, the expulsion of the merchants from the Temple.

[John 3: 1-21](#)

Night meeting with Nicodemus.

[John 4: 46-54](#)

Jesus went to Cana, healing of the royal official's son.

[John 5: 1-15](#)

Healing of the paralytic at the pool of Betezda.

[John 6: 4](#)

Jewish Passover nearby.

[John 7:40-53](#)

The guards sent to arrest him returned without him, Nicodemus defends Jesus and is offended by the Pharisees.

John 9: 1-38

Healing the man born blind.

John 11: 1-57

Raising of Lazarus of Bethany.

John 13: 1-38

Last Supper.

John 18: 1-12

Jesus is arrested in the Gethsemane.

John 18: 28-40

Jesus brought to Pilate. The people chose Barabbas.

John 19: 19-22

Inscription on the Cross

John 19:24

Quoting the Scripture.

John 19: 26-27

Jesus entrusted his Mother to this disciple, and the disciple to the Mother.

John 19:31

The Jews demand that the crucifixes ought to be killed and taken away.

John 19:39

Nicodemus brings a scented mixture about a hundred pounds.

John 20: 1-2

Mary Magdalene at the tomb.

[John 20: 2-4](#)

The Magdalene goes to Peter and the other disciple, and they immediately run to the tomb.

[John 20: 5-8](#)

The disciples come to the sepulcher, Peter comes in and then the other.

[John 20: 14-18](#)

Jesus appears to Mary Magdalene.

[John 20:19](#)

Jesus appears to the disciples.

[John 20: 30-31](#)

First final of the Gospel.

[John 21: 1-25](#)

End of the Gospel.

[Preliminary conclusions on the Gospel of John.](#)

Index Gospel of Mark

[Mark 3:21](#)

Someone says: "He is out of his mind."

[Mark 5: 25-34](#)

The woman afflicted with hemorrhages for twelve years.

[Mark 6: 1-6](#)

Jesus returns to Nazareth, scorn of the villagers.

[Mark 9: 43-48](#)

If your hand causes you to sin ...

[Mark 12: 1-12](#)

The wicked tenants.

[Mark 14:12](#)

The disciples ask Jesus where to prepare for Passover.

[Mark 16: 1-20](#)

Text written by "four hands"?

Index Gospel of Matthew

[Matthew 2: 1-12](#)

Jesus' birth in Bethlehem, the Three Kings.

[Matthew 2: 13-18](#)

Massacre of the Innocents, fulfillment of the Scripture.

[Matthew 2: 19-23](#)

Return of the Holy Family from Egypt.

[Matthew 3: 1-12](#)

John the Baptist Preaching, the Gospel written on “real-time”?

[Matthew 10:25](#)

Jesus called "Beelzebub" by the Pharisees.

[Matthew 11: 2-6](#)

Message of the Baptist from prison.

[Matthew 16:18](#)

The gates of hell shall not prevail.

[Matthew 26:18](#)

The disciples preparing the Passover.

[Matthew 26:17](#)

The disciples ask to Jesus where to prepare for Passover.

[Matthew 26:57](#)

Jesus brought into the house of the High Priest.

[Matthew 27:62](#)

In the middle of celebration of Passover the High Priests go to Pilate.

[Matthew 28: 2](#)

The earthquake, the Angel, the stone removed.

[Matthew 28: 3-4](#)

The appearance of the Angel, the guards terrified.

[Matthew 28: 5](#)

The angel spoke to the women.

[Matthew 28: 7](#)

The Angel tells the women that Jesus would have appeared to the disciples in Galilee.

Index Gospel of Luke

[Luke 1](#)

Annunciation to Zechariah, Birth of John.

[Luke 1:43](#)

The Virgin Mary meets with Elizabeth.

[Luke 2: 8](#)

The shepherds watch outdoors.

[Luke 2:11](#)

Announcement of the Angel.

[Luke 2:22](#)

Presentation of Baby Jesus in the Temple.

[Luke 1: 5 - 2:52](#)

The "Source".

[Luke 2: 41-52](#)

Jesus lost in Jerusalem.

[Luke 3](#)

Beginning of the preaching of John the Baptist.

[Luke 12: 58-59](#)

The "Prison".

[Luke 20: 1-19](#)

The provocation of the Pharisees turns back against them.

[Luke 22: 7, 23:54](#)

Day of Unleavened Bread and immolation of the Passover's lamb.

[Luke 23: 7-11](#)

Jesus brought to Herod.

[Luke 24:32](#)

The heart was burning in chest.

Gospel of John

index

How, by whom and when was written the Gospel of John?

Since the second century AD the Bishop Polycarp, who was a direct disciple *of the apostle whom Jesus loved*, attests that the Author was the apostle John. The oldest manuscript's fragment that has survived is commonly dated to around 135 AD.

Some scholars nowadays argue that the Gospel would be the result of a not well defined *John's school followers*, that of the disciples of the apostle John, who in a late period would have put in writing the memories of their teacher.

It's quite clear that later was written the text the greater the likelihood of errors, mistakes and typos.

Some details in the text would rather point instead to a drafting of a *nearly real-time*, a short distance from the events that occurred, and if so the probability of errors or oversights would be radically reduced to almost zero.

The following exhibit such *details*, and we will put ourselves in the shoes of the Author and wondering why he has written or not written some things rather than others who would have been perhaps more linear.

It states already, that such details are very many.

John 1: 1-3

*Theological explanation of the essence of Christ,
creation of the universe through Christ.*

index

[1:1] In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

[1:2] He was in the beginning with God.

[1:3] All things came to be through him, and without him nothing came to be.

With these few words the Author of the fourth Gospel explains the essence of Christ with a theological statement of the highest caliber

Christ is the Word, the Word of God.

In the first verses of Genesis, God creates because *he speaks, he says*, and talking, saying, He creates.

He creates *through* the Word.

He creates the universe through the Word.

Christ is that Word.

This lighting is so deep that it can not have human root.

This is the beginning of the whole Universe itself: Jesus Christ.

John 1: 19-51
*Testimony of John the Baptist on himself
and on Christ to the Pharisees.
First disciples.*

index

Two facts merge into a single narrative.

Christ is announced by the Baptist to the Pharisees, the messianic fulfillment of Israel, with these words:

[1:23] ... *"I am 'the voice of one crying out in the desert, "Make straight the way of the Lord," as Isaiah the prophet said."*

The Messiah is announced in the ancient texts in the verse from Isaiah 40:5, not here quoted from the Baptist, but surely well-known by the learned Pharisees:

[Isaiah 40:3] *A voice cries out: In the desert prepare the way of the LORD! Make straight in the wasteland a highway for our God!*

[Isaiah 40:4] *Every valley shall be filled in, every mountain and hill shall be made low; The rugged land shall be made a plain, the rough country, a broad valley.*

[Isaiah 40:5] *Then the glory of the LORD shall be revealed, and all mankind shall see it together; for the mouth of the LORD has spoken.*

The Glory of God would have appeared, and every man would have seen it.

To understand the severity of the meaning of these words we need to know the figure of John the Baptist from the knowledge that the Pharisees had on him, under the light of what had happened thirty years before in the Temple of Jerusalem during a major Jewish feast to an old priest named Zechariah.

The words of the angel announcing the birth of a son to Zechariah, containing a prophecy about the child himself, and surely faithfully recorded by the scribes at the time of the fact, are those that we can read in Luke chapter 1, among those:

[Luke 1:17] He will go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah to turn the hearts of fathers toward children and the disobedient to the understanding of the righteous, to prepare a people fit for the Lord."

This coming Zechariah son would have been: "... great in the sight of (the) Lord..." [Luke 1:15].

The scribes and the Pharisees sent to the Baptist certainly knew that the man standing before them and the child whose birth was foretold to their priest Zechariah, were the same person, and that's why his words were particularly serious for them, and full of meanings.

The Lamb of God

Twice [v. 1:29 and 1:36] the Baptist called Jesus with the title *Lamb of God*.

Such Jesus would have been sacrificed on the altar of God *to take away the sin of the world* [see 1:29], and this knowledge came to him from the Holy Scriptures of which he was an excellent judge, both in spirit and in letter, as well as from the teachings of his father Zechariah.

With these words (*take away the sin of the world*) he recognizes in Jesus not a man or a prophet, however great he may could be, but because in the Jewish faith only God can forgive sins (... *Who can forgive sins but God only?* [Mark 2:7]), stating that Jesus takes away the sin of the world is equivalent to declare him as God himself.

The First five disciples

About the meeting of Jesus with his first disciples there are in the Gospels two versions, this one in John and those in the Gospel of Matthew, chapter 4: 18-19 and Mark 1: 16-20.

It seems two conflicting *versions*, because in this Gospel the encounter occurs in the place of Jesus' baptism, a village near Jericho, while in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew on the Lake of Galilee, many miles up to north.

Rather than conflicting versions it may be two complementary ones.

This meeting in John's Gospel should have been the first under all aspects, because it is very precise and detailed, and that of Matthew and Mark would be a second meeting with Peter, Andrew, James and John, when Jesus, after spending the forty days period in the desert begins to gather around him his first disciples.

When the day after the baptism of Christ [John 1:35] He returns, two disciples of the Baptist, heard for the second time the testimony that their Rabbi gave about that man decide to follow him. One of these two disciples of John the Baptist was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother [John 1:40].

Andrew met his brother [John 1:41].

Here a problem arises: where this meeting came to be?

The location of the baptism that in the Gospel of John appears to be "[...in Bethany across the Jordan](#)," [John 1:28] is documented since the time of the Spanish noblewoman Etèria (she lived in the fourth century after Christ and was pilgrim in the Holy Land), a few kilometers east of Jericho on the Jordan river.

Such Etèria collects this data from the living tradition of the place.

Peter lived in Capharnaum, on the north shore of Lake Galilee, and as Andrea leads his brother to Jesus, this implies that he has returned to Capharnaum, he convinced his brother and together they returned to Bethany. These two places are about 70/80 miles distance, therefore Andrew would have traveled about 140/160 miles to bring his brother to Jesus, and that would have been taken 20, maybe 30 days.

It is highly unlikely that things have taken place in such way.

A similar problem, and even more difficult to explain is the encounter of Jesus with Philip, the Galilean, meeting not taken place in Galilee, because Jesus *was preparing to go to that region* [John 1:43], and subsequent meeting of Philip with Nathanael, that we know from chapter 21 of the Gospel of John he was also from Cana in Galilee.

Actually, perhaps, this double problem may have an easy explanation.

We can assume that the group was going to Jerusalem for one of the “*must be there*” feasts, and the meeting with all five had been carried out near Bethany in two or three days.

They would have been in that place to avoid passing by Samaria because of the well-known problems, or just to meet Andrew and the other disciple, who at the time were following the Baptist.

An authoritative testimony stating that this really was the first encounter of Jesus with his disciples comes by the Apostle Peter.

We read in the Acts that after the death of Judas Iscariot the apostle Peter, speaking before one hundred and twenty disciples of the Lord, says that they would have to choose between any of them to take the place of Judas.

These are his words:

[Acts 1:21] Therefore, it is necessary that *one of the men who accompanied us* the whole time the Lord Jesus came and went among us,

[Acts 1:22] *beginning from the baptism of John* until the day on which he was taken up from us, become with us a witness to his resurrection." [Acts 1:21-22].

Choosing the new Apostle should have been done among: "*one of the men who accompanied us... beginning from the baptism of John*"

It 'obvious that these unknown disciples, never mentioned before in the Gospels, met Jesus at the baptism of John, and not on Lake Tiberias.

It's also clear that on that occasion of the baptism there were other disciples who are not named ever, but who began to follow Jesus as their Rabbi.

It follows to be highly likely that a caravan of Galileans with their families was heading to Jerusalem through the Jordan Valley, the caravan made a stop in Jericho to meet and greet the two disciples of John the Baptist, that Andrew, brother of Peter, and the other disciple whose name hasn't been told, John the Apostle.

John 2: 1-11
Miracle at Cana.

index

The second chapter begins with the words:

και τη ημερα τη τριτη

kai te hemera te trite

and in the day the third

which are usually translated as:

[2:1] *On the third day* there was a wedding in Cana in Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there.

What is meant by this "*on the third day*", perhaps three days after the previously mentioned meeting with the disciples?

In this case Jesus might have been invited to the wedding earlier, but how do we explain that his disciples were invited also? [John 2: 2], and how could they have done in just three days to arrive at Cana considered the facility of the time?

Maybe also for this problem the answer is simple.

At Christ's time the marriage was celebrated *on the third day* of the week, and if this is the meaning of the words "*on the third day*", it indicates that the marriage took place in the *third day* of any of the following weeks, and therefore not being a direct connection with the encounter of Jesus and his disciples and the wedding at Cana they would have had plenty of time to get back together in Galilee and be invited to the wedding party.

Jesus "rude" with his Mother?

In the story of this miracle it seems like Christ have turned to his mother in a *rude manner*.

The issue is still controversial and far from being finally resolved.

At the urging of the mother, according to the King James Bible version, Jesus answers:

[2:4] ...*Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come.*

The original words in the Greek text Nestlè-Aland are:

τι εμοι και σοι γυναι

ti emoi kai soi gunai

literally: *what to me and to you, woman*

These words, as they are, do not have an obvious way clear.

The Hebrew concept: *between you (man) and me, between me and you (men)...* etc. is expressed with the words:

bin'i uv bin'echa

ביני וביניך

These terms are used, for example, in Genesis 9:12, where God in the aftermath of the flood establishes *a covenant between him and mankind*:

[Genesis 9:12] God added: "This is the sign that I am giving for all ages to come, of the covenant *between me and you* and every living creature with you:

The pact would have been represented by the rainbow.
Same concept and the same words to the verses 9:13, 15 and 17.
In this case the deal is about something positive, sanctioning unity
not division.

The same terms are used in Genesis 17:2, when God promises to
Abraham a numerous progeny:

[Genesis 17:2] *Between you and me* I will establish my covenant,
and I will multiply you exceedingly."

Again there is no doubt on the positive aspect of such terms.
In the same chapter in verse 7 God is establishing the covenant
with Abraham and his descendants:

[Genesis 17:7] I will maintain my covenant *with you and your de-*
scendants after you throughout the ages as an everlasting pact...

Same words and the same concept to the verses 10 and 11.

Also in Genesis chapter 23 it is Ephron that caters to Abraham
who must bury his wife with the words:

[Genesis 23:15] sir, listen to me! A piece of land worth four hun-
dred shekels of silver - *what is that between you and me*, as long
as you can bury your dead?"

Here we have what may have been precisely the exact root of the
words that Christ addresses to the Mother in Hebrew:

what is that between you and me

the Greek has precisely: *what to me and to you.*

And even in this case as in the previous one, survey the positive sense of the terms, of union and not to disagree, because the meaning is: *the value of this field is nothing compared to our friendship and what binds us.*

In Genesis 31:44-51 the same words are often used to seal the deal between Jacob and Laban, again in a positive sense.

In Exodus 31:13-17, is God setting *the Saturday (Shabbat)* as a sign *between him and the people.*

Again no doubt about the positive nature of the implicit meaning in these words.

In I Kings 15:19 is about an alliance between the two kings:

[I Kings 15:19] "There is a treaty *between you and me*, as there was between your father and my father...

Same Hebrew words are been used: *bin'i uv bin'echa.*

So in this conversation between Mother and Son, far from being a rude form of response, such words are rather marked by a great love and that would mean:

How come, I (implied -Son of God-), can not deny anything to you, if you ask me with such a look into your eyes? What strength in you is forcing me?

With obvious allusion to the Love between Mother and Son.

The Mother understands, and gives instructions.

What the author of this Gospel wished to emphasize is the authority that the Mother exercised on the Divine Son, authority not to be understood in the *worldly* sense, but derived from the

power of love between the two, *force of Love that leaves no choice.*

In the same way the Apostle says that: [II Corinthians 5:14] “**For the love of Christ impels us...**” (literally: *presses us*), where the *thrust* is a real *constraint that do not force our will*, but because of the Love in us for such person, in fact, leaves us no choice but to grant the request that was made.

To this request supported by Divine Love can not be to say no, according to the most famous expression: *your wish is my command.*

This would be the meaning of Christ's words to his Mother.

For Christ says: “**... My hour has not yet come.**” but in fact then satisfied the request of the Mother, what the Author of this Gospel is intended to stress is that *the Virgin Mother has the power to reduce the time and changing circumstances.*

The Virgin Mother, through her humility, *has power* on God himself.

John 2: 13-25

Easter, the expulsion of the merchants from the Temple.

index

In later times the Passover feast was approaching, this is the first reported in the Gospel of John.

At the time of this Easter, in the presence of his disciples (as it seems to be by verse 17), Jesus performs unspecified *signs* which were considered sufficient by many that "... *began to believe in his name when they saw the signs he was doing.*" [v. 2:23].

This: *to believe in his name*, is not easy to interpret as it would seem, because it can't mean that they believed he was the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed God, because this is a revelation that Jesus keeps strictly secret and confidential until near the end of his ministry (perhaps *that was the end* of his ministry?). Many in the Gospels the circumstances in which he prevents anyone disclosing such secret.

In this chapter 2 it is reported an episode in the first of the three Passovers mentioned in the Gospel of John. This episode is the expulsion of the merchants from the temple, which in the Synoptics only occurs during the only Passover told, that of the death and resurrection of Jesus [Mark 11:15, Matthew 21:12, Luke 19: 45-46].

It would seem an apparent discrepancy.

If the Passovers in Christ's life were three why this episode is mentioned in John's Gospel as it did happen in the first, while in the Synoptics took place in the third?

Hence the question: is it certain that John mentions *three* different Passovers?

On the occasion of this Passover Jesus says to the Pharisees:

[2:19] "... Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up."

Since this is one of the main accusations that Jesus had to bear before the Sanhedrin in the aftermath of his arrest (ie theoretically two years later), there is a problem of timing.

1) Perhaps it was his usual teaching? That is did he say with some frequency to the Pharisees *destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it?*

In this case, this would explain why those words have been spoken by Jesus both during the first Passover, and two years later during the third and last, but is not logical.

2) Perhaps this phrase uttered by Jesus two years before his arrest was printed (badly) in the memory of someone? This could be why the evidence did not agree fully. Maybe.

3) The last alternative is that this sentence was handed down by Jesus *only once*, and *only* at the last Passover, but this would mean that the first Passover mentioned in the Gospel of John and the last one *are actually the same Passover*, so in perfect agreement with the Synoptic texts.

Is notoriously recognized that Jesus lived thirty-three years.

This data is based on two specific evangelical quotes, in Luke we read that at the beginning of his preaching he was about thirty years old, and also because of the three Passovers mentioned in the Gospel of John.

If the three Passovers of John are actually the same Passover

(Easter) does it means that Jesus died when thirtyone years old?

This would not bring a big change in the preaching of Christ, but no, it isn't stated.

If the four evangelists speak of a single Passover this is why just on this has been accomplished the work of God in the world, and that do not exclude that the preaching of Christ had a duration of two to three years.

The *conventional age* of thirty-three years old is not challenged in any way.

Later we will see why some problems also arise even on the second Passover reported by the Author of the Gospel of John.

John 3: 1-21
Night meeting with Nicodemus.

index

It seems like such a meeting did not take place in Jerusalem, because the verse 3:22 says that after this encounter Jesus went to Judea.

Nicodemus seems to be alone, but he uses the plural ("Rabbi, we know that...").

It was perhaps in the company of someone else?

Is maybe referred to some of the Pharisees and Jewish leaders?

In this encounter Jesus announces to Nicodemus his death by crucifixion:

[3:14] And just as Moses *lifted up* the serpent in the desert, so must the Son of Man be *lifted up*,

The translation "*lifted up*" (even being correctly translated from Greek) perhaps is not appropriate, because as we are used to think, "*to be lifted up*", it always have a positive sense. The comparison with the serpent (bronze) in the desert should instead suggest the term *hanging*.

This word in Hebrew can be expressed with two very different words, both phonetically and in meaning.

One is שׂוּם, *shim* (Numbers 21: 8), which is used to describe the snake hanging to the wood and that has a generic meaning (can also be used to indicate a shield hanging on the wall), and another is תְּלִיחַ, *thlith* (Deuteronomy 21:22), which is a much more serious word that indicates *the man hanging on a tree*, where it is implied *the curse* on man sentenced to such death.

[Galatians 3:13] Christ ransomed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us, for it is written, "Cursed be everyone who hangs on a tree".

With these words [John 3:14] Jesus may have used the first term for the snake and the second for himself.
If so it is easy to think that Nicodemus was shocked.

Amen, Amen
(translated in the King James as: *verily, verily*)

The meeting with Nicodemus is described very precisely and in the detail, and it is therefore likely that the Author is an eyewitness and / or who has transcribed the speech shortly after the event. Three times is found in this interview the repetition *Amen, amen*.

Only in the Gospel of John this word *is always repeated twice*, except in 21:25, where talking is the Author.

It is repeated on 25 occasions (ie 50 *Amen*) and to pronounce it it is always Christ.

Even when he turns to Peter in the disputed Chapter 21 he says:

[21:18] *Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdest thyself... [KJV].*

In all other references in the New Testament, the word is called only once.

The only exception is in Revelation 17:12, but it appears at the beginning and end of the quote, not consecutively, and to pronounce it are *all the angels, the elderly (24) and the four beasts*.

To report the *curious repetition* of this word goes of course in favor of an *eyewitness account* of the events described (including

the disputed chapter 21), because it is unthinkable that the author has repeated it in his own initiative inventing it without reason. Also because of this we would tend to rule out the theory of *John's school followers* mentioned at the beginning. The Author of the Gospel of John is someone who witnessed the events personally, that then exposes with absolute precision.

John 4: 46-54

Jesus went to Cana, healing of the royal official son.

index

The first eleven verses of chapter 2 speak of the miracle at Cana, but in chapter 4 we read in verse 46:

“Then he returned to Cana in Galilee, where he had made the water wine...”

This is the first explicit mention of the Author to reconnect to a fact already written previously, and suggests the question: why add "*where he made the water into wine*"?

Just two chapters before this, he has already described that fact with eleven verses stating that this was the first miracle, that is, a central event of the manifestation of Christ.

If this Gospel was written by the Author in old age and on an ongoing basis, from cover to cover, thus having at hand and before his eyes the current Chapter 2:1-11, why would have he needed to reconnect somehow to that place through the *citation of that miracle*? Wasn't enough to say simply and only that the meeting with the official of the king took place at Cana in Galilee, and failing to mention the miracle of water turned into wine? Instead he adds the statement: "*where he made the water into wine.*"

A question arises: these eleven verses inserted in Chapter 2 had already been written? Maybe not, hence the clarification of what had happened in that place.

Another possibility is that the Author had already written the story of the miracle at Cana, but for some reason he no longer had his writing at hand.

This would mean that the preparation of the Gospel of John follows a particular pattern.

Meeting with the royal official.

During this trip to Cana Jesus meets a royal official whose son is seriously ill in Capernaum.

Jesus' response to the request of the man in pain is staggering, because it would seem to imply that the man, almost *taking advantage* of the circumstance of the dying child wants to attend a miracle of Jesus, as if this, that is a miracle in itself, was way more important than the life of the child himself.

To any father, such reading should create big problems.

[4:48] Jesus said to him, "Unless you people see signs and wonders, you will not believe."

Maybe Jesus and the man had already met at an earlier time, and in this meeting the man may have declared his faith in him, *without seeing any miracle*, so his faith was weak, or maybe didn't have it at all.

From this point of view Jesus' answer is logical: he reproaches him for having declared his faith in him, but had not really deeply believed with the heart, and that's because the man hasn't seen any miracle.

The man, worried because of his son, and with an eye to his sick child repeats the request, and this shows his true faith.

Jesus invites him to go home because his son was already healed.

Jesus compels him to believe without having seen any sign, no miracle, in fact the man returns home without having had proof that his son was healed, but *only* on the word of Christ.

He does believe in the word of Jesus immediately.

The man has the confirmation that the healing of his son was true only the next day [v 4:52].

This is the true faith from which everyone should learn something, the faith that believes beyond signs and wonders, is the faith that comes before the miracle, it is faith that *produces* the miracle.

The chapter is closed with this statement:

[4:54] (Now) this was *the second sign* Jesus did when he came to Galilee from Judea.

The first real miracle should have been the one in Cana, but then it is difficult to understand why the Author affirms that the healing of the son of the royal official was the *second sign*, while earlier, according to the current wording of the Gospel, he claims that Jesus made other miracles previously, to the feast of Passover in Jerusalem (John 2:23), and other miracles are also mentioned by Nicodemus in chapter 3 (“...for no one can do *these signs* that you are doing...”).

By this also we can argue that the preparation of the Gospel of John follows a very particular pattern, and also because of this reason we may have doubts about the *first* Passover.

John 5: 1-15
*Healing of the paralytic at
the pool of Betezda.*

index

The first three verses of chapter 5 have a strange particularity.

[5:1] After this, *there was* a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

[5:2] Now *there is* in Jerusalem at the Sheep (Gate) ³ a pool called in Hebrew Bethesda, with five porticoes.

[5:3] In these *lay* a large number of ill, blind, lame, and crippled.

On the third verse we read from the original greek text: “*was laid down*”, in the past tense.

The special feature in this passage is that the first verse uses the verb *to be in the past tense*, verse 2 uses the same verb *in the present* and the 3 again use the verb *to lay in the past tense*.

By this difference in the conjugation of verbs someone already did argues that this part of the Gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army in 70 AD.

If the Author used the past tense in the first and third verse why he did not used the same conjugation in the second verse, as it should have been be if the destruction of Jerusalem had already taken place?

Easy answer: because at the time of the writing of this single fact Jerusalem had not yet been destroyed, and the use of the verb in the present means that the pool was still intact and accessible. Not only these verses, but the whole episode of the paralytic healed refers to the past tense.

Verses 19, 24 and 25 contain the usual Jesus said *amen, amen*.

John 6: 4
Jewish Passover nearby.

index

[2:13] Since the Passover of the Jews was near, Jesus went up to Jerusalem.

[6:4] The Jewish feast of Passover was near.

[11:55] Now the Passover of the Jews was near,

As already mentioned it's because in this Gospel the Passover is mentioned three times that is usually believed that the preaching of Jesus is to be extended for at least three times this feast, so to be happened in more than two years.

The alternative is that instead, assuming these facts written separately at different times, the Author always refers to the same Passover (Easter), or perhaps two at most.

Only in this Gospel the Passover is mentioned three times, while in the Synoptics it's told about only one.

[6:4] The Jewish feast of Passover was near.

This theoretically should be the second, but two separate verses that we find at the end of chapter make mention of *Judas' betrayal*.

The first is the following:

[6:64] But there are some of you who do not believe." Jesus knew from the beginning the ones who would not believe *and the one who would betray him*.

and the second is the last two final verses, the most important:

[6:70] Jesus answered them, "Did I not choose you twelve? Yet is not one of you a devil?"

[6:71] He was referring to Judas, son of Simon the Iscariot; it was *he who would* betray him, one of the Twelve.

In this verse 71 the english translation gives:

“it was *he who would* betray him”,

but the Greek text have the word *εμελλεν* (emellen), which appears seven times in the New Testament in this precise form, and is a specific Greek form to include that the fact described *have to be happening soon after*. According to the meaning of this word Judas' betrayal would take immediately after, and it seems to be a reference to the last Passover (Easter), *not to the second*.

This allusion to the betrayal of Judas after it was reported an approaching Passover, would appear to suggest that this Passover mentioned in verse 6:4 (of which there is no reference or fact reported) and Passover mentioned in verse 11:55 (last Passover and Judas betrayal) are both related to the same feast, the same Passover, which is Easter.

John 7:40-53

The guards sent to arrest him returned without him, Nicodemus defends Jesus and is offended by the Pharisees.

index

The guards returned without having arrested him.

The High Priest irritated by this, and well aware of who they were those of the Pharisees harbored sympathy for him, as an indictment and open challenge to them he says:

[7:48] Have any of the authorities or the Pharisees believed in him?

Nicodemus, recognizing himself in one of those directly accused by this, replied calmly:

[7:51] "Does our law condemn a person before it first hears him and finds out what he is doing?"

In this sentence there is a counter accusation by Nicodemus that means:

why you who are the High Priest have already judged (and condemned) this man without having even consulted him?

They attack Nicodemus accusing him of being ignorant about the Holy Scriptures, some serious offense, considered the environment.

The session ends [v 53].

In this passage we read:

[7:50] Nicodemus, one of their members *who had come to him earlier*, said to them,

It is in the verses 1-21 of Chapter 3 which is told about the visit of Nicodemus to Jesus at night, and even in this case the Author is careful to remember that Nicodemus was the character of such a visit.

Same reasoning: if the Author had written his story from cover to cover, on an ongoing basis, why would he need to remind the reader the particular already known that Nicodemus was the one "*who had come to Jesus previously*"?

This is the second Author's explicit reference to reconnect to a fact already written earlier.

It seems that Chapter 3 and Chapter 7 were written at different times, or that in this case the prior written was no longer in the hands of the Author.

John 9: 1-38
Healing the man born blind.

index

The figure of this blind beggar is fascinating.

After the miracle he is being questioned by the Pharisees, but it is he who directs the speech, he is the *director* of the orchestra.

It's clear from the first words that he didn't like the Pharisees very much. Perhaps many times they have passed in front of him and made him feel guilty of his blindness, denying him even a few coins.

On the second question of the Pharisees, on how such man opened his eyes, he replied:

[9:27] He answered them, "I told you already and you did not listen. Why do you want to hear it again? *Do you want to become his disciples, too?*"

These words contain a violent sarcasm that certainly the Pharisees understood, and insulting him answered that they were disciples of Moses, and that they did not know such man.

Far from being intimidated by this answer the beggar responds:

[9:30] ... "This is what is so amazing, that you do not know where he is from, yet he opened my eyes

and he concludes:

[9:33] If this man were not from God, he would not be able to do anything."

The implicit concept in these words is: *this man comes from God because it has never happened that someone opened the eyes of one born blind.*

If you *do not know him and do not know where he is from* is clear that **you** are not from God, and thus you are coming from the enemy, that is from the devil.

It was enough to be stoned on the spot!

The Pharisees throw him out.

John 11: 1-57
Raising of Lazarus of Bethany.

index

In the first verse two sisters are mentioned: Mary and Martha.

[11:1] Now a man was ill, Lazarus from Bethany, *the village of Mary and her sister Martha.*

There is no mention of these two sisters in previous points in the Gospel of John, however they are called by name as when you talk to people who are familiar with those of whom you refer a fact.

Verse 2 is even stranger:

[11:2] Mary was the one who had anointed the Lord with perfumed oil and dried his feet with her hair; it was her brother Lazarus who was ill.

The position of this verse at the beginning of chapter 11 is apparently inexplicable, because it is a reference to a fact that the Author has not yet shown (in the order of the chapters of the Gospel) and which is in Chapter 12.

Here seems to be ahead of the confirmation of the valuable information that the facts stated in the various chapters were written by the Author in a no particular order, and drafted in its present form only later.

There may have been one of two possibilities.

- 1) the simplest. The Author wrote the chapter 11 *after* writing the chapter 12, and he may have written it after a long time, because (the same reasoning) again as is in his custom,

summarized in these words of 11: 2 a fact already written in detail in previous times (now chapter 12).

- 2) He write the chapter 11 regardless of 12 but to people who knew the family and who were aware of Mary who anointed with perfumed oil the Lord's feet and wiped them with her hair, but added many precious details. This deduction stems from the fact that it is given no explanation of who Martha, Mary and Lazarus were, and would therefore be clear that the readers of his writing knew them very well.

These two options could also be complementary.

Being the two chapters written at different times is also evident from the first verse of chapter 12, citing:

[12:1] Six days before Passover Jesus came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, *whom Jesus had raised from the dead*.

Again the same question: if the Author was writing the chapters sequentially, cover to cover, why he is linking *to the previous chapter*, almost entirely dedicated to the raising of Lazarus, summing up the fact with the phrase, "*whom he had raised from the dead*"?

John 13: 1-38
Last Supper.

index

[13:1] *Before* the feast of Passover, Jesus knew that his hour had come to pass from this world to the Father. He loved his own in the world and he loved them to the end.

This is a dinner celebrated *before* the Passover, the Greek word used by the Author, or at least by his translator, is προ (pro). The Author uses it nine times in this Gospel, out of a total of 48 occurrences in the New Testament.

In John 1:48, Jesus says to Nathaniel: "*Before* Philip called you, I saw you under the fig tree."

In John 5: 7 is the paralytic who turned to Jesus and says: "Sir, I have no one to put me into the pool... someone else gets down there *before* me."

In John 17: 5 it is Jesus that turns to the Father: "Now glorify me, Father, with you, with the glory that I had with you *before* the world began."

It 'a word used indisputably (also in the other six cases) to indicate a given fact that precedes another.

This Last Supper was not the Passover dinner.

John 18: 1-12
Jesus is arrested in the Gethsemane.

index

On the night of the Last Supper Jesus and the group of his disciples moves twice: from the Upper Room to a place not well defined [v 14:31], and from this to Gethsemane [v 18: 1]. This is also a clear indication that the Last Supper was not the Passover night, because a rule to be respected in that night "*different from other nights*" there was in fact a ban on leaving the house, respecting on this an ancient ritual established by Moses. Indeed, he ordered all the Israelis not to leave their homes because on the last night of their bondage the Destroying Angel of God would be passing in the village and would kill all the firstborn in the houses with no trace of blood on the door. That's why no one was allowed to leave the house that night, which was to be passed by eating the lamb and keeping watch.

As the Last Supper celebrated by the people of Israel in Egypt marked their last night of slavery, so the Last Supper celebrated by Christ marked the last night of the slavery from sin in mankind.

Cites the verse 14 of this chapter 18:

[18:14] It was Caiaphas who had counseled the Jews that it was better that one man should die rather than the people.

The reference is to the chapter 11, verses 49-50, when Caiaphas expresses his counsel after the resurrection of Lazarus.

Here there is a *double quote* already reported previously. In fact, not only was named Caiaphas as the one who had expressed his advice, but is also added on the previous verse that he

was *the chief priest of that year*: “...*Caiaphas, who was high priest that year.*” [18:13].

John 11:49 have:

“*kaiaphas archiereus on tou eniautou ekeinou*”,
Caiaphas chief-priest beeing of year that

In John 18:13 we read:

“*kaiapha hos en archiereus tou eniautou ekeinou*”,
Caiaphas he was chief-priest of year that

And as on other occasions in this Gospel, we wonder why the Author has quoted a fact already reported and a clarification already referred, if not because the texts were written after some time, and not as an orderly and consequential exposition but without a precise logic, and probably from time to time they should perhaps being used to explain some of the circumstances of the life of Christ to the communities of the different regions, to their teaching.

John 18: 28-40

Jesus brought to Pilate. The people chose Barabbas.

index

[18:28] Then they brought Jesus from Caiaphas to the praetorium. It was morning. And they themselves did not enter the praetorium, in order not to be defiled so that they could eat the Passover.

It was early morning, perhaps dawn, when Jesus is brought before Pilate.

That same evening would have been Passover.

Pilate, after a useless negotiations with the Jews, decided to propose a choice.

The decision concerned the freedom of Jesus, the Son of God, or Barabbas (literally: Bar-Abba, son of the father), and then, as so often today, they shouted, "Barabbas!"

If mankind do not want to be ruled by the Son of God he will be by Barabbas, that here is the representation of Satan.

John 19: 19-22
Inscription on the Cross

index

"Jesus the Nazorean, the King of the Jews."

The High Priests, not quite satisfied, suggest to change the inscription.

Pilate responds: "What I have written I have written."

Seems to appear in these words a profound contempt of Pilate against the High Priests, and if we imagine the look that he may had to have at that time it meant certainly: - *say one more word and I will take off that cross that man and I'll put you!* -

The High Priests did not insist, waiting for their next move, because they still had one last thing to ask the governor.

John 19:24
Quoting the Scripture.

index

[19:24] So they said to one another, "Let's not tear it, but cast lots for it to see whose it will be," in order that the passage of scripture might be fulfilled (that says): *"They divided my garments among them, and for my vesture they cast lots."* This is what the soldiers did.

This is the Gospel's quote from Psalm 22:

[Salmo 22:19] They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture. [KJV]

which is also the Psalm that begins with the words: - My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? -, and which contains precise details on the crucifixion of Christ.

John 19: 26-27
*Jesus entrusted his Mother to this disciple,
and the disciple to the Mother.*

index

[19:26] When Jesus saw his mother and the disciple there whom he loved, he said to his mother, "Woman, behold, your son."

[19:27] Then he said to the disciple, "Behold, your mother." And from that hour the disciple took her into his home.

Jesus gives a great responsibility to this young disciple he loved, and this can open a new perspective on the events that occurred soon after the discovery of the empty tomb.

Entrusting his mother to the disciple, Jesus probably did not fail to pronounce the name, but for some reason, however, is silent.

To recall, the *name* of the apostle John is never mentioned in the Gospel of John.

This Gospel is certainly the most *Marian-friendly* of the four.

The disciple accepts the Virgin Mother in her home, and years later we find them together at Ephesus, in the Western Turkey.

The Virgin Mother was the most reliable custodian of the whole life of Christ in every detail and intimate secrets, and this knowledge was allegedly poured on this disciple. John's Gospel seems permeated by the teachings of the Virgin, and perhaps this is why it is so different from the Synoptics.

Someone once said that *"there is no one more Christ-friendly than Mary, and no one more Marian-friendly than Christ"*.

John 19:31

*The Jews demand that the crucifixes
ought to be killed and taken away.*

index

[19:31] Now since it was preparation day ... the Jews asked Pilate that their legs be broken and they be taken down.

The Jews are those which were demanding that crucifixes be killed and removed from the crosses, and according to the apostle Paul in his speech at Antioch in Pisidia are the same Jews and their leaders who take down Jesus from the cross and put him in a tomb [Acts 13: 27-29].

[Acts 13:27] The inhabitants of Jerusalem and their leaders ...

[Acts 13:28] ... they asked Pilate to have him put to death,

[Acts 13:29] and ... they took him down from the *tree* and placed him in a tomb.

The original Greek word here translated as *tree* is ξυλου (xulou), which generically means *wood*.

This is perfectly plausible, because knowing that Jesus said he would rise again on the third day it would have not made sense to leave the tomb unattended throughout the first night. More realistic indeed is the speech of Paul, who claims that Jesus' body was not left unattended by the Jews.

Being Christ physically removed from the cross and laid in a tomb by his disciples and particularly by Joseph of Arimathea, Nicodemus and the people present there is not on debate, but Paul's words show that there was a continuous control of the Jews, and this certainly because they were afraid that the disciples might steal the body and claim he had risen. Plausible then that the Jews,

the next day, have gone to Pilate to request that the body of Jesus should be guarded by soldiers [Matthew 27:62] (still considering that *the next day begins at sunset*), but at the same time some of them were watching over the body of Christ. This is the least we can assume considering carefully the words of Paul.

John 19:39
*Nicodemus brings a scented mixture
about a hundred pounds.*

index

[19:39] Nicodemus, *the one who had first come to him at night*, also came bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes weighing about one hundred *pounds*.

The original Greek word here translated as *pounds* is λίτρας (litras) and seems a disproportionate measure, but in the ancient Greek the *litras* was a coin, not a weight or volume, then the Gospel of John speaks of the value of such aromatic mixtures, not the quantity.

Here too, we read that Nicodemus was "*the one who had first come to him at night*", and follows the usual question.

John 20: 1-2
Mary Magdalene at the tomb.

index

[20:1] On the first day of the week, Mary of Magdala came to the tomb early in the morning, while it was still dark, and saw the stone removed from the tomb.

In this Gospel of John only Mary Magdalene is mentioned, even though the next verse has a "*we don't know*" that clearly indicates that she was not alone.

The Gospel of Matthew mentions *Mary Magdalene and the other Mary*.

In Mark are *Mary Magdalene, and Mary of James, and Salome*.

Luke mentions a group, among them: "*Mary Magdalene, Joanna, and Mary the mother of James; the others who accompanied them also told this to the apostles*".

There is no need to consider these as contradictory testimony because the discrepancy is only apparent, because just imagine that Mary Magdalene had a role of Mother Superior of the women who followed Jesus (excluding of course the Virgin Mother) and dissonance fades.

If we read on the newspaper that a mayor has built a road we do not imagine that this man after made the plan himself gets on the tractor and begin to pave the way. It is implied that he is leaning on an engineer, architects, the site manager and finally to the workers, whether some of these are mentioned or not.

The Mary Magdalene is always mentioned, and first named in the four Gospels, because of its leading role on women who followed Jesus.

John 20: 2-4

*The Magdalene goes to Peter and the other disciple,
and they immediately run to the tomb.*

index

[20:2] So she ran and went to Simon Peter and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and told them, "They have taken the Lord from the tomb, and we don't know where they put him."

[20:3] So Peter and the other disciple went out and came to the tomb.

[20:4] They both ran, but the other disciple ran faster than Peter and arrived at the tomb first;

why Peter and the other disciple go running to the tomb?

Sure not because they had realized that Jesus had risen, they were in fact very far from this thought, as the same Author in verse 9:

[20:9] For they did not yet understand the scripture that he had to rise from the dead.

They run just to make sure of the things said to them by the women, that is, that the body of their Rabbi was no longer in the tomb because someone had removed it.

If they run just to check what had happened then it is not logical to assume that this *other disciple*, whoever he was, has been ahead of Peter, who had become in effect their leader after the death of Jesus.

In all likelihood this *other disciple* was younger than Peter, but also, and even more, he could not feel entitled to bypass an elder, and even if he could run faster than *he should have kept behind* Peter, especially in those time and in those areas.

If so, why then did he run faster than Peter?

From the booklet: *Maria, donna dei nostri giorni* (Mary, woman of our time), Don Antonio Bello (1935-1993), bishop of Molfetta, Italy:

(direct translation).

“Many people wonder surprised why the Gospel, as it speaks of Jesus appeared on Easter Sunday to many people, like Mary Magdalene, the pious women and the disciples, do not refers to us, however, any appearance to the Mother by the risen Son.

I would have an answered, because there was no need!

There was no need, that is, that Jesus appeared to Mary, because she, the only one, was present at the resurrection.

The theologians, actually, tell us that this event was delivered from the eyes of all, took place in the unfathomable depths of the mystery, and, in his historic implemented, it had no witness. I think, however, that there was an exception: Mary, the only, had to be present to this supreme adventure of history.

As she was the only one, at the time of the Incarnation of the Word.

As she was the only one on the exit of him from her virginal womb of flesh. And she became the first glimpse of God made man.

So she had to be present, the only one, to the exit of him from the virginal womb of stone: the tomb "*in which no one had ever been laid.*" She became the woman first God made man's eyes.

The others were witnesses of the Risen One. She, of the Resurrection.”

This very short text assumes that the Virgin Mary remained at the sepulcher in confident expectation of the resurrection of the Son, and if it were true it would be a great insight because there is no mention in the history of Christianity that has ever suggested a possibility so amazing. When compared with what has already

been suggested in John 19: 26-27, *Jesus entrusted his Mother to this disciple, and the disciple to the Mother*, can give an idea of the responsibility that this disciple felt he had on him and that made him reach the tomb first.

This may have been his reasoning: Jesus on the cross entrusted his mother to me, but I was not able to take her away from the tomb, and left her alone. Now Mary Magdalene comes to tell us that the body of the Master is gone.

What happened to the Virgin Mother? She was there, why she did not run to warn us? Perhaps she has been hurt? Or maybe she was wounded? Perhaps worse?

These were the thoughts that have taken off the foot of the apostle, who would have arrived first even though he could have been the old man and youngest the other.

It is not a matter of human musculature, but of sacred awe.

All this will suggest another interpretation of the verse "*and he saw and believed*", discussed ever since.

John 20: 5-8

*The disciples come to the sepulcher,
Peter comes in and then the other.*

index

[20:5] he bent down and saw the burial cloths there, but did not go in.

[20:6] When Simon Peter arrived after him, he went into the tomb and saw the burial cloths there,

[20:7] and the cloth that had covered his head, not with the burial cloths but rolled up in a separate place.

The other disciple gives a look into the tomb (which was probably a double room) but did not go in, he was not seeking the Master's body but the Virgin Mother, and had seen that she was not in the tomb. He decides to look around.

Then Peter arrives and enters into the tomb to search for the body of Jesus, or at least any track to understand what had happened. He sees the same things that the other disciple seen, indeed he see it better, because he comes in.

[20:8] Then the other disciple also went in, the one who had arrived at the tomb first, *and he saw and believed.*

Here we have two men who see the same things, the one who is the leader is confused, the other believes that the Master is truly risen.

Someone tries to explain the faith of this other disciple by the position of the bandages, shroud or whatever they were, and to explain it, it is assumed that the body of Jesus, resurrecting, had to dematerialize. But is it so?

Being the body of Christ dematerialized because of the resurrection is a simple theory far from proven.

Also if the position of the bandages and the shroud had been *certain evidences* of the resurrection why Peter does not believe? Still the fact remains, that one man has believed and the other did not.

Perhaps in this there is also a considerable symbolic significance, as if each of us had been able to enter the tomb that morning half of us would believe the other half would not.

It depends on *what is in our heart*, not from what we have (or have not) in front of our eyes. And what was in the heart of the disciple who believes has already been said, the Virgin Mother.

She was not outside of the tomb, he had tried to find her behind every bush and cranny around there without finding her, perhaps remained only one possibility: she could may be inside the tomb. Maybe, before in the twilight, had not seen her.

In this desperate search a shocking thought crosses his mind: ***the Rabbi really risen???***

What convinced the young disciple is not something he saw, but *something that has not seen*: the Virgin Mother who should have been there.

He enters, ***he sees that she is not there, understands, and believes.***

The faith in the resurrection of Christ of the first man in the world do not comes through the special arrangement of some bandages and clothes, but *through the Virgin Mother who speaks in our heart saying: My Son has risen.*

John 20: 14-18
Jesus appears to Mary Magdalene.

index

The Magdalene saw Jesus but does not recognize him.

We may think that this depended on her eyes full of tears, or whether this figure was backlit, but perhaps it is best not to rely too much on these details because, however, are not sufficient to explain why the two disciples of Emmaus did not recognize him either, and even seven of his Apostles as is reported in the following chapter 21.

Christ was *different* because he was resurrected in His Glory, not for some physical or visual reason.

[20:15] ... "Woman, why are you weeping? Whom are you looking for?"

On Jesus' question she answers with sadness, as if she thought that man may be the true owner of the tomb, and the burial done without his knowledge.

Actually we know that the tomb was of Joseph of Arimathea, so the question of Magdalene was out of place, but being upset by everything that had happened since the previous Thursday she is perfectly excusable.

Even the voice of Jesus had to be different.

Jesus called her *by name* and only then she recognizes him.

Perhaps in pronouncing her name he used a special and unique inflection, so dear to her, and there were no more doubts: was him!

John 20:19
Jesus appears to the disciples.

index

[20:19] On the *evening* of that *first day of the week*, when the doors were locked, where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in their midst and said to them, "Peace be with you."

The word here translated as *evening* is “οωιαξ” (opsias), and rather means *late afternoon*.

In this way it appears in the Gospel of Matthew 27:57, and indicates the time of day on Friday when Joseph of Arimathea goes to Pilate to request the body of Jesus, got permission, backs to Calvary, and laid him in the tomb.

The beginning of this is “οωιαξ”, then at least two or three hours before sunset.

If the sun had gone down and *the first three stars* had appeared in the sky then it would have been the second day of the week, therefore in contrast with the verse that speaks *of the first day of the week*.

This mention of *the first three stars* comes from the Jewish tradition, in fact that was the sign to understand that the new day began, when they saw in the sky the first three stars. Incidentally and curiosity; if the sky was overcast, then the priests had two cords, one white and one black. When they could no longer distinguish from each other then the new day began.

John 20: 30-31
First final of the Gospel.

index

[20:30] Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of (his) disciples that are not written in this book.

[20:31] But these are written that you may (come to) believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through this belief you may have life in his name.

This is certainly the end of the Gospel of John, according as it seemed right to the Author finish his story.

It is likely that these words shut the entire Gospel according to current wording, section 1-20.

John 21: 1-25
End of the Gospel.

index

But something happens that deeply shakes the Author of the Gospel already written and completed, and urges him to take up pen and ink again.

He takes up the story with the words: μετα ταυτα (meta tauta, *after these events*).

Already chapters 5, 6 and 7 began with these words in their first sentence.

[21:2] Together were Simon Peter, Thomas called Didymus, Nathanael from Cana in Galilee, Zebedee's sons, and two others of his disciples.

- 1) Simon Peter
- 2) Thomas
- 3) Nathanael
- 4) James and John
- 5) two disciples

Total seven people.

Jesus is on the shore and calls them.

These disciples did not recognize him, nor looking [v 21: 4] (in these circumstances we can assume that he was far away, but that's not the real reason), or by the voice [v 21: 5].

Jesus "*speaks*" and produces a miracle.

The *eyes of the other disciple's heart* open immediately, those of Peter struggling.

The first says to Peter: "*It is the Lord.*"

Peter jumped into the water and reach the shore by swimming, then the other six also come.

[21:12] Jesus said to them, "Come, have breakfast." And none of the disciples dared to ask him, "Who are you?" because they realized it was the Lord.

Despite having him right there in front of their eyes they did not recognized him, but it is clear, however, that at least during the meal this veil is removed.

Perhaps this stranger called them by name, one by one, perhaps instead one of them has had the courage to call him by name.

When Jesus asks Peter the question [v 21:15] presentations have already been made and all doubts dispelled, otherwise Peter could not have been able to declare his love to him.

There is a lacking of any hint of any kind of emotion on those present, even though it is obvious that the Author could have written a whole book to describe the details of that one meeting, *but details were not his goal.*

Three times the same question three times the same answer. Someone has already noted, with good reason, that this ritual seems a *penance* inflicted by Jesus to Peter for his triple denial. Not that Jesus was in need of this triple statement, but Peter!

Is at this time that Jesus reconfirmed Peter as Pope First, driving his Church.

The main character of chapter 21 is not Jesus, but Peter.

The whole chapter is an ode to Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and has been added as a valuable addendum at the end of the Gospel of John already finished, after the death of Peter, to reaffirm his

role and his leadership and guide that henceforth he would hand to his successors.

This would be the reason that prompted the Author to add this last part of his Gospel: *martyrdom of Peter*.

The Author is also careful to discourage those who felt that he should be their guide, by virtue of the words of Christ: "[What if I want him to remain until I come?...](#)", as if he were to live forever, and on this point we may see the *divisions* already arisen within the nascent Church of which Paul speaks, his words addressed to the Corinthians in the first letter chapter 1:

[\[I Corinzi 1:10\]](#) I urge you, brothers, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree in what you say, and that there be no divisions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and in the same purpose.

[\[I Corinzi 1:11\]](#) For it has been reported to me about you, my brothers, by Chloe's people, that there are rivalries among you.

[\[I Corinzi 1:12\]](#) I mean that each of you is saying, "I belong to Paul," or "I belong to Apollos," or "I belong to Kephas," or "I belong to Christ."

[\[I Corinzi 1:13\]](#) Is Christ divided? ...

Also this chapter 21 was *written* (γραωας, Grapsas [v 21:24], literally) by this Author, and in the final drafting of the Gospel of John the two disciples unknown but present for this last miraculous catch, to confirm what he wrote attest that:

[\[v 21:24\]](#) ... and we know that his testimony is true.

implicit concept: -because we were present and we testify the veracity of this-.

The concluding sentence comes from the Author himself:

[21:25] There are also many other things that Jesus did, but if these were to be described individually, *I do not think* the whole world would contain the books that would be written.

because no one would dare to add that "*I do not think*", which in fact is a personal signature on such a valuable document but the Author himself.

[21:20] 20 Peter turned and saw the disciple following whom Jesus loved, the one who had also reclined upon his chest during the supper and had said, "Master, who is the one who will betray you?"

Even in this last case *we have a reference to a fact already written*, provided in chapter 13, and along with the Jesus usual repetition "Amen, amen" of verse 18 ("Amen, amen, I say to you, when you were younger, you used to dress yourself and go where you wanted...") confirms that the Author of chapter 21 is the same as the entire Gospel of John.

Preliminary conclusions on the Gospel of John.

index

It seems that the Author wrote his Gospel (then maybe it was not a Gospel as we know it today, but his memories), without a precise logic description as would be natural to think, but a little at the time, it seems that still he wanted to reconnect to what he had already written on another earlier occasion and that also he did not have most of his previous writing at hand anymore.

Maybe to him, they were just *notes*.

We need to ask ourself a question: did the Author has ever had the intention of writing a *Gospel*? Or did he wrote in detail the events that took place during his time with Jesus of whom he had been eyewitness to respond to particular needs of a given moment? Individual documents that were made to reach the community of believers concerning them, and for which they were written?

From this angle we can develop the theory of why they were written in pieces, and also why the Author had not the text at hand while writing other facts.

Given the preciousness of these writings, they were kept with religious sanctity by the Churches, and were then collected to form a single text, leaving almost intact the original text.

The Author played a prominent role in the nascent Church of Christ, but not recognizing himself as a *theologian*, unlike Paul, he exposed the faith in Christ through the facts of his life, the facts of which he himself had witnessed.

On this may be true that the Gospel of John was written at the end of the first century (more realistically in the late 60s), but with the original texts of the Author written in his own hand decades before. So rather than being written it was drawn up and shared at the suggested time.

If so then it is likely that the Apostle wrote much more than what is contained in his Gospel, and if it did so we could assume that the original writings were written in Hebrew or Aramaic.

The above suggests of course an only Author: **John the Apostle**.

This is also why the supposed rudeness between Son and Mother are only illusory.

Could in fact this disciple, Author of the Gospel, write something disrespectful on her who had been entrusted by Christ on his death cross?

Of course, we inhabitants of the third millennium, having the heart in no one and nothing we may could say yes... but such a disciple?

*If you think
that this text
was interesting
you may please
send it
to a friend.*

Thank you.



[Donation](#)



Gospel of Mark

Mark 3:21

Someone says: "He is out of his mind."

[index](#)

[3:21] When *his relatives* heard of this they set out to seize him, for they said, "He is out of his mind."

The translation of this verse did create many problems which are not been solved quite correctly.

Out of the original words from the Greek text is not clear at all who were those that *heard*, who were those that *were going to take him*, who were those *telling that he was out of his mind*.

Here we have a man able to attract the attention of such a crowd which was impeding them even to have lunch.

On the previous verses (10 and 11) it's written that Jesus had cured many, and was casting demons.

Why should anybody think that such man is crazy?

And if he is crazy what about the crowd that was following him?

It's a real nonsense.

There is absolutely no way out of the Greek text to assume that *his relatives* had anything to do with this story, no way to assume that *his relatives* heard about Jesus doing such things, no way at all to assume that were *his relatives* telling he was crazy.

So, who was? His disciples? Someone from the crowd? The Pharisees?

“ἦοι παρ αὐτοῦ” (hoi par autou), these are the Greek words translated in English as “*his relatives*”.

“ἦοι παρ αὐτοῦ” (hoi par autou), means: “*those with him*”, so they could have been anybody *but his relatives*.

In this same Gospel of Mark the Author himself to indicate Jesus actual relatives, use in the verse 6: 4 a completely different word, namely: “συγγενεσιν” (suggenesin).

This word is also used by Luke in 2:44, and indicates the caravan of people, folk from the same town, on a return trip from Jerusalem, when Jesus was lost at twelve years old.

If those who were going to take Jesus in Mark 3:21 were really his relatives the Author should have used the same term: “συγγενεσιν” (suggenesin), but he did us: “ἦοι παρ αὐτοῦ” (hoi par autou, - those with him -).

Who the Author wanted to indicate with the words “*those with him*” is difficult to understand, but we can say that there were certainly *not* his relatives, for which he should have used the precise term aforesaid: “συγγενεσιν” (suggenesin).

It is written on the first chapter of the Gospel of Luke:

[1:36] And behold, Elizabeth, *your relative*, has also conceived a son in her old age ...

These are the words that the Angel Gabriel addressed the Virgin Mary at the Annunciation, and leave no room for misunderstandings.

Also on this occasion the word *relative* is “συγγενις” (suggenes), the same root.

Wanting still forcibly give to such words “ἰοὶ παρ αὐτοῦ” (hoi par autou, *-those with him-*) the significance of *his relatives*, still we’d have a discrepancy of how can it be possible to consider someone who performs miracles of this kind a crazy man.

We should rather think that those *relatives, friends or people however close to him* were acting in that way to protect him against the likely retaliation by the Pharisees, which in fact had already been established as can be seen in verse 3: 6.

[3:6] The Pharisees went out and immediately took counsel with the Herodians against him *to put him to death*.

To pretend he was a *madman* would then pass it off as a clumsy attempt to divert the Pharisees of their intention to kill him because of those miraculous events.

Those with him (ἰοὶ παρ αὐτοῦ), whoever they were, knew very well how dangerous could it be to go against the Pharisees doing those miracles on the Sabbath, and do it in a synagogue.

The sense would be: better pass it off as a crazy than let him to be kill.

In this sense, then, the episode would be understandable.

At the end of chapter 3 mother and brothers of Jesus came and called to him.

[3:6] His mother and his brothers arrived. *Standing outside they sent word to him and called him*.

Standing outside, we may think two different things:

1) that because of the large crowd Mother and brothers called him *invasively*.

2) that was *a kind and gentle way of the Mother* not to interfere in the preaching of his son but only may notify their presence and their confident expectation.

Here the terms are clear: Mother and brothers (*brothers* according to the broad sense that was given to the word in coveted Israelite). These are actually his “συγγενεσιν” (*suggenesin*, relatives).

Informed of their presence Jesus answers:

[3:33-35] ... "Who are my mother and (my) brothers?" ... Here are my mother and my brothers. (For) whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and mother."

Is it a *denial* of his family due to the fact *that they have not done the will of God?* Or is it a *raising, an inclusion* of the people who were listening to him *into* his family, that certain loved with all his heart?

If the sense would be the first, that is a denial of the family, then it would mean that the Mother also would not have done the will of God.

It is surreal, before being illogical!

Someone said:

"We are his brothers when we do the will of his Father who is in heaven. We are his mothers, when we carry him in our hearts and in our body through the love and a pure and sincere conscience, and give birth to him through a holy activity which must shine before others by example. "

Every man and woman who does the will of God becomes part of his immense Holy Family, which includes not only the mother

Mary and father Joseph, but also all his brothers and all the saints and martyrs of all time.

The original family of Jesus is not excluded, but rather who does the will of God becomes part of it and it is incorporated in it.

Is not reported what happens after that Jesus uttered those words to the surrounding crowd, but is easily presumed that he turned up in a hurry and went to meet them with a smile, hugging his Mother and brothers and offering a materially visible example of those invisible goods which will benefit those who do the will of God.

Mark 5: 25-34

The woman afflicted with hemorrhages for twelve years.

index

The *automatism* of this miracle leaves us amazed.

The patient, in this case woman suffering from loss of blood, almost without the knowledge of Jesus and without his permission snatches a miracle, seizing a virtue/power/strength of Him.

Jesus realizes immediately that *a power had gone out from him* [v 5:30], but does not yell at the woman of this *misappropriation*, on the contrary, he bless her, then let her go with peace.

The *empty vessel* filled with the powerful faith of the woman attracts the *power of Christ*, which produces the miracle, power of Christ that wasn't poured out into any other of the surrounding crowd.

The woman immediately realizes that she was cured of his illness [5:29], but in her heart she did feel guilty of *stealing something from the Lord*, and that's why as soon as she realizes that her gesture did not go unnoticed, as perhaps she hoped:

[5:33] ... approached in fear and trembling. She fell down before Jesus and told him the whole truth.

The woman *did not ask* for this miracle, *she just wanted it* ... and it still worked!

It seems the only case in the four Gospels in which a miracle is granted without making a prior request, and without that the Lord himself has expressly granted!

The special aspect is that Jesus *perceives that force out of him*, as if it was a kind of *energy* that he download on the sick one, and we may wonder if this happened every time he performed a miracle.

Mark 6: 1-6

Jesus returns to Nazareth, scorn of the villagers.

[index](#)

The return of Jesus to Nazareth and preaching in their synagogue do not refer to the story of the attempt to kill Jesus by the villagers, which instead is told in detail by Luke, chapter 4: 16-30.

It being understood that the four Gospels do not have to be a photocopy of each other (otherwise it would have been enough one), the reason why the Gospel of Mark and Matthew do not speak of this attempt is probably because it was not considered any importance by the Authors, however, given that despite the intentions of some was not implemented.

Probably in many other circumstances of his life Jesus has received this kind of threat, more or less violent, than those mentioned in the Gospels, which have not been mentioned for the same reason.

About this episode can be said that has certainly happened before the one with the Samaritan woman at the well reported in the Gospel of John, because in it is made a specific reference to this rejection of their countrymen:

[\[John 4:44\]](#) For Jesus himself testified that a prophet has no honor in his native place.

Mark 9: 43-48

If your hand causes you to sin ...

index

[9:43] And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off ...

[9:45] And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off ...

[9:47] And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out ... [KJV]

We may realize that an *eye* can be *reason for stumbling* (this is the original sense of the word *offend*) if we consider that even *looking* at a woman is bad, but it is unclear why the eye should be held responsible instead of the soul and the human heart.

We can also understand that the *hand* can be *reason for stumbling* because through it robbery and murder are accomplished, but again it is not clear why this tool in our body, that acts only on our desire, has to be regarded as responsible for our misdeeds.

It may be useful to point out that *having a bad eye*, that is evil, in Semitic environment means *being envious*.

The eye itself is neither good nor bad, it is our thoughts that make it so.

What needs to be eradicated is not the eye, but our bad thoughts.

The eye, the hand and foot show us in what we are missing, and it is precisely they who tell us the sins of our hearts.

It is written in the Book of Proverbs, Chapter 6:

[Proverbs 6:16] There are six things the LORD hates, yes, seven are an abomination to him;

[Proverbs 6:17] *Haughty eyes*, a lying tongue, and *hands that shed innocent blood*;

[Proverbs 6:18] A heart that plots wicked schemes, *feet that run*

swiftly to evil,

Eradicate an evil thought from our hearts can be just as painful that to draw an eye, cut a foot or a hand, but leads to eternal life.

Those who instead *have care* of their sin and *guards it jealously* as it was his eye, his hand or his foot will end up in hell, with all its sin.

This is the meaning of Christ's words.

A further confirmation of the above is said in Matthew 6:

[Matthew 6:3] But when you give alms, do not let your left hand know what your right is doing,

Can it be a more symbolic example than this?

Both our hands have a mind of their own?

Our hands intrude into the private affairs of one other one?

This reasoning should both: be making people smile and suggest the answer: no, our hands do not have a proper thought, the meaning is that when you give alms that needs to be done in absolute secrecy. In this way, and only this, we receives a reward from God.

Mark 12: 1-12
The wicked tenants.

index

With this parable Jesus accuses the Pharisees and the chief priests to be fully aware of who he was, and still refusing him and planning his death.

All the prophecies predicted in the Temple of Jerusalem at the office of the priest Zechariah were about to take place.

Jesus was the One who was to come, and the Pharisees knew it.

The evidences had been many, starting with the priest Zechariah, then his son John the Baptist and his testimony given to the messengers from Jerusalem, then the testimony that Christ made of himself, confirmed by the miracles he did.

Being possible for the Pharisees recognize him as *the One who was to come*, the Son of God, it is a certainty that comes from the same faith that some Pharisees had in him, especially Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, in addition to the old Simeon, who, when the baby Jesus was brought to the Temple, do not gets scandalized to see that the parents are two common people outside the royal caste, but takes it in his arms and recognizes it as Messiah.

If either one of the two Pharisees named above had been the High Priest maybe things would have been different, but for God's foreknowledge it has been as it has been.

Imagining that young Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus were present in the Temple when the Angel appeared to Zechariah, it can be assumed that they also followed all the stages of the event's Messiah.

We can assume that they did receive the prophecy given by the Angel to their priest, that a son would be born to them and that their son would be the forerunner of Messiah.

It can be assumed that they have welcomed the birth as a sign from God, and it is easy to imagine that they have visited the priest Zechariah as soon as that child was born.

Only six months later they had been informed, as confirmed in several ways, that an exceptional event had happened in Bethlehem, where Someone was born in a cave, the son of two *apparent* wayfarers. Birth accompanied by the appearance of an Angel.

There was in him no stately bearing to make us look at him,
nor appearance that would attract us to him.

...

But you, Bethlehem-Ephrathah
too small to be among the clans of Judah,
From you shall come forth for me
one who is to be ruler in Israel;
Whose origin is from of old,
from ancient times.

It can be assumed that they had closely followed certain kings came from the East, who had arrived in Jerusalem guided by a star.

Those kings were asking where the King of the Jews was born.

They were pagans, but declared Jesus as the King of the Jews.
Pagan was also Pilate, but wrote: "King of the Jews".

They greeted with horror the slaughter ordered by King Herod, the great king who feared a child and who rails against him all his fury.

... In Ramah is heard the sound of moaning,
of bitter weeping!
Rachel mourns her children,
she refuses to be consoled
because her children are no more.

Before this happens, the two Pharisees sure had time to make that small and discreet trip of a few miles to get to Bethlehem from Jerusalem.

As Simeon too, they had been able to hold the little Messiah in their arms.

With all of this they could not be amazed that the Holy Family had to run away, but knew in their hearts that they would have seen them again!

Here they are, in fact, on a Passover, coming from Nazareth and bringing with them the little Jesus, just a few years old. And so it will be from year to year.

Neither could they wonder of his words of wisdom and grace when, twelve years old, he was with the Pharisees in the Temple, where the Virgin Mother and father Joseph find him.

All this, and much more, kept in the heart the two Pharisees, believing with no doubt.

Even then, Jesus twelve, there was no doubt.

And if it was so for these two Pharisees why the Sanhedrin did not recognize him and acknowledged like them?

That is the deeper meaning and the reason of this parable upon the wicked tenants.

With this parable Jesus says that the Pharisees thought not only that he was just a awkward or dangerous man, but the Son of God, and in spite of this they decided to kill him anyhow.

Such is the gravity of this parable.

It would be useless and foolish, however, to blame only those Pharisees of this rejection, since in fact the intrinsic meaning in this parable is that every man who abandons and rejects i God's commandments behave in such a way to be as one of those Pharisees.

It's a warning to each of us.

Whether we like it or not, whether we like it or not, whether we believe it or not, God is the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and we will have to give Him account of all our acts.

This is the true meaning of the parable.

Mark 14:12
*The disciples ask Jesus
where to prepare for Passover.*

index

[14:12] *On the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, when they sacrificed the Passover lamb, his disciples said to him, "Where do you want us to go and prepare for you to eat the Passover?"*

This dinner took place on the night of Jewish Passover (15 Nisan) or on the previous one (14 Nisan)?

The *first day of Unleavened Bread* coincided with the day of Passover, and whether to "*sacrifice the Passover*" means the dinner eating the lamb then the statement is correct.

But if by the terms to "*sacrifice the Passover*" refers to the time when the lamb is sacrificed (slaughtered) in the Temple then is a discrepancy, because even though the two moments (the celebration of Passover and lamb sacrifice) are rituals that *take place in the same solar day* (sacrifice of three o'clock P.M. and Passover meal around eight P.M.), then the statement is a contradiction because it would be two different days.

It 'always useful to remember that the Jewish day begins and ends with sunset and not at midnight, and therefore the only dinner at which we allude talking about a certain day of the week is actually the dinner of the previous day.

Having this doubt we read on Mark 14:12, that the Evangelist declares:

[15:37] *Jesus gave a loud cry and breathed his last.*

And after that Christ is dead:

[15:42] When it was already evening, *since it was the day of preparation*, the day before the sabbath,

[15:43] Joseph of Arimathea, a distinguished member of the council, who was himself awaiting the kingdom of God, came and courageously went to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus.

This verse 15:42 attests incontrovertibly that Jesus died on the day of Preparation, that is the day preceding Passover.

As already mentioned for the term *evening* (οψιαξ, opsias), it should be understood rather *late afternoon*, something between 4,00 and 5,00 P.M. because that is the time when Joseph of Arimathea goes to Pilate to ask for Jesus' body [and both in the Gospel of Mark and Matthew this time is οψιαξ (Mark 15:42 and Matthew 27:57)], obtains permission after Pilate has secured of his death, returns on Calvary, lays the body of Jesus from the cross, takes him to the nearby tomb and closes the tomb.

Calculate all these facts as having occurred in the space of two / three hours seems to be a reasonable period of time.

Mark 16: 1-20
Text written by "four hands"?

index

The two parts, from verse 1 to 8, and 9 to 20 (end Gospel), are so different as to suggest two distinct sources.

The first (Mark: 1-8), get a little lost in minor details, such as the words of the women going to the tomb early in the morning.

Considering those times, who would be interested in knowing their speeches? Perhaps no one:

[16:3] They were saying to one another, "Who will roll back the stone for us from the entrance to the tomb?"

They Receive from the Angel the order to report such things to the Apostles:

[16:7] But go and tell his disciples and Peter, 'He is going before you to Galilee; there you will see him, as he told you.'

But they, frightened, silent (?):

[16:8] Then they went out and fled from the tomb, seized with trembling and bewilderment. They said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid.

openly transgressing the order of the Angel?

And this is the first part, which seems written by an unsteady hand.

Then comes the second part, much more direct, focused and incisive. This part declares that:

- 1) Jesus is risen the night between Saturday and Sunday, by the way in the morning [v 16: 9].
- 2) Appears to Mary Magdalene [v 16: 9].
- 3) She went to warn the disciples [v 16:10], and in this point there is a total contrast between verse 8 above quoted, and this verse 10.
- 4) The disciples did not believe [v 16:11].
- 5) Appears to two disciples on the way [v 16:12].
- 6) These return to give the news to the disciples, but they are not believed [v 16:13].
- 7) Jesus appeared to the eleven [v 16:14].

In these seven points and few words the *source* tells the resurrection of Jesus, his appearing to Mary Magdalene and then to the disciples, with a disconcerting synthetic substance.

The subsequent verses 16: 15-18 narrate the last commands of Jesus, but these words are also a summary of the commands that Jesus gave to his disciples since this appearance up to forty days later, when he ascended into heaven, as it also ends this Gospel.

The telegraphic way exposing the facts, and facts so important is well suited to the figure of Peter, the rude fisherman that some did not like mincing words or well done and furbished phrases. The juice was all that mattered, and here there is so much juice.

It would seem, therefore, that the first part was written by Mark and the second suggested by Peter, although it remains difficult to understand why both versions have been inserted in the Gospel of Mark and came down to us.

*If you think
that this text
was interesting
you may please
send it
to a friend.*

Thank you.



[Donation](#)



NO PAYPAL ACCOUNT NEEDED!

Gospel of Matthew

Matthew 2: 1-12

Jesus' birth in Bethlehem, the Three Kings.

index

About the three Kings we know that: came from the east, were looking for a baby, they knew that the baby was the *king of the Jews*, his star had risen “εν τε ανατολε” (en te anatole, lit: *in the East*).

It is not known how many there were nor if they made the trip together.

If they *came from the east* and the star *had risen in the east* perhaps it means that the celestial body came *from the east of the east*. This star, or whatever it was, would have illuminated the entire globe?

It would seem that this star appeared at times, and this for two reasons in particular.

The first reason is that if it would have been always clearly visible, the Kings would not have needed to stop by King Herod to ask where it was born the *King of the Jews*, being such thing in itself, if they knew the king, quite unwise.

The second reason is this, if after the secret meeting with the King: "[When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.](#)" [2:10, KJV], is a clear sign that it had disappeared and reappeared again.

These words translated as "[they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.](#)" in the original Greek turns out to be the following: “εχαρησαν χαραν μεγαλην σφοδρα” (literally: *they rejoiced with*

exceeding great joy strongly), which is a classic Judaism.

This would mean that these words, which are not the *sayings of the Lord* [with reference to the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius of Caesarea (265-340 AD) which in turn cites the writings of Papias of Hierapolis (70-150 AD) who speaks of such *sayings*], were written originally in Hebrew and translated faithfully in greek without alterations.

The inference is that the *sayings of the Lord* above mentioned did not concern only *the words of Christ*, but they were also a detailed account of *facts* about his life (... the primitive Gospel of Matthew?).

When this star appeared to the Kings? In the time of Jesus' birth, or long before? If before, why? This star is only appeared to be *driving these Kings, according to them*, or for the whole world? When the star appeared the Kings knew immediately what it meant? Who told them? How soon by the appearance of the star Kings have began their traveling?

All these questions make that what is commonly believed, that the Kings have arrived in Bethlehem on January 6, that only thirteen days after the birth of Jesus is impossible to achieve.

If the star has appeared much earlier and the Kings had plenty of time to know the meaning, organize the long journey and arrive in Bethlehem on that date we created an even bigger problem, because it is inconceivable that such a celestial body was *concerned* to calculate all the time necessary for these Kings to arrive to Bethlehem on January 6, and *decided* to appear, for example, six / nine months before the birth of Jesus. A case like that makes us smile.

Also unlikely to assume that such a star has appeared in the East at

the time of the conception of Jesus, and that still does not coincide with the intention of King Herod to kill all children under two years of age.

Continuing a bit over with this irrational reasoning, it is beyond any logical considering that the star has appeared even before conception, that is, *before the Virgin Mary gave her assent to the Angel*.

From this point of view is rather logical to assume that such a star had appeared in the days of Jesus' birth, and that the maximum age of the children killed by King Erodes corresponds to the time it took to the three King to get from their country to Jerusalem, which would mean that the Kings arrived in Bethlehem when the Baby Jesus was about two years old.

Since we know that King Herod died in 4 b. C. that brings to date the birth of Jesus around 6 b. C.

Why the Kings were looking for a *newborn*, why they knew *that was his star*, and why they knew that this baby was the *King of the Jews* it not understandable.

The number of the Kings being three *is deduced from the number of their gifts*, and their names are only mentioned in a late apocryphal gospel.

The "home", or "cave"?

[2:11] and on entering the *house* they saw the child with Mary his mother. They prostrated themselves and did him homage ...

Given that Jesus was certainly born in Bethlehem because attested by two out of four Gospels (Matthew and Luke) and mentioned also in the Gospel of John [7:42] (which should be sufficient for

all Christians), has never come to us any Christian tradition claiming two different places where he could have been born. The tradition is unanimous, we must keep this in mind and take note.

Jesus was born in the Grotto of the Nativity currently known.

This verse 2:11 mention a *home*.

The caves have always been safe shelters, gave protection from heat and cold, and also those under the present Basilica of the Annunciation in Nazareth, which is believed to have been homes of the people of Nazareth, are caves.

The text of Msgr. Dominic Bartolini, *Sull'antico tempio di Salomone in Gerusalemme e sull'antica Grotta del Presepio di N.S. Gesù Cristo in Betlemme*, (on the ancient temple of Solomon in Jerusalem and the ancient Cave of the Nativity of Our Lady Jesus Christ in Bethlehem), published in 1868 which recounts his journey to the Holy Land and where he speaks of these caves named *Kan*, quotes on page. 62:

"The Kan of Palestine are nothing more than shelter places for travelers ...

... In those they are intended to stretch out the mats and couches to rest, and there are also the cribs for feeding the animals. Because of that the Kan are reputed in those regions as houses of refuge to avoid the heat, the cold, the rain, and the freeze nights. Still they have an agreeable temperature both in summer as in winter, which are the two seasons more pronounced in those places, and therefore a delicious fresh prevails when outside the air is burning, and when the cold is quite much within there reigns a constant warmth. "

Also from the Gospel of Luke is understandable that the climate of the cave was pretty good.

The Gospel of Luke tells of the Virgin Mother:

[Luke 2:7] ... She wrapped him in swaddling clothes *and laid him in a manger,*

Which mother gives birth in such extreme hardship conditions in a cold place *and lays the child?*

Which mother in those circumstances would not hold tight to her breast her newborn son to give him the maximum possible heat with her body?

And such of a Mother?

However, if the thought of the newborn baby Jesus suffering the cold moves our hearts to his sufferings so be it also.

Matthew 2: 13-18
*Massacre of the Innocents,
fulfillment of the Scripture.*

index

When the Three Kings did leave Bethlehem secretly without passing from Jerusalem, the spies of Herod inform him immediately, the king feels mocked and order *the slaughter of the innocents*.

We have always imagined a horde of bloodthirsty soldiers of Herod who enters Bethlehem and indiscriminately kills all children aged two years and under, but probably this massacre was targeted and limited.

King Herod and his officers certainly possessed census data made two years before by the Empire, in which case they knew where to go to look for these children.

Arriving at night, in secret, *success* would have been more likely and also *more discreet, less noisy* in every sense.

[2:18] "A voice was heard in Ramah, sobbing and loud lamentation; Rachel weeping for her children, and she would not be consoled, since they were no more."

This is Matthew's quote of Jeremiah 31:

[Jeremiah 31:15] Thus says the LORD: In Ramah is heard the sound of moaning, of bitter weeping! Rachel mourns her children, she refuses to be consoled because her children are no more.

The text of Jeremiah also relies on Genesis 35:

[Genesis 35:19] Thus Rachel died; and she was buried on the road to Ephrath (that is, Bethlehem).

Rachel's Tomb in Bethlehem still exists nowadays and can be visited.

It is held in great reverence by Jews, Christians and Muslims, and there is a very high probability that it is the original site of the burial place of Rachel.

To be noted that Rachel died in childbirth to her second child, and his father called him Benjamin.

The words of the prophet Jeremiah seem to connect to the massacre of the innocents the site of the tomb of Rachel, with her spirit and with her cry of pain, as if she still was a living presence there.

Matthew 2: 19-23
Return of the Holy Family from Egypt.

index

[2:19] When Herod had died, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt

It is believed that Herod died a few months after the massacre of the Innocents, it follows that even the permanence of the Holy Family in Egypt was short, and this may be one reason why the author of the Gospel of Luke does not mention it.

If hypothetically between the slaughter of the innocents and the death of Herod would have passed longer time rather than the supposed few months, then the year of birth of Jesus should be further backdated before the 6 BC.

The Holy Family settled in Nazareth.

Because this city it's never mentioned in any document of the time it do not in itself proof of its non-existence as some believe, although it can be taken for granted its lack of influence on both a strategic plan that cultural and social.

It had to be a village totally insignificant in every respect, from which the famous phrase of Nathanael to Philip in the Gospel of John, chapter one.

Matthew 3: 1-12
*John the Baptist Preaching,
the Gospel written on “real-time”?*

index

[3: 1] In *those days* John the Baptist appeared, preaching in the desert of Judea

The previous chapter ended with the Holy Family that settled in Nazareth on their return from Egypt. This first verse of the third chapter should be the natural continuation, but speaks of the preaching of John the Baptist, and since Jesus and John the Baptist were peers it's missing about thirty years of history, or perhaps some other story. It's therefore difficult to understand which ones are *those days* the Author is speaking about.

The gospel written in "real time"?

Some parts of the canonical Gospels, were may be written in "*real time*", while those events occurred?

Because if that be so some theories suggested by someone on the lateness of the texts would crumble miserably.

.- “ouv”, oun, therefore -

The Baptist to the Pharisees:

[Matthew 3:10] Even now the ax lies at the root of the trees.
Therefore every tree that does not bear good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire.

(from the original Greek):

“παν ουν δενδρον μη ποιουν καρπονκαλον εκκοπτεται και ειξ πυρ βαλλεται”

(pan ουν dendron me poioun karpon kalon ekkoptetai kai eis pur balletai)

literally: *every therefore tree not forming fruit good is cut off and into fire is thrown.*

Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount:

[Matthew 7:19] *Every tree that does not bear good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire.*

“παν δενδρον μη ποιουν καρπονκαλον εκκοπτεται και ειξ πυρ βαλλεται”

(pan dendron me poioun karpon kalon ekkoptetai kai eis pur balletai)

literally: *every tree not forming fruit good is cut off and into fire is thrown.*

Same sentence, word by word except for the second “ουν” (oun, *therefore*) that is present in Matthew 3:10 (preaching of John the Baptist), is not present in Matthew 7:19 (Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount) and is still present in Luca 3: 9 (preaching of John the Baptist), according to the New Testament Interlinear, San Paolo.

It is not a scriptural quotation, because in this case the source would be easily traced in the Old Testament.

The same words so exactly alike as to create disconcert.

To have been uttered for the first time from the Baptist it's not a surprise, but to have been repeated by Christ in the same exact form (except *therefore*) one or maybe two years later, this is stranger.

Being then reported word by word (including the *therefore*) years later by Luke, a witness not present to the facts, and that we know having collected his documentation about twenty to thirty years since the course of events, it is even more *inexplicable*.

The presence of this simple conjunction in the text of Luke, would indicate that the Baptist's words were written immediately after being pronounced, and what Luke does is diligently copying the text as it was written by *someone* at the time of John the Baptist.

Maybe we should examine the possibility that a written text of the words of John the Baptist existed.

Someone would have recorded his words.

Someone would have shown to Jesus his *notes*, which he would have used, not because He needed those writings but to show to the unknown *scribe* **his gratitude and encouragement to keep on writing.**

Someone would eventually provided his writings to Luke the Evangelist.

Matthew 10:25
Jesus called "Beelzebub" by the Pharisees.

index

[10:25] ... If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more those of his household!

As on other occasions in the Gospel of John, also in this Gospel of Matthew is cited an episode that actually has not been told by the Author (according to the existing wording of the Gospel of Matthew).

The circumstance in which Jesus is called Beelzebub, and in whose name, according to the Pharisees, he did make healings on possessed are referred in Chapter 12.

It follows that the Gospel of Matthew also, is not a precise orderly and consequential exposure of facts, but probably follows a logical order to the importance of the facts, without going into a detailed diary of what happened before and what happened after.

Matthew 11: 2-6
Message of the Baptist from prison.

index

The Baptist from prison sends *two* [Luke 7:18] of his disciples to Jesus to ask him:

[11:3] ... "Are you the one who is to come, or should we look for another?"

Can we read in these words a *doubt* of the Baptist?

Did the Baptist really had *doubts* about that Jesus of Nazareth which:

- 1) he himself had baptized,
- 2) on which he had seen the Holy Spirit coming down as prophesied to him [John 1: 32-33]
- 3) he himself had declared to be the Lamb of God [John 1:29 and 1:36],
- 4) would have taken away the sin of the world [John 1:29]
- 5) he was the one to whom he was not worthy to untie the thong of his sandals [Mark 1: 7, Matthew 3:11, John 1:27]
- 6) would baptize with the Holy Spirit [Mark 1: 8, Matthew 3:11]
- 7) for which a voice came from heaven, saying: "**You are my beloved Son; with you I am well pleased.**" [Mark 1:11, Matthew 3:17, Luke 3:22]
- 8) he himself had announced it might be revealed to Israel [John 1:31]
- 9) he himself had declared to be the Son of God [John 1:34].

No, no doubt at all, but a mere *divine formality!*

When the postman rings at our door, delivers a registered letter

and ask us to sign, is it because *he is not sure* that we are actually the recipients of the package?

Of course not! He knows us very well! That signature is needed to the sender.

It's exactly the other way around: **it is because he knows that we are the right person that he asks us to sign.**

Who was John the Baptist?

The Baptist was a messenger, if we prefer: the postman of God. The Baptist knew that from that prison would not come out alive. The Baptist knew that soon he would be in front of God, *who would have asked him on behalf of his mission.*

Like any respected *good messenger* had indeed brought the message to the children of Israel that *He who was waited for centuries* had come between them, and returned with the "*signature*" that *his message had been delivered*: the Word of Christ, his own confirmation.

He who the Baptist himself had been sent to announce had appeared.

With this *signing* his mission could really be considered closed.

In fact, Christ does not just answer *yes*, but cites the Scripture.

[11:4] Jesus said to them in reply, "Go and tell John what you hear and see:

[11:5] the *blind* regain their sight, the *lame* walk, *lepers* are cleansed, the *deaf* hear, the *dead* are raised, and the poor have the good news proclaimed to them.

[11:6] And blessed is the one who takes no offense at me."

We may find the references to Jesus's speech on Isaiah 35 and 26, and in II Kings 5.

[Isaiah 35:4] Say to those whose hearts are frightened: Be strong, fear not! *Here is your God*, he comes with vindication; With divine recompense he comes to save you.

[Isaiah 35:5] Then will the *eyes of the blind be opened*, the *ears of the deaf be cleared*;

[Isaiah 35:6] Then will the *lame leap like a stag*, then the tongue of the dumb will sing. Streams will burst forth in the desert, and rivers in the steppe.

Also:

[Isaiah 26:19] But *your dead shall live*, their *corpses shall rise*; awake and sing, you who lie in the dust ...

[Isaiah 26:21] See, *the LORD goes forth from his place* ...

In 2 Kings 5: 8, when Elisha heard that the king of Israel had torn his clothes at the request of the king of Aram to heal *leprosy* his general Naaman:

[2 Kings 5:8] When Elisha, the man of God, heard that the king of Israel had torn his garments, he sent word to the king: "Why have you torn your garments? Let him come to me and find out *that there is a prophet in Israel.*"

Also, if the Baptist had really doubted, would have Christ lead to him as example to the crowd who listened? [Matthew 11: 7-15] Would he have pointed to him as *one greater than a prophet*? Would he have confirmed that *the Scripture was talking about him*?

Would he have said he was *the higher of those born of women*?
Would he have said that he was *the Elijah who was to come*?

In our times *doubting* is part of the *conventional wisdom*, and being ourself *such a kind and nice person* we are ready to *forgive* what we believe to have been a *slip* of the Baptist.

Actually in forgiving his "doubts" *we forgive, above all, our*.

Christ himself says that if we doubted not we could even move trees and mountains.

To Peter that after walking on the water begins to sink does not the Christ say: "O you of little faith, why did you doubt?"

When asking something to God should not be left room to doubt:

[James 1:6] ... for the one who doubts is like a wave of the sea that is driven and tossed about by the wind.

[James 1:7] For that person must not suppose that he will receive anything from the Lord,

[James 1:8] since he is a man of two minds, unstable in all his ways.

The *doubt* is evil and malignant as cancer, disturbs and destroys the prayer, is an ingredient that makes the dish sour. Nothing pleases God if seasoned with *doubt*.

Faith is this: no doubt.

Lets remain with Christ affirming that in his state of Grace the man of Faith does not doubt, and even less doubted the Baptist.

Matthew 16:18
The gates of hell shall not prevail.

index

[16:18] And so I say to you, you are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of the netherworld *shall not prevail* against it.

The theological significance that has always been attributed to these words of Christ is that the power of hell, here represented by the *gates*, will never have a chance to defeat the Church. The Church is on the defensive against the forces of hell, which, however, despite the deployment of all their strength and their power can not prevail.

This reading is certainly positive, but the Church still remains on a defensive posture.

Wanting to give a literal meaning to the word "*gates*" we may wonder how they can take an aggressive stance.

The gate of a city, a fortress, a palace can assume some significance in order of the *resistance against the enemy*, but not *being aggressive* towards him.

How can a gate *prevail* if not only *managing to resist*?

Christ's words in Matthew 16:18 views from this angle, would take on a much more aggressive meaning, more fierce, and it is:

Despite the great power and strength of hell *his gates will not prevail*, that is will not be able to resist the aggression of the Church, which destroyed these gates of the evil empire will break in it like a flood, destroying it completely along with all his works.

Under this light the Church assumes a position of attack, not defense.

Without wanting to apply this reading to the whole world (although desirable) can certainly be applied to the single heart of a sinful man, because if he allows the power of God's Grace in the Church of attacking his sin that will be destroyed, *no matter how powerfull that can be.*

The gates of the heart that holds man's sin, and from which flows all forms of evil *will not prevail, that will be smashed, destroyed* and the power of God's Grace will break into it and make the man free.

Matthew 26:18
The disciples preparing the Passover.

index

[26:18] He said, "Go into the city to a certain man and tell him, 'The teacher says, "My appointed time draws near; in your house I shall celebrate the Passover with my disciples.'""

About this man owner of the house where it took place the Last Supper we know nothing.

In Mark's Gospel, the disciples sent for this find him by following a young man with a pitcher of water, and this makes us think that this man had been chosen by the case, it seems almost a *mystical encounter*.

In this verse of Matthew on the other hand we have the evidence to the contrary: Jesus knew this man very well because he sends his disciples to him to say: "**My time is at hand** " [KJV].

This sentence has only one meaning; **my death is near**.

Jesus could give such a message only to someone in which he had the utmost confidence and of which he knew the complete loyalty. Since the disciples did not know who this man was this means that Jesus had secret meetings with this man (perhaps John 3?), and that he had explained to him many details of his mission.

Someone argue that this was the father of Mark the Evangelist, but it can also be assumed that this was the home of Nicodemus, the eminent member of the Sanhedrin.

It's useful to remember that up to nowadays in the same building is located on the ground floor the Tomb of David, and this makes it probable that it belonged to a priest.

Nicodemus and the father of Mark may be the same person.

Matthew 26:17
*The disciples ask to Jesus
where to prepare for Passover.*

index

[26:17] On the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the disciples approached Jesus and said, "Where do you want us to prepare for you to eat the Passover?"

[26:18] He said, "Go into the city to a certain man and tell him, 'The teacher says, "My appointed time draws near; in your house I shall celebrate the Passover with my disciples.'""

[26:19] The disciples then did as Jesus had ordered, and prepared the Passover.

[26:20] When it was *evening*, he reclined at table with the Twelve.

In this Gospel of Matthew, unlike that of Mark, there is no direct mention of the "*sacrifice of the Passover*".

Verse 26:20 shows the term *evening*, which as explained in Mark 14:12 should be understood as "*late afternoon*", and is the amount of time ranging from about 4,00 P.M. to sunset.

It is in this period of time that Jesus and the Twelve sit at the table, probably just before sunset.

In this Gospel also we find a discrepancy similar to that one in the Gospel of Mark, but for another reason.

If the disciples ask where to prepare dinner and it's already *the first day of Unleavened Bread*, which is the real Passover that began with the sunset, how is it possible that carried out all the preparations (go in the city, follow the guy who carries the pitcher of water, enter the house, they ask the owner where was the room, prepare it and then...) they sit at the table in the *late afternoon* of

that day which would then still be *the day of Preparation*, that is, the day before?

Again, as in the Gospel of Mark, facing this strange display of how the facts would have taken place, the Evangelist tells us that Jesus died:

27:50 But Jesus cried out again in a loud voice, and gave up his spirit.

and that the day after the death of Jesus the High Priest go to Pilate to ask a guard for his tomb. This takes place on the day following that of Preparation, that is, on Passover itself.

[27:62] The next day, *the one following the day of preparation*, the chief priests and the Pharisees gathered before Pilate

[27:63] and said, "Sir, we remember that this impostor while still alive said, 'After three days I will be raised up.'

In this Gospel, as in that of Mark, it stood incontrovertibly that Jesus died on the day of Preparation, not on Passover.

Originally, that is, the first year after the escape from slavery in Egypt, Moses had established two different feasts: the Pesach Day (Passover) and a week of Unleavened Bread.

With the time these two feasts merged together, and at the time of Christ either to speak about Passover or Unleavened Bread was intended the same feast.

Preceded this double celebration the day of Parasceve, that is, the Preparation, the day when they sacrificed the lamb.

To be considered that in a Jewish environment the beginning of

any day since the days of Moses until nowadays, was not at midnight but at sunset.

In the week in which Jesus was crucified the day of Preparation began in correspondence with our present Thursday, at sunset, which on that time of the year is at 7,00 P.M. approximately.

By seven o'clock P.M. that Thursday began the Parasceve Day, the day of Preparation.

At 7,00 P.M. of the next day, corresponding to our Friday, began the Passover itself, during which in the evening had to be eaten the lamb sacrificed a few hours earlier in the Temple, the thresholds must have been wet with the blood of the lamb and the youngest son of the family would have asked his father: "*Why is this night different from other nights?*".

The day on which Christ was crucified was the Jewish Passover (Nisan 15) or not?

According to Matthew 26:17 yes, it was, (despite the strange statement of the facts), according to Matthew 27:62 no, it was not!

Perhaps the origin of this discrepancy is in the translation of the third Greek word of the verse of Matthew 26:17, “πρωτη” (prote).

The meaning of “πρωτη” is certain “*first*”, but it can also serve as *first of all*, that is *preceding all the others*.

In this sense Christ used it in response, in Matthew 22:38 and Mark 12:28, to the scribe who asked what was the major commandment, the greatest.

The word have also the meaning of *to precede*, and if so, then Matthew would have meant to say: the day *before* the Unleavened Bread, which is the Preparation Day.

Another possible solution to this dilemma is that, as also in Mark 14:12 we read that the first day of Unleavened Bread is the one in which the lamb is sacrificed (but in effect is the day of Parasceve), at the time of Christ also Preparation Day could be considered as integral part of the feast.

This would mean that the Preparation Day, Passover Day, and the seven days of Unleavened Bread were considered a single feast, and that feast could be called either Passover or Unleavened Bread.

It is prudent to conclude the issue with a question mark.

Matthew 26:57

Jesus brought into the house of the High Priest.

index

[26:57] Those who had arrested Jesus led him away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the elders were assembled.

Soon after Peter denies Jesus three times and the cock crows.

They were roughly between 2,00 and 3,00 a.m. as this is the time when the cock crows for the first time.

The Sanhedrin had gathered in the house of the High Priest for a prior examination of the accused.

The rush to have him killed immediately was huge. Once captured there was the big risk that if he would not have been killed immediately but kept in prison by Pilate, his disciples could organize a revolt during the eight days feast, which would have had disastrous implications.

Actually, the sentence had already been decided way before his arrest, but as the authorities of the Sanhedrin could not execute anyone they would have needed some evidence to be brought before Pilate.

This is why the Sanhedrin, on that very special and particular occasion, had gathered behind closed doors (or almost) in the house of the high priest before Jesus was arrested.

The verdict, already decided, was unanimous and Jesus was sentenced to death.

For the sentence of the Sanhedrin could be applied the sentence of

the Roman authority was needed, and this is why by dawn [John 18:28] (ie around five in the morning, for this is when the dawn breaks in Jerusalem in that part of year), was brought to Pilate.

Matthew 27:62
*In the middle of celebration of Passover
the High Priests go to Pilate.*

index

[27:62] The next day, the one following the day of preparation, the chief priests and the Pharisees gathered before Pilate

In this verse there are some problems.

The first is that we wonder why the High Priests, certainly not naive, would leave all night between Friday and Saturday the body of Jesus in the tomb without overseers, and doing so leaving all the needed time to the disciples to steal the body and supporting the successful resurrection. The Pharisees indeed feared this possibility more than the same lively preaching of Christ [Matthew 27:64 "... This last imposture would be worse than the first."]

They feared a dead Christ more than alive.

As explained in John 19:31, to this question we already have the answer directly expressed by the Apostle Paul, that haranguing the people says that were *the inhabitants of Jerusalem and their leaders that*:

[Atti 13:29] and when they had accomplished all that was written about him, *they took him down from the tree and placed him in a tomb.*

In agreement with these words of the Apostle were the inhabitants and rulers of the people *that took him down from the tree and laid him in the tomb.*

This words suggest a continuous control by the Pharisees, from the time of death until burial of Christ, it being understood that the deposition from the cross and the burial occurred materially by Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea [John 19: 38-42].

Easily to presume, therefore, that despite the official request was made to Pilate the next day, guards and men of the Temple had already begun, immediately and discreetly, to guard the body of Christ.

The second problem of this verse of Matthew 27:62 is the following:

since the day after the death of Christ was Passover some argue that the High Priests and the Pharisees would never go to Pilate, for fear of being contaminated on the day of Passover.

The feast of Passover itself began at sunset the previous day, then the High Priests, the Pharisees and the people had already celebrated the feast the night before.

The dreaded (*alleged*) contamination could not have retroactive effect, so having been the Passover already celebrated *piously, to get dirty* going to Pilate was not such a big deal.

On second stance, even assuming that the Pharisees who would go to Pilate before the feast they could always enjoy the benefits of the Passover the following month, during the Pesach Sheni.

Pesach Sheni means *Second Passover*, and it was a kind of *Passover Reserve* that was celebrated exactly a month after the official one.

It was a real Passover all the way, because it was instituted by Moses himself.

The problem was this: it often happened that for various reasons,

especially the shepherds but also ordinary people who had to do with the dead, was away from home on Passover day, or in conditions of contamination (just the case of those who had a dead man in the house).

These raised the issue to Moses saying: why we were not been able to enjoy the benefits of the Passover?

Moses, feeling a legitimate observation, stated that exactly the same day of the following month would be celebrated the Pesach Sheni, and therefore these problems would be obviated.

The Pharisees really had a great fear that Jesus and his disciples could push the Roman authorities in the destruction of the entire nation, the stakes were huge.

From this point of view *to be contaminated* at Passover, and even more when feast was already been celebrated, could not be considered a major problem, and that is why the Pharisees go to Pilate on this day.

Some ask themselves the question of how it is possible that the Pharisees are reminded of the threat of the resurrection of Jesus only after he had been crucified:

[27:63] ... "Sir, we remember that this impostor while still alive said, 'After three days I will be raised up.'

To ask ourself this question means not take into account the emotional aspects of all the characters of the story. The fact that the Pharisees tell to Pilate "... *Sir, we remember...*", does not mean that in that very moment they were reminded of the problem, but that it was exactly then the right time to ask Pilate this extra *effort*.

Pilate, all the time of Jesus' trial, when he was forced by the High Priests to condemn an innocent man, and until his death, had

reached the limit of his (little) patience, and provoke him further with such a request could jeopardize the most important phase, that is, his decision to crucify him.

Also when Jesus had been crucified Pilate answer to the Pharisees who asked him to change the words on the accusation hanging on the cross reveals the nervousness of the Roman procurator.

The Pharisees, cautiously, decided to wait for the right time.

One step at a time.

Matthew 28: 2

The earthquake, the Angel, the stone removed.

index

[28:2] And behold, there was a great earthquake; for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, approached, rolled back the stone, and sat upon it.

This seems to be a *second earthquake* that occurred after the time of Jesus' death, and that Matthew has already reported in chapter 27, although without using the word "*earthquake*":

[27:51] And behold, the veil of the sanctuary was torn in two from top to bottom. The earth quaked, rocks were split,

In the Gospel of Mark:

[Mark 15:38] 38 The veil of the sanctuary was torn in two from top to bottom.

This also suggests (*but only suggests*) a seismic event.

Also in Luke:

[Luca 23:45] ... Then the veil of the temple was torn down the middle.

This for what concerns the first earthquake, but on this *second earthquake* quoted by Matthew no other evangelist mention it.

The Greek word used in this verse of Matthew 28: 2 is “σεισμος” (seismos), which appears in the New Testament eight times, of which only two in the Gospels.

Matthew 28:2

[Matthew 28:2] And behold, there was a great *earthquake*...

Matthew 8:24

[Matthew 8:24] Suddenly a violent *storm* came up on the sea ...

Here the Greek word *seismos* is translated as "*storm*".

Given the very deeply different sense of the translation (*earthquake, storm*), it seems like that the Greek word *seismos* was used by the Greek editor as a translation of an hebrew word that can mean both. *This presupposes a primitive Hebrew text, which could be the same as mentioned in old times by Papias of Hierapolis.*

(רצש, *rosh*) means big noise, loud crash and is well suited to the description of a storm, but in the Old Testament is often translated with *earthquake*.

If this was the Hebrew word used in the *alleged* primitive drafting of Matthew, then verse 28: 2 would not indicate a *real earthquake* but rather a loud noise, like in the silence of the night probably seemed to be to the soldiers on guard when the Angel rolled away the stone from the tomb.

Matthew 28: 3-4

The appearance of the Angel, the guards terrified.

index

[28:3] His appearance was like lightning and his clothing was white as snow.

[28:4] The guards were shaken with fear of him and became like dead men.

It isn't sure that the women have attended the scene of the removal of the stone from the tomb, but the guards were definitely present.

The Greek text of the verse 28: 4 says that they:

“εγενηθησαν ωξ νεκροι” (egenonto hosei nekroi, *became as dead*).

There is a physical condition that is known in medicine and called cataplexy.

Cataplexy indicates that state in which someone can come to be in as a consequence of a situation of terror or strong shock.

It is a condition in which *the muscles are actually stuck*, because the brain is temporarily paralyzed and can not transmit those impulses necessary to the movement.

This situation can last several minutes.

The precise description of that condition in the guards would then be very accurate, and can only come from an eyewitness, probably one of the guards themselves.

Staying on topic, however, it should raise a doubt about the actual need *to open* the tomb. The stone was removed from the grave to give way to the Risen Christ to come out?

The evening of that same day, Christ appears to the disciples “*when the doors were locked ... [John 20:19]*, therefore in his state of Glory he was not prevented by doors nor walls, and this means that he could exit the tomb *without removing the stone*.

But the stone was removed, it is a fact. Why?

If the aforementioned assumption of the Bishop of Molfetta Don Tonino Bello is divinely inspired then we can say that the stone was not removed to let out the Glorious Body of Christ, ***but to let the Virgin Mother in, just moments before of the Resurrection***, which, unique in the world, was confidently waiting the fulfillment of the words of the Son.

Matthew 28: 5
The angel spoke to the women.

index

[28:5] Then the angel said to the women in reply, "Do not be afraid! I know that you are seeking Jesus the crucified.

According to the original Greek text this verse begins with the word “αποκριθειξ” (apokritheis, *answering*).

The Angel *answers* to the women but the absence of any kind of demand from them suggests *a gap in the story of the author*, between the time when the guards are left like death and the moment when the Angel speaks to the women.

It is not even certain that the Angel who opens the tomb and this speaking to the women is the same.

This would explain why in the other three Gospels the women come to the tomb and find the stone already removed. They would not have attended the event even in this Gospel of Matthew.

When the women reach the tomb the stone has already been removed, Christ is already out of it and the guards already fled, and only after all that the Angel (or *an* Angel) on their demand answers the words quoted in the Gospel: “... Do not be afraid! I know that you are seeking Jesus the crucified.”

Many in the Gospels the circumstances in which the word “αποκριθειξ” (*answering*) is used only *in response* to specific questions.

Matthew 28: 7

The Angel tells the women that Jesus would have appeared to the disciples in Galilee.

index

[28:7] Then go quickly and tell his disciples, 'He has been raised from the dead, and he is going before you to Galilee; there you will see him.' Behold, I have told you."

We may wonder why the Angel says that Christ would have appeared to the disciples in Galilee but appears to them in Jerusalem that evening?

This fact demonstrates exactly that the Risen and Glorious Christ respects the will of man also from his position of King of Heaven and Earth (and in certain situations we might add... *unfortunately!*).

Having not Christ a great desire to remain in the cruel and ungrateful city of Jerusalem should be made visible to all, so under that point of view to see his apostles and disciples in a friendly country (Galilee, infact) can not leave us amazed, but what happens?

It happens that the disciples did not believe the women, it happens that the disciples did not believe the two confreres from Emmaus, it happens that the disciples ... did not believe.

Not believing how could they have gone to Galilee to meet him?

To reject the message of the Resurrection *has forced* the Christ, already risen and already in his state of Divine Glory to change his plans, and to appear to them in the place where he had been betrayed, mocked, scourged and crucified.

This shows very well, in fact, the destructive power of the lack of faith.

Here is a confirmation that the Divine Desire clashes and has to deal with the human will, and that is the meaning of the words:

“your will be done, on earth as in heaven.”

Earth which, *unfortunately*, it is under the power and enslaved by the human will.

*If you think
that this text
was interesting
you may please
send it
to a friend.*

Thank you.



[Donation](#)



Gospel of Luke

Luke 1

*Annunciation to Zechariah,
Birth of John.*

index

The Gospel of Luke begins his account by describing an important ceremony which was officiated by the priest Zacharias in the Temple of Jerusalem.

It is not specified which this feast was, but some aspects of it seems to indicate a specific one.

The first is that *all the people* were waiting and praying outside the Temple:

[1:10] Then, when *the whole* assembly of the people was praying outside at the hour of the incense offering,

Here it is used the Greek word “παν” (pan), giving to the word the meaning of *the whole assembly*: the entire population of Jerusalem:

“και παν το πληθοξ”, (literally: and *all* the people).

The second is that this function lasted for a few days:

[1:23] Then, when *his days of ministry were completed*, he went home.

The third is that during this function Zechariah *did not live in his house*:

[1:23] Then, when his days of ministry were completed, *he went home.*

The fourth aspect is the answer that the Angel gives to Zechariah:

[1:13] But the angel said to him, "Do not be afraid, Zechariah, because your prayer has been heard ...

Since the Angel announces to Zechariah that he would have had a son it would be logical to assume that this was the answer to his prayer, but on that announcement Zechariah is astonished and in disbelief, and responds:

[1:18] Then Zechariah said to the angel, "How shall I know this? For I am an old man, and my wife is advanced in years."

This seems to rule out that his prayer concern was the request of a child, it would also be incomprehensible why a Priest in the Temple of Jerusalem, while officiating an important religious function, could make such a personal request.

Even wanting to think that the Angel brings to Zechariah such announcement in answer to an ancient prayer of him we may wonder why he was sent just in that particular occasion.

And so, what is this prayer of Zechariah to which the Angel brings such a response?

Before answering this question it is necessary to connect the three above mentioned aspects to a specific Jewish feast: the Yom Kippur.

The Yom Kippur is the most important of all Jewish feasts.

On this day the people asked God to forgive their sins committed during the previous year.

Maybe this will give us a little smile, but outside the Temple was hung a cloth of red cloth, that if God had accepted the request of the people made by their priest in the Temple would become white. This by virtue of Scripture:

[Isaiah 1:18] ... says the LORD: Though your sins be like scarlet, they may become white as snow; Though they be crimson red, they may become white as wool.

This is the reason why all the people (but literally *everyone* - παν pan -) was awaiting the divine's response (first aspect).

The feast of Yom Kippur lasts eight days, and the most important day is the last one.

This fits well to the second aspect (the service that lasted for a few days).

The priest who was to officiate at the service for the duration of the festival was *taken* from his home with great honors, and transferred to a special place of the Temple, where he remained until the completion of his service.

Here we have the third aspect (the return of the priest at his home at the end of his service).

The main prayer that the priest turned to the Most High that day has already been mentioned: *he was asking that the sins of the people may be forgiven.*

This is the prayer that Zechariah speaks to God and from which, that year, get immediate response from the Angel.

God would have forgivn the sins of man, not by a repeated yearly sacrifice, but through “The Sacrifice”, in which his own blood would be shed as the price for all sins.

For this reason He would have sent to the people of Israel a son to Zacharias, that:

[1:15] ... will be great in the sight of (the) Lord. He will drink neither wine nor strong drink. He will be filled with the holy Spirit even from his mother's womb,

[1:16] and he will turn many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God.

[1:17] He will go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah to turn the hearts of fathers toward children and the disobedient to the understanding of the righteous, to prepare a people fit for the Lord."

To the specific aspects mentioned above we may add a fifth, that is *the time of incense* and that all the people were praying outside the Temple.

Precisely because the specification that *all the people were praying outside the Temple* is not likely that could be the ordinary burning of the incense that was made daily, morning and evening.

[1:10] Then, when the whole assembly of the people was praying outside *at the hour of the incense offering*,

The well-known Jewish exponent Rabbi Abarbanel (or Abarbanel) lived in the fifteenth century scholar of Jewish customs and traditions of ancient times describes the incense offering made on the day of Yom Kippur as:

“the most difficult service in the Beis Hamikdash, because it was done differently than on all other days.”

[from the book: The Abarbanel, on the Yom Kippur service in the Beis Hamikdash, Author: R. Yitzchaq Abarbanel, Translated in english by: Rabbi Elimeleck Lepon (1990), Edited by Targum Press Inc. (USA), pag. 15 and following.]

According to him the offering of the incense was made on this day *in the Holy of Holies*, the most sacred part of the Temple where only the High Priest could enter once a year, on the day of Yom Kippur. On that day he went in and out four times in the Holy of Holies.

Curiosity: since no one, absolutely no one but the High Priest could enter for any reason in the Holy of Holies, the Jewish tradition (or perhaps *the legend*) reports the use of secure the leg of the High Priest to a rope, in case for some reason he died in that place.

Some argue that this is just a legend born in medieval times, but the same rabbi Abravanel in the quoted book says that some High Priests had lost their lives in this service, because of unworthiness (so he claims) or for committing errors in the ritual.

If it was to be established, beyond all doubt, that this was precisely the feast day of Yom Kippur the implications would be enormous, because it would mean that God, in His Holy Temple, in the holiest day of the year spoke to the children of Israel foretelling the coming of their Messiah.

Luke 1:43

The Virgin Mary meets with Elizabeth.

index

On the sixth month of Elizabeth's pregnancy she was visited by the Virgin Mary.

Elizabeth greets her with these words:

[1:43] And how does this happen to me, that the *mother of my Lord* should come to me?

In Hebrew, “*My Lord*” is: Adonai (אֲדֹנָי).

This word is also the synonym that is used by all the Israelites when reading the Scriptures find the sacred word: Yahweh (יְהוָה). Yahwèh is “Ha-shem”, “the-Name” (implied: of God), and should never be pronounced.

Conventionally, therefore, instead of reading the forbidden name, was said: Adonai.

According to this reading of the meaning of the Hebrew words then the words spoken by Elizabeth to the Virgin Mary (although she did not call her “mother of יְהוָה, but mother of אֲדֹנָי”) then become:

"Who am I that *the mother of God* should come to me?"

It's also known that still the major prayer of the Jewish people is the Shemmà, which reads:

Shemmà Israel, Adonai elohènu, Adonai ehàd.

[Deuteronomy 6:4] "Hear, O Israel! The LORD is our God, the LORD alone!

[Deuteronomy 6:4] Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD: [KJV]

In this prayer also is read (*from right to left*) Adonai where instead is written Yahweh.

שמע ישראל יהוה יהוה אלהנו יהוה אחד

From Isaiah:

[Isaiah 7:14] Therefore *the Lord* himself will give you this sign: the virgin shall be with child, and bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel.

In this case in the original Hebrew, the word translated as "*the Lord*" is אדני, (Adonai), and not Yahweh.

Calling the Virgin Mary *mother of Adonai* Elizabeth also refers to this verse?

On this issue it is prudent to postpone for further discussion.

Testimony of Zacharias.

After that the Virgin Mary visited Elizabeth and Zechariah and informed the relatives of what had happened to her, on the occasion of the circumcision of the child the father calls him John, and having regained the word says that God...:

[1:69] He has raised up a horn for our salvation *within the house of David* his servant,

speaks about Joseph, husband of Mary, who was *of the house and family of David* [Luke 2: 4].

Then, turning to his son says:

[1:76] And you, child, will be called prophet of the Most High, for you will go before the Lord to prepare his ways,

[1:77] to give his people knowledge of salvation through the forgiveness of their sins,

These words are highly important because uttered by the priest that only nine months before had officiated the religious function in the Temple of Jerusalem, and that certainly was not a visionary or a fool.

Through the Angel's words spoken to him in the Temple and *through* the words of the Virgin Mary he recognizes in his son *the Elijah who was to come*, and in the Holy Conception of the Virgin Mary the coming Messiah.

All this could not go unnoticed in the eyes (and ears) of the Pharisees, and this is why, when about thirty years later a delegation is sent from Jerusalem [John 1:19 et seq.] to ask the Baptist who he was, they knew very well that "*that John*" was the son of "*that priest*".

Again: this is what we have to keep in mind when we read the first chapter of John about the Pharisees going to ask John the Baptist: "who are you?"

They were afraid to hear the answer, they could "feel" they would not have liked the answer, but if they like it or not "that" answer was exactly what came.

December 25, the day of Jesus' birth?

The Yom Kippur feast comes about at the end of September.

If the Baptist was conceived towards the end of September (because it is in this time of the year that the feast of Yom Kippur is celebrated) is plausible that he was born on June 24, that is exactly nine months later.

The Virgin Mary visited Elizabeth in her sixth month of pregnancy, and this means that the traditional date of December 25 as the day of birth of Jesus Christ is compatible with the Gospel story.

Such calculations must however consider the big difference between the current calendar year on which is based our calendar that lasts 365 days and 6 hours, and the Jewish lunar one, in use at the time of Christ that was offset respect to our, ie shorter about ten days a year.

This is why every three or four years there was a leap year, where instead of a single day was added a whole month of thirty days, creating effectively a year of thirteen months.

The Israelites priests inserted seven of such leap years over 19 years (just one every three or four years), and with such a complicated solution was restored the normal order of things and seasons.

The Romans, however, were more updated since the time of Julius Caesar, and possessed of a calendar very similar to ours. Through the Roman calendar any Jewish date could be transmitted properly.

Luke 2: 8
The shepherds watch outdoors.

index

[2:8] Now there were shepherds in that region living in the fields and keeping the night watch over their flock.

Some scholars argue the improbability of these words, and said that being in winter very cold the shepherds could not spend the night outdoors.

This statement is only partially true.

Who had the pleasure to spend the Christmas time in Bethlehem should have noticed that the climate is relatively mild at night, and with a good sleeping bag anyone could spend the night outdoors, much more so of rough shepherds.

True also that in the same period if a Nordic perturbation descends the climate is very cold and snowfalls can come also, but these disturbances can normally last only a few days.

In the Shepherds' Field located about two/three miles from Bethlehem, where tradition says that there was the apparition of the Angel, are visible and can be visited oldest and largest caves, where by chance the shepherds took refuge along with their flock in such icy nights.

Incidentally and further curiosity, that seems to be the area where the young David, the future king of Israel, was grazing his flock of sheep.

Luke 2:11
Announcement of the Angel.

index

[2:11] For unto you is born this day *in the city of David* a Saviour, which *is Christ* the Lord. [KJV]

These words recorded by the Author of the Gospel should be already a translation in Greek from hebrew, because although the Greek language was a little known throughout the Empire, is difficult to accept the hypothesis that these pastors knew it. If they did not know the Angel could not announce the birth of their *Christos*, but more properly the *Messiah*.

In his message the Angel says that the birth had taken place *in the city of David*, and the shepherds have no doubts about what this city was, because the verse 2:15 backs their deduction:

[2:15] ... "Let us go, then, to *Bethlehem* to see this thing that has taken place, which the Lord has made known to us."

The City of David is synonymous with Bethlehem.

It was night [vs. 2: 8], Bethlehem was full of strangers, and after a search they managed to have the information they sought. A married couple with the wife in a state of advanced pregnancy had been housed in a cave that served as stables in such place, and as they had been informed by the Angel saw the Child wrapped in *swaddling clothes and lying in a manger*.

The shepherds refer to the Father and the Mother of the Child all that had happened [vs. 2:17], and they also refer such things to the small crowd that had been drawn in that place despite the late hour [vs. 2:18]. The next day everyone (including the priests of the town) were aware.

Here it is left to the logic in each of us to imagine that even in Jerusalem the event had been told.

We are a year and three months later since when the priest Zechariah had *that vision* in the Temple.

Luke 2:22
Presentation of Baby Jesus in the Temple.

index

[2:22] When the days were completed for their purification *according to the law of Moses*, they took him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord,

The *Law of Moses* to which this verse refers is the entire chapter 12 of Leviticus, and it is from this law that we are sure that the presentation of Jesus in the Temple took place exactly forty days after the birth.

We can also be assured that the Holy Family did not have sufficient economic means, as the verse 2:24 tells us that the offer of the Family to the Temple was "*a pair of turtledoves or two young pigeons*," *in accordance with the dictate in the law of the Lord.*

Precisely, the Law cites:

[Leviticus 12:8] *If, however, she cannot afford a lamb, she may take two turtledoves or two pigeons ...*

Now, since the Author does not even mention the first offering, the lamb, it is clear the reason why.

The aged Simeon.

During the presentation of Jesus in the Temple a man meets them:

[2:25] ... whose name was Simeon. This man was righteous and devout ...

Although this man was *moved by the Spirit* [vs. 2:27], he was also certainly present during the celebration when the Angel appeared to Zacharias, and was therefore aware that the priest had a son as foretold to him by the Angel (with all the implications that this entailed and he knew, *being a just man, and feared God*), and that had also come to know of that *strange event* happened in Bethlehem just a month and a half before.

Knowing the day of birth of "*that child*" therefore he also knew the exact day when he would have been brought to the Temple. This without taking anything away from the Spirit of God that led him to go to the Temple and of which we feel *the breath* in all of this.

Luke 1: 5 - 2:52
The "Source".

index

When the Author of the Gospel of Luke begins to gather information to "...write it down in an orderly sequence for you..." everything had already occurred.

If this investigation was carried out toward the years 50/60 means that the first events described in the Gospel occurred 50/60 years before the investigation itself.

Who, after 50/60 years could give such precise information not only about the birth of Jesus, but also on the circumstances that preceded the conception of John (then, the Baptist)?

The answer is suggested by the question itself.

Everything that is reported in the Gospel of Luke, from the beginning in verse 1:5 to the end of chapter 2, can only have one source: the Virgin Mother.

If after 50/60 years the Author of the Gospel of Luke collects evidence from the voice of the Virgin Mother, it is highly unlikely he would dare to alter even a single word.

The consequences, to all effects, are that the Gospel of Luke from verse 1: 5 to 2:52 it can be said, with good reason, *written* by the Virgin Mother herself, *the Gospel of Mary*, since the facts mentioned here are her direct testimony.

This is in complete agreement with the prologue of the author, who claims to have "...investigating everything accurately anew..." [vs. 1:3].

Someone has already pointed out that when the Author says that the Virgin Mother *pondered these things in her heart*, wants to gently indicate his source.

If the Virgin Mother is the Source of these stories so precise and detailed we should not be too much surprised that she felt no need to report their escape to Egypt, also because it's very likely that was not for a long time. It is also probable that the text of Matthew was already known and renowned among Christians of that time, and that made superfluous by the Virgin Mother the report it again.

The birth of Jesus in the two Gospels of Luke and Matthew.

Some scholars believe that there is a profound discrepancy between the two accounts.

Those who support this argument do not pay attention to the fact that Luke records Jesus birth itself, beginning with the Annunciation, conception, and even before that, of the Baptist.

Luke's story starts from the conception of John the Baptist until when Jesus is presented in the Temple, that is exactly to its forty-first day after birth.

From this point he *jumps* to Jesus twelve years old.

The Gospel of Matthew instead leaves out all the details of Jesus' birth, which is referred to only with the words:

[Matthew 1:25] He had no relations with her until she bore a son, and he named him Jesus.

omitting even to indicate the place, which is reported only in chapter 2 with the arrival of the Kings, when Jesus was already

two years old.

There is another aspect to support that the arrival of the Kings occurred when Jesus was already in its second year of age, and it is the words of King Herod, whom calling secretly the Kings tells them:

[Matthew 2:8] He sent them to Bethlehem and said, "Go and *search diligently* for the child. When you have found him, bring me word, that I too may go and do him homage."

Indeed, how could the king be sure the baby was still in Bethlehem two years after his birth? If this child had been taken in another place from their parents, he would have had little chance to find him despite his massive *intelligence apparatus*, because since he was not loved at all by his people no one would cooperate with him.

This is why he sends the not suspected Kings.

In his thinking if they would had found the child they would return to inform him, but if the child was no longer in Bethlehem then those Kings should "*search diligently*" to find where he was, and then apply his project.

The two stories therefore could not match, because they refer to two different periods of the life of Jesus and the Holy Family.

Gospel of Luke: from the conception of John the Baptist until the second month of the life of Jesus.

Gospel of Matthew: from the arrival of the Kings on, with Jesus already in his second year of life.

Luke 2: 41-52
Jesus lost in Jerusalem.

index

[2:41] Each year his parents went to Jerusalem for the feast of Passover,

[2:42] and when he was twelve years old, they went up according to festival custom.

In these words some details are clear, while others do not seem certain.

Surely the parents of Jesus went up to Jerusalem in previous years, this implies that they were already returned to live in Nazareth for at least a few years, that from the Gospel of Matthew we know it happened on their return from Egypt.

The second particular certain is that when Jesus was twelve years old he was brought by his parents to Jerusalem. Is reasonable to assume, however, that even in the years before the infant Jesus was brought with them, and that the particular expression of the Author of the Gospel meant not so much that this was the first time that Jesus was led into the Holy City, but that was in that circumstance, Jesus twelve, in which occurred on certain episode later recounted.

In both cases this is also an information referred by the Virgin Mother, and this means that, like every other good mother, *she kept count* of how old her child was.

If she knew how old Jesus was at the time of this fact it is just as likely she did remember, like any good mother, the exact day of his birth.

She remembered the day of birth *according to the Jewish calendar*, and even considering the difficulties of calculation

already mentioned, the traditional date of December 25, it seems increasingly likely.

Brothers and sisters of Jesus?

This story also revealed the absence of any reference to improbable brothers and/or sisters of Jesus.

At twelve, Jesus was the only child.

This particular is in stark contrast with the assumptions, more or less logical, that Jesus had ever had brothers or sisters according to the classical sense that we give to these words.

Pharisees and teachers of the Law amazed by the boy Jesus.

We can assume that the custom of the parents to travel to Jerusalem for the feast of Passover was not being interrupted, and from this it follows that they had been returned in the following years.

If so then it would be just as logical consequence accept the probability that in those years the Holy Family had visited those "*teachers*" [v. 2:46] that "*were astounded at his understanding and his answers*" [v. 2:47].

It's less than twenty years before his open manifestation to Israel, and about who some of these "*doctors*" were should be an intuitive deduction.

Luke 3

Beginning of the preaching of John the Baptist.

index

The Gospel of Luke, as that of Matthew, jumps from the birth of Jesus to the preaching of John the Baptist, leaving thirty years of history (except for brief as important parenthesis of the loss of Jesus' twelve).

The beginning of the preaching of John the Baptist has a very *precise date*:

[3:1] In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, when Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea, and Herod was tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of the region of Ituraea and Trachonitis, and Lysanias was tetrarch of Abilene,

[3:2] during the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas...

Seven names are mentioned; the emperor, the governor, three tetrarchs and two High Priests. In theory it should be relatively easy to find out what year it was.

Unfortunately, as this information is accurate, reliable documents to find the beginning and end of the three tetrarchs not easy, nor is it easy to determine in what year the high priests Annas and Caiaphas were in office.

Here should be noted that there was only *one High Priest* in Israel and that his function was not to expire each year.

However since the two characters mentioned were in close degree of kinship, and considering that one replaced the other in this position we may accept the definition of (two) *High Priests*, as well as today, in 2014, in a sense we may consider that there are two Popes.

Since the whole Gospel was originally intended for that Theophilus [vs. 1: 3], at that time probably everyone, or at least the elderly Israelites, knew to what time this informations were referred (and this argues in favor of the reliability of the Author), but time passing by these data became uncertain.

Luke 12: 58-59
The "Prison".

index

[12:58] When thou goest with thine *adversary* to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou mayest *be delivered from him* ; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison.

[12:59] I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last mite.” [KJV].

The word translated as *adversary* in Greek is αντιδικου, (antidikou).

We read in the First Letter of Peter 5: 8

[1 Peter 5:8] Be sober, be vigilant; because *your adversary the devil*, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour” [KJV].

The Greek word here translated as *your adversary* is “αντιδικοξ” (antidikos).

The *adversary* to which it refers to Christ in Luke 12:58 is Satan, and His suggestion is to do everything possible, and as soon as possible, to get rid of all charges that he would bring against us before God.

He has the power to drag the man before the Divine Tribunal, and through his sins not forgiven through confession, have him imprisoned until he has paid all his debt.

It is a clear description of what Catholic theology defines Purgatory.

It would be smart to give due attention to these words.

Luke 20: 1-19

The provocation of the Pharisees turns back against them.

index

During his stay in Jerusalem, when Jesus was teaching every day in the Temple, the Pharisees approach him and ask him with what authority he was doing those things.

Christ's response is intended to demonstrate that, in fact, they knew perfectly well what authority, that is, with the authority of whom, he was doing such things, and he asks them a question from which the answer they should have to admit that He came from heaven.

The cycle is closing.

The Baptist came as announced by the scriptures and announced to their High Priest in the Temple, during the service of Yom Kippur.

The Baptist had warned them, but they did not accept his preaching.

After him came the Messiah with miracles, but not even to Him had they believed, was to fulfill what was written.

They knew it was him but did not want to admit it.

Not even they admit that the Baptist came from Heaven, because if they did then, like the pieces of a domino falling on each other, they would also have been forced to admit the divine origin of Christ.

That is the object of the question of Jesus about the Baptist and the subsequent parable about the wicked tenants.

[20:19] The scribes and chief priests sought to lay their hands on him at that very hour, but they feared the people, *for they knew that he had addressed this parable to them.*

Luke 22: 7, 23:54
*Day of Unleavened Bread
and immolation of the Passover's lamb.*

index

[22:7] When the day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread arrived, the day for sacrificing the Passover lamb,

In this Gospel also, as that of Matthew, *the day of Unleavened Bread and the immolation of the lamb* is considered as the same day, and the Last Supper is celebrated that evening, but soon after the death of Christ, when he is deposed from the cross we read:

[23:54] *It was the day of preparation, and the sabbath was about to begin.*

In this Gospel of Luke, like that of Matthew and Mark, we note this strong disagreement.

Reading from verse 22: 7 on it would seem that the Last Supper was celebrated coinciding with the feast of Passover, but the verse 23:54, on the death of Christ occurred, the Author affirms that it was still the day of Preparation, that is the one that precedes Passover itself, and in which the lamb is killed around three o'clock p.m.

It should have been about six p.m., and Passover would begin about an hour later, at sunset.

Already in the study of the Gospel of Matthew it was suggested that perhaps the day of Preparation was considered at the time of Christ part of the feast of the Passover / Unleavened Bread, but this is only a theory, based on deduction, because there are not ancient texts confirming or invalidating this supposition.

If this were established the discrepancy would be resolved.

In none of the four Gospels it is questioned whether the death of Jesus took place in the afternoon of Friday, and even there is no doubt that his resurrection took place on Sunday.

What is not clear is whether the evening of the Last Supper was coinciding with the beginning of the day of Passover (Pesach, 15th of Nisan), or whether it was the evening of the day of Preparation (Preparation Day, the 14th of Nisan) ie twenty-four hours before.

The Jewish Pesach does not necessarily needs to fall on a fixed day of the week as the Christian Easter, but it is celebrated on the 15th of the month of Nisan, and it can be on any day. In the year of Christ's death was coinciding with the feast of Sabbath, and the Gospel of John says: "...for the sabbath day of that week was a solemn one..." [John 19:31], right because it was a double celebration.

Luke 23: 7-11
Jesus brought to Herod.

index

The Gospels of John, Matthew and Mark do not talk about the fact that Jesus was led by Herod. This story is told by Luke and is certainly occurred in that morning.

Where were these two places, the Praetorian and the residence of Herod?

Logically the Praetorian had to be in the tower Antonia, and the residence of Herod in his palace, but some scholars argue that when Pilate went to Jerusalem from his habitual residence in Caesarea Philippi resided not in the Tower Antonia but in Herod's palace.

Since both Pilate that Herod were in Jerusalem in those days seems like that Herod resided in the Palace of the Hasmoneans, whose location has not yet been definitively established.

This palace of the Hasmoneans should have been about halfway between the Antonia Fortress and the Palace of Herod, therefore in any of these three buildings may have housed Pilate and Herod the maximum distance between them was about half a mile, a relatively short distance to be traveled within some minutes.

Luke 24:32

The heart was burning in chest.

index

[24:32] Then they said to each other, "*Were not our hearts burning (within us) while he spoke to us on the way and opened the scriptures to us?*"

[24:32] And they said one to another, *Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures?* [KJV].

Keeping well in mind that this collection of information by the Author should have taken place around the years 50/60, this particular about the "*heart burn within us*" can only be an eyewitness.

To report to the Author of the Gospel of Luke about the encounter of Jesus with these two disciples was probably one of the two (which in fact is named [Cleopas, Luke 24:18], particular omitted in Mark [16: 12-13]), as if it came from some other person in twenty or thirty years from the fact they would have hardly mentioned *the heart which was burning in the chest*.

Nor is it too hard to imagine that such *ardor* was of the same type that all the disciples felt when Jesus spoke to them while teaching the Scriptures or as he taught his doctrines, in fact it is also through this ardor that the disciples realize that to accompany them along the way it was the Rabbi.

[Psalm 39:3] My heart was hot within me, while I was musing the fire burned..." [KJV].

*If you think
that this text
was interesting
you may please
send it
to a friend.*

Thank you.



[Donation](#)

