

Jesus was not a Jew By Dr W.G. Finlay (Article copied by S M Dimond for a document written by Dr W.G. Finlay)

Protestant evangelical circles hold the Lord Jesus Christ up to be a Jew while the Roman Catholic Church suggests that the Madonna and Child were of the black or coloured race. The World Council of Churches hold him to be a universal man – totally race less and wholly committed to the idea of the brotherhood of man. In Jewish circles he is held to be an imposter and according to the Jewish Encyclopaedia it is thought that He was an illegitimate son of Panthera a Roman Soldier.

In South Africa the July edition of the observer was banned as the Editor contended that Jesus was not a Jew.

Who was Jesus of Nazareth?

Peter said “The Christ, the Son of The Living God”. Christ said “Blessed art thou Simon Barjonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter and upon this rock will I build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it (Matt 16:17-18). In one breath the Lord calls him Simon Bar-jonah and the next Peter. In John 1:42 when Simon Barjonah was called to follow the Lord Jesus, he nick named him Cephas, or more correctly Petros which means stone. In Isaiah 51:1 Abraham is referred to as the rock from which the Israel family was hewn and Peter because he was a chip of that rock was renamed as Petros, a stone chipped of that rock. Here was one of the Covenant family which acknowledged that He Jesus was The Anointed One as God the Father had promised through his servants the prophets, who would redeem Israel, make an end of sin and bring in everlasting righteousness (Dan 9:24). It was on this confession that the Lord stated that He would build or confirm His Church. The Greek word from which Church is translated is ecclesia which means ‘a called out assembly’ which in the days when it was used was an exclusive term precluding slaves and aliens and this word was used as it was understood by the disciples as having an exclusive national sense.

The Family Line

There are two accounts which purport to be the genealogy of the Lord Jesus Christ but in point of fact deal with two branches of the same family i.e. the sons of David, Solomon and Nathan.

The first account is recorder in Matthew which shows the decent of Joseph, Mary’s husband after the birth of the Lord, from David via Solomon by Bathsheba (2 Sam 12:24). As it was a divine birth one wonders why this genealogy of Joseph is given and why it was prefaced by “The Book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David etc. One can only think that Matthew who was probably a Levite (Mark 2:14) was very conscious of the legal implications as they dominate the thinking of the true Israelites who had been converted to Pharisaism (Matt23:15). Joseph being a pure Israelite (the genealogy proves the point) and unimpeded by Pharisaic delusions could understand and accept immediately the fulfilment of Israelitish prophecies made some 5 & 7 centuries earlier. Matthews account therefore apart from overcoming the legal heirdee(?) presented the Advent in a national context which is precisely what the Lord himself insisted (Matt15:24 and what he stated to Peter (Matt 16:18).

The second genealogy is in Luke 3:23-38 and is the line of Mary the human vehicle through which the word was made flesh (John1:14). The account in Luke's Gospel does more than merely identify the Davidic ancestry of Mary it amplifies the quotation made by the angels of the Lord to Joseph when he said that He, Jesus would save his people from their sins (Matt1:21). If Marys genealogy is followed through from Heli it will be noted that it passes through the Davidic house, through Abraham, through Shem, through Noah and back to Enos the son of Seth who was the son of The Adam. The Greek reads "which was of the Enos, which was of the Seth, which was of The Adam which was of The God". (If the Adam is not stated confusion arises as to which Adam is meant, that in Gen 1:26 or Gen 2:7?)

There is no evidence to suggest that the Adam in Gen 1:26 (man) was given any law where as the Adam (the man) in Gen 2:7 was certainly given the law as was symbolised in the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Having transgressed the Law of the Lord, an act which gave rise to the expression sin (1 John:34) The Family line is thus clear and unmistakable and cannot be equated with the contention of Universal Man.

He shall be called a Nazarene

In Matthew 2:23 it will be noted that Joseph having sought safety in Egypt now decided to return home. And came and dwelt in a city of Nazareth to fulfil prophecy. He shall be called a Nazarene. This statement positively dissociated Jesus of Nazareth from the Jews. The word Nazareth arose as follows. 1) This name does not appear in the Old Testament which brings a query to mind. If there was no such place how could the prophets write about it? The Hebrew root which developed into Nazareth was Netzer which means a branch and this word is found in the Old Testament and is associated with the situation which arose out of Israel's transgression of Gods Holy Law. The twelve tribes, Israel kingdom was divided into two sections (1King 12:16-20). Through the invasion of Assyrians and immigration of foreigners only a small number of Israelites would be left in the Northern Kingdom (Isa 17:4-6). This small number the fruitful branches were written off as parah Netzer. Parah meaning dropped and Netzer being branches gradually became Nazareth.

In John1:11 it is stated that he came unto his own and his own received him not. In Matt 13:54 'His Own' is qualified as the people of Nazareth 'And when he was come into his own country he taught them in their synagogue.....And they were offended in him. Jesus said 'A prophet is not without honour save in his country and in his own house.'

Judaea and its inhabitants

Judah was the name of the tribe of which Christ was born into.

Judaea was a territorial name and not a racial or tribal one and when it is considered that the English word "Jew" is derived from the historical Judaea it will be seen that a geographical and not a racial term has been perpetuated. The northern boundary of Judaea certainly did not take in Galilee nor did it cover the people living there – the difference being so great that even the dialect spoken in the north differed from the Judaeans (Matt26:69-73)

Inscription on the cross

Many say Christ is a Jew as the cross inscription is said to state 'Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews'. But he states that the Jews were not of God (John 8:47) that they were not his sheep (John 10:26)

The cross inscription was changed 3 times and for proof study the four Gospel accounts and note the series of events.

- 1) In John 19:19 Pilate wrote a title written in Hebrew, Greek, Latin and being Roman, Latin would best describe who he was. The Latin reads Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum which is Jesus the Nazarene Ruler of the Judaeans which far from making him a Judaeans establishes him as a Nazarene which is obviously not a Judaeans.
- 2) The argument between the chief priests and Pilate concerning what had been written –(John 19:21&22). The original writing and argument took place before the parting of the Lords garments (John 19:23) and although John does not record the results of the controversy Matthew picks up the story and relates, they set up His title after they had parted his garments – a title which had removed his identity as a Nazarene. There are no details that this title was written in 3 languages.
- 3) If the inscription contained only one language as suggested by Matthews account there could be repercussions from Pilate and so a third inscription appeared and it will be noted that this took place at about the sixth hour when darkness fell and this inscription was written in Greek Latin and Hebrew – in the reverse order to what Pilate had written it. The investigator would not notice the change in order of language or that the Nazarene identity of Jesus had been removed.

If Christ was to come now He would be hounded as a "racist" – 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt 15:24). He would be castigated as anti-Semitic – Ye (the Jews) are of your father the devil (John 8:44) and He would be accused of violating Human Rights by limiting His disciples activity to ONE PEOPLE alone "(Matt 10:6)